

**BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL
AT TIMARU**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act
1991 ("**the Act**")

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991
AND

IN THE MATTER of the hearing of submissions on The
Proposed Timaru District Plan

Hearing Stream B: Rural

STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE BY VANCE ANDREW HODGSON

FOR THE NEW ZEALAND PORK INDUSTRY BOARD

5 JULY 2024

CONTENTS

SUMMARY STATEMENT	3
QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE	3
SCOPE OF EVIDENCE.....	4
REVERSE SENSITIVITY AND SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES	5
RULE GRUZ-R20 PERMANENT WORKERS' ACCOMMODATION.....	11
INTENSIVE AND EXTENSIVE PRIMARY PRODUCTION	13
APPENDIX 1 – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO PLAN CHANGE PROVISIONS.....	18

SUMMARY STATEMENT

1. This planning evidence addresses the New Zealand Pork Industry Board ("**NZPork**") submission on the Timaru District Council's ("**TDC**") s42A Report response to the submissions on the Proposed Timaru District Plan ("**PDP**"), Hearing Stream B: Rural.
2. The submissions cover a number of provisions, but I have been asked to provide planning evidence on the topics: reverse sensitivity and sensitive activities, intensive and extensive primary production, and permanent workers accommodation.
3. My suggested amendments to the provisions of the PDP as they relate to those topics are included by provision, in Appendix 1.
4. I support the recognition in the proposed plan of the need to protect primary production from reverse-sensitivity effects in the GRUZ. However, amendments are needed to ensure a clear, consistent and effective approach to managing reverse-sensitivity.
5. In particular, I recommend that if the activity status remains permitted for sensitive activities, then GRUZ-S4(2) should be amended such that it applies a 20m setback to a new building for a sensitive activity *and* to the establishment of a sensitive activity within an existing residential unit.
6. I support the clear definition structure for intensive primary production and recommend provision is made for mobile pig shelters that support extensive pig farming activity.
7. In my view, worker's accommodation should be provided for in the GRUZ as recommended in the s42A report to support primary production and achieve the outcomes sought by the proposed plan.

QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

8. My full name is Vance Andrew Hodgson. I am a director of HPC Ltd, a resource management consultancy based in Waiuku. I have been employed in resource management related positions in local government and the private sector since 1994 and have been in private practice for 20 years. I

hold a Bachelor of Resource and Environmental Planning (Hons) degree from Massey University.

9. I have worked in the public sector, where I was employed in student, assistant, and senior policy planning roles by the Franklin District Council. I have provided resource management consultancy services to various district and regional councils. The scope of work for the public sector has been broad, covering plan change processes, submissions to national standards/regulations/policy statements and regulatory matters, mediation, and appeals.
10. In private practice I regularly advise a range of private clients on statutory planning documents and prepare land use, subdivision, coastal permit, water permit and discharge permit resource consent applications. I have experience in resource consent applications, hearings and appeals on a range of activities, particularly for activities in the rural environment. I have provided independent resource management advice to NZPork on policy matters across New Zealand since 2013.
11. While these are not proceedings in the Environment Court, I consider the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses relevant, and I agree to comply with it. My qualifications as an expert are set out above. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise, except where I state I am relying on what I have been told by another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

12. This evidence provides a planning assessment of those provisions on which NZPork submitted and addresses the Section 42A Report, prepared by Timaru District Council for Hearing Stream B: Rural.
13. The submissions focused on the provisions for the rural zones and seek to ensure the provisions enable and support the ongoing primary production activities of pig farming in the district, recognising existing activities and making provision for growth and land use change.

14. I did not prepare the submissions for NZPork but have been asked to present planning evidence on the following matters:
- Reverse Sensitivity and Sensitive Activities
 - Permanent Workers Accommodation
 - Intensive and Extensive Pig Farming
15. I note for the panel that I have also been asked to prepare planning evidence for Horticulture New Zealand on overlapping submissions concerning reverse sensitivity and sensitive activities and permanent workers accommodation. There is therefore some repetition across the two statements of evidence on these matters.
16. My evidence includes recommended amendments to the plan change provisions where appropriate. Appendix 1 includes a list of my suggested amendments to the plan change by provision order for ease of reference.
17. For the submissions of NZPork, I rely on the evidence provided by Hannah Ritchie the Environmental and Planning Manager for NZ Pork.

REVERSE SENSITIVITY AND SENSITIVE ACTIVITIES

Defining a 'Sensitive Activity'

18. Sensitive activity is defined in the PDP as follows:

means:

1. *Residential activities*;
2. *Education facilities and preschools*;
3. *Guest & visitor accommodation*;
4. *Health care facilities* which include accommodation for overnight care;
5. *Hospitals*;
6. *Marae (building only)*; or
7. *Place of assembly*.

except that:

- a. *subclause f. above is not applicable in relation to electronic transmission.*

b. subclause g. above is not applicable in relation to noise or electronic transmission.

19. Where interpretation is important in understanding the outcome sought by an objective or policy and in determining the activity status of a rule, the definition must be clear. The PDP definition accords with my experience with activities that can be sensitive to the effects of primary production.

GRUZ-R7 Educational Facilities

GRUZ-R8 Supported Residential Care Activity

GRUZ-R9 Residential Visitor Accommodation

20. Rules GRUZ-R7, GRUZ-R8 and GRUZ-R9 provide a permitted activity pathway for defined sensitive activities¹ where minimum standards are met.
21. All activities require that the activity to be contained within and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit. In addition, particular standards apply as follows:
- A permitted education facility must be for childcare or home schooling with a maximum number of children of six excluding those that live onsite.
 - A permitted supported residential care activity must have a maximum occupancy not exceeding six residents, not including any staff.
 - A permitted residential visitor accommodation has a maximum occupancy of six guests per night.
22. Both HortNZ² and NZPork³ sought a change in activity status for these activities on the basis that they are potentially sensitive to the effects of primary production and best managed through a consent process (restricted discretionary).

¹ Proposed Timaru District Plan. s42A Report: Overarching matters Proposed Timaru District Plan: Part 1 - Introduction and General Definitions: Paragraphs 220-225

² 245.125, 245.126, 247.127

³ 247.26, 247.27, 247.28

23. I do not take the same comfort as the s42A report writer⁴ who is of the opinion that the introduction of these activities within the existing principal residential unit will not increase the sensitivity of the activity to the effects of primary production to such an extent that it would warrant the need for a consent application.
24. If primary production is to be protected from sensitive activities (GRUZ-03) or indeed the effects of reverse sensitivity as per the change recommended by the s42 report writer to this objective⁵, then it is my opinion that these defined sensitive activities should be subject to greater controls.
25. The expectations of those undertaking or enjoying these activities might conflict with primary production. In the case of parents looking at rural based educational options this might conflict with the smells, sights, noise and vehicle movements of primary production. The same conflict is possible between supported residential care activity and residential visitor accommodation that might have looked to leverage from a perception of rural character and amenity that might be quite different from the reality of the GRUZ, which has a purpose set out in GRUZ-O1 that aligns with the zone name and description prescribed in the Zone Framework Standards of the National Planning Standards⁶.
26. The controls on the maximum number of participants for each activity, is a useful method but still brings a gathering of people (children and parents, those needing care and visitors) into an existing dwelling that might be adjacent an existing farm and create new or compound conflict and complaints.
27. The evidence of Hannah Ritchie highlights a situation of conflict in another Canterbury district.
28. Physical separation from key primary production activities is an additional method that can be used and aligns with GRUZ-P5. It is a method applied through GRUZ-S4 to other permitted sensitive activities including new residential units. It

⁴ Proposed Timaru District Plan. s42A Report: Rural Zones: Paragraph 10.19.3. 0.20.3. 10.21.4

⁵ Proposed Timaru District Plan. s42A Report: Rural Zones: Paragraph 10.4.18

⁶ *General Rural Zone: Areas used predominantly for primary production activities, including intensive indoor primary production. The zone may also be used for a range of activities that support primary production activities, including associated rural industry, and other activities that require a rural location.* Ministry for the Environment. November 2019. National Planning Standards Table 13: Zone names and descriptions

is also applied through GRUZ-S5 to new intensive primary production activities and new farm effluent disposal areas.

29. The s42A author recommendation is that if the Hearing Panel did consider the separation of these activities and primary production was required, a better approach would be to require them to meet permitted standard GRUZ-S5 to ensure they are setback from intensive primary production activities, farm effluent disposal areas, and a lawfully established quarries or mines.
30. I agree with the recommendation but assume the reference should be to GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for Sensitive Activities.
31. I do not consider the sensitivity of these activities would be similar to that of a residential activity. As previously expressed, I consider these activities could potentially bring children and parents, those needing care and visitors, with different amenity expectations into the rural environment than those of existing residents that might otherwise accept primary production as part of the character and amenity of this environment.
32. If GRUZ-S4 is applied to these activities, then the following standards would apply to the change of land use of the existing residential unit:
 1. No new sensitive activity may be established within 500m from:
 - a. the closest outer edge of any paddocks, hard-stand areas, structures or buildings used to house stock, or treatment systems, used for an intensive primary production activity; and
 - b. an existing farm effluent disposal area; and
 - c. a lawfully established quarry or mine.
 2. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m from any other site boundary in a different ownership where a primary production activity is being conducted, unless the site existed prior to 22 September 2022, in which case a 10m setback applies;
 3. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m of an existing shelter belt.
33. My preference is as per the HortNZ and NZPork submissions that these activities have a restricted discretionary status

with matters of discussion covering reverse sensitivity, cumulative effects and mitigations that might be provided to address the effect. E.g.

The potential for reverse sensitivity effects to arise on primary production in the surrounding environment, including any cumulative reverse sensitivity effects arising due to the establishment of additional sensitive activities and any mitigations;

34. However, if GRUZ-S4 is applied as a permitted activity standard I note that while GRUZ-S4(1) is helpful in the context of intensive primary production, GRUZ-S4(2) is not applicable as it applies to new buildings and not existing residential units within which these activities are required to establish.
35. If the activity status is to remain permitted for sensitive activities, it is my recommendation that consideration is given to amending the setback standards of GRUZ-S4(2) such that it applies to a new building for a sensitive activity *and* to the establishment of a sensitive activity in an existing residential unit.
36. As proposed, GRUZ-S4(2) is nuanced to apply a 10m boundary setback for new buildings for sensitive activities on sites existing prior to 22 September 2022 and a 20m setback for those created after that date.
37. The submission of HortNZ [245.130] seeks that this is amended such that a 20m setback applies to all sites. I support that submission and recommend GRUZ-S4(2) is amended to capture the above as follows:

GRUZ-S4

2. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected, and no new sensitive activity may be established in an existing residential unit, within 20m from any other site boundary in a different ownership where a primary production activity is being conducted, ~~unless the site existed prior to 22 September 2022, in which case a 10m setback applies;~~

38. Setbacks are a blunt but effective method and I appreciate that where setbacks change through plan reviews there can be an effect on the land use and development aspirations

of landowners. However, the setback of concern here is in regard to separating activities that can and do conflict and it is not clear to me why it is appropriate to nuance the setback if 20m is determined to be the most effective distance. I note this is not the style of GRUZ-S4(1) which applies a setback for new sensitive activities from intensive primary production and other activities, with no site date qualifiers.

39. I consider the amendments I propose would provide greater clarity as to how reverse sensitivity effects on primary production activities are to be managed, enabling the efficient use and development of the GRUZ as required by Section 7(b). In addition, these amendments assist in enabling maintenance and enhancement the amenity of sensitive activities as required by Section 7(c) of the RMA. The amendments assist with achieving the purpose of the zone as express through GRUZ-O1, protecting primary production from reverse sensitivity effects as express through GRUZ-O3, and the amenity outcomes sought for sensitive activities as they exist and are able to assimilate into the environment described in GRUZ-O2(2), *being a working environment of mostly utilitarian buildings and structures and machinery where primary production generates noise, odour, light overspill and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonable basis.*

GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities

40. The submission of HortNZ [245.114] and NZPork [247.29] also sought a restricted discretionary activity status for recreational activities (GRUZ-R11) on the basis this is also an activity sensitive to the effects of primary production. I note this is not a sensitive activity by definition.
41. Where it involves organised sports, the setbacks prescribed in GRUZ-S4 are a permitted activity performance standard. This highlights the sensitivity of the activity, irrespective of it falling outside of the definition.
42. The s42A recommendation is to amend GRUZ-R11 to enable as a permitted activity, commercial recreational activities that are undertaken outdoors and involve less than 15 people.
43. These activities have a permitted activity status where they meet the following definition:

means the use of land, water bodies and/or buildings for the purpose of the active or passive enjoyment of organised sports (excluding motorsport), recreation or leisure, whether competitive or non-competitive, and whether a charge is made for admission or not.

44. I see this activity an uneasy fit in the rural zones and an area where conflict with primary production is likely. Those conflicts extend to animal welfare, biosecurity, safety, noise, fires, fireworks, people, traffic. This is an activity that could introduce people into the rural environment seeking active or passive recreational enjoyment and that expectation could clash with a primary production activity.
45. Applying a sensitive activity setback provides a layer of control but in this case only for organised sports. As per other defined sensitive activities discuss above, I consider the activity should be subject to consenting where the appropriateness of the activity could be considered on its merits and where conditions of consent might need to be imposed to manage effects.
46. My review of the GRUZ objective and policy suite is that it does not fall to support a permitted activity status for all recreational activities with the definition proposed. The focus is on ensuring primary production activities are enabled and not limited or constrained by other activities. A recreational activity adjoining primary production could have that affect.
47. If the permitted activity status is to remain it is my opinion that the broad suite of setbacks prescribed in GRUZ-S4 should apply to all recreation activities (and as proposed to be amended in this evidence).

RULE GRUZ-R20 PERMANENT WORKERS' ACCOMMODATION

48. Policy GRUZ-P9 and Rule GRUZ-R20 provides for permanent worker accommodation.
49. Both NZPork [247.30] and HortNZ [245.122] supported these provisions but raised concern with the site area thresholds.
50. The s42A recommendation is to lower the threshold from 80ha to 40ha. I support the recommendation and also note that the framework enables the consideration of workers accommodation on sites smaller than 40ha via a consenting pathway.

51. Addressing the issue of need, I refer to the industry evidence of both NZPork and HortNZ that show this is an ancillary activity that typically supports primary production. A 40ha unit size brings the threshold more closely to the site sizes used to support pig farming and likely closer to some horticultural units
52. For the pig farming sector, the need largely relates to the volume of work and animal husbandry requirements. Having workers live onsite ensures 24hour availability of staff, minimises the animal welfare risks, and inefficiency associated with an employee living offsite. As is the case with many farm workers situations, it is reasonable to expect there may be an associated household of partners and children.
53. For the horticultural sector, the need can vary from permanent to seasonal employee requirements and a range of accommodation styles. Workers can live offsite but there are production efficiencies and advantages in providing accommodation on the site of production activity.
54. The PDP is a plan for current and future land use with GRUZ-O1 clearly establishing the important place for primary production and those activities that directly support primary production in the district's future. This is a worthy objective.
55. I note there are drivers for change that support a transition within the primary production sector to improve efficiency, sustainability, and the drive to lower emissions. This trend is occurring internationally as consumers across the world demand higher requirements in areas like sustainability, climate change, food traceability and animal welfare practices.
56. I understand from information provided by NZPork, that pig farming is potentially an option in mixed farming systems for farmers wanting to reduce their biogenic methane emissions without losing production.
57. I understand from HortNZ that diversification to horticulture presents an opportunity to reduce emissions while increasing food production and that the drivers and conditions for growth in Horticulture exist in the district. In my opinion achieving GRUZ-O1 and providing flexibility for land use change, leads to a need to ensure district plans methods support all aspects of the primary production systems and

supporting activities. Workers' accommodation is a necessary supporting activity.

58. The provision for workers' accommodation has the potential to undermine the residential density standards set in the plan change if that accommodation is not used for intended purpose or becomes surplus to requirements and is subdivided and sold as a principal residential unit. This could then effectively introduce more sensitive activities into the rural environment and not achieve the purpose of the Act or the objectives of the rural zone.
59. In the PDP, the rules and assessment are structured to avoid this outcome and I support the provisions.

INTENSIVE AND EXTENSIVE PRIMARY PRODUCTION

60. My experience with various district and regional plan change processes in recent years is that resource management responses to intensive primary production activity are changing to provide more clarity for plan interpretation and administration, and to manage associated environmental effects.
61. Plan consistency is developing and there has been a need for change. Plans have moved past unrepresentative and emotive definitions like factory farming for various intensive primary production activities. As described by Ms Ritchie for NZPork, I also understand that there is a difference in activity and effect from intensive indoor and outdoor pig farming activity and that it is helpful in plans to define and provide provisions for both.
62. The developing approach has largely been driven out of Canterbury which is the key pork production region of New Zealand; where a variety of intensive primary production activity occurs, along with outdoor extensive farming systems.
63. Reflective of New Zealand pig farming practice, the structure I see developing in planning frameworks generally nests as follows:

Primary Production	Intensive Primary Production	Intensive Indoor Primary Production

		Intensive Outdoor Primary Production (Pig Farming)
	Extensive pig farming	

64. I explain the structure as follows:

Primary Production

65. Primary Production is defined in the National Planning Standards 2019.

Primary Production means:

(a) any aquaculture, agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, mining, quarrying or forestry activities; and

(b) includes initial processing, as an ancillary activity, of commodities that result from the listed activities in a);

(c) includes any land and buildings used for the production of the commodities from a) and used for the initial processing of the commodities in b); but

(d) excludes further processing of those commodities into a different product.

Intensive Primary Production

66. Intensive Primary Production is then a subset of Primary Production to provide a nesting pathway to Intensive Indoor and Intensive Outdoor activity.

Intensive Indoor Primary Production

67. Intensive Indoor Primary Production is defined in the National Planning Standards 2019.

Intensive Indoor Primary Production means:

primary production activities that principally occur within buildings and involve growing fungi or keeping or rearing livestock (excluding calf-rearing for three months in any calendar year) or poultry.

Intensive Outdoor Primary Production

68. Intensive Outdoor Primary Production is not defined in the National Planning Standards 2019 and for pig farming it is important to do so to ensure reverse sensitivity protections are in place.
69. Intensive Outdoor Primary Production (Pig Farming) relies on the outdoor environment to assist with the growth and husbandry of animals along with buildings and enclosures to contain and house animals. However, this Primary Production activity does not *principally occur within buildings* and falls outside of the definition of Intensive Indoor Primary Production.
70. Intensive Outdoor Primary Production (Pig Farming) is an intensive activity. It would typically rely on regular feed source for the livestock substantially provided from off-site sources rather than the productive capacity of the land to produce grass and animal food crops. Another characteristic of Intensive Outdoor Primary Production, largely resulting from the import of feed and stock density, can be difficulty in maintaining pasture and groundcover.

Extensive pig farming

71. Extensive pig farming is livestock farming as it is traditionally recognised, outdoors, grass and feed crop fed animals, some imported feed, animal shelters and stocking rates that maintain ground cover.
72. In pig farming, the shelters are often mobile to assist with maintaining pasture and groundcover, and as part of rotational grazing or arable rotation.
73. From a land use perspective, the effects are the same as that of other extensive livestock farming (sheep, beef, lamb, dairy, deer). It does not need the same reverse sensitivity protections as intensive primary production.
74. Providing a definition around this activity can assist plan interpretation and administration. The Canterbury Regional Air Plan does this (to distinguish from intensive primary production and to clarify permitted activity status under that plan).

Canterbury Air Regional Plan Te mahere ā-rohe mō te hau o Waitaha October 2017

4 Definitions and Interpretation

Intensive pig farming

means the keeping, rearing or breeding for any purpose of more than 25 pigs that have been weaned, or more than six sows, where the predominant productive processes are carried out within buildings or closely fenced outdoor runs or where the stocking density precludes the permanent maintenance of vegetation cover but excludes extensive pig farming.

Extensive pig farming

means the keeping of pigs outdoors on land at a stock density which ensures permanent vegetation cover is maintained and in accordance with any relevant industry codes of practice, and where no fixed buildings are used for the continuous housing of animals.

75. The submission of NZPork suggested the definition might also assist interpretation and administration of the PDP. As I read the definition suite, the activity would fall within the definition of Primary Production and is not required. This is pastoral farming of livestock where grass cover is maintained, and supplementary feed produced within the site and/or imported as is the case with other pastoral activities.
76. Hannah Ritchie sets out the industry developed guidelines for maintaining permanent pasture or ground cover and provides evidence on the adoption and effectiveness of good management practice as a code of practice for the pork industry. As I understand it, the maintenance of permanent pasture or ground cover is a critical qualifier that supports the broader sustainability outcomes the industry seeks and directly responds to the actual or potential effects of pig farming.

Mobile pig Shelters

77. As identified in the evidence of Ms Ritchie, the submission of NZPork [247.31] sought the exclusion of movable pig shelters including farrowing huts less than 30m² in area and less than 2m in height from the setbacks for buildings and structures prescribed in GRUZ-S3.
78. On review NZPork have confirmed that the 10m setback in GRUZ-S3 is workable for the sector for these mobile structures

but note an issue with the s42A recommended amendment to GRUZ-R1⁷ to include a 100m setback for milking sheds and buildings used to house or feed stock from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership.

79. I understand from the evidence of NZPork that movable pig shelters are typical of outdoor pig farming activity (particularly in the Canterbury Region) and required to meet animal welfare requirements.
80. The necessary mobile nature of these structures means that effects on the environment are temporary.
81. The s42A recommendation to NZPork [247.31] was to reject⁸ the submission on the basis that a 30m² mobile pig shelter may affect the amenity of the GRUZ. I disagree and consider buildings and structures that support primary production part of the character and amenity of the GRUZ. As identified by Ms Ritchie, if the s42A recommended change to GRUZ-R1 is adopted, it is suggested that an exclusion is provided for moveable pig shelters, including farrowing huts 10m² in area and less than 2m in height as the case in the Selwyn District in the context of building coverage limitations.

⁷ Proposed Timaru District Plan. s42A Report: Rural Zones: Paragraph 10.15.6

⁸ Proposed Timaru District Plan. s42A Report: Rural Zones: Paragraph 10.36.7

APPENDIX 1 – PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO PLAN CHANGE PROVISIONS

The provisions in the Proposed Timaru District Plan are shown in **green text** with amendments as recommended in the S42A Report are shown in **strikeout** and **blue italics**. Amendments recommended in this evidence are shown with deleted text is shown as **strikeout** and new text as **underlined in black**.

Provision	Proposed Plan including amendments in S42A Report	As Recommended in this Evidence
GRUZ-R1 Primary production and intensive primary production, not otherwise listed in this chapter	<p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>PER-1 The activity does not include any offensive trade; and</p> <p>PER-2 GRUZ-S5 is complied with; and</p> <p>PER-3 For grazing of stock within 50m of a residential unit under different ownership located in the Māori Purpose Zone, permanent ground cover of no less than 90% must be maintained, except during crop renewal or resowing.</p> <p>PER-4 For milking sheds and buildings used to house or feed stock are located at least: 1. 200m from any land in the Māori Purpose Zone, Settlement Zone and Residential Zones.; and <u>2. 100m from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership.</u></p> <p>Note: any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	<p>Activity status: Permitted</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>PER-1 The activity does not include any offensive trade; and</p> <p>PER-2 GRUZ-S5 is complied with; and</p> <p>PER-3 For grazing of stock within 50m of a residential unit under different ownership located in the Māori Purpose Zone, permanent ground cover of no less than 90% must be maintained, except during crop renewal or resowing.</p> <p>PER-4 For milking sheds and buildings used to house or feed stock <u>(excluding mobile pig shelters and farrowing huts less than 10m² in area and less than 2m in height)</u> are located at least: 1. 200m from any land in the Māori Purpose Zone, Settlement Zone and Residential Zones.; and <u>2. 100m from the notional boundary of an existing sensitive activity on a separate site under different ownership.</u></p>

		Note: any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.
GRUZ-R7 Educational facilities	<p>Activity status: Permitted Where PER-1</p> <p>The activity is undertaken within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit; and</p> <p>PER-2 The education facility is for a childcare service, or home schooling; and</p> <p>PER-3 The maximum number of children attending at any one time is six, excluding any children who live there.; <u>and</u></p> <p><u>PER-4</u> <u>All the Standards of this chapter are complied with</u></p>	<p>Activity status: Permitted Where PER-1</p> <p>The activity is undertaken within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit; and</p> <p>PER-2 The education facility is for a childcare service, or home schooling; and</p> <p>PER-3 The maximum number of children attending at any one time is six, excluding any children who live there; <u>and</u></p> <p><u>PER-4</u> <u>All the Standards of this chapter are complied with</u> <u>and</u></p> <p><u>PER-5</u> <u>The education facility complies with GRUZ-S4.</u></p>
GRUZ-R8 Supported residential care activity	<p>Activity status: Permitted Where</p> <p>PER-1 The supported residential care activity is within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit; and</p> <p>PER-2 The maximum occupancy does not exceed six residents, not including any staff.</p>	<p>Activity status: Permitted Where</p> <p>PER-1 The supported residential care activity is within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit; and</p> <p>PER-2 The maximum occupancy does not exceed six residents, not including any staff. <u>and</u></p>

		<p>PER-3 The supported residential care activity complies with GRUZ-S4.</p>
<p>GRUZ-R9 Residential visitor accommodation</p>	<p>Activity status: Permitted Where</p> <p>PER-1 The visitor accommodation is contained within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit; and</p> <p>PER-2 The maximum occupancy is six guests per night.</p>	<p>Activity status: Permitted Where</p> <p>PER-1 The visitor accommodation is contained within, and ancillary to the use of, an existing principal residential unit; and</p> <p>PER-2 The maximum occupancy is six guests per night. <u>and</u></p> <p>PER-3 The visitor accommodation complies with GRUZ-S4.</p>
<p>GRUZ-R11 Recreation activities</p>	<p>Activity status: Permitted Where</p> <p>PER-1 The activity is not operated as a commercial activity; and</p> <p><u>PER-1A</u> <u>Notwithstanding PER-1 above, any commercial recreation activity that is undertaken outdoors and involves less than 15 people</u></p> <p>PER-2 Any organised sports comply with GRUZS4, 'sensitive activity' in this standard should be read as 'organised sports'.; <u>and</u></p> <p>Note: any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>	<p>Activity status: Permitted Where</p> <p>PER-1 The activity is not operated as a commercial activity; and</p> <p><u>PER-1A</u> <u>Notwithstanding PER-1 above, any commercial recreation activity that is undertaken outdoors and involves less than 15 people</u></p> <p>PER-2 Any organised sports <u>Recreation activities</u> comply with GRUZ-S4; 'sensitive activity' in this standard should be read as 'organised sports'.; and</p> <p>Note: any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13.</p>

<p>GRUZ-S4 Setbacks for Sensitive Activities</p>	<p>1. No new sensitive activity may be established within 500m from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the closest outer edge of any paddocks, hard-stand areas, structures or buildings used to house stock, or treatment systems, used for an intensive primary production activity; and b. an existing farm effluent disposal area; and c. a lawfully established quarry or mine. <p>2. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m from any other site boundary in a different ownership where a primary production activity is being conducted, unless the site existed prior to 22 September 2022, in which case a 10m setback applies;</p> <p>3. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m of an existing shelter belt.</p> <p><u>4. No new sensitive activity may be established within xxm from the boundary of any area used for the discharge of industrial trade waste at Fonterra Clandeboye site.</u></p> <p>Except that these setbacks do not apply to a new sensitive activity being established within the same site on which a lawfully established: intensive primary production activity; effluent disposal; quarry or mine; is located.</p> <p>Note: The Canterbury Regional Council regulates the discharge of contaminants into air from animal effluent in the Canterbury Air Regional Plan.</p>	<p>1. No new sensitive activity may be established within 500m from:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the closest outer edge of any paddocks, hard-stand areas, structures or buildings used to house stock, or treatment systems, used for an intensive primary production activity; and b. an existing farm effluent disposal area; and c. a lawfully established quarry or mine. <p>2. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected, and no new sensitive activity may be established in an existing residential unit, within 20m from any other site boundary in a different ownership where a primary production activity is being conducted, unless the site existed prior to 22 September 2022, in which case a 10m setback applies;"</p> <p>3. No new building for a sensitive activity may be erected within 20m of an existing shelter belt.</p> <p><u>4. No new sensitive activity may be established within xxm from the boundary of any area used for the discharge of industrial trade waste at Fonterra Clandeboye site.</u></p> <p>Except that these setbacks do not apply to a new sensitive activity being established within the same site on which a lawfully established: intensive primary production activity; effluent disposal; quarry or mine; is located.</p> <p>Note: The Canterbury Regional Council regulates the discharge of contaminants into air from animal effluent in the Canterbury Air Regional Plan.</p>
---	---	---

