

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
Oakland Farming Ltd	S153.001	SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM-O1	Oppose	Concerned that a broad approach creates uncertainty as to what activities will require consultation with mana whenua. Need for iwi consulting in everyday farm tasks will hinder farming operations.	~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae withing Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are offered appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use.SASM should be identified and mapped in the planning maps.
Oakland Farming Ltd	S153.002	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Wording should reflect the NPSIB and to be clear SNAs should be identified.	Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna ~~(Significant Natural Areas).~~ through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.
Oakland Farming Ltd	S153.003	EW - Earthworks	EW-S3	Oppose	Earthworks relating to fencing activities for stock exclusion should be exempt from these requirements.	Setbacks from rivers and streams1. Earthworks (excluding where required for fencing for stock exclusion) shall be setback the minimum distance from the top of the closest bank of a river or stream as follows:(a) 20m for high order rivers or streams (order 5 and above);(b) 10m for middle order rivers or streams (order 3 and 4); and (c) 5m for low order rivers or streams (order 1 or 2).
Oakland Farming Ltd	S153.004	EW - Earthworks	EW-R1	Oppose	Fencing is a small scale land disturbance and should not be so restrictive and the rule is inconsistent with the NFL chapter. The restrictions do not provide for sufficient space to access fences for inspections and maintenance.	Land disturbance for the construction of fencesActivity status: Permitted Where: ~~1. Any land disturbance does not exceed:(a) 1 metre in width for more than 10 metres in any 100metre length; and/or(b) 1 metre in height or depth; and2. the ground is reinstated to original levels within 48 hours of work being completed.~~
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.001	Interpretation	critical infrastructure	Support in part	Requests the Telecommunications Act 2001 definition of telecommunication be added to the definition of critical infrastructure.	Include telecommunications as a defined term as 'telecommunications as means the conveyance by electromagnetic means from one device to another of any encrypted or non-encrypted sign, signal, impulse, writing, image, sound, instruction, information, or intelligence of any nature, whether for the information of any person using the device or not'.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.002	Interpretation	functional need	Support	The definition of functional need is supported.	Retain as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.003	Interpretation	infrastructure	Support	The definition of infrastructure is supported.	Retain as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.004	Interpretation	network utilities	Support	Definition of network utilities is supported..	Retain as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.005	Interpretation	network utility operator	Support	Definition of network utility operator is supported	Retain as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.006	Interpretation	operational need	Support	The definition of 'Operational Need is supported	Retain as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.007	Interpretation	reverse sensitivity	Support	The definition of reverse sensitivity is supported	Retain as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.008	Interpretation	Definitions	Support in part	A definition of mast is needed to understand how it is different from a pole	Add a definition for Mast
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.009	Interpretation	Definitions	Support in part	Rule INFR-R3 refers to support poles and Rule INFRR4 refers to support structures. A definition of each, or a rationalization between the two terms is necessary to understand what they mean	Provide a definition for support poles and support structures
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.010	Interpretation	Definitions	Support in part	Telecommunications terms in the PDP defined under the RMA (being the NESTF). It needs to made clear that the PDP adopts the same definition.	Cross reference to NESTF or provide definitions for Ancillary Equipment, Antenna, Cabinet, Pole and Small Cell Unit
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.011	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-Overview	Support in part	For consistency between what para. 2 states infrastructure is and the definition in the PDP	In the second paragraph, update the word communication to telecommunication and radio communication.

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.012	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-Overview	Support in part	Unclear how rules in the infrastructure chapter are to be applied. Under the NPS 'all provisions relating to...infrastructure that are not specific to the special purpose zone chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport Heading'	Add a paragraph explaining how the infrastructure chapter interacts with other chapters of the DP noting that it is a standalone chapter and there are no rules in any other chapter which apply to the activities regulated under the INFR chapter.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.013	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-O1	Oppose in part	The scope of INFR-O1 should be widened to fully recognize what critical infrastructure needs to achieve.	Amend INFR-O1 as follows: ~~The operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of infrastructure is provided to meet the needs of the community and businesses.~~ Critical infrastructure: 1. is efficient, effective and resilient; 2. provides and distributes essential and secure services as part of local, regional or national networks, including in emergencies; 3. coordinates with urban development and land uses throughout the district; and 4. enables people and communities to provide for their wellbeing.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.014	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-O2	Support in part	The proposed amendments to INFR-O1 result in INFR-O2 being superfluous and Gore District Subdivision and Land Development Bylaw 2019 does not need to be referenced in an objective, as it is not referenced in any subsequent rules or standards which is where its implementation could actually be followed.	Delete INFR-O2
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.015	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-O3	Support in part	INFR-O3 is clearly directed at reverse sensitivity. The objective should be rewritten to specifically state reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend INFR-O3 as follows: ~~Infrastructure or land reserved for future infrastructure is protected from adverse effects of subdivision, use and development that is incompatible or may compromise the construction, maintenance, upgrade and use of infrastructure.~~ The safe and efficient operation and security of critical infrastructure is not compromised by incompatible activities and reverse sensitivity effects.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.016	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-O4	Support in part	It is appropriate that the adverse effects of critical infrastructure are managed, but such management needs to be done in the context of the needs for the critical infrastructure.	Amend INF-O4 as follows: ~~Adverse effects from the construction, maintenance, upgrade and use of critical infrastructure are managed.~~ The functional and operational needs of critical infrastructure are taken into account when managing any adverse effects of its location, design and operation on the natural and physical environment
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.017	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-P1	Support	INFR-P1 clearly enables infrastructure	Retain INFR-P1 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.018	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-P2	Support	INFR-P2 provides direction for infrastructure to be located underground but recognizes the practicalities that some infrastructure must be located above ground for functional and operational reasons.	Retain INFR-P2 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.019	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-P4	Support	The telecommunications industry looks for colocation opportunities wherever practicable. A policy encouraging the same is welcomed.	Retain INFR-P4 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.020	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-P5	Oppose	INFR-P5 appears to be a repeat of INFR-P3, with the addition of the phrase shared which has the same basic meaning as co-location. Two policies are not required.	Delete INFR-P5
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.021	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-P6	Support	INFR-P6 enhances INFR-O3, and is explicit in its reference to reverse sensitivity effects.	Retain INFR-P6 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.022	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-P7	Support in part	As with INFR-O4, it is appropriate that the adverse effects of critical infrastructure are managed, but such management needs to be done in the context of the needs for the critical infrastructure.	Amend INFR-P7 as follows: Manage the development of infrastructure, so that adverse effects on adjoining activities, sites, ecosystem health, and Ngāi Tahu cultural values are avoided, remedied or mitigated, recognising the functional need and operational need of critical infrastructure

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.023	INFR – Infrastruct ure	INFR-Overview	Oppose	In order to comply with NPS, it must be a standalone chapter. Noting the propsoed amendments to INFR9, the only other chapters which should be applicable to infrastructure are the subdivision and general district wide matters chapters in Part 2 of the plan. All other actual and potential effects of infrastructure are provided for within the Infrastructure chapter	Amend Note 1 as follows: The provisions in this chapter apply ~~in addition to the provisions of the other chapters in the District Plan and the plan should be read as a whole. This chapter also implements other chapters in the District Plan that do not have specific rules such as Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori and Mana Whenua.~~ on a district wide basis. As such the rules in the zone chapters do not apply. The provisions in the subdivision and General District Wide matters chapters in Part 2 of the District Plan are applicable.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.024	INFR – Infrastruct ure	INFR-R1	Support	INFR-R1 ia an appropriate rule for the development and management of underground infrastructure. While the rule is supported, it could be rewritten so that it is consistent with the terminology used in INFR-P2.	Retain INFR-R1 as notified with potential to rewrite to refer to 'underground infrastructure' rather than 'be;low ground'
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.025	INFR – Infrastruct ure	INFR-R2	Support	NFR-R2 provides absolute clarity that infrastructure placed within a building is permitted	Retain INFR-R2 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.026	INFR – Infrastruct ure	INFR-R3	Support in part	Increasing the replacement location distance to 10m allows for greater flexibility when elements such as driveways, potential contamination areas and so forth occur.	Amend INFR-R3(1)(d) as follows: maximum change in location of structure - ~~5m~~ 10m
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.027	INFR – Infrastruct ure	INFR-R4	Support	The replacement of existing support structures should be permitted for above ground infrastructure in urban zones. It should also be made clear that existing support structure should include buildings.	Amend INFR-R4(1) as follows: Other than where existing or replacement support structures (including buildings) are used, lines are to be located underground. Replacement support structures must meet the permitted provisions in INFR-R3(1), and compliance with all INFR Standards is achieved.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.028	INFR – Infrastruct ure	INFR-R5	Support	The consistency in standard and approach (including activity status) between INFR-R5 and regulation 55 of the NESTF is supported.	Retain INFR-R5 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.029	INFR – Infrastruct ure	INFR-R8	Support in part	Controlled Activity status should be afforded to those activities which are of sufficient size to not have significant adverse effects on the environment, meet the infrastructure standards in the PDP, but cannot meet the NESTF permitted regulations.	Amend INFR-R8 so that Controlled Activity status is afforded to the following activities and sizes: 1. for panel antenna a width of 0.8m is not exceeded; 2. for dish antenna, the antenna does not exceed a diameter of: a. 1.2m in a residential zone; or b. 3m in all other zones. 3 Any activity which does not meet the NESTF permitted regulations but otherwise complies with the INFR standards.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.030	INFR – Infrastruct ure	INFR-R9	Support in part	INFR-R9 should include all overlays so that there is no requirement for infrastructure applications to consider other chapters. Activity status should be made restricted discretionary, with matters of discretion being effect on the overlay the infrastructure is within, and the functional and operational needs of critical infrastructure. (in line with changes requested to INFR-04 and INFR-P7). Last, to provide consistency with NESTF Regulation 57, telecommunications should not have to meet this rule for natural hazards as they are accounted for in the Civil Defense Emergency Management Act 2001	Amend INFR-R9 so that the activity status in the specified areas is restricted discretionary not discretionary and add effects on the the matter listed in (a) to (d) as well as the the functional needs and operational needs of, and benefits derived from critical infrastructure, including the potential impact on the levels of service or health and safety if the work is not undertaken as matters of discretion. Further, an update is required to INFR-R9.1 to include the containinated land, hazardous substances, natural hazards (excluding telecommunications) ecosystems and indigenous boidiversity and public access chapters.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.031	INFR – Infrastruct ure	INFR-S1	Support in part	Identification of lines over waterbodies on planning maps is needed so it is apparent which waterbody the standard applies to and clarify how INFR-S1 and INFR-S5 interact.	Retain INFR-S1, but detail navigable waterbodies on the planning maps, and ensure that there is a clause in the standard which provides clarification for how INFR-S1 is to interact with INFR-S5.

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.032	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-S2	Support	It is noted INFR-S2 does not apply to poles and antennas.	Retain INFR-S2 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.033	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-S3	Support in part	By adding the words (excluding any lightning rod or GPS antenna) from the measurement of height provides alignment with the NESTF. The permitted heights should encourage co-location of telecommunication providers onto a single structure and to achieve this separation between the antennas, which is best achieved via height is needed in alignment with INFR-P4. The permitted height for one provider in the industrial zones is supported but due to large trees in the rural area greater height is sought to prevent blocking signal. Under INFR-S3.2, antenna which are attached to poles and masts need to have clearance above built structures to meet radiofrequency standards, and provide line of sight connection to end users for functional and operational requirements	Amend wording: The maximum height (excluding any lightning rod or GPS antenna) of any utility pole or mast shall be. INFR-S3.1 - 25m for one telecommunications provider and 30m for two or more telecommunications providers in the General Industrial Zone and Light Industrial Zone, 35m for one telecommunications provider and 40m for two or more telecommunications providers in the Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone. INFR-S3.2 so that the permitted height in all other zones is the underlying building height in the zone, plus 5m (for one telecommunication provider) and plus a further 5m if the facility provides for the co-location of two or more telecommunication providers.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.034	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-S4	Support	The exceptions to INFR-S4 are supported	Retain INFR-S4 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.035	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-S5	Support in part	INFR-S5 is supported, however it is currently unclear as to what the interaction between INFR-S1 and INFR-S5 is.	Ensure that there is a clause in the standard which provides clarification for how INFR-S5 is to interact with INFR-S1.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.036	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-S6	Support	INFR-S6 provides appropriate footprints for telecommunication infrastructure.	Retain INFR-S6 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.037	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-S7	Support in part	Some finessing of the rule is proposed to better reflect the different antenna types used in the telecommunication industry.	Amend INFR-S7 as follows: 1. That for panel antennas the maximum width is 0.7m, ~~and for all other dish antenna types the maximum surface area diameter~~ is no greater than 1.5m2 0.6m in the residential zones and 1.2m in all other zones and for whip and dipole antennas, the maximum length is ~~are~~ less than 4m in length. 2. For small cells and ancillary equipment the volume of the unit must not exceed 2.5m3.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.038	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-Additional provisions sought	Support in part	Temporary infrastructure is used when a) an event-with insufficient infrastructure for capacity expected b) construction activity requiring existing networks turned off c) fault or disaster Limiting temporary infrastructure to 12 months means that there is a time limit for any resultant environmental effects.	New rule permitting temporary network utilities. The only standard should be that the infrastructure must be removed within 12 months. The elevation can be to discretionary activity status
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.039	NH – Natural Hazards	NH-Additional provisions sought	Support in part	Activities regulated under the NESTF are exempt from having to comply with District Plan rules about natural hazards (Regulation 57), and confirmed by the NESTF user guide (section 6.11). It would be appropriate for the PDP to follow the same approach. The reason for the approach is due to industry practice. This practice is that the telecommunication companies rely on local authorities to identify hazards in their city or district, and the companies have resilience requirements as essential infrastructure networks and lifeline utilities under the Civil Defence Emergency	Add Note 3: Telecommunications infrastructure is exempt from having to comply with the provisions in this chapter

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Management Act 2002 (CDEMA) Resilience to natural hazards is provided by avoiding the hazard in the first instance, but where the hazard cannot be avoided for the infrastructure to provide its function, designing the infrastructure to be as resilient as possible to the hazard.	
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.040	HH – Historical Heritage	HH-P7	Oppose	Rule INFR-R	Delete HH-P7
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.041	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-O3	Support	SUB-O3 clearly sets out that infrastructure is integrated with the subdivision of land	Retain SUB-O3 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.042	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-P2	Support	Requiring provisions for infrastructure in new allotments is supported	Retain SUB-P2 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.043	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-P5	Support in part	Reverse sensitivity effects should be avoided, remedied or mitigated on all critical infrastructure to provide consistency.	Amend SUB-P5 as follows Ensure reverse sensitivity effects from subdivision on adjacent critical infrastructure and land use are avoided, remedied or mitigated or managed, ~~including from adjacent land uses, railway lines and State Highways.~~
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.044	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-P7	Support	SUB-P7.1 essentially requires consultation with infrastructure providers so that they can explain capacity matters to the applicant.	Retain SUB-P7 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.045	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-P9	Oppose	SUB-P9 is not necessary, as this matter is regulated under the Infrastructure chapter	Delete SUB-P9
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.046	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R5	Support in part	Restricted Discretionary activity status for subdivision which creates new allotments in all zones except the development areas, and having telecommunication servicing a matter of discretion is supported	Retain SUB-R5 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.047	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R6	Support	Restricted Discretionary activity status for subdivision which creates new allotments in the Gore South Development Area, and having telecommunication servicing a matter of discretion is supported	Retain SUB-R6 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.048	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-R7	Support	Restricted Discretionary activity status for subdivision which creates new allotments in the Gore West Development Area, and having telecommunication servicing a matter of discretion is supported.	Retain SUB-R7 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.049	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-Additional provisions sought	Support in part	Infrastructure allotments can have different demands from a subdivision perspective than zone based subdivision in any given area. Controlled activity subdivision for infrastructure is appropriate, with control to allow for actual and potential adverse effects on the environment to be addressed.	Add a new rule for subdivision for infrastructure purposes as follows: All Zones - Activity Status: Controlled. Subdivision to create any site to be used solely for the provision of infrastructure. Matters of Control 1 The location, size and design of allotments, building platforms, accessways, right of ways, vehicle crossings, open space and connections to the surrounding area; and 2 the ability to accommodate permitted and/or intended land uses; and 3 the response to the site's and surrounding areas natural and physical features, character, amenity, constraints and vegetation; and 4 measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects: of any natural hazards or other risks; and on any sensitive environments, waterbodies, ecosystems or notable trees; and on infrastructure; and on existing or permitted adjoining or adjacent land uses;
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.050	EW - Earthworks	EW-O1	Support	EW0-O1 appropriately sets out the requisite direction for earthworks	Retain EW-O1 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.051	EW - Earthworks	EW-P1	Support	Recognizing the benefits of earthworks for network utilities is supported.	Retain EW-P1 as notified

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.052	EW - Earthworks	EW-Exemptions	Support in part	As the infrastructure chapter encourages and permits underground infrastructure, trenching is required. Trenching is generally limited in extent, does not alter the ground level, and is backfilled as work progresses along lineal infrastructure. It has limited effects and should be exempted	Add trenching no deeper than 1.0m and wider than 1.0m for underground infrastructure, provided that no more than 120m of trench is open at any one time to the list of earthworks and land disturbance activities that are exempt from the rules in this chapter
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.053	EW - Earthworks	EW-R11	Support	The volumes and requirements of this rule are appropriate.	Retain EW-R11 as notified
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.054	EW - Earthworks	EW-S4	Oppose in part	Access tracks to telecommunication sites are often on steep land. 15 degrees is considered to restrictive. Wellington has slope angle of 34 degrees	Amend EW-S4 as follows: Earthworks shall not be undertaken on land with an existing slope angle exceeding ~~15~~ 34 degrees.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.055	National Direction Instruments	National Direction Instruments	Support	This section is important to help plan readers understand the relationship between the District Plan and NES.	Retain the National Environmental Standards subsection.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.056	UFD – Urban form and development	UFD-O1	Support	Appropriately recognises the need for development to be integrated with existing or new infrastructure.	Retain UFD-O1 as notified.
One New Zealand Group Limited	S32.057	UFD – Urban form and development	UFD-O7	Support	Appropriately recognises the need for new and existing infrastructure for well-functioning urban environments.	Retain UFD-O7 as notified.
PA & JE Johnstone Family Trust	S131.001	HH – Historical Heritage	HH-SCHED2-HH-81	Oppose	There is no demand for Commercial space in this part of Gore and limited commercial demand exists — even on the Main Streets of Gore. The building is not a significant Historic or Heritage building — Many alterations and additions have already been made. Significant other buildings of far greater historic value, and in much better commercial locations have been demolished over recent years. The location is residential, and not at all commercial. Any Engineering and Building costs to retore the building would be completely and utterly uneconomic to accomplish and would still result in a Commercial building for which there is no demand. Any attempt to re-purpose the building for possible residential use — would require all of the above virtual rebuild costs — plus the massive costs of conversion to a residential building with additional engineering, fire, safety, insulation, air conditioning and related costs, which would completely render the project totally uneconomic. Full letter attached.	Remove the building from the proposed list of HH sites.Would like sufficient time to speak at hearing and evidence from technical expert will be provided at hearing.
peter kempthorne	S25.001	Zone map layers	Water Supply Treatment Facility Buffer Area	Oppose in part	Buffer zone over neighbouring residential A zone land has a direct effect on our property and should have been consulted. No science about the distance of 50 metres.	Remove the 50 metre buffer zone

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
peter kempthorne	S25.002	AIRPZ – Airport Zone	AIRPZ-Overview and Purpose	Support	We welcome the Gore Airfield been included into the district plan	Include Gore Airfield Zone in the PDP
peter kempthorne	S25.003	GDC – Gore District Council	GDC-10	Oppose in part	Water treatment plant is where the second reservoir was to be built and a substandard aerator was put close the boundary.	Build the treatment plant so that it complies with limits on noise and visual rules
peter kempthorne	S25.004	GDC – Gore District Council	GDC-11	Oppose in part	Inconsistent protection of Hilbre Avenue Water Treatment Plans when compared with East Gore and Mataura	Place a buffer zone around Hilbre Ave treatment plant
peter kempthorne	S25.005	AIRPZ – Airport Zone	AIRPZ-Overview and Purpose	Oppose in part	Protect from unwarranted complaints about aircraft movements.	A 4km buffer zone over the Gore Airfield
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.001	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - General	Not Stated	The provisions of this chapter do not acknowledge working farms are present in the ONL area, which have existing use rights. This chapter is interpreted differently by various people.	To amend the provisions to acknowledge the continued presence of existing activities, particularly farming, within the ONL.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.002	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL-P1	Amend	NFL-P1.2 notes that the ONL contains working pastoral farms. The rules in the NFL and ECO section for SNA does not consider this aspect. The s32 report for the NFL Chapter states that the NFL policies acknowledge the importance of farming and maintenance of existing activities for the district, however the rules, objectives and policies in the District Plan do not acknowledge the importance of farming to the values of the ONL and the importance of maintaining existing farming activities in the district. It makes it difficult to interpret.	Amend NFL-P1.2. as follows: 2. Recognising ~~the~~ that working pastoral farms exist within the ONL and as such contribute to existence of working pastoral farms and their contribution to the openness and landform legibility of outstanding natural features and landscapes
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.003	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL-P4	Oppose	NFL-P4 should give weight to existing activities for example normal farming. practices.	Amend NFL-P4 to add: 4. In the Hokonui Hills ONL, whether the site is a working farm and the contribution this makes to the values of the Outstanding Natural Feature.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.004	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL-R1	Oppose	Restrictions for buildings/ structures for farming purposes are not practical. For example, sheep/ cattle yards would be too small at 30m2 in area. Only few buildings and structures would meet the permitted size limits and farm buildings are generally Zinc Alum Corrugated Iron. This rulnig comes at a higher cost to landowners. Overtime corrugated iron dulls. Based on the s32 comments of the area being managed effectively. It seems extreme to propose these changes.	Amend NFL-R1 as follows: 1. The building or structure is for farming purposes, excluding residential use; (a) Does not exceed ~~30m2~~ 300m2 in area; and (b) Height shall not exceed ~~6m 3m~~ 6m 3m ; 2. Buildings or structures for non-farming purposes; (a) The maximum height does not exceed ~~2m~~ 5m ; and (b) The maximum gross floor area is no more than ~~5m2~~ 30m2 . 3. All non-farming buildings and structures must be finished in materials with a maximum reflectance value of 30%.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.005	NFL – Natural Features and	NFL-R3	Oppose	This rule is overly restrictive when you look at the references in the NFL Chapter s32 report as it says that activities are effectively managed under the Operative District Plan and should	Ideally, the whole clause should be removed especially points 3,4 and 5. As they are unachievable when looked at from a fencing perspective. Where it is needed for the construction of any road or track no greater than 7

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
		Landscape s			not apply to normal farm fencing activities and other typical farming activities in the rural zone such as cultivation. Restrictions of a meter wide and only 100 meters in length and ground to be reinstated within 48 hours are impossible to achieve and not practical for hill country farming. I have fences that need replacing which on one side alone are over a kilometre long. Clarification is required to determine whether the references in R3 are relating to a farm post and wire fence. Fences are already controlled under NFL-R5, and this is a duplication.	meters in width or requiring more than 2 meters of cut or fill. 1. The depth of the earthworks shall not exceed ~~1m~~ 2m below the original surface of the ground; and 2. the ~~depth~~ height of fill or stockpiles shall not exceed ~~1m~~ 3m above the original surface of the ground; and 3. the area of the earthworks shall not exceed 100m2 in any 12-month period; ~~and 4. the width of land disturbance for fencing shall not exceed 1m; and~~ 5. the ground for fencing-related land disturbance is reinstated to original levels within 48 hours of work being completed
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.006	NFL – Natural Features and Landscape s	NFL-R5	Oppose	Farm fencing is required for health and safety and stock management. Unless native bush is being removed, normal farm fencing including earthworks and land disturbance (if required) should be permitted.	Amend as follows: Fences within an identified ONF/LActivity status: Permitted Where: 1. The fence is required for the exclusion or control of stock or to mark property boundaries. ~~a post and wire fence;~~ Note: fences are a structure and therefore subject to the river setback rules
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.007	NFL – Natural Features and Landscape s	NFL-R6	Oppose	Fences are required in many situations. Not only in relation to national regulations or regional rules relating to stock exclusion. This rule duplicates rule ECO-R1(1) and creates confusion.	Delete rule completely.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.008	NFL – Natural Features and Landscape s	NFL-R6	Oppose	New farm tracks are required for a variety of reasons, for example health and safety and the protection of vulnerable areas. Applying for resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary activity is likely to be time consuming and impractical in situations where there is urgent fixing required.	Amend NFL-R6 as follows: New Roads, ~~farm tracks~~ , walking and cycling tracks within an identified ONF/L . All zones Activity status: Restricted Discretionary New farm tracks within the Rural Zone. Activity Status: Permitted
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.009	NFL – Natural Features and Landscape s	NFL-R7	Oppose	The difference between the extraction for commercial use or use outside the farm as opposed to on farm use (which should be allowed in any farming situation) needs to be stated in the rule. The definition of farm quarrying in the interpretation section needs to be allowed under an ONL as well.	Amend NFL- R7 as follows:Mining and quarrying (excluding farm quarries) within an identified ONF/L Activity Status: Non complying.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.010	Natural environme ntal Values map layers	NFL-MAP- Hokonui Hills	Amend	The ONL covers 60% of the submitters farm, which is 30% of the ONL overlay and SNA map. The ONL overlay area covers a large area of pastoral farmland. The submitter is unsure whether this has been considered when determining what area shall fall under the ONL.	Amend the ONL layer to reflect the area of outstanding natural values.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.011	Zone map layers	GRUZ-MAP	Amend	A portion of the submitters farm has been rezoned as Rural Lifestyle given its locality to the Mandeville township. This area is susceptible to inundation on the Council mapping, there is suitable land in the proximity that would be better suited for rural lifestyle.	Amend the planning maps to select suitable land for rural lifestyle zoning, excluding areas subject to inundation.

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
					However, it is unable to be subdivided under GRUZ-S1 standard, as it would have to be 40 hectares.	
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.012	How the Plan works	General approach	Amend	There is no guidance regarding existing activities and existing use rights in the introductory chapters. Guidance could be provided in the "How the Plan Works" chapter.	Amend the “How the Plan Works” chapter to provide guidance regarding existing use rights.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.013	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL-R3	Amend	The definition for earthworks excludes fencing, therefore the reference to fencing in NFL-R3 should be removed.	Remove reference from NFL- R3 with regards to fencing based on the earthworks definition.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.014	Interpretation	fences	Amend	The definition of fences excludes post and wire fences, yet there are references to fences that are clearly meaning farm post and wire fences.	Amend the wording to make it clear whether post and wire fences are included.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.015	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Amend	Hard to distinguish the difference between vegetation clearance and indigenous vegetation clearance.	Clarification required for the reasoning of having two definitions for vegetation clearance and indigenous vegetation clearance or amalgamate them together.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.016	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Amend	Hard to distinguish the difference between Vegetation Clearance and Indigenous Vegetation Clearance. The submitter queries the inclusion of "applying the seed of exotic pasture species" as a method of vegetation clearance.	Clarify the reasoning for having two definitions or amalgamate them into one.Remove references to application of seeds from exotic pasture species as a method of vegetation clearance.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.017	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Amend	The whole waterfall range is not identified as SNA1, waterfall range is predominately identified as an ONL.	Amend the definition as follows:Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (~~Waterfall Range~~) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA (b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4 SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 ~~including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan~~ assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.018	Interpretation	agricultural, horticultural and pastoral activities	Amend	Farm quarries should be allowed within the definition of agricultural, horticultural and pastoral activities.	Amend as follows: Agricultural, horticultural and pastoral activities. Means the use of land and / or buildings which are used for producing livestock, crops and other agricultural produce that is reliant on the soil resource of the land and includes storage of equipment and machinery associated with the activity but excludes any processing, quarrying (except for farm quarries) or direct sales.

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.019	Interpretation	land disturbance	Amend	Land disturbance is controlled in the ECO and NFL chapters, given its meaning this is inappropriate.	Amend all sections that land disturbance appears in to reflect its true meaning or remove if applicable. As it states that land disturbance does not permanently alter the profile, contour or height of the land, therefore, why have it?
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.020	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P1	Amend	This policy suggests that the whole Waterfall Range is an SNA-1 which is incorrect.	Amend ECO -P1 as follows:Work in partnership with Local Authorities, mana whenua, stakeholders and landowners to: 1. identify Significant Natural Areas (SNAs) to include: (a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (~~Waterfall Range~~) and SNA-2 (Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps, and (b) A variation to the Proposed District Plan to identify areas that meet the criteria set out in Appendix 4; and 2. map and describe each specified highly mobile fauna area.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.021	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Although this is a permitted activity, it is highly restrictive on some activities that have nominal effects such as fencing. A clearance width of 1.5m is not a sufficient width. For example, if you are clearing an area to be fenced, the bucket of a digger would typically be approximately 2m wide and for a dozer 3m. In farming situations, a firebreak with a width of 1.5 meters falls below FENZ recommendations.	Amend ECO-R1 to accurately reflect the practicalities of these activities (based on the type of equipment required to complete them). For example, remove the width restriction associated with fencing, fire breaks and tracks. Clarification is required on whether this rule refers to the occasional bit of indigenous vegetation clearance that may have happen in the path of land disturbance or does this refer to solid areas of indigenous vegetation i.e. native bush.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.022	EW - Earthworks	EW-S4	Oppose	This rule is inappropriate for anyone who owns rural land with any sort of hills, as a resource consent would be required along with a costly geotechnical assessment. Not all 15-degree slopes are unstable, therefore, the rule is over the top.	Delete in full Rule EW – S4
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.023	EW - Earthworks	EW - General	Amend	The overview states that ONL's are excluded, although, some rules state all areas.	Clarification is required whether areas subject to the ONL are excluded from the provisions in the earthworks chapter.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.024	EW - Earthworks	EW-Exemptions	Support	The submitter supports the list of exemptions under the earthworks section. However, wants them included in the NFL chapter as a permitted activity.	Include the list of exemptions as permitted activities in the Natural Features and Landscapes (ONL) along with farm fencing (as previously mentioned, proposed rule NFL- R5).
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.025	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-S1	Oppose	Rural landowners are unable to develop their land for residential use, unless it is in 40 hectare lots.	Amend rule GRUZ-S1 as follows: 1. There shall be no more than one residential unit per 2 ~~40~~ hectares; and 2. For sites under 2 ~~40~~ hectare, no more than one residential unit per site; and 3. There shall be a maximum density of one minor residential unit per site
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.026	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-S7	Oppose	Why are setback requirements larger than what is required from central government laws for farm fences? Fences are classed as a structure in this plan. The setback should be the standard 5m setback from the waterbody.	Amend as follows: Setbacks from stream and river All activities (excluding fencing) 1. Any building or structure is set back from the top of the closest bank of any stream or river the minimum distance as follows: (a) 20m for high order rivers or streams (order 5 and above); (b) 10m for middle order rivers or streams (order 3 and 4); and (c) 5m for low order rivers or

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
						streams (order 1 and 2). (d) exception being farm fences which are required to be a minimum of 5m. Refer to Appendix 3 for river and stream orders
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.027	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-R1	Oppose	The rule was wanting some controls around buildings and structures but unsure what the activities are that they refer to.	Activity Status: Permitted Where: 1. Any new or extended building, (excluding farm fences and any farm buildings or structures)-structure and activity complies with General Rural Zone standards GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, GRUZ-S4, GRUZ-S5, GRUZ-S6, GRUZ-S7 and GRUZS8. Except that: (a) This rule does not apply to Quarrying and Mining, as those activities are subjects to Rules GRUZ-R2 and GRUZ-R3. (b) This rule does not apply to Forestry in an ONL, ONF or SNA, which is subject to District Plan rules NFL-R8 and ECO-R1.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.028	SUB - Subdivision	SUB-S1	Oppose	This rule prevents rural landowners from subdividing land off for residential purposes unless it is 40 hectares.	Amend SUB-S1 as follows: 1. No lots to be created by subdivision, including balance lots, shall have a net site area less than the minimum specified: ... (h) General Rural – ~~8ha~~ 2ha.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.029	SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - General	Amend	Creates uncertainty for plan users by classifying the entire district as SASM, instead of identifying specific sites and areas. The s32 report mentions resource consent triggers for high-risk activities, but these are not specified. All activities regardless of their risk level will, therefore, require an assessment of cultural effects.	Remove uncertainty for plan users by clarifying why the entire district has been identified as a SASM. Provide a list of high-risk activities for which an assessment of cultural effects is required.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.032	Appendix 3 - River and stream order	APP3	Amend	Setback requirements are greater than Central Government ruling for fencing for stock exclusion.	Align setbacks with higher order planning documents.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.033	Appendix 5 - NFL-APP - Landscape Values	APP5-NFL-APP	Amend	Otamita Stream does not originate in the Waterfall range, creeks come from this into the Otamita but its origin is further up in the Otamita Gorge/Valley, part of the Southland District. The ONL covers a large area of actual pastoral farmland, concerned this hasn't been considered when deciding what area should fall under the ONL.	Correct the description of the ONL
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.034	Zone map layers	RLZ-MAP	Amend	A portion of the submitters farm has been rezoned as Rural Lifestyle given its locality to the Mandeville township. This area is susceptible to inundation on the Council mapping, there is suitable land in the proximity that would be better suited for rural lifestyle. However, it is unable to be subdivided under GRUZ-S1 standard, as it would have to be 40 hectares.	Amend the planning maps to select suitable land for rural lifestyle zoning, excluding areas subject to inundation.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.035	Interpretation	earthworks	Not Stated	The definition for earthworks excludes fencing, therefore the reference to fencing within NFL-R3 should be removed.	Remove reference from NFL- R3 with regards to fencing based on this definition.

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.036	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL-Additional provisions sought	Amend	I support this list of exemptions under the earthworks section however it needs to be included in the NFL section as a permitted activity.	Include the earthworks exemptions as a permitted activity rule in the Natural Features and Landscapes (ONL) along with farm fencing (as previously mentioned, proposed rule NFL- R5)
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.037	SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM - General	Oppose	Identifying the whole district as SASM may unnecessarily require consent and consultation for day-to-day farm activities, increasing time, cost and workload. As objectives and policies regarding Ngāi Tahu values have been incorporated into the plan, there is no justification for the entire district to be a SASM. The SASM chapter should instead provide further clarity to plan users by identifying and delineating those specific sites, areas and landscapes that are significant to Māori. Similar approaches have been undertaken in other recently reviewed district plans.	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori are identified and mapped in the planning maps through a transparent, consistent process..
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.038	SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek is concerned that the broad-brush approach within the PGDP creates uncertainty for plan users as to what activities require consultation with mana whenua and could increase time, cost and workload of day-to-day farm activities. The approach creates disproportionate onus on applicants and is also unclear what “appropriate considerations” (as referred to in Objective SASM-O1) may be. The SASM chapter should provide further clarity by identifying and delineating those specific sites.	Amend SASM-O1 to read: ~~All~~ Those lands, waterbodies, natural features, and marae within Gore District identified as Sites of Significance to Māori in the Planning Maps are recognised as sites and areas of cultural significance to mana whenua and/or tangata whenua, and are afforded appropriate considerations with regard to the cultural values identified in MW-2.3 in relation to their management, development, and use.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.039	SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM-P1	Oppose	Stoney Creek requests that existing activities are provided for in accordance with s10 of the RMA.	Amend SASM-P1 to read: New Use, subdivision, and development is enabled where adverse effects on ~~the~~ Ngāi Tahu cultural values, including those listed in MW-2.3, are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Council shall have regard to any other benefits (e.g. pest control) provided by the proposed activity.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.040	SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM-P2	Oppose	Amendments are suggested to align with the concerns raised with regard to SASM-O1	Amend SASM-P2 to read: The impact of proposed activities on Sites of Significance to Māori as identified in the Planning Maps on the Ngāi Tahu cultural values identified in MW-2.3, and their underlying relationship with the natural environment is determined in partnership with Hokonui Rūnanga and takes into account any benefits of the proposal.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.041	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-O1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports the alignment NPSIB and requests that this objective reflect the wording contained within the NPSIB. The use of 'significant indigenous vegetation' and 'significant habitats of indigenous fauna' is unclear.	Amend ECO-O1 to read: Maintain Indigenous biological diversity in the Gore District and protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna ~~(Significant Natural Areas)~~ . through the identification of Significant Natural Areas.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.042	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous	ECO-O3	Oppose	The wording of this policy is more stringent than the NPSIB as it requires the “enhancement” of values. Amend wording to align with NPSIB.	Amend ECO-O3 to read: Provide for appropriate ~~new~~ subdivision, use and development within and adjacent to Significant Natural Areas where adverse effects on the values of the area can be avoided or managed. ~~maintained and enhanced.~~

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
		Biodiversity				
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.043	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P2	Oppose	Existing activities within or affecting SNAs are provided for in Policy 9 and Clause 3.15 of the NPSIB. Amend wording to better align with the NPSIB objectives.	Amend ECO-P2 to read: ~~Allow~~ Enable activities within or affecting Significant Natural Areas that may impact the extent or ecological integrity of the SNA indigenous biodiversity values where: 1. ~~This~~ The activity is for a lawfully established activity; or 2. Their purpose is to facilitate or express Ngāi Tahu rights, interests, or cultural purpose; or 3. The activity has a functional or operational need to be located in the area; or ...
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.044	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P3	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the alignment of the PGDP objectives and policies with the wording of the NPSIB which allows for new subdivision, use or development where this is required to address a high risk to public health or safety.	Amend ECO-P3 to read: Any new subdivision, use, or development shall avoid adverse effects on an SNA that result in:1. loss of ecosystem representation and extent; ... Unless: 6A. The activity is required to address a high risk to public health or safety. or: The activity relates to: ~~Unless they relate to:~~ ... 6. Construction of specified infrastructure that provides significant national or regional public benefit; 7. Mineral and aggregate extraction that provides significant national public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved using resource in New Zealand;
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.045	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P8	Oppose	ECO-P8 has a different set of criteria to the NPSIB. Managing effects on indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs by applying the effects management hierarchy would be in line with the NPSIB.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P8 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised policy balanced provisions recognising that some vegetation removal is necessary and providing for this where effects are managed using the effects management hierarchy. Alternative relief: Amend Policy ECO-P8 to read: When assessing consents for subdivision, land use and development outside of SNAs, require applicants to demonstrate that effects on indigenous biodiversity will be managed by applying the effects management hierarchy., avoid effects which will: 1. Prevent an indigenous species or community being able to persist in their habitats in the ecological district; 2. Result in a degradation of the threat status, further measurable loss of indigenous cover or disruption to ecological processes, functions or connections in land environments in category one or two of the Threatened Environment Classification at the ecological district level; 3. Result in a reduction in the local population of threatened taxa in the Department of Conservation Threat Categories 1 – 3a – nationally critical, nationally endangered and nationally vulnerable; and 4. discourage mana whenua access to indigenous biodiversity for a mana whenua cultural purpose
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.046	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P9	Oppose	ECO-P9 gives no weight to existing activities but should reflect that there may be lawfully established activities within or affecting SNAs that may require resource consent but do not have adverse effects on ecological values and may provide benefits such as pest control. ECP-P9 Point 8 refers to ECO-P7 for offsetting, however ECO-P7 does not refer to offsetting.	Amend ECO-P9 to read: When assessing resource consents in Significant Natural Areas, consider the following matters: ... 5. The effects the activity may have on the introduction, ~~or~~ spread or control of exotic pest plant and animal weed -species and pest animals both terrestrial and aquatic; ... 8. The appropriateness and effectiveness of any biodiversity offsetting or compensation ~~in accordance~~

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
						~~with ECO—P7~~ to offset any residual adverse effects that remain after avoiding, remedying and mitigating measures have been applied. 9. Whether the activity is a lawfully established existing activity that is no grater in intensity, scale or character and will not result in a loss of extent or degradation of ecological integrity of a SNA.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.047	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P10	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the recognition of the benefits farmers provide in the management of indigenous biodiversity but wish to better recognise the extent of benefits. Clause 6 of ECO-P10 encouraging the provision of free ecological surveys, financial support and rates remissions for SNA landholders is supported.	Amend ECO-P10 to read: Maintain indigenous biodiversity across the district by: ... 8. Recognising the benefits of farm management practices and active management of indigenous biodiversity, including but not limited to voluntary animal and plant pest and stock control, fencing , and/or formal legal protection. ...
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.048	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-P11	Oppose	There may be situations where offsetting is appropriate but is not for cultural purposes or is consistent with other values or drivers.	Preferred relief: Withdraw ECO-P11 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Alternative relief: Amend Policy-P11 as follows: Provide for biodiversity offsets and compensation to manage residual adverse effects of an activity where: 1. The goal of the biodiversity offsets is no net loss and, preferably, a net gain of biodiversity of similar species and location where practicable; or 2. The conservation outcomes are measurable and positive; and 3. The biodiversity offsets or compensation are in accordance with best practice, including but not limited to New Zealand Government guidance on biodiversity offsetting.; and ~~4. Off-setting and compensation packages are consistent with Ngāi Tahu cultural purposes~~
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.049	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance rules but finds Rule ECO-R1 too restrictive, especially for fencing. The rule's broad definition of "Land Disturbance" raises confusion, as it encompasses all land activities without clarification. The permitted width for disturbance is impractical for installing fences, it does not allow for access and maintenance. The rule lacks provisions for upgrading existing structures, which may have better environmental outcomes and should be enabled. Maintenance of improved pasture under ECO-R1(e) is more restrictive than NPSIB. The inclusion of a permitted activity rule for the incidental removal of indigenous species during exotic species control is supported but should be clarified in the rule. There should be no limits around the removal of deliberately planted vegetation. A restricted discretionary status would be more appropriate for minor environmental effects. Non-complying activity status for indigenous vegetation removal for those activities listed in ECO-R1(1) where this falls within a SNA does not acknowledge the presence of existing activities within SNAs (as allowed for under the NPSIB). Therefore,	Preferred Relief: Withdraw ECO-R1 and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station. Include in the revised rule an exemption for indigenous vegetation removal and land disturbance associated with farming activities within the new Hokonui Hills Special Precinct (discussed further below). Alternative relief: Amend ECO-R1 as follows: Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and Land Disturbance associated with Indigenous Vegetation Clearance Activity status: Permitted 1. It is necessary for the following purposes: (aa) The installation, maintenance, repair, replacement or upgrade of: (i) Fences (ii) Farm tracks (iii) Farm infrastructure [Refer to proposed definition] (a) The maintenance, repair, or replacement or upgrade of existing lawfully established: ~~(i) fences,~~ (ii) vehicle tracks, (iii) roads, (iv) infrastructure, (v) walkways, (vi) firebreaks, (vii) dams, (viii) waterway crossings, or (ix) network utilities, ~~and the clearance or land disturbance is no more than 1.0m in width from those works in (ii), (iii), (iv), (v), (vii), (viii) and (ix), and 1.5m for (i), and (vi)...~~ (e) Maintenance of improved pasture outside of a SNA , where: (i) the improved pasture has not become a SNA, and (ii) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (iii) it will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species. (f) In accordance with an approved Reserve Act or Conservation Act reserve management plan. (g) For the maintenance, repair or replacement of

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
					Discretionary activity status is proposed for these activities.	existing buildings and structures, or to remove a potential fire risk, including an area no further than ~~2.0m~~ 7.5m from the exterior wall of an existing building. (h) The removal indigenous vegetation that is incidental to the removal of exotic species generally and pest plants and pest animals in accordance with any Regional Pest Management Plan or the Biosecurity Act 1993. ...k) The works relate to indigenous vegetation that was deliberately planted: ~~(i) Within a domestic garden; or~~ (ii) For the use of screening/shelter belt purposes (such as farm hedgerows).Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi) Restricted discretionaryWhere: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and associated land disturbance takes place outside a Significant Natural Area. 2. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance does not comply with ECO-R1(1)(a)(i) or ECO-R1(1)(a)(vi). Matters of Discretion:1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ~~ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9~~ and ECO-P10.... 7. The benefits to indigenous biodiversity provided by the proposed activity.ECO-R1(3): Restricted Discretionary Matters of Discretion: 1. Effects on indigenous biodiversity values.2. the matters outlined in ECO-P3, ECO-P7, ECO-P8, ECO-P9 and ECO-P10.3. The quantity and quality of indigenous vegetation impacted and the reasons for the works.4. The benefits of the proposed activity.5. The mitigation proposed. ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2): Discretionary Non-complying Where: 1. The indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance takes place inside a Significant Natural Area.emNOTE - the 1.5m limit for vegetation clearance and land disturbance associated with fences ECO-R1 was withdrawn by Council resolution on 21 November 2023/em
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.050	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	indigenous vegetation clearance and land disturbance for any purpose other than those listed in ECO-R1(1) is a discretionary activity and there are instances where this is too restrictive. There's no provision for removing regenerating vegetation in areas lawfully cleared before. A proposed new rule aims to grant permitted activity status for minor vegetation clearance.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(2): 2. Indigenous Vegetation Clearance and any associated land disturbance outside a SNA for any purpose other than listed in ECO-R1(1) or ECO-R1(3), provided:(a) The vegetation to be cleared is regenerating indigenous vegetation less than 15 years old, where the land was previously lawfully cleared of indigenous vegetation; or(b) The area of indigenous vegetation clearance does not exceed 500 m2 in any 12 month period.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.051	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-Additional provisions sought	Support	The maintenance of improved pasture within or adjacent to a SNA is provided for in the NPSIB, but this is not reflected in the PGDP rule framework.	Add a new Rule ECO-R1(3): Indigenous vegetation clearance and any associated land disturbance required for the maintenance of improved pasture within or affecting a SNA where: (i) the maintenance of improved pasture is part of a regular cycle of periodic maintenance, and (ii) the intensity, scale or character of the effects are not increased, and (iii) the improved pasture has not itself become a SNA, and (iv) the land is not an uncultivated depositional landform, and (v) the maintenance will not adversely affect a Threatened or At Risk (declining) species.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.052	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - General	Oppose	As drafted, the ONL chapter is fundamentally flawed as it fails to acknowledge the established presence of pastoral farming within mapped ONL areas and would significantly restrict farming activities. There seems to be no justification for this as comments in the S32 seem to contradict the change. Considers the evaluation and assessment in the report insufficient. The rule framework is overly restrictive particularly when the policy	Preferred Relief: Withdraw the Natural Features and Landscapes chapter in its entirety and redraft in consultation with key stakeholders, including Stony Creek Station.Stony Creek Station considers that an appropriate resolution would be to create a Hokonui Hills Special Precinct, within which rural activities associated with pastoral farming are permitted, with appropriate and practical limits set. The provisions of the other chapters of the PGDP

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
					framework acknowledges the presence and benefits provided by existing pastoral farming within the Hokonui Hills ONL which, by GDC's own assessment, has not resulted in significant adverse effects under the current framework.	would not apply to farming activities within the Hokonui Hills Special Precinct
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.053	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL-P1	Oppose	Inclusion of policies that recognise pastoral farming within ONLs but considers NFL-P1 does not go far enough to recognise the benefits of pastoral farming.	Amend NFL-P1 to read: Avoid adverse effects on the values and characteristics of identified outstanding natural features and landscapes described within Appendix 5 by: ... 2. Recognising the benefits provided by existing existence of working pastoral farms and their contribution to the openness and landform legibility of outstanding natural features and landscapes;
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.054	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL-P4	Oppose	When assessing resource consents within the ONL, it is important to recognise the presence of existing activities within these areas.	Amend NFL-P4 to read: When assessing resource consents within Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, consider the following matters; ... 4. The presence of existing activities within the ONL and whether the activity is changing in intensity, scale or character.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.055	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - General	Amend	The Rule table within the NFL chapter states that the rules are applicable in “All zones”. This is misleading as the rules only apply within an identified ONL or ONF.	Amend “All zones” under rules NFL-R1 to NFL-R8 to read “All areas identified as ONL/ONF in the Planning Maps”.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.056	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL-R1	Oppose	The increased number of activities controlled in the Hokonui Hills ONL contradicts the comments made in the S32 report and there is seemingly no justification for the increase. The findings of the report are disputed, including the cost benefit analysis. Considers the rule framework overly restrictive and that it contradicts the policy framework which acknowledges the presence and benefits of pastoral farming, especially as the existing provision has not resulted in significant adverse effects.	Amend NFL-R1 to read: Activity status: PermittedWhere: 1. The building or structure is for farming purposes; ~~excluding residential use;~~ (a) Does not exceed 500 30m 2 in area; and (b) Height shall not exceed 8 3m ; 2. Buildings or structures for non-farming purposes; (a) The maximum height does not exceed 2m; and (b) The maximum gross floor area is no more than 5m2 3. All buildings and structures (excluding fences and buildings and structures for farming purposes) must be finished in materials with a maximum reflectance value of 30%
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.057	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL-R2	Amend	Supportive of permitted status for tree planting but it is not appropriate to limit this for certain purposes as this may discourage further planting e.g. where non-indigenous species may be required for wind breaks, shelter belts etc.	Amend NFL-R2 to read:Tree planting, other than plantation forestry within an identified ONF/L Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. The tree planting is of indigenous species or is required and for restoration, conservation, or hazard prevention measures, shelter belts, wind breaks, or to address land instability or erosion. Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. Effects on the values as listed in NFL-APP Appendix 5. 2. Impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, including those listed in MW2.3. 3. Any benefits provided by the proposed tree planting.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.058	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL-R3	Oppose	S32 report states the operative plan controls were effective at managing activities within ONLs. As such, additional controls in the PGDP are not supported and should align more with the controls that exist currently.	Amend Rule NFL-R3 to read: Land disturbance and earthworks within an identified ONF/L Activity status: Permitted Where: X. Required for cultivation, fencing or pest plant management; or X. Associated with the construction of any road or track no greater than 7 metres in width or requiring more than 2 metres of cut or fill for a total distance greater than 100 metres; or X. The earthworks do not exceed 100 linear metres in any direction; and 1. The depth of the earthworks shall not exceed 1m-2m

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
						below the original surface of the ground; and 2. the ~~depth~~ height of fill or stockpiles shall not exceed ~~1m~~ 3m above the original surface of the ground; and 3. the area of the earthworks shall not exceed 100m2 in any 12 month period; ~~and 4. the width of land disturbance for fencing shall not exceed 1m; and 5. the ground for fencing related land disturbance is reinstated to original levels within 48 hours of work being completed.~~
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.059	NFL – Natural Features and Landscape s	NFL-R4	Oppose	Supportive of permitted activity status that allows earthworks to maintain existing facilities within an ONL, however considers the scope of NFL-R4 to be too narrow.	Amend Rule NFL-R4 to read: Maintenance repair, replacement or upgrade of buildings and structures (excluding fences) , critical infrastructure, existing roads, farm tracks, walking and cycling trails, waterway crossings, or improved pasture within an identified ONF/L Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. The scale of the activity ~~critical infrastructure, road, farm or trail~~ is not increased. Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. Effects on the values as listed within NFL-APP Appendix 5 resulting from an increase in the scale of the activity. 2. Impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, including those listed in MW2.3. 3. The operational or functional need for the activity to be undertaken within an Outstanding Natural Feature or Landscape.
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.060	NFL – Natural Features and Landscape s	NFL-R5	Oppose	Supportive of the inclusion of a permitted activity status for fences within the ONL, but questions why only post and wire fences are permitted. Fences are not visually dominant structures and are required for good animal husbandry, health and safety and stock management and are overly restricted within ONLs.	Amend Rule NFL-R5 to read: Fences within an identified ONF/L Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. The fence is required for the exclusion or control of stock or to delineate property boundaries. ~~a post and wire fence;~~ Note: fences are a structure and therefore subject to the river setback rules ~~Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. Effects on the values as listed within NFL-APP Appendix 5. 2. Impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, including those listed in MW2.3.~~
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.061	NFL – Natural Features and Landscape s	NFL-R6	Oppose	NFL-R6 duplicates ECO-R1(1) and creates confusion as to which standard applies.	Delete Rule NFL-R6 in its entirety.
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.062	NFL – Natural Features and Landscape s	NFL-Additional provisions sought	Amend	Farm tracks are essential to pastoral farming and new tracks are sometimes required to avoid sensitive environments. Requiring consent for any new farm track is too restrictive to farming operations.	Add a new rule NFL-R6A: New farm tracks within an identified ONF/L. Activity status: Permitted. Where: 1. Any new farm track is no greater than 7 metres in width. 2. Unretained cut and fill batters shall not:

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
						(a) be steeper than 2 horizontal to 1 vertical; (b) be constructed using moisture content susceptible soils; (c) have a bench with a width of more than 1.8m. 3. Excess material from the construction of the farm track is reinstated to match the natural contour of the surrounding land. Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. Effects on the values as listed within NFL-APP Appendix 5. 2. The necessity of what is proposed and any alternatives. 3. Mitigation measures proposed. 4. The operational or functional need for the activity to be undertaken within an Outstanding Natural Feature or Landscape 5. The benefits of the proposed activity.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.063	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL-R6	Oppose	Farm tracks are essential to pastoral farming and new tracks are sometimes required to avoid sensitive environments. Requiring consent for any new farm track is too restrictive to farming operations.	Amend Rule NFL-R6 to read: New Roads, farm tracks greater than 7 metres in width , walking and cycling tracks within an identified ONF/L Activity status: Restricted DiscretionaryMatters of Discretion:1. Effects on the values as listed within NFL-APP Appendix 5. 2. Impacts on Ngāi Tahu cultural values, including those listed in MW-2.3. ~~3. The necessity of what is proposed and any alternatives.~~ 4. Mitigation measures proposed. 5. The operational or functional need for the activity to be undertaken within an Outstanding Natural Feature or Landscape 6. The benefits of the proposed activity
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.064	NFL – Natural Features and	NFL-R7	Oppose	NFL-R7 does not distinguish between extraction of material for use outside of the property from where it was taken and farm quarries as defined in the PGDP.	Amend NFL-R7 as follows: NFL-R7 Mining and Quarrying (excluding farm quarries) within an identified ONF/L Non-Complying

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
		Landscape s				
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.065	NFL – Natural Features and Landscape s	NFL-Additional provisions sought	Amend	NFL-R7 does not distinguish between extraction of material for use outside of the property from where it was taken and farm quarries as defined in the PGDP.	Insert a new rule NFL-R7A: NFL-R7A Farm quarries that comply with GRUZ-R3. Activity status: Permitted
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.066	SUB - Subdivisio n	SUB-R1	Oppose	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R1.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.067	SUB - Subdivisio n	SUB-R4	Oppose	Stoney Creek questions why sites containing SNAs or ONLs are not afforded controlled activity status when the environmental effects of these activities are negligible.	Delete Condition 6 ('The site does not contain a Significant Natural Area or Outstanding Natural Landscape or Feature') from SUB-R4.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.068	SUB - Subdivisio n	SUB-R11	Oppose	An amendment to exclude activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4 is sought.	Amend SUB-R11 as follows: Subdivision in any area of an Outstanding Natural Landscape, Outstanding Natural Feature or Significant Natural Area excluding activities captured by SUB-R1 and SUB-R4.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.069	SUB - Subdivisio n	SUB-S1	Oppose	An 8ha minimum lot size does not allow for an efficient use of land and is too small to farm economically but would be a significant loss of productive land if farmers subdivide discrete areas of larger parcels.	Amend SUB-S1 as follows: 1. No lots to be created by subdivision, including balance lots, shall have a net site area less than the minimum specified: ... (h) General Rural - ~~8ha~~ 2 ha.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.070	EW - Earthworks	EW - General	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports the recognition of the need for earthworks associated with rural production activities, however considers that the rules contained within the Earthworks Chapter do not reflect the specific constraints and complexities of the Hokonui Hills environment.	Preferred relief: Insert an exemption in the preamble of the chapter for any earthworks and land disturbance activities within the Hokonui Hills Special Precinct. Develop appropriate earthwork provisions for the Hokonui Hills Special Precinct, in consultation with key stakeholders, that reflect the site specific conditions and challenges of this area.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.071	EW - Earthworks	EW-O1	Oppose	Minor changes to this Objective are proposed to reflect the purpose of the RMA.	Amend EW-O1 as follows: Earthworks and land disturbance for subdivision, land use and development are facilitated and undertaken in a manner that avoids, remedies or minimises adverse effects on the ~~surrounding~~ environment and protects the natural environment, Ngāi Tahu cultural values, people and property.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.072	EW - Earthworks	EW-P1	Support	Supportive of the recognition of the need for earthworks associated with rural production activities.	Retain EW-P1(2) as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.073	EW - Earthworks	EW - General	Oppose	It is unclear how Rules and Standards interact and there is no guidance clarifying the applicability of standards. The activity status should be set by the rule and not the standard,	Amend table headings from 'Standards' to 'Standards for Permitted Activities'. Insert a guidance note clarifying whether Standards are applicable to all activities or only those listed within the relevant Rule. Clarify the relationship between rules and standards

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
					otherwise it is implied activities require consent under both the rule and the standard.	and whether standards are to be treated as standalone rules.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.074	EW - Earthworks	EW-Exemptions	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the listed exemptions from the Earthworks chapter, but questions the status of a note as opposed to a policy or rule.	Convert the exclusions note to a permitted activity rule in the Earthworks chapter.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.075	EW - Earthworks	EW-R1	Oppose	The permitted provisions of EW-R1 are inconsistent and more restrictive than those proposed in the NFL chapter. The width of land disturbance permitted by the rule is not achievable for the installation of fences and is unworkable for a farming operation. General earthworks are permitted up to 1000m3, there is no commentary in the S32 report why fences are further restricted.	Amend Rule EW-R1 to read: Land disturbance for the construction of fences (All zones except ONLs) Activity status: Permitted ~~Where:~~ ~~1. Any land disturbance does not exceed:~~ ~~(a) 1 metre in width for more than 10 metres in any 100 metre length; and/or~~ ~~(b) 1 metre in height or depth; and~~ ~~2. The ground is reinstated to original levels within 48 hours of work being completed.~~ 3. The works are undertaken in accordance with Earthworks Standards EW-S3, EW-S5 and EW-S7. No other Earthworks Standards apply.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.076	EW - Earthworks	EW-R7	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports a permitted activity standard for earthworks relating to common farming activities. However, maintenance, repair and upgrade of existing facilities should be excluded from the volume limitations given that these areas are already disturbed. It is not considered necessary to further restrict earthwork activities in the ONL.	Amend Rule EW-R7 as follows: General Rural Zone Excluding Historic Heritage sites, ~~Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Features.~~ EW-R7 Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. The total earthworks area for any new dead hole, farm rubbish pit, silage pit or farm track in any 12 month period does not exceed 2,500 m2 per site. 2. The area is progressively stabilised, filled or recontoured. 3. The works are undertaken in accordance with Earthworks Standards EW-S1, EW-S2, EW-S3, EW-S4, EW-S5 and EWS7. No other Earthworks Standards apply. Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
						Matters of discretion: 1. The timing and duration of the works. 2. Effects on ground stability. 3. Effects on any adjoining site, including visual effects, dust, noise, vibration or loss of privacy. 4. Visual amenity and landscape effects, and whether there is a functional or operational need for the location of the activity, and the extent to which alternative practicable options have been considered and their feasibility.... ~~9. The matters of discretion of any infringed Standard(s).~~ 10. Whether the earthworks are of a type, scale and form that is appropriate for the location and character of the zone.
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.077	EW - Earthworks	EW-R8	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports a permitted activity standard for earthworks relating to common farming activities. However, maintenance, repair and upgrade of existing facilities should be excluded from the volume limitations given that these areas are already disturbed. It is not considered necessary to further restrict earthwork activities in the ONL.	Amend Rule EW-R8 as follows: General Rural Zone Excluding Historic Heritage sites, ~~Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Features.~~ EW-R8 Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. The total earthworks area for any new dead hole, farm rubbish pit, silage pit or farm track in any 12 month period does not exceed 2,500 m2 per site. 2. The area is progressively stabilised, filled or recontoured. 3. The works are undertaken in accordance with Earthworks Standards EW-S1, EW-S2, EW-S3, EW-S4, EW-S5 and EWS7. No other Earthworks Standards apply. Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The timing and duration of the works. 2. Effects on ground stability. 3. Effects on any adjoining site, including visual effects, dust, noise, vibration or loss of privacy. 4. Visual amenity and landscape effects, and whether there is a functional or operational need for the location of the activity, and the extent to which alternative practicable options have

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
						been considered and their feasibility.... ~~9. The matters of discretion of any infringed Standard(s).~~ 10. Whether the earthworks are of a type, scale and form that is appropriate for the location and character of the zone.
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.078	EW - Earthworks	EW-R9	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports a permitted activity standard for earthworks relating to common farming activities. However, maintenance, repair and upgrade of existing facilities should be excluded from the volume limitations given that these areas are already disturbed. It is not considered necessary to further restrict earthwork activities in the ONL.	Amend Rule EW-R9 as follows: General Rural Zone Excluding Historic Heritage sites, ~~Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Features.~~ EW-R9 Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. The total earthworks area for any new dead hole, farm rubbish pit, silage pit or farm track in any 12 month period does not exceed 2,500 m2 per site. 2. The area is progressively stabilised, filled or recontoured. 3. The works are undertaken in accordance with Earthworks Standards EW-S1, EW-S2, EW-S3, EW-S4, EW-S5 and EWS7. No other Earthworks Standards apply. Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The timing and duration of the works. 2. Effects on ground stability. 3. Effects on any adjoining site, including visual effects, dust, noise, vibration or loss of privacy. 4. Visual amenity and landscape effects, and whether there is a functional or operational need for the location of the activity, and the extent to which alternative practicable options have been considered and their feasibility.... ~~9. The matters of discretion of any infringed Standard(s).~~ 10. Whether the earthworks are of a type, scale and form that is appropriate for the location and character of the zone.
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.079	EW - Earthworks	EW-R14	Oppose	Stoney Creek supports a permitted activity standard for earthworks not otherwise provided for. It is considered existing protection of ONLs is achieved through other chapters and further restrictions are unnecessary in the Earthworks chapter.	Amend EW-R14 as follows: Earthworks and land disturbance not otherwise provided for General Rural Zone, Industrial Zone, Airport Zone Excluding Historic Heritage sites, ~~Significant Natural Areas, Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Features.~~ Permitted 1. In any 12 month period, the total volume of earthworks does not exceed 1,000m3 per site. 2. All Earthworks Effects Standards are complied with. Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: ... 11. Whether there is a functional or operational need for the location of the activity
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.080	EW - Earthworks	EW-S3	Oppose	Earthworks for fencing activities for stock exclusion should be exempt from these requirements.	Amend EW-S3 as follows: Setbacks from rivers and streams 1. Earthworks (excluding where required for fencing for stock exclusion) shall be set back the minimum distances from the top of the closest bank of a river or stream as follows: (a) 20m for high order rivers or streams (order 5 and above); (b) 10m for middle order rivers or streams (order 3 and (c) 5m for low order rivers or streams (order 1 and 2). Refer to Appendix 3 for river and stream orders

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.081	EW - Earthworks	EW-S4	Oppose	It is onerous to consider that any earthworks on land over 15 degrees require a site specific geotechnical assessment, where these could be very minor activities with no adverse effects.	Amend EW-S4 as follows: Instability of Land 1. Earthworks shall not result in any instability of land or structures beyond the boundary of the site where the earthworks occur. ~~be undertaken on land with an existing slope angle exceeding 15 degrees.~~
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.082	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ- Additional provisions sought	Amend	Stoney Creek seeks specific zoning for activities within the Hokonui Hills area to recognise the presence of farming activities and protections for the values of the area with specific objectives policies and rules. Activities within the Hokonui Hills Special Precinct should be exempt from the GRUZ rules.	Insert Hokonui Hills Special Precinct. Develop appropriate provisions for the Hokonui Hills Special Precinct, in consultation with key stakeholders, that reflect the site-specific conditions and challenges of this area.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.083	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ - General	Oppose	Supportive of objectives, policies and rules specific to rural activities but should not duplicate the more site specific provisions that within the proposed Hokonui Hills Special Precinct.	Insert an exemption in the preamble of the chapter for any activities within the Hokonui Hills Special Precinct.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.084	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-O1	Support	Stoney Creek supports the inclusion of an objective recognizing the importance of primary production to the District.	Retain GRUZ-O1 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.085	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-O2	Amend	Supportive of the description of the character and qualities of the rural zone but consider that a 'very low degree' of built form does not reflect the nature of the zone.	Amend GRUZ-O2 as follows: The character and qualities of the General Rural zone comprise: ... 2. a ~~very~~ low degree of built form, well setback from other properties and roads; and...
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.086	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-O3	Support	Supportive of recognizing the importance of supporting activities for primary production.	Retain GRUZ-O3 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.087	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-O4	Support	Supportive of GRUZ-O4.	Retain GRUZ-O4 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.088	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-O5	Amend	supportive of GRUZ-O5, but considers that it is expanded to cover all rural land and not just highly productive land.	Amend GRUZ-O5 as follows: The value and long-term benefits of using ~~highly productive rural~~ land for primary production is recognised and the availability of highly productive land for primary production for future generations is protected.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.089	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-P1	Support	Supportive of GRUZ-P1.	Retain GRUZ-P1 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.090	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-P2	Support	Supportive of enabling rural industry in the rural zone.	Retain GRUZ-P2 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.091	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-P3	Support	Supportive of GRUZ-P3.	Retain GRUZ-P3 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.092	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-P4	Support	Supportive of recognising the benefits of conservation, pest management, riparian planting and fencing in the Rural Environment.	Retain GRUZ-P4 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.093	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-P5	Support	Supportive of GRUZ-P5.	Retain GRUZ-P5 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.094	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-P6	Support	Supportive of GRUZ-P6.	Retain GRUZ-P6 as drafted.

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.095	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-P7	Amend	Supportive of enabling agriculture aviation activities.	Amend GRUZ-P7 as follows: Enable agriculture aviation activities, and rural airstrips to support primary production and conservation activities, whilst avoiding, remedying or mitigating any adverse ~~managing the noise effects through controlling the location of airstrips and scale of their use.~~
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.096	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-P8	Support	Supportive of recognising that residential activity is required in the rural zone to support primary production.	Retain GRUZ-P8 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.097	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-P10	Amend	Supportive of the implement the NPSHPL, however GRUZ-P10 as worded is not consistent with the objective and policies of the NPSHPL.	Amend GRUZ-P10 to align with the wording of the NPSHPL.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.098	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-P11	Support	Supportive of GRUZ-P11.	Retain GRUZ-P11.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.099	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ - General	Oppose	It is unclear how Rules and Standards interact and there is no guidance clarifying the applicability of standards. Having an activity status in the standard implies that the standard is a standalone rule. It is also unclear if the standards apply to activities requiring resource consent or only permitted activities.	Amend table headings from “Standards” to “Standards for Permitted Activities”. Insert a guidance note clarifying whether Standards are applicable to all activities or only those listed within the relevant Rule. Clarify the relationship between rules and standards and whether standards are to be treated as standalone rules.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.100	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-R1	Amend	Supportive of a permitted activity rule for primary production activities but questions the need to apply the new standards to 'activities' and existing buildings/structures.	Amend GRUZ-R1 as follows: Primary Production (including Intensive Indoor Primary Production) Activity Status: Permitted Where: ~~1. Any new or extended building, or structure (excluding fences and farm infrastructure) and activity~~ 1. Any new or extended building, or structure (excluding fences and farm infrastructure) and activity complies with General Rural Zone standards GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, GRUZ-S4, GRUZ-S5, GRUZ-S6, GRUZ-S7 and GRUZ-S8. No other GRUZ standards apply. Except that: (a) This rule does not apply to Quarrying and Mining, as those activities are subjects to Rules GRUZ-R2 and GRUZ-R3. (b) This rule does not apply to Plantation Forestry in an ONL, ONF or SNA, which is subject to District Plan rules NFL-R8 and ECO-R1
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.101	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-R3	Oppose	Farm quarries are considered to be a supporting activity under the NPS HPL and therefore should not be restricted on Highly Productive Land.	Amend GRUZ-R3 as follows: Quarrying Activities Activity status: Permitted All areas excluding ONLs. ...

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
						3. The activity is not located on Highly Productive Land, unless it is a farm quarry; and 4. The area is progressively stabilised, filled or recontoured; and 5. Any new building or structure relating to the quarrying activity ~~and activity~~ complies with General Rural Zone standards GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, GRUZ-S4, GRUZ-S5, GRUZ-S6, GRUZ-S7 and GRUZ-S8, and Earthworks standards EW-S3, EW-S5 and EW-S7. No other Standards apply. Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. Location and scale of the activity ... 12. The need for the activity to support primary production.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.102	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-R5	Support	Supportive of permitted activity status for the establishment of woodlots.	Retain GRUZ-R5 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.103	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-R6	Support	Supportive of a permitted activity status for conservation activities.	Retain GRUZ-R6 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.104	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-R7	Amend	Supportive of permitted status for residential activities with minor amendments.	Amend GRUZ-R7 to read: Residential Activity All areas Activity status: Permitted Where: 1. For new residential units and new minor residential units, standard GRUZ-S1 Density is met; and 2. Any new building, ~~addition~~, or ~~external~~-alteration that increases the number of habitable rooms and activity complies with zone standards GRUZ-S2, GRUZ-S3, GRUZ-S4, GRUZ-S5, GRUZ-S6 and GRUZ-S7; and 3. For minor residential units, the maximum floor area

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
						shall be 80m2 ; and 4. The residential unit is connected to telecommunications services (whether hardwired or wireless). Activity status where compliance is not achieved with: GRUZ-R7(1): as per GRUZ-S1 activity status and matters of discretion. GRUZ-R7(3)(2): Restricted Discretionary Matters of Discretion: 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed standard. GRUZ-R7(3): ~~Non-Complying~~ Discretionary GRUZ-R7(4): Restricted Discretionary Matters of Discretion: 1. Whether any form of telecommunication is available at the location the proposed residential unit 2. The functional need to having a residential unit in a location without access to telecommunication and whether there are suitable alternative locations for a residential unit on site.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.105	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-R9	Support	Supportive of a permitted activity rule for rural commercial activities.	Retain GRUZ-R9 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.106	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-R11	Support	Supportive of a permitted activity status for homestay activities.	Retain GRUZ-R11 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.107	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-R13	Support	Supportive of a permitted activity status for rural commercial recreation activities.	Retain GRUZ-R13 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.108	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-R16	Support	Supportive of a permitted activity status for agricultural aviation activities.	Retain GRUZ-R16 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.109	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-R17	Amend	The rule table does not provide an activity status for Visitor Accommodation. It appears as though it is incorrectly referenced as GRUZ-R18, which is a discretionary activity.	Provide a correct activity status reference for GRUZ-R17.

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.110	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-R20	Oppose	Non-complying status for activities that are not otherwise provided for is extremely stringent.	Amend GRUZ-R20 to read: All other activities Activity Status: ~~Non-complying~~ Permitted 1. Any activities, including associated buildings, not otherwise provided for in the list of rules that comply with all General Rural Zone standards. Activity Status where compliance is not achieved: ~~N/A~~ Discretionary
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.111	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-S1	Oppose	The standard as worded is unclear as to whether a minor residential unit is allowed in addition to a residential unit.	Amend GRUZ-S1 as follows: Density 1. There shall be no more than one residential unit (not including minor residential units) per 40 hectares; and2. For sites under 40 hectare, no more than one residential unit (not including minor residential units) per site; and 3. There shall be a maximum density of one minor residential unit per site
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.112	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-S3	Oppose	The matters of discretion do not recognise that supporting activities (as defined by the NPSHPL) may need to be located on Highly Productive Land.	Amend GRUZ-S3 to read: ... Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The adverse effects on the rural character. 2. The adverse effects on amenity values of adjoining sites, including outlook, privacy, shading, dominance and sense of openness. 3. The adverse effects on Ngāi Tahu cultural values including those listed in MW-2.3. 4. Whether the building is located on high class soils and whether it is for a supporting activity. 5. The reason for the additional building size. 6. Noise and odour from housing animals
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.113	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-S4	Oppose	Reduced setback distances are sought for primary production buildings over 500 m2. The matters of discretion also do not anticipate two or more adjoining sites (legal parcels) that make up a single farm.	Amend GRUZ-S4 as follows: Setback to Side and Rear Boundaries All Areas Any building is setback from any side or rear boundary the minimum distances as follows: 1. Residential buildings are setback 30m; 2. Dairy sheds and buildings that house animals are setback 50m; 3. Buildings greater than 500 square metres are setback ~~200m~~ 50m , except for in the Rural Industry Precinct (PREC13) where the setback is 100m; 4. Buildings less than 10 square metres are setback 2m; and/or 5. All other buildings are setback 15m. Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The adverse effects on rural character 2. The adverse effects on amenity values of adjoining sites, including outlook, privacy, shading, dominance and

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
						sense of openness 3. The extent to which buildings are set back on the adjoining sites and the use of the intervening space 4. The reasons for the reduced setback 5. Noise and odour from housing animals 6. Reverse Sensitivity effects 7. The ownership of the adjoining site and whether it forms part of the same farming operation.
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.114	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-S5	Amend	Generally supportive of setbacks to road boundaries, but seeks a reduced setback from Interregional Connector roads.	Amend GRUZ-S5 as follows: Setback to Road Boundaries All Areas Any building or structure is setback from any road boundary the minimum distances as follows: 1. Residential buildings are setback: (a) ~~100m~~ 50m from the boundary of an Interregional Connector road (state highway); (b) 40m from the boundary of a Rural Connector road; ... 5. All other buildings and structures, except fences and farm infrastructure [Refer proposed definition], are setback 15m. Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: ... 8. The functional or operational need for the building to be located within the road setback
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.115	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-S7	Oppose	An exclusion is sought for fences where required to exclude stock from waterbodies or to protect areas of riparian planting.	Amend GRUZ-S7 as follows: Setbacks from stream and river All activities Any building or structure (excluding fences for stock exclusion) is set back from the top of the closest bank of

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
						any stream or river the minimum distance as follows: (a) 20m for high order rivers or streams (order 5 and above) ... Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: ... 8. Whether the activity will result in environmental benefits through the exclusion of stock.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.116	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-S9	Oppose	The requirement for helicopter flight paths to be separated horizontally by at least 250m from any noise sensitive activity is unworkable as this does not account for any vertical separation.	Amend GRUZ-S9 as follows: Rural Airstrips and Helicopter Landing Areas 1. Any rural airstrip or helicopter landing area is separated by at least 500m from any notional boundary to a noise sensitive activity on a site not being serviced by the use of the rural airstrip or helicopter landing area.; and 2. ~~The flight path to the helicopter landing area is not within a horizontal distance of 250m of any notional boundary to a noise sensitive activity.~~
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.117	Interpretation	agricultural aviation activity	Support	Supportive of this definition.	Retain 'agricultural aviation activity' definition as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.118	Interpretation	agricultural, horticultural and pastoral activities	Amend	Farm quarries should be included within the definition of agricultural, horticultural and pastoral activities.	Amend the definition for agricultural, horticultural and pastoral activities to read: Means the use of land and / or buildings which are used for producing livestock, crops and other agricultural produce that is reliant on the soil resource of the land and includes storage of equipment and machinery associated with the activity but excludes any processing, quarrying (except farm quarries) or direct sales.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.119	Interpretation	conservation activity	Support	Supportive of this definition.	Retain 'conservation activities' definition as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.120	Interpretation	cultivation	Support	Supports the alignment of definitions with the National Planning Standards.	Retain 'cultivation' definition as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.121	Interpretation	dead holes	Support	Supports this definition.	Retain 'dead holes' definition as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.122	Interpretation	earthworks	Support	Supports this definition.	Retain 'earthworks' definition as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.123	Interpretation	farm quarry	Support	Supportive of this definition.	Retain 'farm quarry' definition as notified.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.124	Interpretation	farm track	Amend	Supportive of the definition but wishes to decouple the definition from 'vehicle access' as farm tracks do not provide vehicle access to legal roads.	Amend the definition for farm track to read: ~~Means vehicle access tracks~~ for the movement of vehicles and/or stock associated with agriculture, pastoral and horticultural activities.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.125	Interpretation	fences	Oppose	It is unclear why post and wire fences have been excluded from this definition as they are specifically referenced within the Rules.	Amend the definition for fences to read: Means any structure, intended to be a permanent division, screen or barrier, but shall not include a ~~post and wire~~

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
						~~fence or~~ a temporary fence such as an electric fence or construction hoarding.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.126	Interpretation	helicopter Landing Area	Amend	Should be clear that areas used temporarily for helicopter landing areas are also included.	Amend the definition for helicopter landing areas to read: Any area of land, building or structure outside of the Airport Zone intended or designed to be used (including temporarily) , whether wholly or partly, for helicopter movement or servicing, including heliports and helipads
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.127	Interpretation	highly productive land	Amend	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents but the definition references clauses of the NPSHPL that may cause confusion for plan users.	Amend the definition for Highly Productive Land to read: Has the same meaning as the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land Means land that has been mapped in accordance with clause 3.4 of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and is included in an operative regional policy statement as required by clause 3.5 (but see clause 3.5(7) of the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land for what is treated as highly productive land before the maps are included in an operative regional policy statement and clause 3.5(6) for when land is rezoned and therefore ceases to be highly productive land)
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.128	Interpretation	improved pasture	Support	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Retain 'improved pasture' definition as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.129	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation	Support	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Retain 'indigenous vegetation' definition as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.130	Interpretation	indigenous vegetation clearance	Oppose	This definition does not align with the definition for 'vegetation clearance' but should be defined in the same manner regardless of indigenous or exotic species.	Either: Amend the definition for indigenous vegetation clearance as follows: Means the ~~clearing or~~ removal of indigenous vegetation by vegetation clearance ~~any means, including cutting, crushing, cultivation, irrigation, chemical application, drainage, stopbanking, overplanting, burning or any other mechanical means as well as mob stocking.~~ Or: Delete the definition of Indigenous Vegetation Clearance entirely
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.131	Interpretation	land disturbance	Support	Supportive of the definitions with National Planning Standards.	Retain 'land disturbance' definition as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.132	Interpretation	LUC 1, 2 or 3	Support	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Retain 'LUC 1, 2 or 3' as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.133	Interpretation	mahinga kai	Amend	Details provided in the definition for Mahinga Kai would be more appropriate in the Mana Whenua chapter.	Amend the definition of mahinga kai to: Means the same as outlined in MW – 2.3.3.3 and is an all-inclusive term that refers to the ability to access resources for harvesting, the site where gathering of these resources occurs, the act of gathering and using the resource, and the good health of the resource. ~~As a result of this practical focus, mahinga kai is considered by Hokonui Rūnanga to be, in today’s language, the principal ‘environmental indicator’ in natural systems. If mahinga kai is not present, or is unsafe to harvest, then that natural system is under stress and requires remedial action. Mahinga kai was and is central to the Ngāi Tahu and Hokonui way of life. The collection and processing of mahinga kai is an important social, cultural, environmental, and~~

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
						economic activity contributing to the overall well-being of Ngāi Tahu whānui. Mahinga kai practices rely on thriving and abundant biodiversity, safe and aesthetically pleasing places to practice, and the active transfer of knowledge between people. These attributes are dependent on the sustainable management of many other natural resources in the takiwā, especially waterbodies and the management of stormwater. Hokonui Rūnanga expect to be able to practice mahinga kai in our takiwā at multiple locations that are deliberately selected for the quality of the resource and its ability to sustain itself.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.134	Interpretation	maintenance of improved pasture	Support	Supportive of the alignment of wording used in higher order documents.	Retain 'maintenance of improved pasture' definition as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.135	Interpretation	primary production	Support	Supportive of the alignment with national planning standards.	Retain 'primary production' definition as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.136	Interpretation	rural airstrip	Support	Supportive of this definition.	Retain 'rural airstrip' definition as notified.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.137	Interpretation	rural commercial recreation activity	Support	Supportive of this definition.	Retain 'rural commercial recreation activity' definition as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.138	Interpretation	rural environment	Support	Supportive of this definition.	Retain 'rural environment' definition as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.139	Interpretation	rural industry	Support	Supportive of the alignment with national planning standards.	Retain 'rural industry' definition as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.140	Interpretation	rural produce retail activity	Support	Supportive of this definition.	Retain 'rural produce retail activity' as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.141	Interpretation	significant natural area (SNA)	Oppose	This definition does not accurately reflect the definition in the NPSIB and would include areas without following the correct process.	Amend the definition for significant natural area to reflect the NPSIB wording, as follows: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity and means: ~~(a) Areas identified as SNA-1 (Waterfall Range) and SNA-2 Pukerau Red Tussock Reserve) on the planning maps until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by Gore District Council determines that it is not an SNA~~ ~~(b) any area that is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 4~~ SNA also includes areas meeting the criteria outlined in Appendix 4 including those identified at resource consent stage or as part of a Farm Environment Plan assessment or as part of a Biodiversity Covenant. (a) any area that, after 4 August 2023, is notified or included in a district plan as an SNA following an assessment of the area in accordance with Appendix 1 of the NPSIB; and

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
						(b) any area that, on 4 August 2023, is already identified in a policy statement or plan as an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna (regardless of how it is described); in which case it remains as an SNA unless or until a suitably qualified ecologist engaged by the relevant local authority determines that it is not an area of significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna.
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.142	Interpretation	vegetation clearance	Oppose	Querying why grazing has been so limited in this definition as when managed should not constitute vegetation clearance. This definition is more restrictive than higher documents. Mob-stocking and over planting are technical terms and it is unclear exactly what these refer to as they are not in the PGDP definitions.	Amend the definition of vegetation clearance to read:- (a) the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation by any means (for example, by cutting, crushing, application of chemicals, or burning); and (b) includes activities that result in the disturbance, damage, destruction, or removal of vegetation (for example, ~~over planting~~ , applying the seed of exotic pasture species, ~~mob stocking~~ , or draining away water); but(c) does not include—...v) ~~the grazing of improved pasture within the relevant setback from a natural wetland~~
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.143	Interpretation	Definitions	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the inclusion of a definition for farm infrastructure to align with the amendments sought to ECO-R1, GRUZ-R1 and GRUZ-S5.	Insert a new definition for farm infrastructure: Means those structures (excluding buildings) reasonably necessary to enable primary production activities relating to irrigation, the provision of stock water, the storage and distribution of animal feed, stock yards and ramps, but excludes fences, farm tracks, feedlots and silage pits.
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.144	Interpretation	Definitions	Amend	Stoney Creek supports the inclusion of a definition for “supporting activity” as per the NPSHPL, to align with the amendments sought to GRUZ-R3 and GRUZ-S3.	Insert a new definition for supporting activity: Has the same meaning as per the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land and means: in relation to highly productive land, those activities reasonably necessary to support land-based primary production on that land (such as on-site processing and packing, equipment storage, and animal housing).
Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	S127.145	Appendix 5 - NFL-APP - Landscape Values	APP5-NFL-APP	Oppose	Supportive of background information but concerns are raised that the extent, description and attributed values fail to recognise and misrepresent the current land use and values of the area. There is insufficient supporting documentation regarding the extent of the ONL area. Stoney Creek considers that the values listed to be protected are not present over much of the ONL area, which is working farmland and that the ONL area should be reduced. The description does not recognise the character and structures of the station which occupies 42 percent of the area and list qualities of naturalness and wilderness as values to be protected when over 70 percent of the area is a modified pastoral landscape. Pastoral farming can also provide benefits to landscape values through pest and weed management. Croydon Bush Scenic Reserve has distinctively different vegetation form the	Amend Appendix 5 in a way that: ulliAccurately reflects the significant presence of pastoral farming within the ONL;/liliRecognises the benefits provided by pastoral farming in terms of maintaining a sense of openness, landscape legibility and pest control, within the ONL;/liliRecognises that the patterns and values of indigenous biodiversity vary significantly across the extent of the ONL and the highest value area is concentrated within the Croydon Bush SNA;/liliCorrects the statement that the ONL is free of structures;/liliRecognises the historical and cultural significance of the area to the rural community; and/liliMake available all documents referred to within Appendix 5, the s32 Report and the Landscape Assessment prepared by Mike Moore publicly available on the Gore District Council website./li/ul

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
					rest of the ONL, and exotic vegetation has not been listed as a potential threat. The description also does not recognise the historical and cultural values of the Croydon Area which is one of the earliest European settlements in Southland. The Southland Murihiku Regional Landscape Study (Boffa Miskell, 2019) which was relied upon in determining the ONL status should be made publicly available.	
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.146	Natural environmental Values map layers	NFL-MAP-Hokonui Hills	Oppose	The spatial extent of the ONL as notified in the Planning Maps is fundamentally flawed. The mapping appears to be carried over from previous versions of the Plan without review or updates.	Amend the Hokonui Hills ONL boundaries to accurately reflect the area of Outstanding Natural Landscape values. Figure 10 of Appendix B [refer to original submission] provides a suggestion of the extent of the ONL area within Stoney Creek station which can be discussed further with the Council, including incorporating evidence provided by a landscape expert at the hearing stage.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.147	Maps	MAP-Additional provisions sought	Amend	Stoney Creek's preferred relief relies upon the establishment of a new precinct to be called the Hokonui Hills Special precinct where rural activities associated with pastoral farming are permitted with appropriate limits to protect the Hokonui Hills.	Insert a new map layer to be called the Hokonui Hills Special Precinct. Replace the underlying zoning of this area (General Rural) with the special precinct zoning.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.148	GRUZ - General Rural Zone	GRUZ-P9	Support	Stoney Creek supports a policy providing for activities with a genuine link with rural land and primary production.	Retain GRUZ-P9 as drafted.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.149	Interpretation	silage pit	Oppose	This definition is broad and could be taken to include areas for the storage of hay or grain within a silo/container, or small scale storage of bagged feed. Alignment with the definition as per the Proposed Southland Land and Water plan is suggested.	Amend the definition of silage pit as follows: ~~Means an area constructed and used for the purpose of fermentation and storage for animal feed.~~ land or structures on which silage (plant material harvested while green for fodder and kept succulent by partial fermentation, but does not include baleage or hay) is stored, processed or directly utilised, excluding the storage of bales of plant material completely encapsulated in plastic.
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.150	Whole Plan	Whole Plan	Not Stated	Stoney Creek supports the intent of the PGDP to guide sustainable development in the Gore District, managing use and development of natural and physical resources today while protecting the interests and opportunities of future generations to also utilise those resources in a sustainable way. However, considers that the PGDP as drafted has failed to meet this objective. Concerned about lack of consultation and that many of the more problematic provisions have immediate legal effect and therefore must be complied with until a decision is made on the PGDP. This could take years, and has wide reaching implications for the Station in terms of their ability to continue operating.	Withdraw the requested provisions as outlined in the letter to the Chief Executive of Gore District Council dated 7 November 2023
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.151	NFL – Natural Features and Landscapes	NFL - General	Oppose	The mapped extent of Hokonui Hills ONL extends beyond the area of outstanding natural values and there is no justification provided for the extent. No evidence provided to suggest that the level of protection provided by the Operative Gore District Plan was insufficient.	Modified pastoral landscape should not be mapped as ONL Reduce restrictions relating to the Hokonui Hills ONL overlay

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.152	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO - General	Oppose	The provisions were developed in a matter of months after the commencement of the NPSIB which left little space for consultation outside of the formal notification process. A plan change will be necessary to amend rules and map Significant Natural Areas. Blanket protections proposed in the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter provide little to no ability for essential pastoral farming practices such as fencing and the construction or maintenance of farm tracks to be undertaken without resource consent. The immediate legal effect of the rules within the Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter significantly hinders the ability of Stoney Creek Station (and farmers in general) to effectively manage vegetation on their properties.	Withdraw chapter
Peters Farm LtdKaren Peters	S127.153	Whole Plan	Whole Plan	Oppose	The provisions in general fail to recognise the presence of established farming activities within the district that have low environmental effects yet provide significant social, cultural and economic benefits. Farming in particular is subject to significant increases in the level of restriction when compared with other land uses, and subject to unworkable provisions that have been developed without input from the farming community. These restrictions are particularly restrictive in ONLs and are not practical for farming activities and creates uncertainty and cost to rural landholders that is not proportionate to the potential environmental effects.	Amend as per submission.
Phil Checketts	S94.001	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	MRZ-S4	Oppose in part	NZBC CAS1 Clause 5.5.2 states: Where roof eaves extend from an otherwise unrated external wall to within 650 mm of the relevant boundary, the total eaves construction and the external wall from which they project shall have an FRR of no less than 30/30/30. 5.2.1 Where the external wall is required to have an FRR, the eaves projection shall either have an FRR of 30/30/30 or the wall shall be extended to the underside of the roof. We think that the two should be aligned or at least direct the owner that fire rating issues should be checked. Vehicles are up to 5.5m long from front bumper to rear toe bar- to ensure a vehicle would fit in a garage built of various materials you would need at least 800mm either at the front or at the back or both so the minimum length of the garage would need to be 8m.	MRZ-S4 1. (b) eaves, gutters and associated downpipes on any building may intrude into the setback by ~~a maximum of 600mm.~~ a maximum of 350mm.without the need for fire rating and 600mm where there is a fire rating required under NZBC (d) a carport or garage, either standalone or attached to the residential unit may be setback a minimum of 500mm from a side or rear boundary provided that the maximum length of the building adjacent to the property boundary does ~~not exceed 6 metres~~ not exceed 8 metres and contains no doors or windows.
Phil Checketts	S94.002	LLRZ – Large Lot Residential Zone	LLRZ-S2	Amend	Under the FENZ requirements we are required to have a 45,000l water supply for fire fighting purposes on a house greater than 200m2. A House under 200m2 requires a 20,000l water	LLRZ-S2 3(c) store ~~45,000 litres~~ 44,000 litres of potable water on-site from another source.

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
					supply. The largest water tanks are 32,000l. On a house over 200m2, We would have to accommodate two 32,000l water tanks for fire fighting with a balance of water of 19,000l (64,000l-45,000l) The balance could be used as part of the 45,000l potable water supply along with a third 32,000l tank. However with a house under 200m2 a 32,000l tank would only have a balance 12,000l of water spare to use as potable water and along with an additional of 32,000l tank it fails short of the 45,000l requirement, by 1,000l. meaning a third tank is required.br /We would suggest that the storage should be reduced to 44,000l of water. this them means a max of two 32,000l tanks for a house under 200m2 and a still a max of 4 tanks for a house over 200m2.	
P & J Talbot	S12.001	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-O2	Oppose	Reasonable consideration needs to be given to non-industrial, incompatible activities and built forms adjacent to the proposed general industrial zone.	Consent from neighbouring properties should be sought before any industrial activities or businesses are feveloped.
P & J Talbot	S12.002	Zone map layers	GIZ-MAP	Oppose in part	None specified.	Industrial zoning adjacent to the rural lifestyle zone must be light industrial only.
P & J Talbot	S12.003	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ - General	Oppose in part	No fuel stations due to environmental damage risk, additional traffic, noise and light pollution as they are generally open 24/7.	No acitivities that operate 24/7.
P & J Talbot	S12.004	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ - General	Oppose in part	No fuel stations due to the risk of environmental damage and the additional traffic noise and light pollution	Sites adjacent to the general industrial zone shall be consulted with full agreeance, prior to any development in the general industrial zone. Including emergency services and training of. No 24/7 activities
P & J Talbot	S12.005	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-P2	Oppose in part	Neighbours should be consulted as a part of the consenting process to ensure that any adverse effects including pollution, noise, light and traffic are mitigated.	Properties adjacent to the General Industrial Zone are consulted with as part of the consenting process for any development.
P & J Talbot	S12.006	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-P3	Oppose	Equal opportunities for development on land zoned general/light industrial, as businesses are not the only ones who may benefit from the location e.g. non-profits, sports groups and clubs.	Equal opportunity for non-industrial activities on land zoned as general/light industrial.
P & J Talbot	S12.007	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-P4	Oppose in part	Not fully understood.	Further clarification on this policy.
P & J Talbot	S12.008	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-P5	Oppose in part	Screening may not be sufficient enough to mitigate noise, visual impact, light, traffic, dust, fumes and security issues therefore it should be extended to address effects on private properties.	Consultation with adjacent properties in regard to screening.Provisions to address the effects on adjacent properties, which may require further screening from 24/7 light, sound protection, visual impact and security on private properties.

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
P & J Talbot	S12.009	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-P6	Oppose	Reserve land should only be used for enhancing purposes, e.g. tree planting, protecting/improving waterways or wetlands etc.	Reserve land should not be developed, use existing land instead.
P & J Talbot	S12.010	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-R2	Oppose	Protect the privacy, security, tranquility, environmental benefits and aesthetics of rural lifestyle blocks.	Should be prohibited on sites that boundary private property.
P & J Talbot	S12.011	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-R3	Oppose in part	To protect the reasons to live on a rural lifestyle block, tranquility, aesthetics, environmental benefits, security and lifestyle.	Training facilities should be setback 500m from private properties.
P & J Talbot	S12.012	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-R4	Oppose	Service stations will create significant negative effects on surrounding properties.	No more service stations required in the Gore District.
P & J Talbot	S12.013	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-R6	Oppose in part	Staorage has visual impacts on neighboring properties.	Increase the distance to boundary of stored items. No storage allows for reasons of convenience only i.e. car bodies, used building materials, hazardous liquids, gases, products
P & J Talbot	S12.016	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-R7	Oppose in part	Food and beverage activity can create high traffic, unpleasant smells and attract undesirable people into a private/ secure area.	Food and Beverage setback of 1000m from adjacent properties to the GIZ.Restrict the hours to normal work hours, 24/7 prohibited.
P & J Talbot	S12.018	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-S1	Oppose in part	Protect the aesthetics, shading impact and property value.	Ground level should be measured prior to any "building up" of the site. Surrounding properties should be consulted with to approve all build designs and dimensions.Site profiles to be set (build foot print and height) for better understanding of scale
P & J Talbot	S12.022	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-S2	Oppose in part	Rural lifestyle will also be impacted.	Include rural lifestyle in 1 (a). Better clarity of "note" as too which side of a right of way as in build side/private property side.
P & J Talbot	S12.024	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-S3	Oppose	Allows for sufficient screening, land scaping, green strip, security fencing etc.br /	Increase the setback distance of buildings to the full height of the building, and a minimum of 15 meters.No reduction in setbacks permitted.
P & J Talbot	S12.026	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-S4	Oppose	Large buildings could be setback 2m from a private RoW, and there would be no provision for screening, sound protection, aesthetics, green strip etc.	Setbacks from RoW to be the same as boundary setbacks.No reduction in setbacks permitted.
P & J Talbot	S12.028	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-S5	Oppose in part	Some sites may not benefit from riparian planting, erosion control may be more beneficial as a part of the consent. If neither are required the applicant should be required to plant an equal amount in another site, e.g. wetland.	Applicants shall be required to perform "environmental good work" if riparian planting is not neccessary.
P & J Talbot	S12.029	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-S5	Oppose in part	Parties on the opposite bank may not be in a position to plant or improve erosion control methods.	If the waterway forms a boundary, the applicant should be liable for riparian planting on the opposite bank or erosion control.
P & J Talbot	S12.031	GIZ – General	GIZ-S7	Oppose in part	Some choices of screening may create further visual effects on neighboring sites.	All screening must be approved by neighbouring property owners.

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
		Industrial Zone				
P & J Talbot	S12.032	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-S8	Oppose in part	Security fencing can be ugly and overly "industrial" looking.	Additional screening is required for security fences along boundaries with rural, rural lifestyle, public or residential zones.
P & J Talbot	S12.033	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	GIZ-O2	Oppose	None specified.	The proposed general industrial zone on Saleyard Road should be light industrial not general industrial.
Port Blakely Limited	S138.001	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	This rule is more stringent than the NES-CF, but does not have jurisdiction to be more stringent, as it relates to indigenous vegetation and not an SNA.	Amend ECO-R1 to include the permitted activities set out in Reg 93(2), (3), (4) &(5) of the NES-CF; orAmend the rule to have two classes of activities, one related to land uses excluding commercial forestry and one related to land uses associated with commercial forestry; orAmend the chapter to make it explicit that clearance of indigenous vegetation associated with a commercial forestry activity is regulated by the NES-CF.
Port Blakely Limited	S138.002	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	Reg 94 makes the activity restricted discretionary where the clearance does not meet the permitted conditions. Amend to align with the NESCF regulations.	Amend ECO-R1(1) and ECO-R1(2) to align with the standards contained in the NES-CF
Port Blakely Limited	S138.003	ECO – Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	ECO-R1	Oppose	This rule is more stringent than the NES-CF. Reg 93(1) permits the clearance of indigenous vegetation in an SNA to clear forestry tracks. Reg 6 does allow District Plan rules to be more stringent in relation to SNA, however it needs to be justified, with the reasons set out in the s32 Report. There was no discussion in the s32 Report as to why it was justified in imposing more stringent standards than the NES-CF in relation to maintaining forestry tracks in SNAs.	Amend to allow for the maintenance of forestry tracks within SNAs, as set out in Reg 93 NES-CF.
Port Blakely Limited	S138.004	EW - Earthworks	EW-Exemptions	Oppose	As per NES-CF, when the earthworks no longer meet the permitted standards, it is the regional council that has jurisdiction to consider an application for a resource consent, not the territorial authority. br /	Amend the list of activities exempt from the Earthworks rules, to include earthworks carried out in relation to commercial forestry; or insert new rule for earthworks associated with commercial forestry, permitting those activities where they comply with regulations 24 to 33 of the NES-CF.
Port Blakely Limited	S138.005	EW - Earthworks	EW-Additional provisions sought	Oppose	As per NES-CF, when the earthworks no longer meet the permitted standards, the regional council that has jurisdiction to consider an application for a resource consent, not the territorial authority.	Insert a new rule for earthworks associated with commercial forestry, permitting those activities where they comply with regulations 24 to 33 of the NES-CF.
Port Blakely Limited	S138.006	SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	SASM-O1	Support in part	Recognises that tangata whenua and Ngāi Tahu consider all elements of the environment are culturally significant to them. This approach is inherently uncertain and unclear for other landowners.	Port Blakely would like to be part of this conversation going forward
Port Blakely Limited	S138.007	Whole Plan	Whole Plan	Not Stated		That the Proposed Plan be rejected in its current form;
Port Blakely Limited	S138.008	Whole Plan	Whole Plan	Not Stated		That the Proposed Plan be amended to reflect the issues raised in this submission;
Port Blakely Limited	S138.009	Whole Plan	Whole Plan	Not Stated		That the Proposed Plan be amended to incorporate the equivalent regulation of the NESCF or otherwise amend or delete the rule so that the equivalent NES-CF regulation applies instead of the Proposed Plan rule;

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
Port Blakely Limited	S138.010	Whole Plan	Whole Plan	Not Stated		That the relevant Proposed Plan objectives and policies be amended as required to support and implement the particular relief described above; and/or
Port Blakely Limited	S138.011	Whole Plan	Whole Plan	Not Stated		Such other relief as may be required to give effect to this submission, including alternative, consequential or necessary amendments to the Proposed Plan that address the matters raised by Port Blakely.
Port Blakely Limited	S138.012	Interpretation	plantation forestry	Support in part	The National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry (NES-CF) replaced the br /National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) when it came br /into force on the 3 November 2023 and is the relevant national standard.br /	Amend the definition of plantation forestry, to have the same meaning as per the NES-CF.
PowerNet Limited	S95.001	Interpretation	critical infrastructure	Oppose in part	The electricity distribution network comprises a ‘lifeline utility’, as defined by the Civil Defence and Emergency Management Act 2002 Act.1 PowerNet seeks that the electricity distribution network is included in the definition of Critical Infrastructure.	Amend as follows: means those necessary facilities, services, and installations which are critical or of significance to either New Zealand, Southland, or Gore. This may include but is not limited to: • strategic land transport network and arterial roads; • rail corridor; • telecommunication facilities; • national, regional and local renewable electricity generation activities of any scale; • the electricity transmission network (the National Grid) and distribution networks ; • sewage collection, treatment and disposal networks; • community land drainage infrastructure; • community potable water systems; • established community-scale irrigation and stock water infrastructure;
PowerNet Limited	S95.002	Interpretation	functional need	Support	PowerNet supports the inclusion of this definition as it reflects the definition in the National Planning Standard (“NPS”).	Retain definition
PowerNet Limited	S95.003	Interpretation	infrastructure	Support	PowerNet supports the inclusion of this definition as it reflects the definition in the RMA.	Retain definition
PowerNet Limited	S95.004	Interpretation	network utilities	Support	PowerNet supports the definition for Network Utilities as it includes the electricity distribution activities, which is appropriate and aligns with the RMA.	Retain definition
PowerNet Limited	S95.005	Interpretation	network utility operator	Support	PowerNet supports the inclusion of this definition as it reflects the definition in the RMA.	Retain as notified
PowerNet Limited	S95.006	Interpretation	operational need	Support	PowerNet supports the inclusion of this definition as it reflects the definition in the NPS.	Retain definition
PowerNet Limited	S95.007	Interpretation	reverse sensitivity	Oppose in part	PowerNet supports the general intent of this definition, however, it considers that amendments are needed. The phrase “more recent establishment or alteration of another activity” implies that reverse sensitivity is not relevant until such time as the new sensitive activity is physically established and the reverse sensitivity effects are in place. This definition should enable the risk of reverse sensitivity effects arising to be managed so that these effects do not occur.	Amended definition as follows: “...or curtailed by the possible establishment or alteration of another activity...”.
PowerNet Limited	S95.008	Interpretation	sensitive environments	Oppose	PowerNet considers that this definition is uncertain and captures areas that are not defined. The definition should be amended to refer to specifically mapped and identified areas on the District Planning maps.	Amend definition as follows: Means land identified with: Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes or Significant Natural Areas or Areas of Indigenous Biodiversity
PowerNet Limited	S95.009	Interpretation	specified infrastructure	Support	PowerNet supports the inclusion of this definition as it reflects the definition in the NPSIB.	Retain definition

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
PowerNet Limited	S95.010	Interpretation	Definitions	Not Stated	PowerNet seeks a definition for ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION NETWORK is included in the District Plan. The term Electricity Distribution Network is referred to in the rules PowerNet proposes (below) and therefore a definition for this activity is required. The suggested definition is considered to be appropriate as it encapsulates what the distribution network does, as well as the structures that are required for the conveyance of electricity.	Include a definition for: ELECTRICITY DISTRIBUTION NETWORK: Means the conveyance of electricity via electricity subtransmission and distribution lines, cables, support structures, substations, transformers, switching stations, kiosks, cabinets, and ancillary buildings and structures, including communication equipment, by a network utility operator. This includes the assets shown on the planning maps.
PowerNet Limited	S95.011	Interpretation	Definitions	Not Stated	PowerNet seeks a definition for Electricity Distribution Yard. The definition captures both distribution and subtransmission lines as well as the structures that are required for the conveyance of electricity.	Include a definition for: Electricity Distribution Yard means a) the area located within 10m of the centreline of a 110kV, 66kV or 33 kV electricity distribution line on single poles / towers or within 10m of a foundation of an associated support structure. As depicted in Diagram 1 – Electricity Distribution Yard Diagram 1 – Electricity Distribution Yard (Diagram on pg 6 of original submission) Note: The Electricity Distribution Yard does not apply to underground cables or any distribution lines (or sections of line) that are designated.
PowerNet Limited	S95.012	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-Overview	Support	PowerNet supports the overview section which recognises the importance of infrastructure to the district.	Retain this section
PowerNet Limited	S95.013	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-O1	Support	PowerNet supports this objective as it provides for infrastructure, including electricity distribution networks, and recognises the importance of infrastructure for communities and businesses.	Retain objective
PowerNet Limited	S95.014	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-P2	Support in part	PowerNet considers that it is appropriate to encourage undergrounding of new power lines in urban environments. However, it is not practicable nor economically viable to underground new electricity lines in rural areas. PowerNet requests this policy is amended so that it only applies to urban environments.	Amend as follows: In urban areas , require the underground placement of network utilities where practical and appropriate for the functional needs and operational needs of the network utility.
PowerNet Limited	S95.015	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-P6	Support in part	PowerNet supports policy INFRP6 which seeks to protect the transmission network which is the National Grid. However, PowerNet seeks an amendment to this policy to provide a similar level of protection to PowerNet’s important distribution network. This policy is part of the planning framework PowerNet is seeking alongside the mapping of its important lines, and including rules to manage incompatible activities close to these lines.	Amend as follows: Adverse effects (including reverse sensitivity effects) are avoided, remedied or mitigated where activities are adjacent to critical infrastructure, including the management of sensitive activities and the effects of subdivision, use and development that may compromise the operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of the National Grid and the electricity distribution network.
PowerNet Limited	S95.016	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-R1	Support	PowerNet supports the permitted activity status for below ground infrastructure as it encourages the undergrounding of infrastructure, where this is practicable.	Retain rule
PowerNet Limited	S95.017	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-R2	Support	PowerNet supports the permitted activity status for infrastructure within buildings.	Retain rule
PowerNet Limited	S95.018	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-R3	Support	PowerNet supports this rule. It is considered appropriate to provide for the upgrading and maintenance of infrastructure, within the parameters established by the conditions. PowerNet agrees that a restricted discretionary	Retain rule

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
					activity status is appropriate where the conditions cannot be achieved	
PowerNet Limited	S95.019	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-S1	Support	PowerNet supports the requirement for lines to be 10m above navigable waterbodies, or attached to and no lower than existing structures.	Retain standard
PowerNet Limited	S95.020	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-S2	Support	PowerNet supports this standard, and the exclusion for masts, poles, lines and support structures.	Retain standard
PowerNet Limited	S95.021	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-S3	Oppose in part	PowerNet supports the 25m height limit for utility poles and masts, and the restricted discretionary activity status where 25m cannot be achieved. PowerNet does not support the 13m height limit for poles and masts in all other zones as poles and masts in other zones are sometimes over 13m. PowerNet seeks that this height limit should be 16m to recognise the operational and functional constructions of electricity distribution activities.	Amend clause (1) of the standard to apply a 16m height limit to all other zones.
PowerNet Limited	S95.022	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-S4	Oppose in part	PowerNet supports the exemption for utility buildings to comply with the underlying zone setback requirements, however it seeks clarification that the exemption will apply to structures and equipment for electricity distribution purposes.	Amend standard as follows: ... Except this rule does not apply to: (a) poles, antennas, and associated cabinets and equipment (cabinets and equipment up to 10m2 in area and 3m in height, exclusive of any plinth or other foundation), for telecommunication and radio communication and electricity distribution activities ; (b) lines and support structures for telecommunications; (c) network utilities within legal road.
PowerNet Limited	S95.023	INFR – Infrastructure	INFR-Additional provisions sought	Not Stated	PowerNet seeks a new rule in the Infrastructure Chapter to manage activities within the electricity distribution corridor.	Include the following new rule: INFR-RX Activities and development (other than earthworks and other than electricity distribution network activities) within the Electricity Distribution Yard All Zones Activity status: Permitted Where: (a) Any building or structure, excluding a fence, is located at least 10m from the centre line of a 66kV electricity distribution line or at least 10m of a foundation of an associated support structure; or(b) Any building or structure, excluding a fence, is located at least 5m from the centre line of a 33kV electricity distribution line or at least 5m of a foundation of an associated support structure; or (c) A fence not exceeding 2.5m in height above ground level; or (d) The building or structure is not used for the handling or storage of hazardous substances with explosive or flammable intrinsic properties (this does not apply to the accessory use and storage of hazardous substances in domestic scale quantities). Note: The New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001) contains restrictions on the location of buildings, structures, and activities in relation to the National Grid and electricity distribution lines. Buildings, structures, and activities in the vicinity of the National Grid or electricity distribution lines must comply with the NZECP 34:2001. Compliance with the rule requirements of the District Plan does not ensure compliance with NZECP 34:2001 or vice versa.
PowerNet Limited	S95.024	TEMP – Temporary Activities	TEMP-Additional provisions sought	Not Stated	PowerNet is required to use a mobile substation unit as a back-up to its permanent substations. The mobile unit is used in the event of an emergency, when the permanent substation is damaged or cut off or when routine maintenance is undertaken on a permanent substation. The mobile substation ensures that electricity supply is not interrupted during maintenance events and can allow for the fast resumption of electricity supply in emergency situations while the permanent network is being repaired. Given	Include the following rule: TEMP-R10 Temporary Substation All Zones Activity Status: Permitted

Original submitter name	Submission Point Number	Plan section	Plan provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested
					the importance of temporary substations for the continuation of electricity supply, it is considered that this temporary activity should be provided for as a permitted activity	
PowerNet Limited	S95.025	NOISE – Noise	NOISE-Overview	Support in part	PowerNet seeks that noise generated by the use of a mobile substation be exempt from having to comply with Noise Standard NOISE-S1 because noise generated by the use of the mobile substation is temporary.	Amend Note 2 of the Noise Chapter as follows: 11. Noise generated by the use of a mobile substation.
PowerNet Limited	S95.026	PWN – PowerNet	PWN-2	Support	PowerNet has sought the rollover of this existing designation. PowerNet considers that the inclusion of the legal description of the designation site will assist with identifying the site.	Include the legal description within the designation schedule for PWN.2 South Gore Substation: Site identifier: 7A Oreti Street, Gore, Lot 1, DP 14629
PowerNet Limited	S95.027	PWN – PowerNet	PWN-3	Support	PowerNet has sought the rollover of this existing designation. PowerNet considers that the inclusion of the legal description of the designation will assist with identifying the site.	Include the legal description within the designation schedule for PWN.3 Mataura Substation: Site identifier: 52 Old Coach Road, Mataura, Sec 1 SO 7222
PowerNet Limited	S95.028	PWN – PowerNet	PWN-5	Support	PowerNet has sought the rollover of this existing designation without change. PowerNet notes that a minor correction is required to the spelling of Lmax in condition 4.	Correct the spelling of Lmax in condition 4 of Designation PWN-5.
PowerNet Limited	S95.029	Information only map layers	MAP Electricity Lines	Not Stated	Amend the planning maps to include the Electricity Distribution Lines The identification of PowerNet’s 33kV lines, and 11kv lines that are the only power supply for communities, which is required in the District Planning maps as part of the suite of changes. PowerNet seeks to protect its infrastructure from reverse sensitivity effects. The proposed mapping of the lines works in combination with the distribution line corridor provisions will assist with managing incompatible activities close to these lines, that may inhibit PowerNet’s ability to provide electricity to the community.	Include PowerNet’s 33kV lines, and 11kv lines that are the only power supply for communities in the District Planning Maps, as shown in the Plan (pg 15 of submission) . Note that the plan maps the 33kV lines, and PowerNet are currently mapping the 10kV lines which are the only power supply for communities, which will be provided to Council once mapping is completed.