

**Before the Hearings Panel
At Waimakariri District Council**

Under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

In the matter of the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

Between **Various**
Submitters

And **Waimakariri District Council**
Respondent

Reply Report on wrap up matters

Reporting Planners on behalf of Waimakariri District Council

Date: 13 December 2024

INTRODUCTION:

- 1 We have prepared this Council Reply Report on behalf of the Waimakariri District Council (**Council**) in respect of matters raised through Minute 43¹ and Minute 44² and any other integration matters arising from our discussions, including those listed in the Reporting Officers' 'Integration and wrap-up matters' memo dated 22 October 2024³.
- 2 We are authorised to provide this evidence on behalf of the Council.

QUALIFICATIONS, EXPERIENCE AND CODE OF CONDUCT

- 3 This is a combined Reply Report from the Reporting Officers, being:

- Mr Mark Buckley;
- Ms Jessica Manhire;
- Mr Andrew Willis;
- Mr Peter Wilson;
- Ms Bryony Steven;
- Mr Neil Sheerin;
- Ms Shelley Milosavljevic;
- Ms Rachel McClung;
- Mr Alan Matheson;
- Mr Andrew MacLennan;
- Mr Garry Blay;
- Ms Brooke Benny; and
- Mr Bryce Powell.

¹ https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0025/168181/Minute-43-Response-to-CIAL-request,-Reply-Report-questions-for-HS12C,-Wrap-up-questions.pdf

² https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0026/168416/Minute-44-Response-to-Council-Memo.pdf

³ https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0025/168280/MEMORANDUM-TO-PANEL-ROR-EXTENSISON-WRAP-UP-MATTERS-CLOSE-OF-HEARINGS-22-OCTOBER-2024.pdf

4 Appendix C of our respective section 42A reports sets out our qualifications and experience.

5 We confirm that we continue to abide by the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses set out
in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023.

SCOPE OF REPLY

6 The purpose of this Reply Report is to reply to the Questions raised in Appendix 2 of Minute
43 and provide the Hearing Panel with an integrated set of recommendation from reporting
planners across all topics, as per the direction in Minute 43 and the timeframes as per Minute
44. Our responses are set out in **Table 1** below.

7 In addition, to the questions raised in Minute 43, we have also identified and responded to
other matters that have arisen through our discussions as set-out in **Table 2** below.

8 For transparency and clarity, we have also included a table of the provisions where our
recommendations differed, what the differences were, and where agreement has now been
reached between the reporting officers, or not. This table is enclosed at **Appendix 1**.

9 The Reporting Officers have combined all of their recommended amendments to provisions
of the PDP. This is enclosed at **Appendix 2a** (PDP and V2 recommendations, excluding
Development Areas), **Appendix 2b** (Development Area recommendations) and **Appendix 2c**
(V1 recommendations). For clarity, **Appendix 2a, 2b and 2c** do not include provisions for
submissions that Reporting Officers recommend for rejection; in most cases if there are
provisions proposed by a submitter's Planner, such provisions would be contained within the
submission, s42A Report, submitter evidence, or Reply Report relating to that topic.

10 The Reporting Officers have provided any updated recommendations on submissions in
Appendix 3 where these recommendations have been subsequently amended via this Reply
Report.

11 For completeness, we also enclose Section 32AA assessments within **Appendix 4** to assist the
panel as a result of altered recommendations.

12 **Appendix 5** sets out the Reporting Officers' response to the Panel's Minute 43 Question 17,
which relates to the application of the National Environmental Standards for Commercial
Forestry (NESCF) in the PDP.

Answers to questions posed by the Hearings Panel via Minute 43

- 13 Reporting Officers' responses to the Hearing Panel's questions posed in Appendix 2 of Minute 43 are in **Table 1** below.

- 14 For transparency, we have provided the names of the Reporting Officers involved in responding to each question. Only the Reporting Officers who reported on the specific matters relevant to the question conferenced have provided a response.

Table 1 - Reporting Officers' responses to Minute 43 Questions

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
1	<p>Mark Buckley</p> <p>Andrew MacLennan</p>	<p>Fulton Hogan [41.18] requested a new policy in the UFD chapter as follows: "<u>Recognising materials requirements:</u></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Decision making on the use of land must take into account the physical construction materials requirements of infrastructure and, in particular, the critical role of aggregates for the sustainable management of communities.</u>"</p> <p>The EI reporting officer agreed that aggregate supply sterilisation is an issue relevant to the district plan review but considered that it is more appropriately located within the Rural zone chapter. Fulton Hogan addressed this at the Rural chapter hearing and maintain that aggregate extraction as it relates to a construction material for infrastructure is not only a rural issue and should be addressed at the strategic level. Please provide drafting responses to Fulton Hogan's request, along with consequential amendments that may be needed, for the Panel's consideration.</p>
<p>The issue regarding aggregate supply was addressed in the Right of Reply report for Strategic Direction para [88] to [93]. The ROR noted that most aggregate extraction in the district was from river systems, which is outside of the district council's jurisdiction and is controlled by the Regional Council.</p> <p>Aggregate extraction is provided for as a discretionary activity within the GRUZ and RLZ zones. This rule approach is reflected in Objective RURZ-O1 and RURZ-P2 maintaining the ability of rural land to be used for primary production where adverse effects on soil and highly productive land is minimised.</p>		

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p>Mr Maclennan clarified his statement with respect to the EI Chapter, that he thought that it was a land use issue and should be addressed in the rural zone chapters. He also noted that the statement on ‘aggregate supply sterilisation’ should have read ‘access to aggregate supply’.</p> <p>Fulton Hogan has not presented any evidence in either the Strategic Direction or the Rural Zones hearings that identifies that aggregate extraction for the district will change from being mostly from rivers to land based extraction. While it is recognised that aggregate extraction is important for the construction industry and the cost of transportation increases with distance from source, most aggregate extraction in the district is from the existing rivers and with one exception is not from land-based pits.</p> <p>The Reporting Officer has reviewed the merits of the suggested policy and considers RURZ-P2 provides for aggregate extraction as a primary production activity, while recognising that it is not prevalent in the district and should remain as a discretionary activity.</p>
2	Andrew Maclennan	<p>The relationship between the EI chapter rules and NZECP 34:2001 is still unclear to the Panel. Three of the planners involved in the JWS prepared on this matter agree that the plan should contain a rule that replicates but simplifies the requirements of NZECP 34:2001, while two planners disagree with this approach for a number of reasons including the fact that “Plan users still need to refer to the full text of NZECP:34 regardless of simplified text (discussed above and appended below) in the Plan as there are other components of NZECP:34 that still need to be met that are not in EI-R54 and R56.” The Panel has reviewed both the proposed rules and the requirements of the NZECP 34:2001, and there appear to be subtle differences in what is required. Please reconsider the consistency of Rules EI-52 to EI-56 (as proposed) with the requirements of NZECP 34:2001, and whether such rules are required in terms of s32 of the Act.</p>

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p>The intention of the drafting proposed was to simplify multiple provisions (2.2.1 and 2.2.3 of NZECP) into one rule to cover both pole and tower-based assets. This has created some slight inconsistencies between the provisions in the PDP and the requirements of the NZECP. These slight inconsistencies were considered acceptable to reduce the complexity of the PDP rule.</p> <p>I have reconsidered whether these rules are required to achieve the relevant objective of the PDP, which is EI-O3. As set out within the JWS, I retain the view that the option of relying on an advice note within the PDP referring to the NZECP regulation is not sufficient. None of the regulations/instruments listed above contain requirements to engage with or notify electricity distributors of a proposed development.</p> <p>I also note that there are several aspects within the PDP rules (EI-R52(2) and (4), EI-R52A(2) and (4), EI-R54(2)(c)) that apply in addition to the requirements of the NZECP which also help to achieve EI-O3.</p> <p>From a s32 perspective, I consider the intention of either option is to implement EI-O3, which states:</p> <p><i>The safe, efficient and effective operation, maintenance, repair, upgrading and development of energy and infrastructure is not constrained or compromised by incompatible activities and development, including by reverse sensitivity effects.</i></p> <p>Option 1 would be to remove EI-R52 and EI-54 and rely on an advice note that requires compliance with NZECP, as set out in Appendix A of the JWS supported by Mr Hume and Ms Dale⁴.</p>

⁴ https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0022/149800/STREAM-5-JOINT-WITNESS-STATEMENT-ENERGY-AND-INFRASTRUCTURE-NZ-ELECTRICAL-CODE-OF-PRACTICE-.pdf

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p>Option 2 would be to retain EI-R52 and EI-54 as set out within the JWS supported by Ms Foote, Ms McLeod, and Mr Maclennan. This option simplifies the requirements of provisions within 2.2.1 and 2.2.3 of NZECP, which provides a consent framework for activities in these areas.</p> <p>I consider Option 2 to be a more effective option for achieving EI-O3 as the PDP Plan rules simplify the requirements of the NZECP, and breaches of a rule default to a consent process where the effects of the activity on the national grid yards and major electricity distribution lines can be considered. In contrast, if the rules are replaced with an advice note, plan users are required to review a somewhat complex technical document to determine compliance. The difficulty associated with understanding and applying this document, given its technical nature (particularly clauses 2.2.1 and 2.2.3), reduces the effectiveness of this option.</p> <p>Presuming both options are accurately understood and implemented, I consider Option 1 more efficient as it removes the duplication between the NZECP:34 and the PDP. However, it requires users to interpret a technical document (NZECP:34), which could be less efficient in practice.</p> <p>On balance, I retain the view that the option of retaining the rules with the PDP is the most appropriate way to achieve EI-O3 of the PDP, as it avoids the complexity of relying solely on the NZECP:34 while ensuring that the safe, efficient, and effective operation of energy infrastructure is maintained, as required by EI-O3.</p> <p>If the Hearings Panel were of a view to remove the specific direction within EI-R52 and EI-R54, I consider the PDP could include, as a permitted standard, the requirement to achieve the requirements of NZECP, similar to that within EI-R55. This would ensure there is a regulatory framework within the PDP to manage activities near the national grid yards and major electricity distribution lines, which will ensure that EI-O3 is achieved.</p>
3	Mark Buckley	<p>A number of inconsistencies appear to remain in the rural provisions that deal with the NPS-HPL and the soil provisions of the CRPS (although we recognise that this may be due to scope issues). We note that Policy 8 of</p>

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
	<p>Shelley Milosavljevic</p>	<p>the NPS-HPL is to is protect HPL from inappropriate use and development and that clause 3.9 provides for a pathway for a range of activities on HPL, including those that have a functional or operational need. One such example of this was raised by Fulton Hogan who seek a pathway for quarrying activities on HPL, and also recommended a new policy and definitions to assist with the interpretation of the NPS-HPL in a local sense, at least in the context of quarries. We note that RURZ-P2 (as recommended) does not appear to accurately reflect this direction. Nor does it seem to reflect the more nuanced approach of Objective 15.2.1 and Policy 15.3.1 of the CRPS (particularly with the proposed use of ‘avoid’). What scope is available to address the wider issue of a pathway for activities not considered to be ‘inappropriate’ by the NPS, along with the specific issue raised by Fulton Hogan?</p>
<p>We have recommended RURZ-P2(2)(a) be amended to specify ‘versatile’ soils and replace ‘<i>minimised</i>’ with ‘<i>avoided</i>’, as shown below. This was via the scope of a submission from Christchurch City Council [360.20] which sought amendment of the rural objectives and policies “<i>to protect the highly productive land/versatile soils from fragmentation and unsuitable ‘primary production’ activities such as forestry or quarrying.</i>”</p> <p><i>Rural Zones s42A Report recommended version:</i></p> <p>RURZ-P2 - Rural land</p> <p>Maintain the availability and life supporting capacity of land in recognition of its importance for undertaking primary production, and to maintain or enhance natural environment values in Rural Zones, including by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. providing <u>Enabling</u>⁵ for primary production activities; 		

⁵ Hort NZ [295.125]. Rural Zones s42A report

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p>2. providing Enabling⁶ for those activities that directly support primary production, or those activities with a functional need to be located within Rural Zones, where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> adverse effects on versatile soils⁷ and highly productive land are minimised avoided⁸; the amenity values and character of Rural Zones are maintained; and to the extent practicable, adverse effects are internalised within the site where an activity is being undertaken. <p>3. ensuring subdivision and subsequent development is managed so that it does not foreclose the ability for rural land to be utilised for primary production activities including not diminishing the potential for rural land to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.</p> <p>Clause (2), the chapeau of sub-clause (a), relates to enabling “<i>activities that directly support primary production, or those activities with a functional need to be located within Rural Zones</i>” and therefore we consider in the context of this, subclause (a) (notified version) relates to providing for such activities (e.g., a rural industry or farm quarry) while minimising adverse effects on soils and HPL. We consider it is no longer appropriate to replace ‘minimised’ in RURZ-P2(2)(a) with ‘avoided’ as it is too restrictive and does not align with the direction of both the CRPS and NPS-HPL, as set out below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRPS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Objective 15.2.1 seeks the maintenance and improvement of soil quality to safeguard their mauri, life supporting capacity, health and productive capacity. ○ Objective 15.2.2 seeks the prevention of soil erosion. • NPS-HPL:

⁶ Hort NZ [295.125]. Rural Zones s42A report

⁷ Christchurch City Council [360.20]. Rural Zones s42A report.

⁸ Christchurch City Council [360.20]. Rural Zones Reply report.

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Objective 2.1 seeks to protect HPL <i>“for use in land-based primary production, both now and for future generations”</i>. ○ Policy 8 seeks that HPL is <i>“protected from inappropriate use and development”</i>. ○ Clause 3.9 sets out appropriate activities within HPL provided mitigation measures are applied (and therefore other activities are deemed ‘inappropriate’). These apply to a broad range of activities including specific activities with functional or operational need to occur within HPL (including aggregate extraction that <i>“provides significant national or regional public benefit that could not otherwise be achieved using resources within New Zealand”</i>). <p>We consider that ‘minimised’ better aligns with the direction of Policy 8 of the NPS-HPL to protect HPL from inappropriate use and development as the ‘inappropriate’ term indicates that this protection is not absolute (while we consider ‘avoided’ would indicate absolute protection). We consider ‘minimised’ adequately conveys the intent of clause 3.9 of the NPS-HPL to provide for ‘appropriate’ activities along with the application of minimisation or mitigation measures on the actual loss or potential cumulative loss of the availability and productive capacity of HPL and avoids or mitigates reverse sensitivity effects. We also consider the amendments to clause (2)(a) would align with the direction of the CRPS (Chapter 15) to maintain and improve soil quality and prevent soil erosion.</p> <p>As set out in Question 4 below, we do not consider that this clause should specify ‘versatile’ soils given the CRPS objectives and policies do not refer to versatile soils and would refine the reference to soils significantly to just LUC 1 and 2, as such now recommend the term ‘versatile’ is deleted.</p> <p>On that basis, we recommend that RURZ-P2(2)(a) is amended as shown in purple text below and that the Christchurch City Council submission [360.20] is rejected, as set out in Appendix 1. We note this also relates to the submission from Fulton Hogan [41.44] that sought that RURZ-P2 be retained as notified.</p>

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
<p><i>Minute 43 Recommendations version:</i></p> <p>RURZ-P2 - Rural land</p> <p>Maintain the availability and life supporting capacity of land in recognition of its importance for undertaking primary production, and to maintain or enhance natural environment values in Rural Zones, including by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. providing <u>Enabling</u>⁹ for primary production activities; 2. providing <u>Enabling</u>¹⁰ for those activities that directly support primary production, or those activities with a functional need to be located within Rural Zones, where: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. adverse effects on <u>versatile</u> soils¹¹ and highly productive land are <u>minimised</u> <u>avoided</u>¹²; b. the amenity values and character of Rural Zones are maintained; and c. to the extent practicable, adverse effects are internalised within the site where an activity is being undertaken. 3. ensuring subdivision and subsequent development is managed so that it does not foreclose the ability for rural land to be utilised for primary production activities including not diminishing the potential for rural land to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. <p>We have updated Appendix 2 and Appendix 3 to reflect these updated recommendations. No s32AA assessment is required given the recommend reverting to the notified PDP wording of the specific aspects of these provisions.</p>		

⁹ Hort NZ [295.125]. Rural Zones s42A report

¹⁰ Hort NZ [295.125]. Rural Zones s42A report

¹¹ Christchurch City Council [360.20]. Rural Zones s42A report.

¹² Christchurch City Council [360.20]. Rural Zones Reply report.

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
4	Mark Buckley Shelley Milosavljevic	<p>With respect to CRPS, we note that ‘versatile soils’ are not referred to in the objectives and policies of that document. However, RURZ-O1, RURZ-P2, and RLZ-P1(3) use that phrase. Objective 15.2.1 of the CRPS requires the <i>‘Maintenance and improvement of the quality of Canterbury’s soil to safeguard their mauri, their life supporting capacity, their health and their productive capacity.’</i> We also note that the Principal Reasons for the soil provisions state that <i>“The protection of soil quality is not absolute. There will be situations where soil will be degraded as a result of land-uses and where it is not necessarily appropriate to foreclose a development option purely for soil conservation or soil quality reasons, such as in existing urban locations, or when alternative areas or options are not available.”</i> Is there scope to better reflect the direction of the CRPS, particularly in relation to the RLZ given it is not a rural production or general rural zone and therefore not subject to the NPS-HPL?</p>
<p>On reflection, reconsidering the scope and intent of Chapter 15 (Soils) of the CRPS, we now consider it inappropriate for RURZ-O1, RURZ-P2, and RLZ-P1 to refer to ‘versatile soils’ given the CRPS objectives or policies do not use this term. Chapter 15 of the CRPS relates to ECan’s soil conservation function under s30 of the RMA, and its objectives 15.2.1 and 15.2.2 respectively seek the maintenance and improvement of soil quality to safeguard their mauri, their life supporting capacity, their health and their productive capacity, and the prevention of soil erosion.</p> <p>The objective of the NPS-HPL is to protect highly productive land for use in land-based primary production, both now and for future generations, while CRPS Chapter 15 (Soils) provides <i>“consideration of soil quality and erosion much more broadly than protecting highly productive land for use in land-</i></p>		

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p><i>based primary production</i>¹³. The NPS-HPL is limited to Land Use Capability (LUC) 1, 2 and 3 soils within the General Rural Zone or Rural Production Zone, while CRPS Chapter 15 (Soils) applies to the entire region, regardless of the zoning and LUC soil classification. Therefore, the area of overlap between the NPS-HPL and CRPS Chapter 15 is the protecting the productive capacity of soil (within LUC 1, 2 or 3 soils in any General Rural Zone or Rural Production Zone).</p> <p>Given this, we now recommend RURZ-O1, RURZ-P2, and RLZ-P1 be amended as set out below.</p> <p><u>RURZ-O1</u></p> <p>The Rural Zones Reply Report¹⁴ recommended version of RURZ-O1 is shown below.</p> <p><i>Rural Zones Reply Report recommended version:</i></p> <p>RURZ-O1 - Rural Environment</p> <p>An environment with a predominant land use character comprising primary production activities and natural environment values, where rural openness dominates over built form, while recognising:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the east of the District has a predominant character of small rural sites with a pattern of built form of residential units and structures at more regular intervals at a low density compared to urban environments; and

¹³ Paragraph 8 of Supplementary Statement of Evidence of Serena Orr on behalf of Canterbury Regional Council; Hearing Stream 6. 13 October 2023. (https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/data/assets/pdf_file/0029/144686/STREAM-6-SUPPLEMENTARY-EVIDENCE-4-SUBMITTER-316-CANTERBURY-REGIONAL-COUNCIL-ECAN-.pdf)

¹⁴ Via the Rural Zones s42A Report and further amendments via the Rural Zones Reply Report.

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p>2. the remainder of the District, while having a range in the size of rural sites, has a predominant character of larger rural sites with a corresponding density of residential units and built form.; <u>and</u></p> <p>3. <u>the importance of protecting the highly productive and versatile soils that form part of the highly productive land in the District.</u>¹⁵</p>
<p>We now consider that this recommended new clause (3) should be deleted because it does not align with the direction and purpose of RURZ-O1, which in our opinion is to set out the character of the rural environment and distinguish between the character of the two rural zones (Rural Lifestyle Zone and General Rural Zone). On this basis, we recommend that the Christchurch City Council submission [360.20] seeking this amendment should now be rejected and recommended clause (3) be deleted, as shown in purple text below, and in Appendix 1.</p> <p><i>Minute 43 recommended version:</i></p> <p>RURZ-O1 - Rural Environment</p> <p>An environment with a predominant land use character comprising primary production activities and natural environment values, where rural openness dominates over built form, while recognising:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the east of the District has a predominant character of small rural sites with a pattern of built form of residential units and structures at more regular intervals at a low density compared to urban environments;; <u>and</u> 2. the remainder of the District, while having a range in the size of rural sites, has a predominant character of larger rural sites with a corresponding density of residential units and built form.; <u>and</u> 		

¹⁵ Christchurch City Council [360.20]. Rural Zones s42A report and amended through Rural Right of Reply report.

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p data-bbox="353 252 1921 335">3. the importance of protecting the highly productive and versatile soils that form part of the highly productive land in the District.¹⁶</p> <p data-bbox="230 411 340 438">RURZ-P2</p> <p data-bbox="230 464 2027 603">In relation to versatile soils we had recommended clause (2)(a) be amended to specify ‘<i>versatile</i>’ soils and replace ‘<i>minimised</i>’ with ‘<i>avoided</i>’, as shown below. This was via the scope of a submission from Christchurch City Council [360.20] which sought amendment of the rural objectives and policies “to protect the highly productive land/versatile soils from fragmentation and unsuitable ‘primary production’ activities such as forestry or quarrying.”</p> <p data-bbox="230 679 801 707"><i>Rural Zones s42A Report recommended version:</i></p> <p data-bbox="327 730 627 758">RURZ-P2 - Rural land</p> <p data-bbox="327 783 2027 866">Maintain the availability and life supporting capacity of land in recognition of its importance for undertaking primary production, and to maintain or enhance natural environment values in Rural Zones, including by:</p> <ol data-bbox="353 882 2027 1118" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="353 882 1086 909">1. providing Enabling¹⁷ for primary production activities; <li data-bbox="353 935 2027 1018">2. providing Enabling¹⁸ for those activities that directly support primary production, or those activities with a functional need to be located within Rural Zones, where: <ol data-bbox="450 1034 1624 1118" style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="450 1034 1624 1069">a. adverse effects on <u>versatile</u> soils¹⁹ and highly productive land are minimised <u>avoided</u>²⁰; <li data-bbox="450 1086 1400 1118">b. the amenity values and character of Rural Zones are maintained; and

¹⁶ Christchurch City Council [360.20]. Rural Zones s42A report and amended through Rural Right of Reply report.

¹⁷ Hort NZ [295.125]. Rural Zones s42A report

¹⁸ Hort NZ [295.125]. Rural Zones s42A report

¹⁹ Christchurch City Council [360.20]. Rural Zones s42A report.

²⁰ Christchurch City Council [360.20]. Rural Zones Reply report.

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p>c. to the extent practicable, adverse effects are internalised within the site where an activity is being undertaken.</p> <p>3. ensuring subdivision and subsequent development is managed so that it does not foreclose the ability for rural land to be utilised for primary production activities including not diminishing the potential for rural land to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.</p> <p>However, we now do not consider that this clause should specify ‘versatile’ soils given the CRPS objectives and policies do not refer to versatile soils and it would refine the reference to soils significantly to only LUC 1 and 2. We therefore recommend that RURZ-P2(2)(a) is amended to delete the recommended amendments and as such the Christchurch City Council submission [360.20] seeking these amendments should now be rejected, as shown in purple text below, and in Appendix 1. There is a submission from Fulton Hogan [41.44] that sought that RURZ-P2 be retained as notified. The response to Question 3 above reconsiders the recommendation of the term ‘avoided’ in RURZ-P2(2)(a).</p> <p><i>Minute 43 Recommendations version:</i></p> <p>RURZ-P2 - Rural land</p> <p>Maintain the availability and life supporting capacity of land in recognition of its importance for undertaking primary production, and to maintain or enhance natural environment values in Rural Zones, including by:</p> <p>4. providing Enabling²¹ for primary production activities;</p> <p>5. providing Enabling²² for those activities that directly support primary production, or those activities with a functional need to be located within Rural Zones, where:</p>

²¹ Hort NZ [295.125]. Rural Zones s42A report

²² Hort NZ [295.125]. Rural Zones s42A report

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p>a. adverse effects on <u>versatile</u> soils²³ and highly productive land are <u>minimised avoided</u>²⁴;</p> <p>b. the amenity values and character of Rural Zones are maintained; and</p> <p>c. to the extent practicable, adverse effects are internalised within the site where an activity is being undertaken.</p> <p>6. ensuring subdivision and subsequent development is managed so that it does not foreclose the ability for rural land to be utilised for primary production activities including not diminishing the potential for rural land to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.</p> <p><u>RLZ-P1</u></p> <p>The Rural Zones s42A Report recommended RLZ-P1 be amended as shown in <u>purple text</u> below, and in Appendix 1.</p> <p>RLZ-P1 - Character of the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p> <p>Maintain the character in the Rural Lifestyle Zone which comprises:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a highly modified landscape strongly influenced by fine grained patterns and processes of human induced activity, including a predominance of small rural lots with a resulting pattern of residential units, buildings, fencing, amenity and domestic planting mixed with smaller scale primary production activities; 2. a dominance of human modified open space and vegetation, including paddocks and trees over buildings; and 3. a zone supporting activities reliant on the natural and physical resources, <u>such as versatile soils</u>,²⁵ of the Rural Lifestyle Zone.

²³ Christchurch City Council [360.20]. Rural Zones s42A report.

²⁴ Christchurch City Council [360.20]. Rural Zones Reply report.

²⁵ Christchurch City Council [360.20]. Rural Zones Right of Reply report.

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
<p>However, upon reflection we now consider that the recommended amendment ‘such as versatile soils’ should be deleted (as shown below) given the CRPS objectives and policies does not specify ‘versatile’ soils and soil in general are considered a ‘natural resource’ thus already provided for by this term. As such we now recommend that the Christchurch City Council submission [360.20] submission be rejected.</p> <p>RLZ-P1 - Character of the Rural Lifestyle Zone</p> <p>Maintain the character in the Rural Lifestyle Zone which comprises:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. a highly modified landscape strongly influenced by fine grained patterns and processes of human induced activity, including a predominance of small rural lots with a resulting pattern of residential units, buildings, fencing, amenity and domestic planting mixed with smaller scale primary production activities; 2. a dominance of human modified open space and vegetation, including paddocks and trees over buildings; and 3. a zone supporting activities reliant on the natural and physical resources, <u>such as versatile soils,</u>²⁶ of the Rural Lifestyle Zone. <p>We have updated Appendix 2 and Appendix 3 to reflect these updated recommendations. No s32AA assessment is required given the recommend reverting to the notified PDP wording of the specific aspects of these provisions.</p>		
5	Mark Buckley	<p>We also note that the NPS-HPL has recently been amended to include ‘intensive indoor primary production or greenhouse activities’ within the clause 3.9 exemptions list. This was an issue raised by HortNZ throughout the hearings. Can you please revisit this issue in light of the change to the NPS-HPL.</p>

²⁶ Christchurch City Council [360.20]. Rural Zones Right of Reply report.

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
<p>This question is already addressed in the Section 42A Reporting Officers Memo²⁷ to the Panel dated 26 August 2024 regarding the August 2024 amendments to the NPS-HPL. No changes are needed.</p>		
<p>6</p>	<p>Mark Buckley</p>	<p>The recommended new rule GRUZ-R X Artificial Crop Protection Structures uses three descriptors in relation to where a standard applies as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) 'within 30m of the boundary of <u>the property</u> ' b) 'from the boundary to an <u>adjacent lot</u>', c) 'site coverage' <p>In relation to the use of 'lot' in the setback standard, we note that a property can be made up of a number of 'lots'. The definition of 'site' overcomes this to a degree by including 'an area of land which comprises two or more adjoining legally defined allotments in such a way that the allotments cannot be dealt with separately without the prior consent of the council', although this does not overcome the problem completely as properties are also made of several titles that can be sold 'separately without the prior consent of the council'. Property is not defined but does not need to be as it would have its ordinary mean and is relatively easy to determine. Please reconsider the use of these terms in this rule and for consistency in other parts of the plan where similar issues might exist.</p>

²⁷ https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/_data/assets/pdf_file/0026/166715/MEMO-TO-HEARINGS-PANEL-AUGUST-2024-NPS-HPL-AMENDMENTS.pdf

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
<p>The reporting officers suggest that for this rule, references to ‘property’ be replaced with ‘site’ and ‘lot boundary’ be replaced with ‘site boundary’. This is because ‘site’ and ‘lot’ have legal definitions or are otherwise specified within legislation or regulation. However, we note elsewhere in the PDP ‘property’ is used to describe other matters²⁸ and therefore ‘lot’ and ‘property’ should be retained where the terms are relevant to the context. We have reviewed the remaining chapters of the plan and recommended changes where required.</p>		
<p>7</p>	<p>Andrew MacLennan Mark Buckley</p>	<p>The Panel notes that RURZ-P7 Retail Activities is split into two parts, the first dealing with ‘new’ activities and the second dealing with the ‘expansion of existing activities’. We note that the first part does not refer to ‘traffic effects’ although the second part does. Waka Kotahi and KiwiRail have raised concerns with this. The reporting officer appears to reject this on the basis that the TRANS Chapter will provide for the safe and efficient operation of the transport system. However, the Panel have not identified any relevant TRANS rules that might address this issue, particularly in relation to the cumulative effects of rural retail outlets on high-speed roads. Can you please advise how this is addressed? If it is not addressed, please provide a drafting response to address the issue.</p>
<p>There are several policies and rules in the TRAN chapter that will apply new retail activities in rural zones:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>TRAN-P4 - New activities</i> provides policy direction on new activities including a requirement to provide safe entry and exit for vehicles. This is supported by Standard TRAN-S3 will also apply to the construction of new vehicle crossings. 		

²⁸ For example, within the hazards chapter which does not limit the applicability of policies to a site, lot or building instead seeking to protect ‘property’

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p>- <i>TRAN-P5 - High traffic generating activities</i> requires that the adverse effects of high traffic generating activities on the transport system are managed. This is supported by <i>TRAN-R20 - High traffic generators</i> which requires that if an activity generates average daily traffic volume that exceeds the thresholds contained in Table TRAN-1 consent is required and an Restricted Discretionary Activity.</p> <p>However, officers have re-considered the relief sought from Waka Kotahi. Officers agree with the amendment sought by the submitter to clause (1) to include “adverse effects on the safe and efficient functioning of the transport system are avoided or mitigated” within a new subclause. This will ensure effects on the transport system of a new retail activity are be considered within the policy. Officers disagree that amendments are required to (2) as “traffic” is already included within clause (2). Officers’ recommended the following amendment to RURZ-P7:</p> <p>“In relation to retail activity:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. new retail activity be limited to that associated with a home business, selling products directly produced in the Rural Zones, or selling products or services directly supporting primary production; providing that: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a.</u> to the extent practicable adverse effects of the activity are internalised within the site; and <u>b.</u> amenity values and the character of Rural Zones are maintained; and <u>c.</u> <u>adverse effects on the safe and efficient functioning of the transport system are avoided or mitigated. [275.76]</u> 2. the expansion of any existing retail activity shall: <p>...”</p>

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
8	Mark Buckley	<p>The Panel is confused on why the maximum GFA limitation in a SASM is recommended to be deleted from RLZ-R11 Rural industry but not for GRUZ-11, and why the maximum land area in GRUZ-11 is recommended for deletion but not in RLZ-R11. Please advise.</p>
<p>It appears there is a drafting error in Appendix 2 of the Rural Zones Reply Report as it incorrectly recommends deletion of RLZ-R11(4) and GRUZ-R11(5).</p> <p>Appendix A of the s42A Report, along with paragraph [374] (GRUZ-R11 Rural Industry) and paragraphs [627 and 633] (RLZ-R11 Rural Industry), correctly show the recommended deletion of GRUZ-R11(3) and RLZ-R11(3) respectively.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I recommend that GRUZ-R11(3) and RLZ-R11(3), which requires that <i>“the maximum GFA occupied for the rural industry shall be 250m²”</i> be deleted. • I do not recommend that RLZ-R11(4) and GRUZ-R11(5) be deleted, this was an error in Appendix 2 of the Rural Reply Report. • This is correctly shown in Appendix 2 of this Wrap Up Reply Report. 		
9	Peter Wilson Mark Buckley	<p>During the course of the hearings on the UFD chapter (and subsequent chapters) it became apparent that various policies in the UFD chapter (at least P2, P3, P7, and P8) need to be revised to address the different</p>

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p>development criteria that applies within the Greater Christchurch Area (Chapter 6 of the CRPS and Map A) and that which applies outside the Greater Christchurch Area (Chapter 5 of the CRPS). Complicating this issue is how the application of the Policy 8 of the NPSUD might apply in this policy context, in particular where feasible development capacity under UFD-01 cannot be met in the urban form required by Map A of the CRPS. The Panel has heard substantial evidence on the need to address shortfalls outside of the areas identified on Map A, and outside the areas identified in UFD-P2(1). To assist the Panel with its deliberations, can you please provide a set of provisions that:</p> <p>a) split the policies into two parts (inside and outside of the GCA), and</p> <p>b) incorporate a policy basis to address Policy 8 of the NPS-UD.</p>
<p>Mr Wilson and Mr Buckley have considered this, largely agreeing with the Panel’s question and have produced an amended set of UFD policies that address the matter. In making these amendments, these Reporting Officers note that the notified UFD policies did attempt to cover the matters raised by the Panel in their question, but that further clarity was required to address the distinction between Chapter 5 CRPS (outside of the dashed line in Map A of the CRPS), and Chapter 6 (inside the dashed line in Map A of the CRPS). Amendments have been proposed for these policies, as well as to delete UFD-P6, in response to submissions and Mr Wilson’s recommendations in Hearing Steam 10A (Development Areas) and his final recommendations on certification in Hearing Stream 12E to remove certification as a process. This also responds to the request by Christchurch City</p>		

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
<p>Council and Ravenswood Developments Limited to give effect to the responsiveness and significance criteria in the NPSUD and Policy 8 in particular²⁹. These recommended amendments are shown in Appendix 2.</p> <p>Scope for these changes come from Canterbury Regional Council [316.8], [316.9], [316.10], [316.12], [316.13], which considered that the notified UFD provisions failed to give effect to the CRPS, and Christchurch City Council [360.9], [360.10], [360.11] which stated that the notified UFD policies were not consistent with Chapter 6 of the CRPS, including UFD-P2, UFD-P3, UFD-P5, and also UFD-P7 and UFD-P8 in relation to CRPS Policy 6.3.11. Ravenwood Developments Limited [347.9] also that sought UFD-P4 is amended to better give effect to the NPS-UD. Appendix 3 shows the updated recommendations on these submissions that reflect these amendments.</p>		
10	All Reporting Officers	<p>The Panel has noted a number of jurisdictional issues within some of the standards and other provisions of the PDP, which are essentially ultra vires because they relate to Regional Council functions. Can the plan provisions please be reviewed to ensure all such provisions are identified and dealt with if possible.</p>
<p>All Reporting Officers have reviewed the provisions they reported on and have not identified any remaining outstanding jurisdictional / ultra vires issues relating to Regional Council functions that need to be addressed.</p>		
11	Andrew MacLennan	<p>The EI chapter section 42A report author recommends accepting the Waimakariri District Council submission (367.15)) that would make “large scale solar electricity generation” a restricted discretionary activity. We note that this would already seem to be a ‘restricted discretionary activity’ under Rule EI-R43 (so question whether the new rule is needed) but would also highlight that this rule (along with EI-R43) has no scale limitation i.e.</p>

²⁹ Noting also that the draft CRPS, which may have provided guidance on these matters, has now been delayed.

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p>very large renewable projects (outside of large-scale windfarms) are restricted discretionary activities. In the Panel experience, largescale REG activities are generally identified as discretionary activities because they impact on a wide range of resources over the large geographic area. Is there scope to address this matter?</p>
<p>It is acknowledged that the relationship between EI-R43 and EI-R44A as included within the EI Reply Report version of the EI chapter may be potentially confusing and risk an incorrect interpretation being applied. The intention of EI-R43 as notified was that it was that it only applied to (emphasis added) ‘renewable energy generation, including renewable electricity, from waste’. However, within the notified version of the PDP the two commas (in bold above) within the rule title were missing. We consider the commas should be included within the rule title to ensure that the rule is interpreted and applied in the way that it was intended. This recommended change is shown in the Officer Recommendations version of the PDP.</p> <p>With these additions, EI-R43 is irrelevant as it relates to renewable energy generation, including renewable electricity, from waste.</p> <p>The requested ‘large scale solar electricity’ rule EI-R44A came about due to a number of proposed large scale solar farms in the district and region. The notified proposed plan has rules for small scale or community scale solar (EI-R40), small scale or community scale wind (EI-R41), and large scale wind (EI-R44), but nothing specifically on large scale solar. As this was deemed a ‘gap’ the Council submission sought a new rule for large scale solar.</p> <p>If it was determined large scale solar did not comply with EI-R40 it would become RDIS. In that context perhaps a new rule for large scale solar is unnecessary. However, there is a risk a large scale solar applicant could argue a large scale solar farm was community scale and therefore a permitted activity under EI-R40 which was not the intention. It was therefore thought better to more specifically provide for large scale solar through its own new rule which is still considered a better approach.</p>		

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p>In relation to whether large-scale REG activities should be identified as discretionary activities because they impact a wide range of resources over a large geographic area, it is noted that there is scope within the submissions to introduce a specific rule for large scale solar electricity generation. It is also noted that the suggested matters of discretion associated with the large scale solar electricity generation rule EI-R44A are very broad and could, in effect, render the requested restricted discretionary activity a discretionary activity. From a drafting perspective, it is considered more appropriate that the new rule adopts a discretionary activity status, which also aligns with the discretionary activity status of EI-R44 large scale wind. If the activity status of EI-R44A becomes DIS instead of RDIS then as a consequential amendment the matters of discretion should be deleted. These recommended changes are shown in the Officer Recommendations version of the PDP.</p>
<p>12</p>	<p>All Reporting Officers</p>	<p>The Panel has received varying recommendations on how Chapters should cross-reference each other, particularly in respect to the Energy and Infrastructure Chapter. We would like a final, integrated, and consistent recommendation on cross-referencing.</p>
		<p>This question was raised by the Hearings Panel as part of the questions to the Reporting Officers within the Hearing 7 workstream. Mr MacLennan’s view within his responses to questions within Hearing 7A was that cross-reference between the EI chapter and the residential chapters provides a useful reminder that there are relevant rules in the EI chapter that need to be considered when developing near the National Grid and Major Electricity Distribution Lines.</p> <p>On reflection, Mr MacLennan notes that within each zone chapter, there are already notes which state: <i>“As well as the provisions in this chapter, district wide chapter provisions will also apply where relevant.”</i> This provides a general indication to plan users that other district-wide provisions will apply to these zone chapters. He also acknowledges that a wide range of other district-wide rules will apply to the residential zones that do not include a specific cross-reference.</p>

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p>Given this, to ensure consistency across the PDP, Mr Maclennan now considers that the specific cross-reference to the rules in the EI chapter is not necessary. This advice is included in the Residential reply report and reflected in the recommended combined PDP.</p> <p>All Reporting Planners have also considered the merits of cross referencing across the plan and consider that adding additional cross-referencing risks minimising the intent and use of the instructional text within the introductory sections of the chapters that provide the basis for how the matrix of plan provisions work together. Examples of these zones are the SPZ-KR Zone and the Energy and Infrastructure chapters. Reporting Officers prefer the use of these statements rather than a more simplistic rule specific cross-referencing approach, recognising that many rules will have hyperlinks and other functionality enabled by an ePlan format.</p>
13	Brooke Benny Mark Buckley Andrew Maclennan Neil Sheerin	<p>Please consider that part of the House Mover’s submission point that seeks particular standards be introduced that relate to relocatable buildings which are to be permanent buildings on a site. We note that this is an integration issue between all zone chapters, where House Movers have sought this relief.</p>
		<p>The relevant Reporting Officers agree that the amendments recommended for the TEMP Activities Chapter, under Rule TEMP-R6, addresses the matter raised across the different Zones. A temporary relocatable building is a permitted activity, provided it meets the applicable standards under Rule TEMP-R6, until it becomes a permanent building (i.e. a building consent). At such time that it becomes a permanent relocated building, the built form standards of the underlying zone will apply.</p>

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
		<p>If the standards of TEMP-R6 (1) – (4) are not met (i.e. maximum of one for a specific period, not connected to services, not fixed to the ground, and underlying zone built form standards), any relocatable building is considered to be a permanent building and applicable to the underlying zone. A relocatable building that is “<i>stored prior to permanent siting on site or transfer to another site</i>” is considered to be a permanent building. Therefore, any relocatable building would be applicable to the applicable rules within one chapter; i.e. Temporary Activities or the underlying Zone.</p> <p>In relation to all other chapters beyond the TEMP Activities Chapter, the Reporting Officers agree that bespoke provisions/ particular standards sought by House Movers for a relocatable building are not necessary as there may be amenity and character issues that are appropriate to be addressed through the resource consent process.</p> <p>The Reporting Officers agree that the recommended amended definition of ‘construction work’ proposed by Brooke Benny and Jessica Manhira should be adopted (as outlined in Appendix 1). Therefore, provided the amended definition is adopted, such Officers agree that an advice note (as recommended by Andrew MacLennan in his Right of Reply Report for the Residential and Large Lot Residential chapters) within each zone chapter is not required.</p>
14	All Reporting Officers	<p>Please provide a consolidated response and final recommendations to the matter of whether the Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development Objectives and Policies should have primacy or not, including any recommended drafting. In doing so, please carefully consider the wording set out in the Introduction of both Chapters, and advise whether there should be any amendments made to this wording, and if so, under what scope.</p>
<p>Reporting Officers have reviewed their memo of 8 December 2023, and the memo of Kainga Ora dated 16 February 2024. Reporting Officers note that Kainga Ora agree with the Reporting Officers’ position in respect of matters (i) to (iii) but disagree with respect to Strategic Directions (SD) ‘overriding’</p>		

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
<p>all other objectives and policies (as per SD approach (iv)). Reporting Officers agree with paragraph 7 of the Kainga Ora memo, and with respect to paragraph 8 consider that SDs may be able to provide pathways to resolve conflicts, but that SDs should not and could not anticipate and resolve every conflict that may arise.</p> <p>Reporting Officers maintain their view that SD and UFD objectives and policies should not have primacy in terms of primacy approaches (iii) and (iv), as set out in their memo dated 8 December 2023. As such, Reporting Officers do not recommend any amendments to the Introduction sections of both the SD and UFD chapters in relation to this matter.</p>		
<p>15</p>	<p>Brooke Benny</p> <p>Mark Buckley</p> <p>Andrew Maclennan</p> <p>Neil Sheerin</p>	<p>Please consider that part of the House Mover’s submission point that seeks particular standards be introduced that relate to relocatable buildings which are to be permanent buildings on a site. We note that this is an integration issue between all zone chapters, where House Movers have sought this relief.</p>
<p>This question is a duplication of Question 13 above. Please refer to the response provided in Question 13.</p>		
<p>16</p>	<p>Andrew Maclennan</p> <p>Peter Wilson</p> <p>Andrew Willis</p>	<p>Please provide a final consolidated response as to whether the proposed railway corridor setback should be consistent through the Plan, and where the setback should best be located (in zone chapters or the Energy and Infrastructure chapter).</p>

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
	<p>Jessica Manhire</p> <p>Mark Buckley</p> <p>Neil Sheerin</p>	
<p>The Reporting Officers agree that the railway setback should be consistent across the plan and consider there is insufficient evidence on why there should be a distinction between the zones. Reporting Officers largely agree that 4m is sufficient to allow for maintenance of buildings without the need to access the rail corridor.</p> <p>The Reporting Officers consider there are pros and cons of both options - locating in the zone chapters versus a District-wide chapter such as Energy and Infrastructure or Transport.</p> <p>If including the railway setback in the zone chapters, then there is a risk that when a new zone is created, or a new rail corridor in a zone that does not have a setback rule, that a railway setback is not included in the provisions for that zone.</p> <p>There are already setback rules in the zone chapters, and plan users are likely to look in the zone chapters for such a rule. The rule may be missed if it is only located in a District-wide chapter.</p> <p>However, Reporting Officers largely agree that the railway setback should be located in the zone chapters, as this aligns with the notified plan structure and is the more logical location for plan users. KiwiRail also asked for the setback to be located in the zone chapters, and whilst KiwiRail originally sought and preferred a 5m setback, KiwiRail also indicated a 4m setback was acceptable.</p>		

Question	Reporting Officer(s)	Question
17	Shelley Milosavljevic Peter Wilson Mark Buckley	Please provide updated recommendations in respect to the application of the National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry.
See Appendix 5.		
18	Rachel McClung Peter Wilson	Please provide updated recommendations which address the Kainga Ora submissions on Variation 1 that were not addressed through Hearing Stream 8 nor Hearing Stream 7A.
Please refer to the Variation 1 Reply Report prepared by Mr Wilson, and the memorandum prepared by Ms McClung that was appended to Mr Wilson's Variation 1 Reply Report.		

Table 2 – Additional matters identified by Reporting Officers’

<p>Mr Willis’s Right of Reply on Hearing 12D (4 December 2024)</p>	<p>Andrew Willis</p>	<p>In order to take into account Mr Wilson’s 12E calculations, Mr Willis wishes to amend his statement on capacity arising from rezonings at para 60 as follows (additions in <u>underlining</u>):</p> <p>“As set out in my S42A Addendum report, the demand for urban housing is forecast to be 4,970 dwellings over the short-medium term (2023-2033), which is based on the Statistics New Zealand High projection. Combined, the estimates of new additional capacity recommended in Hearing Stream 12E hearing (6,406) and the existing <i>feasible</i> capacity from the PDP (5,940) provide at least 12,346 dwellings (2023-2033), which is well in excess of projected demand for housing and therefore there will be significant SETZ / GRZ substitutability options available within the District, and elsewhere within Greater Christchurch (I assess substitutability in the next section). <u>For the 30-year term (2023-2053), Mr Wilson’s plan-enabled capacity is 17542 dwellings, which is well in excess of even the 30-year combined bottom line of 13,250”</u></p>
<p>Planning Officers memo to Panel (22 October 2024)</p>	<p>Peter Wilson Mark Buckley Andrew Willis Jessica Manhire</p>	<p>Any necessary recommended consequential amendments to the Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development chapters.</p>

	Rachel McClung	
See Appendix 2.		
Planning Officers memo to Panel (22 October 2024)	Peter Wilson Mark Buckley Andrew Willis Rachel McClung Jessica Manhire	Integration of 12A, 12C and 12E recommended rezonings, including consistent structure of provisions (as requested by the Panel).
See Appendix 2.		
Planning Officers memo to Panel (22 October 2024)	Peter Wilson Mark Buckley	Integration both within the DEV chapter and between the DEV chapter and other chapters, including integration in terms of how new development areas (FUDAs) are addressed.
See Appendix 2.		

Planning Officers memo to Panel (22 October 2024)	Brooke Benny Jessica Manhire	The definition of ‘Construction Work’ across the NOISE and TEMP chapters.
<p>House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association seeks the definition of ‘construction work’ be amended to add: <i>"for the avoidance of doubt, installation of a building includes the relocation and re-siting of a building."</i></p> <p>The submission notes that the definition of ‘construction work’ in the PDP does not specifically include ‘relocatable building’, and only includes reference to ‘building’. In Ms Benny’s opinion, a relocatable building is intended to be captured under the definition of ‘construction work’, as clause ‘a.’ of that definition includes ‘any building,...’ and the definition of ‘building’ (a National Planning Standard definition) <i>“means a temporary or permanent movable or immovable physical construction...”</i>. Accordingly, the relocation and re-siting of a relocatable building is captured within that definition. Thus, this means that a relocatable building is included in the definition of ‘construction work’ under the ‘installation’ of a ‘building’.</p> <p>However, Ms Benny now agrees with Ms Manhire that amending the definition as sought by submission [221.1] would ensure clarity is provided to readers as to the different types of buildings which are intended to be captured by the definition.</p> <p>Therefore, the Reporting Officers recommend the submissions by House Movers [221.1] and [221.5] (relating to the definition of construction work) be accepted.</p>		
Planning Officers memo	All Reporting Officers	Any recommended corrections to minor errors (those that can be recommended via Clause 16 of Schedule 1 of RMA and others).

to Panel (22 October 2024)		
<p>Section 42A Reporting Officers have identified recommended amendments that they consider would qualify as Clause 16 amendments which could be undertaken by staff and on which it is considered no recommendation from the Hearings Panel is required. All other recommended amendments within the s42A Reports are already before the Panel as Officer recommendations and are shown in the Officer Recommendations version of the PDP and are recommendations on which it is expected the Panel will make decisions.</p>		

Date: 13 December 2024

Appendix 1 – Recommendations on conflicting reporting officer recommendations

PROVISION	SUB REF	SUBMITTER / FURTHER SUBMITTER	RELEVANT REPORTS	S42A RECOMMENDATIONS	COMBINED OFFICER REASONS / COMMENTS	COMBINED RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS TO PDP?
SUB-S3	[10.1]	Daniel Smith	SPZ(Rangiora Airfield) Right of Reply).	<p>The submitter sought to exclude the Special Purpose Zone (Rangiora Airfield) from the density requirements of SUB-S3, as follows:</p> <p><i>“Residential subdivision of any area subject to an ODP, except in the Large Lot Residential Zone and Special Purpose Zone (Rangiora Airfield), shall provide for a minimum net density of 15 households per ha, unless there are demonstrated constraints then no less than 12 households per ha.”</i></p> <p>This was supported by the reporting planner.</p>	SUB-S3 should not apply to the Special Purpose Zone (Rangiora Airfield). This is because rule SPZ(RA)-R5 has been drafted to give effect to the objectives and policies of the zone. If the zone were included in SUB-S3 it would be in conflict with the specific requirements of SPZ(RA)-R5.	Recommend that reference to Special Purpose Zone (Rangiora Airfield) is not added to SUB-S3.
	[183.9]	Richard and Geoff Spark	Subdivision (urban) right of reply	<p>Density minimums are required to meet anticipated growth demands. However, there are challenges to implementing SUB-S3 as proposed. Recommend amendments to provide certainty as to if the standard is met or not.</p> <p>Recommended amendments as follows:</p> <p><i>“1. Residential subdivision of any area subject to an ODP <u>within the Medium Density Residential Zone</u>, except in the Large Lot Residential Zone, shall provide for a minimum net density of 15 households per ha, unless there are demonstrated constraints then no less than 12 households per ha.”</i></p>		
NH-R2	[10.1]	Daniel Smith	SPZ(Rangiora Airfield) Right of Reply).	<p>Addition to clause 3:</p> <p><i>“if the activity is a residential unit or a minor residential unit and is located outside of the Non-Urban Flood Assessment Overlay and located</i></p>	The Daniel Smith submission [10.1] sought that the district-wide natural hazards rule referenced the proposed “Special Purpose Zone (Rangiora Airfield).”	Recommend that clause 3 of NH-R2 is deleted

PROVISION	SUB REF	SUBMITTER / FURTHER SUBMITTER	RELEVANT REPORTS	S42A RECOMMENDATIONS	COMBINED OFFICER REASONS / COMMENTS	COMBINED RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS TO PDP?
				<i>within Rural Zones <u>or the Special Purpose Zone (Rangiora Airfield)</u>,³⁰ it has a finished floor level that is either.”</i>	NH-R2 was not specific to the airfield site location or the SPZ(RA). Therefore, the Natural Hazards reply report recommendation to delete the requirement for a finished floor level in Clause 3 in response to ECan [316.78] should be retained, and the recommended addition to clause 3 from Daniel Smith [10.1] withdrawn.	
	[316.78]	ECan	Natural Hazards s42A report.	Recommends clause 3 is deleted		
NH-R3	[10.1]	Daniel Smith	SPZ(Rangiora Airfield) Right of Reply).	Addition to clause 2(e) <i>“if the activity is a residential unit or a minor residential unit and is located outside of the Non-Urban Flood Assessment Overlay and located within Rural Zones <u>or the Special Purpose Zone (Rangiora Airfield)</u>³¹, it has a finished floor level that is either.”</i>	The Daniel Smith submission [10.1] sought that the district-wide natural hazards rule referenced the proposed “Special Purpose Zone (Rangiora Airfield).” NH-R3 was not specific to the airfield site location or the SPZ(RA). Therefore, the Natural Hazards reply report recommendation to delete the requirement for a finished floor level in Clause 2e in response to ECan [316.78] should be retained, and the recommended addition to clause 3 from Daniel Smith [10.1] withdrawn.	Recommend that clause 2(e) of NH-R3 is deleted
		[316.78].	ECan	Natural Hazards s42A report.		
	41.33	Fulton Hogan	Earthworks s42A report	Insert following policy into urban environment zone chapters RESZ, CMUZ, INZ, OSRZ, SPZ(HOS), SPZ(HOS), SPZ(KR), SPZ(PBKR), SPZ(PR), SPZ(MCC): <u>avoiding quarry, landfill, cleanfill area, mining, or dam activities within to urban environments</u> ³² .	The earthworks s42A report states that “This is by way of recommendation to those chapter authors for inclusion in their list of policies as they see best”. These authors agree that the changes to the respective policies can occur. There is not considered to be any need to alter the policies for the special purpose zones as these zones already	Amend RESZ-P6: Non-residential activities Non-residential activities are provided for in a manner that:

³⁰ Daniel Smith [10.1] (SPZ(Rangiora Airfield) Right of Reply).

³¹ Daniel Smith [10.1] (SPZ(Rangiora Airfield) Right of Reply).

³² Fulton Hogan [41.33]

PROVISION	SUB REF	SUBMITTER / FURTHER SUBMITTER	RELEVANT REPORTS	S42A RECOMMENDATIONS	COMBINED OFFICER REASONS / COMMENTS	COMBINED RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS TO PDP?
					have a defined purpose, which is not quarrying, landfill, cleanfill area, mining, or dam activities.	<p>1. <u>Avoid quarry, landfill, cleanfill, mining or dam activities within urban areas</u>³³.</p> <p>2. avoids, or where appropriate remedies or mitigates, actual and potential adverse effects from structures, signs, glare, noise and hazardous substances, including controls on timing or duration of activities;</p> <p>3. ensures that the scale of the activity does not significantly impact on the amenity values of adjoining residential activities, including their pleasantness and aesthetic coherence; and</p> <p>4. recognise that the following non-residential activities serve a benefit to the surrounding community and are provided for, subject to appropriate management of their effects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. community facilities; b. educational facilities; and c. childcare facilities; and <u>emergency service facilities</u>.³⁴ <p>Amend CMUZ-P8:</p> <p>Other activities</p> <p>1. Discourage activities which have objectionable odour, dust or noise, or would give rise to significant adverse effects on the character, role, anticipated activities and amenity values of all Commercial and Mixed Use Zones.</p> <p><u>2. Avoid quarry, landfill, cleanfill, mining or dam activities within urban areas</u>³⁵.</p> <p>Amend INZ-P5:</p> <p>Avoid sensitive activities within Industrial Zones</p>

³³ Fulton Hogan [41.33], para 49, Earthworks s42A report

³⁴ Recommendation from Residential Zones s42A report: FENZ [303.51]

³⁵ Fulton Hogan [41.33], para 49, Earthworks s42A report

PROVISION	SUB REF	SUBMITTER / FURTHER SUBMITTER	RELEVANT REPORTS	S42A RECOMMENDATIONS	COMBINED OFFICER REASONS / COMMENTS	COMBINED RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS TO PDP?
						<p>1. Maintain and support the function of industrial zones through avoiding any sensitive activities, such as residential and visitor accommodation, in industrial zones with the potential to hinder or constrain the establishment or ongoing operation or development of industrial activities.</p> <p><u>2. Avoid quarry, landfill, cleanfill, mining or dam activities within urban areas³⁶.</u></p> <p>Amend OSRZ-P1:</p> <p>Predominant character, amenity values, role and function of the zones Within the Open Space and Recreation Zones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. enable activities and structures, including compatible multi-functional uses, that are compatible with the predominant character, amenity values, role and function of the zone; 2. manage activities and structures and their effects where these may be potentially incompatible with the predominant character, amenity values, role and function of the zone; and 3. avoid activities and structures incompatible with the predominant character, amenity values, role and function of the zone, where these will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. undermine the predominant character, amenity values, role and function of the zone; b. limit access to or the use of the zone for open space and recreation; c. adversely affect amenity values or safety; d. result in reverse sensitivity effects for, or lead to conflict with, existing activities within or adjoining the zone; and e. do not have a functional need or operational need to locate within the zone; and

³⁶ Fulton Hogan [41.33], para 49, Earthworks s42A report

PROVISION	SUB REF	SUBMITTER / FURTHER SUBMITTER	RELEVANT REPORTS	S42A RECOMMENDATIONS	COMBINED OFFICER REASONS / COMMENTS	COMBINED RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS TO PDP?
						f. <u>avoid quarry, landfill, cleanfill, mining or dam activities within the zones.</u> ³⁷
SD-01(6)	[192.29]	Forest and Bird	SD Reply Report and ECO Reply Report	<u>6. the mauri of ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity is safeguarded and freshwater is managed in a way that gives effect to Te Mana o te Wai.</u> (6) the mauri of ecosystems and indigenous biodiversity is safeguarded and the health and well-being of freshwater is prioritised is managed in a way that gives effect to Te Mana o te Wai.	Refer to paragraphs 27-31 of ECO Reply Report. The ECO Reporting Officer discussed these matters with Mark Buckley (SD Reporting Officer) and it was agreed to go with the recommendation within the ECO Reply Report. Therefore the conflict is resolved.	Yes, use ECO Reply Report version of SD-O1(6).
Definition of Construction Work	221.1 and 221.5	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association	NOISE s42A report Temporary Activities s42A report	I recommend the definition of 'construction work' be amended, as shown in Appendix A, to add: "for the avoidance of doubt, installation of a building includes the relocation and re-siting of a building." ³⁸ I recommend that submissions by House Movers [221.1 (relating to the definition of construction work) and [221.5] be rejected. ³⁹	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association seeks the definition of 'construction work' be amended to add: " <i>for the avoidance of doubt, installation of a building includes the relocation and resiting of a building.</i> " The submission notes that the definition of 'construction work' in the PDP does not specifically include 'relocatable building', and only includes reference to 'building'. In Ms Benny's opinion, a relocatable building is intended to be captured under the definition of 'construction work', as clause 'a.' of that definition includes 'any building,...' and the definition of 'building' (a National Planning Standard definition) " <i>means a temporary or permanent movable or immovable physical construction...</i> ". Accordingly, the relocation and resiting of a relocatable building is captured within that definition. Thus, this means that a relocatable building is included in the	Yes

³⁷ Fulton Hogan [41.33], para 49, Earthworks s42A report

³⁸ NOISE s42A report, para 219. Recommendation of Jessica Manhire.

³⁹ Temporary Activities s42A report, para 88. Recommendation of Brooke Benny.

PROVISION	SUB REF	SUBMITTER / FURTHER SUBMITTER	RELEVANT REPORTS	S42A RECOMMENDATIONS	COMBINED OFFICER REASONS / COMMENTS	COMBINED RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS TO PDP?
					<p>definition of 'construction work' under the 'installation' of a 'building'.</p> <p>However, Ms Benny now agrees with Ms Manhire that amending the definition as sought by submission point 221.1 would ensure clarity is provided to readers as to the different types of buildings which are intended to be captured by the definition.</p> <p>Therefore, the reporting officers recommend the submissions by House Movers [221.1] and [221.5] (relating to the definition of construction work) be accepted.</p>	

Appendix 2a – Reporting Officers’ Recommended Provisions – PDP + V2

- PDP as notified is shown in black text.
- Recommendations to the PDP that originate from PDP submissions are shown in red text (with underline and ~~strike-out~~ as appropriate)
- Variation 2 as notified – purple text (with underline or ~~strike-out~~ as appropriate).
- Variation 2 Reporting Officers Recommendations – orange text (with underline or ~~strike-out~~ as appropriate).

Appendix 2b – Reporting Officers’ Recommended Provisions – DEVs

- PDP as notified is shown in black text.
- Recommendations to the PDP that originate from PDP submissions are shown in red text (with underline and ~~strike-out~~ as appropriate)

Appendix 2c – Reporting Officers’ Recommended Provisions – V1

- PDP as notified is shown in black text.
- Variation 1 as notified – blue text (with underline or ~~strike-out~~ as appropriate).
- Variation 1 Reporting Officers Recommendations – green text (with underline or ~~strike-out~~ as appropriate).

Appendix 3 – Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions

- Appendix 3 shows updated recommendations in respect to submissions that result from recommendations arising via this Wrap Up Reply Report only.
- In order to distinguish between the recommended responses in the various s42A Reports or Reply Reports, the recommended responses that arise from this Wrap Up Reply Report are shown in **red text (with underline and ~~strike-out~~ as appropriate).**

Appendix 3 – Updated recommended responses to submissions and further submissions arising from this Wrap Up Reply Report

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
360.20	Christchurch City Council	General	Amend General Objectives and Policies for all Rural Zones, Rural Lifestyle Zone, and Large Lot Residential Zone objectives, policies and rules to protect the highly productive land/versatile soils from fragmentation and unsuitable 'primary production' activities such as forestry or quarrying.	3.20 Refer to response to Question 3 and Question 4 in Wrap Up Reply Report.	Accept in part Reject	See the relevant section of the report. Refer to response to Question 3 and Question 4 in Wrap Up Reply Report.	Yes No
259.1	Kathryn Alice Houghton Cawte	RLZ-R2	Not specified. – Shading effect of forestry activities	3.17.5 Refer to Appendix 5 of the Wrap Up Reply Report.	Accept Reject	See relevant section of the report. Refer to Appendix 5 of the Wrap Up Reply Report.	Yes No
414.22	Federated Farmers	Definitions	Amend definition of 'woodlot': "means a stand of trees for the purposes of firewood, Christmas trees, the creation of other wood products, a carbon sink, erosion control, pest, or wilding tree management purposes, but excluding plantation forestry."	3.26 Refer to Appendix 5 of the Wrap Up	Reject Accept in part	See the relevant section of the report. Refer to Appendix 5 of the Wrap Up Reply Report.	No Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
				Reply Report.			
419.7	DoC	Definitions	Amend the definition of 'carbon forest': "means forest land, other than Production Forest, Plantation Forestry and Woodlots , that is for the purpose of carbon sequestration."	3.26 Appendix 5 of Wrap Up Reply Report	Accept Reject	See the relevant section of the report. See Appendix 5 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Yes No
419.29	DoC	Definition	Amend definition of 'woodlot': "means a stand of trees for the purposes of firewood, Christmas trees, the creation of other wood products, a carbon sink , erosion control, pest, or wilding tree management purposes, but excluding plantation forestry."	3.26 Appendix 5 of Wrap Up Reply Report	Accept Accept in part	See the relevant section of the report. See Appendix 5 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Yes. Yes
275.76	Waka Kotahi	RURZ-P7	Amend RURZ-P7: In relation to retail activity: 1. new retail activity be limited to that associated with a home business, selling products directly produced in the Rural Zones, or selling products or services directly supporting primary production; providing that: <u>a.</u> to the extent practicable adverse effects of the activity are internalised within the site; and <u>b.</u> amenity values and the character of Rural Zones are maintained; and	3.5.19 See response to Question 7 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Reject Accept in part	See the relevant section of the report. See response to Question 7 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	No Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p><u>c. adverse effects on the safe and efficient functioning of the transport system are avoided or mitigated.</u></p> <p>2. the expansion of any existing retail activity shall:</p> <p>a. manage any additional adverse effects including visual, traffic, dust, noise, odour, or lighting so as to maintain the amenity values and character of the zone <u>and the safe and efficient functioning of the transport system;</u></p> <p>...</p>				
419.43	DoC	EI-R43	Support inclusion of these Energy Infrastructure rules and matter of discretion. Retain EI-R43 as notified.	See response to Question 11 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Accept Accept in part	No changes sought to the notified provision. See response to Question 11 of Wrap Up Reply Report – recommended addition of two commas in rule title to clarify interpretation and application of rule.	No-Yes
367.15	Waimakariri District Council	New rule EI-R44 A	<p>Amend the Energy and Infrastructure Chapter to provide for large scale solar farming as this may not specifically be covered.</p> <p>Insert new rule EI-R44A to provide for large scale solar electricity generation as a Restricted Discretionary Activity:</p> <p>"EI-R44A Large scale solar electricity generation</p> <p>Activity status: RDIS</p>	See response to Question 11 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Accept Accept in part	The requested new rule is to be included (along with any consequential renumbering) as this will help give effect to the NPSREG. See response to Question 11 of Wrap Up Reply Report – recommended change of activity status from RDIS to DIS and consequential deletion of matters of discretion.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<p>Where:</p> <p>1. the activity involves the installation, maintenance, upgrading or removal of solar cell(s) other than for small scale or community scale renewable electricity generation provided for in EI-R40.</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>EI-MD1 - Historic heritage, cultural values and the natural environment</p> <p>EI-MD2 – Amenity values, location and design</p> <p>EI-MD3 – Operational considerations</p> <p>EI-MD4 Health and Safety</p> <p>EI-MD5 – Electricity generation"</p>				
325.10	Kainga Ora	UFD-P2	<p>Amend UFD-P2:</p> <p>"...</p> <p>2. for new Residential Development Areas, other than those identified by (1) above, avoid residential development unless located so that they:</p> <p>a. occur in a form that concentrates, or are <u>integrated with attached to</u>, an existing urban environment and promotes a coordinated pattern of development;</p> <p>...</p> <p>c. have good accessibility for all people between to housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or active transport;</p> <p>d. concentrate higher and <u>medium</u> density residential housing in locations focusing on activity nodes such as key <u>commercial centres</u> and <u>mixed use activity centres</u>, schools, public transport routes and open space;</p> <p>e. take into account the need to provide for intensification of residential development while <u>maintaining managing appropriate levels</u> of amenity values on surrounding sites and streetscapes <u>that will change and develop overtime in response to providing increased and varied housing</u></p>	See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Reject Accept in part	See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
			<u>densities and types;...</u> "				
316.9	ECan	UFD-P3	Amend UFD-P3 to provide for rural residential development in the part of Waimakariri District that is within the Greater Christchurch area only where it has been identified in an adopted Rural Residential Development Strategy and is in accordance with Canterbury Regional Policy Statement Policy 6.3.9.	3.8 See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Reject Accept	See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	No Yes
325.11	Kainga Ora	UFD-P4	Amend UFD-P4: "Provide for the extension of existing Town Centres and locate and develop new commercial activities to implement the urban form identified in the Future Development Strategy or Council's growth strategy, WDDS or Town Centre Plans."	See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Reject Accept	See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	No Yes
316.10	ECan	UFD-P4	Amend UFD-P5 to give effect to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement	See response to Question 9 of Wrap	Reject Accept	See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	No Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
				Up Reply Report.			
325.12	Kainga Ora	UFD-P5	Amend UFD-P5: "Provide for the extension of existing Town Centres and locate and develop new commercial activities to implement the urban form identified in the Future Development Strategy or Council's growth strategy, WDDS or Town Centre Plans. "	See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Reject Accept	Council does not have a growth strategy, it does however have town centre plans and strategies, and a district development strategy that deal with the expansion of town centres. Under the NPS-UD Council is required to have a Future Development Strategy. See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	No Yes
360.10	Christchurch City Council	UFD-P5	Amend UFD-P5 to resolve issues identified. UFD-P5 and UFD-P8 provide for extensions to as well as new industrial areas, however, it is not clear if or how UFD-P8 is linked to UFD-P5. While the Future Development Strategy provides a long-term strategic direction for urban growth in Greater Christchurch, which the district plan has to have regard to, the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) is the higher order document that needs to be given effect to. There is no reference to the directions of CRPS Objectives 6.2.6 and 6.2.2, and Policies 6.3.1, 6.3.11 and 6.3.12, or the requirement to direct industrial activities to the identified greenfield priority areas for business within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary (PIB). The Waimakariri District Development Strategy referred to in UFD-P5 indicates potential long-term business growth areas that go beyond the Existing Urban Area and PIB shown on the CRPS Map A, and on Figure 16 of the FDS.	3.8 See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Reject Accept	See the relevant section of the report. See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	No Yes

Sub. Ref.	Submitter / Further Submitter	Provision	Decision Requested (Summary)	Section of this Report where Addressed	Officer's Recommendation	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to PDP?
316.11	ECan	UFD-P6	No specific change to UFD-P6 is sought, although separate comments are made elsewhere on the criteria for certification for new development areas.	3.8 See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Reject Accept in part	See relevant section of the report See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Yes
316.12	ECan	UFD-P7	Amend policies to recognise the direction contained in Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement regarding the location of commercial and industrial development within Greater Christchurch.	3.8 See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	Reject Accept in part	See relevant section of the report See response to Question 9 of Wrap Up Reply Report.	No Yes

Appendix 4 – Section 32AA Assessments

QUESTION 9 - URBAN FORM AND DEVELOPMENT – S32AA

C1. Overview and purpose

This evaluation is undertaken in accordance with section 32AA of the RMA. It examines the appropriateness of the recommended amendments to the objectives and policies for the Urban Form and Development following the consideration of submissions received on the PDP.

This further evaluation should be read in conjunction with Part A – Overview and Part B Urban Form and Development and Strategic Directions of the Section 32 Report prepared for the development of the PDP.

C2. Recommended amendments

The proposed amendment strengthen the connections between the Urban Form and Development chapter and the urban development policies of the NPS-UD and the RPS with respect to the application of the Greater Christchurch Area . The recommended amendments are shown in Appendix A.

C3. Statutory Tests

The District Council must ensure that prior to adopting an objective, policy, rule or other method in a district plan, that the proposed provisions meet the requirements of the RMA through an evaluation of matters outlined in Section 32.

In achieving the purpose of the RMA, the District Council must carry out a further evaluation under section 32AA if changes are made to a proposal as a result of the submissions and hearings process. This evaluation must cover all the matters in sections 32(1)-(4).

Objectives

The objectives are to be examined in relation to the extent to which they are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA.⁴⁰ For the purposes of evaluation under section 32AA the following criteria form the basis for assessing the appropriateness of the proposed objectives:

- Relevance;

⁴⁰ RMA s32(1)(a)

- Usefulness;
- Reasonableness; and
- Achievability.

Provisions

Each provision is to be examined as to whether it is the most appropriate method for achieving the objectives. For a proposed plan, the provisions are defined as the policies, rules, or other methods that implement, or give effect to, the objectives of the proposed plan.⁴¹

The examination must include assessing the efficiency and effectiveness (including costs and benefits of the environmental, economic, social, and cultural effects, quantified if practicable, and the risk of acting or not acting) and a summary of the reasons for deciding the provisions.

C4. Evaluation of Recommended Amendments to Objectives and Policies

Objectives UFD-O1 and Policies UFD-P2, UFD-P3, UFD-P4, UFD-P5, UFD-P6, UFD-P7 and UFD-P8 are recommended to be amended as set out in the answer to question 9 above: The following tables provide an evaluation of the recommended amendments to the objectives and policies.

Table C 1: Recommended Amendments to Objective UFD-O1

Relevance	<p>Addresses a relevant resource management issue</p> <p>The issue is the provision of housing capacity and the support of a well-functioning urban environment to enable people to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety.</p>
	<p>Assists the District Council to undertake its functions under s31</p> <p>The amendments are the updated housing development capacity figures as required by the NPSUD.</p>
	<p>Gives effect to higher level documents</p> <p>The amendments better reflect the wording within the requirements NPSUD regarding the provision of feasible capacity and updated housing development capacity. The table within the objective has been updated to reflect the updated housing bottom line information development by the Greater Christchurch Partnership as part of the Greater Christchurch Housing Development Capacity Assessment (2023).</p>

⁴¹ RMS s32(6)(a)

Usefulness	<p>Guides decision-making</p> <p>The amendment gives effect to the NPSUD and enables decision makers to align decisions on urban development towards a well-functioning urban environment.</p>
	<p>Meets best practice for objectives</p> <p>The proposed amendment meets the housing development capacity requirements the NPSUD and the updated housing demand</p>
Reasonableness	<p>Will not impose unjustifiably high costs on the community / parts of the community</p> <p>The proposed changes will not result in any unjustifiably high costs on the community.</p>
	<p>Acceptable level of uncertainty and risk</p> <p>There is no additional uncertainty or risk associated with the recommended amendment. The updated housing development capacity figures will be consistent across the Greater Christchurch Partnership and respond to a number of submissions that wanted an updated figure.</p>
Achievability	<p>Consistent with identified tāngata whenua and community outcomes</p> <p>The amendment does not affect the consistency of the strategic objective with identified tāngata whenua and community outcomes.</p>
	<p>Realistically able to be achieved within the District Council’s powers, skills and resources</p> <p>The Council has the skill base and experience to implement the Proposed Plan and the amendment aligning with the NPSUD.</p>
Conclusion	<p>The recommended amended objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA by providing a coherent package of desired outcomes consistent with sustainable management.</p>

Overall, the recommended amendments proposed to the objective better gives effect to higher order documents. For the purposes of sections 32 and 32AA, I consider that the revised objectives and policies are the most appropriate way of achieving the purpose of the RMA.

C5. Evaluation of Policies and Rules

I have assessed how the recommended changes to the policies, rules and other methods are the most appropriate to implement the objectives below. In undertaking this assessment, I have evaluated the recommended amendments against the provisions as notified.

Efficiency and Effectiveness of the Provisions

I have assessed the efficiency and effectiveness of the recommended amended provisions in achieving the objectives, including identification and assessment of the costs and benefits anticipated from the implementation of the provisions in Table C below.

Table C 1: Assessment of efficiency and effectiveness of Policy UFD-P2

Recommended Amendments to Provisions:	
<p>The following amendments are made to UFD-P3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separation of areas within and outside of the Greater Christchurch Area, • Removal of constraint around adjoining existing urban centres outside of Greater Christchurch Area.. 	
Costs	Benefits
<p>The proposed wording will limit unconstrained growth inside of the Greater Christchurch Area, and ensure that development outside of the Greater Christchurch Area is integrated with existing GRZ and SETZ areas.</p>	<p>The amendment will better align with the CRPS and the NPSUD and the differentiates between being inside and outside Greater Christchurch Area. This will result in better integration and utilisation with existing infrastructure and reduce the potential for reverse sensitivity effects. It also ensures that the District Plan has a responsiveness and significance policy that is consistent with NPSUD Policy 8, and tied to the three-yearly Housing and Business Capacity Assessment.</p>
Efficiency	<p>The recommended amendments will better align with the objectives and policies within the residential zone chapters. The amendments clearly directs development based on whether they are inside or outside Greater Christchurch, thus giving effect to the differentiation within the CRPS (Chapter 6 and Chapter 5). It also ensures that NPSUD Policy 8 is given effect to within the context of the District.</p>

Effectiveness	<p>The recommended amendments provide greater clarity for the provisions, and therefore will be easier to interpret and implement. The original wording did not differentiate between residential areas and large lot residential areas, and thus, provided no distinction with Policy UFD-P3, that deals with large-lot residential. It also did not give full effect to the CRPS and NPSUD, as stated by submitters.</p> <p>No changes to Policy UFD-P3 are proposed as it is considered that this effectively explains the nature of large-lot residential as something different to urban residential, and insofar, is consistent with how the CRPS defines rural-residential development.</p>
Summary	
The recommended amendment provides the most appropriate method for giving effect to NPSUD and the RPS.	

Table C 2: Assessment of efficiency and effectiveness of Policy UFD-P4

Recommended Amendments to Provisions:	
The following amendments are made to UFD-P4:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reword to link to DDS 	
Costs	Benefits
The proposed wording does not introduce any additional costs, being minor in nature.	The amendment better aligns with the NPSUD in defining the role of the NPSUD.

Table C 3: Assessment of efficiency and effectiveness of Policy UFD-P5

Recommended Amendments to Provisions:	
The following amendments are made to UFD-P5:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reword to link to DDS 	
Costs	Benefits
The proposed wording does not introduce any additional costs, being minor in nature.	The amendment better aligns with the NPSUD in defining the role of the NPSUD.

Table C 4: Assessment of efficiency and effectiveness of Policy UFD-P6

Recommended Amendments to Provisions:	
UFD-P6 is deleted as certification is no longer recommended as a process by which new residential areas can be released.	
Costs	Benefits
While the proposed wording will limit unconstrained growth outside of the urban areas and potentially affect perceived development rights, it will result in lower costs associated with land development through better utilisation of existing infrastructure.	The amendment will better align with the NPSUD and the RPS with respect to urban development. This will result in better integration and utilisation with existing infrastructure and reduce the potential for reverse sensitivity effects. There is also likely to be a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions through shorter commuting distances to community services and commercial areas.
Efficiency	The recommended amendments will better align with the objectives and policies within the residential zone chapters.
Effectiveness	The recommended amendments provide greater clarity for the provisions, and therefore will be easier to interpret and implement. The original wording was intended to provide for the identification of areas covered by the urban flood risk overlay. It was not intended to direct residential development potential in the district.
Summary	
The recommended amendment provides the most appropriate method for giving effect to NPS-UD and the RPS.	

Table C 6: Assessment of efficiency and effectiveness of Policy UFD-P7

Recommended Amendments to Provisions:	
The following amendments are made to UFD-P7: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacing “plan change” with <u>any new commercial growth and activities</u> to better reflect that the plan must be responsive to plan changes and consent applications. 	
Costs	Benefits
None identified.	The amendment will better align with the NPSUD and the RPS with respect to urban

	development by being responsive to all proposals.
Efficiency	The recommended amendments will better align with the objectives and policies within the commercial zone chapters and the NPSUD.
Effectiveness	The recommended amendments provide greater clarity for the provisions, and therefore will be easier to interpret and implement.
Summary	
The recommended amendment provides the most appropriate method for giving effect to NPSUD.	

Table C 7: Assessment of efficiency and effectiveness of Policy UFD-P8

Recommended Amendments to Provisions:	
The following amendments are made to UFD-P8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replacing “plan change” with <u>any new industrial growth and activities</u> to better reflect that the plan must be responsive to plan changes and consent applications. 	
Costs	Benefits
None identified.	The amendment will better align with the NPSUD and the RPS with respect to urban development by being responsive to all proposals.
Efficiency	The recommended amendments will better align with the objectives and policies within the industrial zone chapters and the NPSUD.
Effectiveness	The recommended amendments provide greater clarity for the provisions, and therefore will be easier to interpret and implement.
Summary	
The recommended amendment provides the most appropriate method for giving effect to NPSUD.	

Overall, taking into account the assessment above, I consider the recommended amendments to the policies to be more efficient and effective in achieving the objectives than the notified provisions.

Adequacy of Information and Risk of Acting or Not Acting

Section 32(2)(c) of the RMA requires an assessment of the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions.

Submissions have raised a number of matters that need to be addressed to provide clarity to the Urban Form and Development provisions of the Proposed Plan. If no action is taken and the Proposed Plan is retained as notified, it could cause confusion and may result in a lack of consistent interpretation of the Proposed Plan and increased costs in terms of time and money required by District Council staff to process resource consents.

Submissions also seek to amend the Proposed Plan so it better achieves the purpose of the RMA. The recommended amendments address this matter assist in making the provisions efficient and effective in achieving the objectives. The risk in not acting is that the provisions do not effectively or efficiently achieve the objectives.

After reviewing the Urban Form and Development provisions of the Proposed Plan and considering the submissions on these provisions and matters raised in mediation, I consider there is sufficient information on which to base the recommended revised objectives and policies.

C6. Conclusion

I have evaluated the recommended amendments to objectives to determine the extent to which they are the most appropriate way of achieving the purpose of the RMA where there is necessary, and otherwise to give effect to higher order planning documents. I have also evaluated the recommended amendments to the proposed provisions, including their efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the proposed objective(s). I consider the proposed objectives as recommended to be amended are an appropriate way of achieving the purpose of the RMA and the recommended changes to provisions are the most appropriate means of achieving the objectives.

**Appendix 5 – APPLICATION OF NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARD FOR
COMMERICAL FORESTRY**

Response to Question 17 of Appendix 2 of Minute 43 - Please provide updated recommendations in respect to the application of the National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry.

The NESPF was amended on 3 November 2023. It is now called the National Environmental Standards for Commercial Forestry (NESCF) and applies to plantation forests (both exotic and indigenous) and exotic continuous-cover forests (carbon forests). Plantation forestry and the NESPF is included within a number of provisions within the Reporting Officers PDP recommendations.

Table 1 below addresses the application of the NESCF in the PDP:

- a. The first column lists the PDP’s plantation forestry and NESPF related provisions.
- b. The second column shows the Reporting Officers’ Recommendations that were released in each hearing stream accordingly and as such do not all align with the NESCF due to the timing of each hearing stream in relation to the gazettal of the NESCF.
- c. The third column states whether an amendment is required to align with the NESCF and states the scope for these recommended amendments.
- d. The fourth and final column then sets out any updated final recommended amendment.

The primary scope for these amendments is section 44A(6) of RMA which allows to a proposed plan to include reference to a national environmental standard without using a Schedule 1 process. There are also submissions which provide scope for other aspects of some of the recommended amendments.

Table 1: Plantation forestry and NESPF related provisions within Reporting Officers’ recommendations, and amendments required to align with NESCF

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers’ Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)	Amendment needed for alignment with NESCF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)
Abbreviation – NESPF	NESPF Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017	Yes. <i>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</i>	NES PF ^{CF} Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Plantation <u>Commercial</u> Forestry) Regulations 2017
GA-AN4	<p>The NESPF are regulations made under the RMA that provide a nationally consistent set of standards to manage the environmental effects of plantation forestry activities. The eight plantation forestry activities regulated by the NESPF are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Afforestation; 2. Pruning and thinning to waste; 3. Earthworks; 4. River crossings; 5. Forestry quarrying; 6. Harvesting; 7. Mechanical land preparation; and 8. Replanting. <p>The NESPF also regulates ancillary activities such as indigenous vegetation clearance and slash traps that may occur at any stage in the life cycle of a forest. Foresters who wish to undertake any of these plantation forestry activities will need to comply with the NESPF. The provisions of the Rural Zones do not apply to plantation forestry greater than 1ha in area, refer to the NESPF.</p>	Yes. <i>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</i>	<p>The NESPF^{CF} are regulations made under the RMA that provide a nationally consistent set of standards to manage the environmental effects of plantation <u>commercial</u> forestry activities. <u>The regulations apply to both plantation forestry and exotic continuous-cover forests (carbon forests) that are deliberately established for commercial purposes.</u> The eight plantation <u>core</u> forestry activities regulated by the NESPF^{CF} are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Afforestation; 2. Pruning and thinning to waste; 3. Earthworks; 4. River crossings; 5. Forestry quarrying; 6. Harvesting; 7. Mechanical land preparation; and 8. Replanting. <p>The NESPF^{CF} also regulates ancillary activities such as indigenous vegetation clearance and slash traps that may occur at any stage in the life cycle of a forest. Foresters who wish to undertake any of these plantation forestry activities will need to comply with the NESPF^{CF}. The provisions of the Rural</p>

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)	Amendment needed for alignment with NESCF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)
			Zones do not apply to plantation forestry greater than 1ha in area, refer to the NES PCF .
National environmental standards section	Resource Management (National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017 (amended May 2018)	Yes. Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.	Resource Management (National Environmental Standard on for Plantation Commercial Forestry) Regulations 2017 (amended May 2018)
Plantation forestry definition	<p>PLANTATION COMMERCIAL FORESTRY</p> <p>has the same meaning as in the NES-CFPF and includes forestry (as set out below):</p> <p>means a forest deliberately established for commercial purposes, being—</p> <p>(a) at least 1 ha of continuous forest cover of forest species that has been planted and has or will be harvested or replanted; and</p> <p>(b) includes all associated forestry infrastructure; but</p> <p>(c) does not include—</p> <p>(i) a shelter belt of forest species, where the tree crown cover has, or is likely to have, an average width of less than 30 m; or</p> <p>(ii) forest species in urban areas; or</p> <p>(iii) nurseries and seed orchards; or</p> <p>(iv) trees grown for fruit or nuts; or</p> <p>(v) long term ecological restoration planting of forest species; or</p>	No - already done via NFL Final Reply Report (November 2023).	N/A.

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)	Amendment needed for alignment with NESCF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)
	<p>(vi) willows and poplars space planted for soil conservation purposes.</p> <p><u>means exotic continuous-cover forestry or plantation forestry</u></p> <p><u>The NES-CF defines 'exotic continuous-cover forest' or 'exotic continuous-cover forestry' as:</u></p> <p><u>(a) means a forest that is deliberately established for commercial purposes, being at least 1 ha of continuous forest cover of exotic forest species that has been planted and—</u></p> <p><u>(i) will not be harvested or replanted; or</u></p> <p><u>(ii) is intended to be used for low-intensity harvesting or replanted; and</u></p> <p><u>(b) includes all associated forestry infrastructure; but</u></p> <p><u>(c) does not include—</u></p> <p><u>(i) a shelter belt of forest species, where the tree crown cover has, or is likely to have, an average width of less than 30 m; or</u></p> <p><u>(ii) forest species in urban areas; or</u></p> <p><u>(iii) nurseries and seed orchards; or</u></p> <p><u>(iv) trees grown for fruit or nuts; or</u></p> <p><u>(v) long-term ecological restoration planting of indigenous forest species; or</u></p> <p><u>(vi) willows and poplars space planted for soil conservation purposes</u></p> <p><u>The NES-CF defines 'plantation forestry' as:</u></p> <p><u>means a forest deliberately established for commercial purposes, being—</u></p> <p><u>(a) at least 1 ha of continuous forest cover of forest species that has been planted and has or will be harvested or replanted; and</u></p> <p><u>(b) includes all associated forestry infrastructure; but</u></p> <p><u>(c) does not include—</u></p>		

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)	Amendment needed for alignment with NESCF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)
	<p><u>(i) a shelter belt of forest species, where the tree crown cover has, or is likely to have, an average width of less than 30 m; or</u></p> <p><u>(ii) forest species in urban areas; or</u></p> <p><u>(iii) nurseries and seed orchards; or</u></p> <p><u>(iv) trees grown for fruit or nuts; or</u></p> <p><u>(v) long-term ecological restoration planting of forest species; or</u></p> <p><u>(vi) willows and poplars space planted for soil conservation purposes.</u></p>		
Agriculture definition	<p>means a land based activity having any one or combination of the following as the purpose of the use of land:</p> <p>a. arable land use being the use of land to grow crops for harvest; or</p> <p>b. horticultural land use being the use of land to grow food or beverage crops for human consumption (other than arable crops), or flowers for commercial supply; or</p> <p>c. pastoral land use being the use of land for the grazing of livestock; or</p> <p>d. Plantation Carbon Forest or Woodlot being less than 1ha of continuous area of deliberately established tree species that has been planted, or has or will be, harvested or replanted.</p>	<p>Yes, remove reference to 'carbon forest' as covered in 'commercial forestry' term via NESCF now, and replace with 'woodlot' as this is the 'catch-all' for forestry that is not included by the NESCF but is of a commercial nature.</p> <p><i>Scope: s44A of RMA</i></p>	<p>means a land based activity having any one or combination of the following as the purpose of the use of land:</p> <p>a. arable land use being the use of land to grow crops for harvest; or</p> <p>b. horticultural land use being the use of land to grow food or beverage crops for human consumption (other than arable crops), or flowers for commercial supply; or</p> <p>c. pastoral land use being the use of land for the grazing of livestock; or</p> <p>d. Plantation Carbon Forest or Woodlot being less than 1ha of continuous area of deliberately established tree species that has been planted, or has or will be, harvested or replanted.</p>
Carbon forest definition	<p>means forest land, other than Production Forest <u>Plantation Forestry</u>, that is for the purpose of carbon sequestration.</p>	<p>Delete definition of 'carbon forest' as carbon forest is now included within the definition of commercial forestry.</p> <p><i>Scope: s44A(76) of RMA.</i></p>	<p>means forest land, other than Production Forest <u>Plantation Forestry, that is for the purpose of carbon sequestration.</u></p>

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)	Amendment needed for alignment with NESCF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)
Woodlot definition	means a stand of trees for the purposes of firewood, Christmas trees, the creation of other wood products, a carbon sink , erosion control, pest, or wilding tree management purposes, but excluding plantation forestry <u>and carbon forest</u> .	Amend definition of 'woodlot'. <i>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA, along with Federated Farmers submission [414.22] which seeks deletion of 'carbon sink, erosion control, pest or wilding tree management purposes' as removing these then leaves the remaining activities which have a commercial purposes.</i>	means a stand of trees <u>used for commercial purposes that is not controlled by NESCF</u> . for the purposes of firewood, Christmas trees, the creation of other wood products, a carbon sink, erosion control, pest, or wilding tree management purposes, but excluding plantation forestry and carbon forest.
Afforestation definition	has same meaning as in the NESPF.	Yes, amend to refer to NESCF. <i>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</i>	has same meaning as in the NES PF <u>CF</u> .
EW-R7 Advisory Note	Advisory Note The NESPF regulates earthworks for forestry purposes.	Yes, amend to refer to NESCF. <i>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</i>	Advisory Note The NES PF <u>CF</u> regulates earthworks for forestry purposes.
EW-AN1(4)	4. The NESPF regulates earthworks for forestry purposes, and the NESCS manages the effects on human health from the disturbance or removal of contaminated soil. <u>Specific activities (i.e. soil sampling and removing or replacing fuel storage systems) are regulated under the NESCS as well as under the rules of this chapter.</u> Earthworks managed under the NESCS and NESPF are not subject to provisions in this chapter other than where the District Plan deals with terms and conditions not covered in the NES or in the circumstances where the District Plan is allowed to be more stringent. The District Plan can be more stringent than the NESPF for	Yes, update to NESCF and note Clause 6(4A) allows rules to be more stringent or lenient where in relation to afforestation. <i>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</i>	4. The NES PF <u>CF</u> regulates earthworks for forestry purposes, and the NESCS manages the effects on human health from the disturbance or removal of contaminated soil. <u>Specific activities (i.e. soil sampling and removing or replacing fuel storage systems) are regulated under the NESCS as well as under the rules of this chapter.</u> Earthworks managed under the NESCS and NES PF <u>CF</u> are not subject to provisions in this chapter other than where the District Plan deals with terms and conditions not covered in the NES or in the circumstances where the District Plan is allowed to be more stringent. The District Plan can be more stringent than the NES PF <u>CF</u> for forestry in outstanding natural features and landscapes, and SNAs, <u>or more stringent or lenient where in relation to afforestation.</u>

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)			Amendment needed for alignment with NЕСF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)		
	forestry in outstanding natural features and landscapes, and SNAs.						
CE-P6	Activities in the coastal environment Manage activities in the coastal environment by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. providing for existing activities, or new activities where these do not conflict with natural character values; 2. limiting the further expansion or intensity of plantation forestry to preserve natural character values; and 3. ensuring that any new subdivision, use or development: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. is set back from the CMA boundary, and any identified coastal natural character area, to preserve natural character values and public access; b. maintains the character and extent of existing settlements near the coastal environment; and c. limits the prominence of built form and avoids creating strong visual contrasts. 			Yes, update reference to plantation forestry to commercial forestry. <i>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</i>	Activities in the coastal environment Manage activities in the coastal environment by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. providing for existing activities, or new activities where these do not conflict with natural character values; 2. limiting the further expansion or intensity of <u>plantation commercial</u> forestry to preserve natural character values; and 3. ensuring that any new subdivision, use or development: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. is set back from the CMA boundary, and any identified coastal natural character area, to preserve natural character values and public access; b. maintains the character and extent of existing settlements near the coastal environment; and c. limits the prominence of built form and avoids creating strong visual contrasts. 		
CE-R4	Plantation forestry <u>and Carbon Forest</u>			Update to 'plantation forestry' and 'carbon forest' to 'commercial forestry'.	<u>Commercial Plantation forestry <u>and Carbon Forest</u></u>		
	Coastal Environment Overlay	Activity status: PER Where: 1. the activity shall be limited to plantation forestry existing prior to the enactment of the NESPF, that is set back at least 20m from any identified coastal natural character area, as shown on the planning map.	Activity status when compliance not achieved: NC	<i>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</i>	Coastal Environment Overlay	Activity status: PER Where: 2. the activity shall be limited to plantation forestry existing prior to the enactment of the NESPF, that is set back at least 20m from any identified coastal natural character area, as shown on the planning map.	Activity status when compliance not achieved: NC

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)			Amendment needed for alignment with NESCF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)		
	Jockey Baker Creek - VHNC Te Kōhanga Wetlands - HNC Tūtaepatu Lagoon - HNC Ashley River/ Rakahuri Saltwater Creek Estuary – ONC	Activity status: NC	Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A		Jockey Baker Creek - VHNC Te Kōhanga Wetlands - HNC Tūtaepatu Lagoon - HNC Ashley River/ Rakahuri Saltwater Creek Estuary – ONC	Activity status: NC	Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A
ECO-R1(1)(d)	for the purpose of harvesting indigenous vegetation that was planted for the purpose of plantation <u>commercial</u> forestry;			No change required, aligns with NESCF.	N/A.		
ECO-R2(3)(g)&(h) & (8)(h) and (i)	ECO-R2(3): g. for the purpose of harvesting indigenous vegetation that was planted for the purpose of plantation forestry; h. of the indigenous understorey to plantation forest, and is incidental to permitted or otherwise authorised plantation forest clearance; or ECO-R2(8): h. for the purpose of harvesting indigenous vegetation that was planted for the purpose of plantation forestry; or i. of the indigenous understorey to plantation forest, and is incidental to permitted or otherwise authorised plantation forest clearance;.			No change required as clauses recommended for deletion.	N/A.		

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)			Amendment needed for alignment with NESCF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)								
ECO-AN1	3. the NESPF which regulates plantation forest and includes restrictions on afforestation within and 10m of any SNA; and			Update to reference to NESCF and commercial forestry. <i>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</i>	3. the NES PF CF which regulates plantation commercial forestry and includes restrictions on afforestation within and 10m of any SNA; and								
NATC-P4	Preservation of natural character values Preserve the natural character values of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and protect those values by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. ensuring that the location, intensity, scale and form of subdivision, use and development of land takes into account the natural character values of the surface freshwater bodies; 5. avoiding, minimizing remedying or mitigating, in that order, indigenous vegetation clearance and modification which affects natural character, including where associated with ground disturbance and the location of structures, near wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins; 6. requiring setbacks of activities from wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, including buildings, structures, impervious surfaces, plantation forestry, woodlots and shelterbelts; and 7. promoting opportunities to restore and rehabilitate the natural character of surface freshwater bodies and their margins, such as the removal of plant and animal pests, and supporting initiatives for the regeneration of indigenous biodiversity values, and spiritual, cultural and heritage values. 			Yes, amend reference of 'plantation forestry' to 'commercial forestry'. <i>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</i>	Preservation of natural character values Preserve the natural character values of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and protect those values by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ensuring that the location, intensity, scale and form of subdivision, use and development of land takes into account the natural character values of the surface freshwater bodies; 2. avoiding, minimizing remedying or mitigating, in that order, indigenous vegetation clearance and modification which affects natural character, including where associated with ground disturbance and the location of structures, near wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins; 3. requiring setbacks of activities from wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, including buildings, structures, impervious surfaces, plantation commercial forestry, woodlots and shelterbelts; and 4. promoting opportunities to restore and rehabilitate the natural character of surface freshwater bodies and their margins, such as the removal of plant and animal pests, and supporting initiatives for the regeneration of indigenous biodiversity values, and spiritual, cultural and heritage values. 								
NATC-R10	Plantation forestry, carbon forest, woodlot or shelterbelts <table border="1" data-bbox="329 1381 1222 1661"> <tr> <td data-bbox="329 1381 569 1661">Scheduled Natural Character Freshwater Bodies Overlay</td> <td data-bbox="578 1381 958 1661">Activity status: NC</td> <td data-bbox="967 1381 1222 1661">Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A</td> </tr> </table>			Scheduled Natural Character Freshwater Bodies Overlay	Activity status: NC	Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A	Amend reference to 'plantation forestry' and 'carbon forest' to 'commercial forestry'. <i>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</i>	Commercial Plantation forestry, carbon forest, woodlot or shelterbelts <table border="1" data-bbox="1724 1381 2677 1661"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1724 1381 1964 1661">Scheduled Natural Character Freshwater Bodies Overlay</td> <td data-bbox="1973 1381 2326 1661">Activity status: NC</td> <td data-bbox="2335 1381 2677 1661">Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A</td> </tr> </table>			Scheduled Natural Character Freshwater Bodies Overlay	Activity status: NC	Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A
Scheduled Natural Character Freshwater Bodies Overlay	Activity status: NC	Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A											
Scheduled Natural Character Freshwater Bodies Overlay	Activity status: NC	Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A											
NFL-P1	Protect Outstanding Natural Features Recognise the values of the outstanding natural features identified in NFL-APP1 and protect them from the adverse effects of inappropriate subdivision, activities and development, except where the effects of regionally significant infrastructure are managed by EI-P5, by:			No change required as recommendations version aligns with NESCF.	N/A								

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)	Amendment needed for alignment with NESCF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. avoiding use and development that detracts from the very high biophysical values and high sensory and associative values identified in NFL-APP1 for the Waimakariri River; 2. avoiding use and development that detracts from the very high biophysical and sensory values, and high associative values of the Ashley River/Rakahuri Saltwater Creek Estuary identified in NFL-APP1, including on: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. coastal physical processes; b. ecological habitat and indigenous biodiversity; and c. the experience of the elements and processes of (a) and (b); 3. enabling community scale erosion and flood control structures where adverse impacts on the values are mitigated; 4. avoiding any significant loss of indigenous vegetation; 5. avoiding activities such as plantation commercial forestry, woodlots, shelterbelts, mining and quarrying activities and large buildings or groups of buildings or other structures which create adverse effects on the identified values; 6. recognising and providing for working farmland; providing for existing rural production where this does not detract from the identified values; and 7. enabling conservation activities and non motorised recreation activities. 		
NFL-P3	<p>Protect Outstanding Natural Landscapes Recognise the values of the outstanding natural landscapes identified in NFL-APP1 and protect them from the adverse effects of inappropriate subdivision activities and development, except where the effects of regionally significant infrastructure are managed by EI-P5, by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. avoiding use and development that detracts from the very high biophysical values and high sensory and associative values of the Puketeraki Range and Oxford Foothills identified in NFL-APP1, in particular on the: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. exposed alpine environments; b. sheltered densely forested slopes and gullies of the Oxford Hills; c. indigenous vegetation; and d. recreational values; 2. avoiding use and development in areas which have no capacity to absorb change, including near ridgelines, and mitigating adverse effects through bulk, location and design controls in other areas; 3. avoiding any significant loss of indigenous vegetation; 4. avoiding activities such as plantation commercial forestry, shelterbelts, mining and quarrying activities which create adverse effects on the identified values; 	No change required as recommendations version aligns with NESCF.	N/A

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)	Amendment needed for alignment with NESCF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)
	5. recognising and providing for working farmland; providing for existing rural production where this does not detract from the identified values; and 6. enabling conservation activities and non motorised recreation activities; and		
NFL-P4	Maintain Significant Amenity Landscapes Recognise the values of the significant amenity landscapes identified in NFL-APP1 and maintain them, <u>except where the effects of regionally significant infrastructure are managed by EI-P5</u> , by: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. managing adverse effects of use and development on the moderate-high biophysical values and high sensory and associative values of the Ashley River/Rakahuri identified in NFL-APP1, in particular on the: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. braided river system; b. indigenous fauna and vegetation; c. the wilderness and natural environment; and d. recreational values; 2. enabling community scale erosion and flood control structures where adverse impacts on the values are mitigated; 3. avoiding any significant loss of indigenous vegetation; 4. avoiding incompatible activities, including plantation commercial forestry, shelterbelts, mining and quarrying activities, and large buildings or groups of buildings or other structures <u>where these activities result in which create</u> unacceptable adverse effects on the identified values; 5. mitigating through bulk, location and design controls the adverse effects of other uses and development in areas which have no capacity to absorb change; 6. providing for non motorised recreation activities and conservation activities; and 7. recognising and providing for working farmland; providing for existing rural production where this does not detract from the identified values. 	No change required as recommendations version aligns with NESCF.	N/A
NFL-R13	Plantation Commercial forestry	No change required as recommendations version aligns with NESCF.	N/A

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)		Amendment needed for alignment with NЕСF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)
	<u>Ashley River / Rakahuri SAL</u>	<u>Activity status: CON DIS</u> <u>Matters of control are restricted to:</u> <u>NFL-MC1 – The effects on the visual amenity values of the SAL, including any future effects from plantation forestry activities.</u>	<u>Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A</u>	
	Ashley River / Rakahuri Saltwater Creek Estuary ONF Waimakariri River ONF Puketeraki Range & Oxford Foothills ONL	Activity status: NC	Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A	
RURZ-MD4	Forestry <u>less than 1ha</u>, Carbon Forest, Woodlots 1. The extent of adverse effects from the additional shading resulting from the non-compliance, taking into account the use of the affected sites, the amount of shadow cast and the period of time adjacent sites are affected. 2. The ability of existing topography or vegetation to mitigate any adverse shading effects on the adjoining site. 3. The nature of the use of adjoining sites and the extent to which the activity may result in conflict and/or reverse sensitivity effects with activities on adjacent sites. 4. Any shading effects on the transport network. 5. <u>The potential for the spread of wilding trees into conservation land, SNAs and QE II National Trust land and the risk to these areas from wilding trees establishment.</u>		Remove reference to 'forestry less than 1ha' as this is captured in the recommended amended definition of 'woodlot', and remove reference to 'carbon forest' as this is captured in the updated NESCF definition of 'commercial forestry'. Reject clause (5) as this was a consequential amendment in relation to a submission from ECan [316.167] which was initially accepted in the Rural Zones s42A Report but then rejected in the Rural Zones Reply Report.	<u>Forestry less than 1ha, Carbon Forest, Woodlots</u> 1. The extent of adverse effects from the additional shading resulting from the non-compliance, taking into account the use of the affected sites, the amount of shadow cast and the period of time adjacent sites are affected. 2. The ability of existing topography or vegetation to mitigate any adverse shading effects on the adjoining site. 3. The nature of the use of adjoining sites and the extent to which the activity may result in conflict and/or reverse sensitivity effects with activities on adjacent sites. 4. Any shading effects on the transport network. 5. <u>The potential for the spread of wilding trees into conservation land, SNAs and QE II National Trust land and the risk to these areas from wilding trees establishment.</u>

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)	Amendment needed for alignment with NЕСF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)				
		<p>Clause (5) deletion scope: Rejection of submission [316.167].</p> <p>Title amendment scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</p>					
Wilding pines policy	The initially recommended wilding pines policy RURZ-P7 ⁴² , was deleted ⁴³ .	No.	No.				
NOSZ Introduction	This coastal portion of the zone is largely based around Tuhaitara Coastal Park, and also includes: Tūtaepatu Lagoon and coastal wetlands; estuary margins; coastal reserve land at Waikuku Beach and Pines-Kairaki Beach; Woodend Beach Domain; existing lifesaving, coastguard, yacht and boating facilities; existing commercial plantation forestry; and existing equestrian and ancillary activities and facilities at Pegasus Bay Coastal Reserve and beach, Waikuku Beach, Woodend Beach and Pines-Kairaki Beach.	Amend 'plantation' forestry reference. Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.	This coastal portion of the zone is largely based around Tuhaitara Coastal Park, and also includes: Tūtaepatu Lagoon and coastal wetlands; estuary margins; coastal reserve land at Waikuku Beach and Pines-Kairaki Beach; Woodend Beach Domain; existing lifesaving, coastguard, yacht and boating facilities; existing commercial plantation forestry; and existing equestrian and ancillary activities and facilities at Pegasus Bay Coastal Reserve and beach, Waikuku Beach, Woodend Beach and Pines-Kairaki Beach.				
GRUZ-R2	<p>GRUZ-R2 Primary production</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="329 1394 1222 1772"> <tr> <td data-bbox="329 1394 854 1772"> <p>Activity status: PER Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. any forestry less than 1ha, carbon forest or woodlot shall be set back a minimum of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>the greater of either:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>40m; or</u> ii. <u>A distance where the forest species when fully grown would shade a residential unit or</u> </td> <td data-bbox="863 1394 1222 1772"> <p>Activity status when compliance with GRUZ-R2 (1) not achieved: RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RURZ-MD1 - Natural environment values RURZ-MD3 - Character and amenity </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Activity status: PER Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. any forestry less than 1ha, carbon forest or woodlot shall be set back a minimum of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>the greater of either:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>40m; or</u> ii. <u>A distance where the forest species when fully grown would shade a residential unit or</u> 	<p>Activity status when compliance with GRUZ-R2 (1) not achieved: RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RURZ-MD1 - Natural environment values RURZ-MD3 - Character and amenity 	<p>Yes, update to reflect that 'carbon forest' is now included in commercial forestry.</p> <p>Also update title reference for RURZ-MD4. Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</p> <p>Also, to address an error in the Rural Reply Report in relation to the rejection of ECan submission [316.167] that sought a wilding pines policy, clause (2) needs to</p>	<p>GRUZ-R2 Primary production</p> <table border="0" data-bbox="1724 1394 2689 1772"> <tr> <td data-bbox="1724 1394 2178 1772"> <p>Activity status: PER Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. any forestry less than 1ha, carbon forest or woodlot shall be set back a minimum of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the greater of either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. 40m; or ii. A distance where the forest species </td> <td data-bbox="2187 1394 2689 1772"> <p>Activity status when compliance with GRUZ-R2 (1) not achieved: RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RURZ-MD1 - Natural environment values RURZ-MD3 - Character and amenity values of the activity RURZ-MD4 - Forestry, Carbon Forest, Woodlots <p>Notification</p> </td> </tr> </table>	<p>Activity status: PER Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. any forestry less than 1ha, carbon forest or woodlot shall be set back a minimum of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the greater of either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. 40m; or ii. A distance where the forest species 	<p>Activity status when compliance with GRUZ-R2 (1) not achieved: RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RURZ-MD1 - Natural environment values RURZ-MD3 - Character and amenity values of the activity RURZ-MD4 - Forestry, Carbon Forest, Woodlots <p>Notification</p>
<p>Activity status: PER Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. any forestry less than 1ha, carbon forest or woodlot shall be set back a minimum of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>the greater of either:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>40m; or</u> ii. <u>A distance where the forest species when fully grown would shade a residential unit or</u> 	<p>Activity status when compliance with GRUZ-R2 (1) not achieved: RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RURZ-MD1 - Natural environment values RURZ-MD3 - Character and amenity 						
<p>Activity status: PER Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. any forestry less than 1ha, carbon forest or woodlot shall be set back a minimum of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the greater of either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. 40m; or ii. A distance where the forest species 	<p>Activity status when compliance with GRUZ-R2 (1) not achieved: RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> RURZ-MD1 - Natural environment values RURZ-MD3 - Character and amenity values of the activity RURZ-MD4 - Forestry, Carbon Forest, Woodlots <p>Notification</p>						

⁴² Rural Zones s42A Report.

⁴³ Rural Zones Reply Report.

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)		Amendment needed for alignment with NESCF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)	
	<p><u>minor residential unit between 10am and 2pm on the shortest day of the year;</u></p> <p>b. 40m from any residential unit or minor residential unit on a site under different ownership, <u>except where topography already causes shading⁴⁴; or</u></p> <p>c. 10m from any site boundary of a site under different ownership; and</p> <p>d. 10m from any road boundary of a paved public road.</p> <p>2. <u>any new afforestation less than 1ha, carbon forest or woodlot shall undertake a wilding tree risk assessment in accordance with the criteria within the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry and have a score of less than 12.</u></p>	<p>values of the activity</p> <p>RURZ-MD4 - Forestry, Carbon Forest, Woodlots</p> <p>Notification An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified, but may be limited notified.</p> <p><u>Activity status when compliance with GRUZ-R2 (2) not achieved: RDIS</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>RURZ-MD1 - Natural environment values</u></p> <p><u>RURZ-MD4 - Forestry, Carbon Forest, Woodlots</u></p>	<p>be deleted as this was recommended in the Rural Zones s42A Report as a consequential amendment from the addition of the wilding pines policy, which was subsequently deleted via the Rural Zones Reply Report. <i>Scope: Reject [316.167]</i></p> <p>Also, recommend deletion of the recommended amendment to (1)(a) and (b), which was added via the submission from K A Houghton Cawte [259.1]. It is now considered that this submission should be rejected as the recommended amendment would make the rule more complicated and more difficult to enforce and therefore it is recommended to revert to notified clause for this.</p>	<p><u>when fully grown would shade a residential unit or minor residential unit between 10am and 2pm on the shortest day of the year;</u></p> <p>b. 40m from any residential unit or minor residential unit on a site under different ownership; <u>except where topography already causes shading⁴⁵; or</u></p> <p>c. 10m from any site boundary of a site under different ownership; and</p> <p>d. 10m from any road boundary of a paved public road.</p> <p>2. any new afforestation less than 1ha, carbon forest or woodlot shall undertake a wilding tree risk assessment in accordance with the criteria within the National Environmental Standards for Plantation Commercial Forestry and have a score of less than 12.</p>	<p>An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified, but may be limited notified.</p> <p><u>Activity status when compliance with GRUZ-R2 (2) not achieved: RDIS</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>RURZ-MD1 - Natural environment values</u></p> <p><u>RURZ-MD4 - Forestry, Carbon Forest, Woodlots</u></p>
RLZ-R2	RLZ-R2 Primary production		<p>Yes, update to reflect that 'carbon forest' is now included in commercial forestry.</p> <p>Also update title reference for RURZ-MD4. <i>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</i></p>	RLZ-R2 Primary production	
	<p>Activity status: PER Where:</p> <p>1. any forestry less than 1ha, carbon forest or woodlot shall be set back a minimum of:</p> <p>a. <u>the greater of either;</u></p> <p>i. <u>40m; or</u></p>	<p>Activity status when compliance with RLZ-R2 (1) not achieved: RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>RURZ-MD1 - Natural environment values</p>		<p>Activity status: PER Where:</p> <p>2. any forestry less than 1ha, carbon forest or woodlot shall be set back a minimum of:</p> <p>a. <u>the greater of either;</u></p> <p>i. <u>40m; or</u></p>	<p>Activity status when compliance with RLZ-R2 (1) not achieved: RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>RURZ-MD1 - Natural environment values</p>

⁴⁴ K A Houghton Cawte [259.1]. Rural Zones s42A report.

⁴⁵ K A Houghton Cawte [259.1]. Rural Zones s42A report.

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)		Amendment needed for alignment with NЕСF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)	
	<p>ii. <u>A distance where the forest species when fully grown would shade a residential unit or minor residential unit between 10am and 2pm on the shortest day of the year;</u></p> <p><u>ab. 40m</u> from any residential unit or minor residential unit on a site under different ownership, <u>except where topography already causes shading</u>,⁴⁶ <u>or</u></p> <p><u>bc. 10m</u> from any site boundary of a site under different ownership; and</p> <p><u>ed. 10m</u> from any road boundary of a public road.</p>	<p>RURZ-MD3 - Character and amenity values of the activity</p> <p>RURZ-MD4 - Forestry, Carbon Forest, Woodlot</p> <p>Notification</p> <p>An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified, but may be limited notified.</p>	<p>Also, recommend deletion of the recommended amendment to (1)(a) and (b), which was added via the submission from K A Houghton Cawte [259.1]. It is now considered that this submission should be rejected as the recommended amendment would make the rule more complicated and more difficult to enforce and therefore it is recommended to revert to notified clause for this.</p>	<p>ii. A distance where the forest species when fully grown would shade a residential unit or minor residential unit between 10am and 2pm on the shortest day of the year;</p> <p>ab. 40m from any residential unit or minor residential unit on a site under different ownership, except where topography already causes shading; or</p> <p>bc. 10m from any site boundary of a site under different ownership; and</p> <p>ed. 10m from any road boundary of a public road.</p>	<p>RURZ-MD3 - Character and amenity values of the activity</p> <p>RURZ-MD4 - Forestry, Carbon Forest, Woodlots</p> <p>Notification</p> <p>An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified, but may be limited notified.</p>
NOSZ-R13	<p>Planting of vegetation</p> <p>Activity status: PER</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> planting of vegetation is not for plantation forestry; planting shall be limited to indigenous species that are naturally occurring within the ecological district within which the planting is to take place, except as specified in (32) below; planting of indigenous vegetation of ecologically similar origin, or non- 		None required.	N/A.	

⁴⁶ K A Houghton Cawte [259.1]. Rural Zones s42A report.

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)	Amendment needed for alignment with NESCF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)
	<p>indigenous vegetation, in the following circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. re-introduction of indigenous species no longer occurring naturally in the District, procured from a naturally occurring and ecologically similar source; b. conservation activities (excluding non-indigenous vegetation); c. species conservation (excluding non-indigenous vegetation); d. soil conservation, <u>including erosion control</u>; e. <u>natural hazard mitigation</u>; f. planting for the purposes of screening public amenities and parking areas, or for shelter purposes, or for maintaining the character of an existing cultural or historical site; and g. shall exclude: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. all plants listed in the National Pest Plant Accord (reprinted with minor amendments February 2020); ii. all non-indigenous plants listed in the DoC Consolidated List of Environmental Weeds in NZ (May 2008); and iii. all organisms classified as pests and all Organisms of Interest listed in the Canterbury Regional Pest Management Plan 2018-2038. 		

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)	Amendment needed for alignment with NЕСF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)	
SPZ(PR)-R16	<p>SPZ(PR)-R16 Primary production</p> <p><i>This rule does not apply to plantation forestry and woodlots provided for under SPZ(PR)-R20; or mining and quarrying activities provided for under SPZ(PR)-R23.</i></p>	<p>Update reference to 'plantation' forestry to 'commercial' forestry.</p> <p>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</p>	<p>SPZ(PR)-R16 Primary production</p> <p><i>This rule does not apply to plantation <u>commercial</u> forestry and woodlots provided for under SPZ(PR)-R20; or mining and quarrying activities provided for under SPZ(PR)-R23.</i></p>	
	<p>Activity status: DIS</p>		<p>Activity status when compliance is not achieved: N/A</p>	<p>Activity status: DIS</p>
SPZ(PR)-R20	<p>SPZ(PR)-R20 Plantation forestry and woodlots</p>	<p>Update reference to 'plantation' forestry to 'commercial' forestry.</p> <p>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</p>	<p>SPZ(PR)-R20 <u>Plantation Commercial</u> forestry and woodlots</p>	
	<p>Activity status: NC</p>		<p>Activity status when compliance is not achieved: N/A</p>	<p>Activity status: NC</p>
SPZ(KR)-R4	<p>SPZ(KR)-R4 Agriculture</p> <p><i>This rule does not apply to intensive outdoor primary production or intensive indoor primary production provided for by SPZ(KR)-R36.</i></p>	<p>Update to align with amendment in relation to woodlots.</p> <p>Scope: s44A(6) of RMA.</p>	<p>SPZ(KR)-R4 Agriculture</p> <p><i>This rule does not apply to intensive outdoor primary production or intensive indoor primary production provided for by SPZ(KR)-R36.</i></p>	
	<p>Activity status: PER Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. any forestry and woodlot less than 1ha shall be set back a minimum of the following distances: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 40m from any residential unit or minor residential unit on a site under different ownership; b. 10m from any site boundary of a site under different ownership; and c. 10m from any road boundary of a public road. 		<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to: RURZ-MD4 - Forestry less than 1ha, Woodlots</p> <p>Notification An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being</p>	<p>Activity status: PER Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. any forestry and <u>less than 1ha</u> woodlot shall be set back a minimum of the following distances: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 40m from any residential unit or minor residential unit on a site under different ownership; b. 10m from any site boundary of a site under different ownership; and c. 10m from any road boundary of a public road.

PDP Provision	Reporting Officers' Recommended Version (Pre-Wrap up Reply Report) (recommended amendments shown in red text)		Amendment needed for alignment with NESCF	Final Reporting Officers (Wrap up Reply Report) Recommended amendment version (recommended amendments shown in purple text)	
		publicly notified, but may be limited notified.			

