





4.6 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – NL2.2 - Issues ..... 60

4.7 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – NL2.2.1 Outcomes ..... 61

4.8 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – NL 2.2.2 Objective and NL 2.2.3 Policies ..... 61

**RIPARIAN MANAGEMENT ..... 64**

4.1 Riparian Management Policy - General ..... 64

4.2 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.1 Introduction ..... 64

4.3 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.2 Loss of Values ..... 64

4.4 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.2.3 ..... 66

4.5 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.3 Poor Riparian Management ..... 66

4.6 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.4.3(c) ..... 67

4.7 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.4.3(d) ..... 68

4.8 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.4 Public Access ..... 68

4.9 Riparian Management Rules - General ..... 69

4.10 Riparian Management Rules – RP3.3 General Conditions ..... 70

4.11 Riparian Management Rules – RP3.3.2 Subdivision >4ha ..... 71

4.12 Riparian Management Rules – RP3.5 Assessment Criteria ..... 71

4.13 Riparian Management Rules – RP3.6 Schedule of Identified Waterways ..... 72

**FORESTRY ..... 74**

4.1 Definition – Forestry and Shelterbelts ..... 74

4.2 Forestry Activities – Specific Conditions RU3.4.12 ..... 74

**RURAL SUBDIVISIONS ..... 81**

4.1 All Zones: SU2.1 Introduction ..... 81

4.2 All Zones: SU2.2 Subdivision - General ..... 81

4.3 All Zones – SU2.2 Infrastructure and Subdivision ..... 81

4.4 All Zones: SU2.2 Wetlands, Lakes and Rivers ..... 83

4.5 All Zones: SU2.2.2(a) Objective re: Natural Areas ..... 83

4.6 All Zones: SU2.2.3(c) Policy re: Servicing and Access ..... 84

4.7 Rural Subdivision - Objectives and Policies: SU2.3 General ..... 84

4.8 Rural Subdivision Rules – General/Controlled Activity Standard ..... 86

4.9 Rural Subdivision Rules – Restricted Discretionary Activity Rule ..... 89

4.10 Rural Subdivision Rules – SU3.2.1.2 Discretionary Activities (Classification) ..... 91

4.11 Rural Subdivision Rules – SU3.2.1.2(a) Rural Subdivision Rule ..... 91

4.12 Rural Subdivision Rules – SU3.2.2 General Conditions ..... 92

4.13 Rural Subdivision Rules – SU3.2.2.3 Building Platform ..... 94

4.14 Rural Subdivision Rules – SU3.2.2.4 High Voltage Transmission Lines ..... 95

4.15 Rural Subdivision Rules – Assessment Criteria – Controlled Activities ..... 95

4.16 Rural Subdivision Rules – Assessment Criteria: Stormwater ..... 95

4.17 Rural Subdivision Rules – Assessment Criteria – Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities ..... 95

**RURAL ZONE POLICY ..... 99**

4.1 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.1 Introduction ..... 99

4.2 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.1 Introduction ..... 99

4.3 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.1 Introduction ..... 100

4.4 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.1 Introduction ..... 100

4.5 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2 ..... 101

4.6 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2 ..... 101

4.7 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.2 ..... 102

4.8 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3 ..... 102

4.9 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3 ..... 102

4.10 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(a) ..... 103

4.11 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(a) ..... 103

4.12 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(c) ..... 104

4.13 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(e) ..... 104

4.14 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(f) ..... 104

4.15	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(g) .....	105
4.16	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3.1 .....	105
4.17	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3.1 .....	106
4.18	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.1 .....	106
4.19	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3.1 .....	106
4.20	Rural Zone – Policy – RU2.2.3.1 .....	107
4.21	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2 and RU2.4 .....	107
4.22	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3 .....	107
4.23	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3 .....	108
4.24	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3 .....	109
4.25	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3 .....	109
4.26	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3 and Rural Policy in General .....	110
4.27	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3.3 (a) and (c) .....	110
4.28	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.5 .....	111
4.29	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.5 .....	111
4.30	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.6 .....	111
4.31	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.6 Reverse Sensitivity .....	112
4.32	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.6 No Complaints Covenants .....	113
4.33	Rural Zone – Policy - Objective RU2.6.2(a) and Policy RU2.6.3(b) .....	113
4.34	Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.6.2 .....	115
4.35	Rural Zone – Policy - General Comments .....	115
4.36	Rural Zone – Policy – General Comments .....	116
4.37	Rural Zone – Policy – General Comments .....	116

**RURAL RULES AND DEFINITIONS ..... 117**

4.1	Rural Zone Rule Statement: RU3.1 .....	117
4.2	Rural Zone Rules Permitted Activities: RU3.2.1 .....	117
4.3	Rural Zone Rules: General .....	118
4.4	Rural Zone Rules Permitted Activities: RU3.2.1(n) and RU3.2.3(a)(ii) .....	118
4.5	Rural Zone Rules Discretionary Activities: RU3.2.3 .....	119
4.6	Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.1 Front Yard .....	121

4.7	Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.2 Side and Rear Yards .....	122
4.8	Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.3 Density .....	122
4.9	Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.4 Height .....	123
4.10	Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.5 Noise .....	123
4.11	Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.7 Human Remains .....	124
4.12	Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.8 Transportation .....	124
4.13	Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.2 - Visitor Accommodation .....	125
4.14	Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.3 Commercial Activities .....	125
4.15	Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.5 Prospecting and Exploration Activities .....	126
4.16	Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.6 Extraction Activities .....	126
4.17	Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.7 – Motorised Land Activity, & Definition: Motorised Land Activity .....	128
4.18	Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.8 Waste Disposal Activities .....	128
4.19	Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.9 Electricity Generation Activities .....	129
4.20	Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.10 Earthworks .....	130
4.21	Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.13 Airport Activities .....	131
4.22	Rural Zone Assessment Criteria: RU3.5 .....	132
4.23	Definition: Airport/Rural Airstrip .....	133
4.24	Definition: Building .....	134
4.25	Definition: Domestic Scale Non Renewable Energy .....	134
4.26	Definition: Dwelling .....	134
4.27	Definition: Earthworks .....	135
4.28	Definition: Electricity Generation Activity .....	136
4.29	Definition: Exploration Activity .....	136
4.30	Definition: Extraction Activity .....	137
4.31	Definition: Factory Farming and Animal Boarding Facility Activity .....	137
4.32	Definition: Indigenous and Indigenous Riparian Vegetation .....	138
4.33	Definition: Industrial Activity .....	138





4.34	Definition: Prospecting Activity .....	138
4.35	Definition: Reverse Sensitivity .....	139
4.36	Definition: Rural Activity .....	139
4.37	Definition: Rural Character .....	141

4.38	Definition: Site.....	141
4.39	Definition: Vegetation Clearance .....	142
4.40	Definition: Waste.....	142

# Introduction

This document outlines the Commissioners recommended changes to the Proposed Changes to the Ruapehu District Plan (notified June 2010). It also contains the key reasons for these recommended amendments.

This document addresses the following chapters:

- Protected Areas
- Buffer
- Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes
- Riparian Management
- Forestry
- Rural Subdivisions
- Rural Zone Policy
- Rules and Definitions

## **Complete Wording of Provisions is provided in the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)***

Please note, recommended changes may be addressed in a number of different sections of this and the accompanying documents. To see a complete version of any individual changes see the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)*.

## **Principle Document**

Every effort has been taken to ensure that the amendments to the plan change text are identical in both this document and the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)*. However, should there be any inconsistencies between the two documents, the wording in the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)* will be taken as the correct wording.

## **Numbering Inconsistencies**

Due to changes in numbering as a result of submissions we have tended to use the original numbers given to provisions when the Plan Change was notified in this document (however there are examples where the amended reference numbers have been used). However, amended numbers are used in the *Recommended Proposed Plan Change to the Ruapehu District Plan (December 2011)* and will therefore be taken as the correct numbering.





## PROTECTED AREAS

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.1 Protected Areas - New Rule Framework for Skifields</b>			
None	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="846 504 1346 810">1 The RMA is a statute that promotes a participatory planning process. The effect of the RAL rule structure would effectively be to eliminate the opportunity for stakeholder and tangata whenua participation in decision making on most resource management matters affecting the Amenity Policy Areas.</li> <li data-bbox="846 815 1346 1161">2 The Tongariro National Park is World Heritage site, based on the dual attributes of its landscape <i>and</i> cultural values. To adopt a rule framework that inhibits the ability for cultural matters to be considered in the consenting of developments associated with the skifields would be inconsistent with the basis of the world heritage classification.</li> <li data-bbox="846 1166 1346 1437">3 The Tongariro National Park and the Mount Ruapehu are so highly valued nationally and internationally, and are such a sensitive environment that the retention of an over-arching RMA approval function, with the ability for public participation to be part of the consenting process if required, is</li> </ol>	<p>Cheal Consultants (171.16) Rejected            Ruapehu Alpine Lifts Ltd (No 260.1) Rejected            Department of Conservation (No FS1050.29) – to 260.1 Rejected            Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo (No FS1083.10) – to 260.1 Accepted            Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo ki Tongariro (FS1084.10) – to 260.1 Accepted</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.1 Protected Areas - New Rule Framework for Skifields			
	<p>appropriate. While the other legislation that DOC administers (National Parks Act and the Conservation Act) has environmental management components, these do not share the RMA's sole purpose of "the sustainable management of natural and physical resources". One aspect of the definition of sustainable management is that managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources enables people and communities to provide for their cultural, social and economic wellbeing, while sustaining the resources. Adopting the rule framework as modified in evidence submitted by RAL to the Hearing Panel, would greatly limit the opportunity for stakeholder (including tangata whenua and wider community) involvement in the consent process, and would not provide the rigour and consideration provided by a discretionary application. It would not achieve the purpose of the RMA, and would not effectively or equitably provide for proper consideration of the cultural, landscape and other effects of skifields development.</p> <p>4 The overall rule framework provided in the PPC (which is a continuation of the</p>		





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.1 Protected Areas - New Rule Framework for Skifields</b>			
	<p>approach from the Operative Ruapehu District Plan) has proven itself to be efficient and effective in regulating landuse within the Amenity Policy Areas. During the last 10 years a number of resource consent applications for skifield related activities have been lodged with and processed by Council – some of these have been notified processes and have resulted in consents being granted after robust assessment and stakeholder and public participation.</p>		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Protected Areas - Maps</b>			
<p>That locational feature notations be added to the planning maps for the Amenity Policy Areas as required.</p>	<p>Submission 140.27 – identification of the Waimarino Scientific Reserve as Conservation Land and not Reserve Land would be inconsistent with the rule framework of the Protected Areas section of the PPC and potentially cause confusion in terms of implementation of the rules.</p> <p>Submission 268.31 – the identification of locational features on the planning maps will improve their useability and provide greater clarity for plan users.</p>	<p>Sue Slegers (No 140.27) Rejected Ruapehu District Council Staff (No 268.31) Accepted</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.3 Protected Areas Policy – PA2.1 Introduction</b>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.3 Protected Areas Policy – PA2.1 Introduction</b>			
<p>That the last paragraph of PA2.1 Introduction of the Proposed Plan Change be deleted:</p> <p>It is also worth noting that the following Protected Areas are also identified as Regional Landscapes in the Proposed One Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <del>Tongariro National Park, particularly the volcanoes and the Rangipo Desert;</del></li> <li>• <del>Whakapapa River and river valley, including all of the river catchment</del></li> <li>• <del>Whanganui National Park; and</del></li> <li>• <del>Manganui-o-Te-Ao River and river valley</del></li> </ul>	<p>(i) The paragraph to be deleted creates confusion as to the application and extent of the Protected Areas Zone provisions, and is inaccurate. The ONFL notations identified are not in themselves an extension of the Protected Areas zone – they are a notation or an “overlay” over existing zonings. Thus, the only properties that are actually affected by the Protected Areas Zone provisions of the PPC are those that have that zoning – and the presence (or not) of an ONFL overlay makes no difference in that regard.</p> <p>(ii) The Wildlife Act 1953 allows for areas of land to be set aside as wildlife sanctuaries, refuges and reserves subject to any prohibition or restriction imposed by proclamation or notice. The District contains such land and the application of the Protected Areas zone to land subject to the Wildlife Act 1953 remains appropriate.</p> <p>(iii) It is not appropriate to zone the site containing the Erua airstrip as Active Reserve as that zoning caters for the use and development of active sports parks within the District. The site of the airstrip is within a Conservation Area and it is appropriate for it to retain Protected Areas zoning. The airstrip in question can continue to be used under the existing use right provisions of the RMA.</p>	<p>Douglas Prince &amp; Chrissy Renata (No 121.1) Accepted in Part  SJ Merson (No 122.1) Accepted in Part  Winston Oliver (No 131.2) Accepted in Part  Ashley Cole (No 137.14) Accepted in Part  Rural Community Group (No 180.26) Accepted in Part  P John Chuman (No 181.25) Accepted in Part  Bryan Finnerty (No 226.25) Accepted in Part  Miriam Gillingham (No 227.25) Accepted in Part  Rural Community Group (No 180.27) Accepted in Part  P John Chuman (No 181.26) Accepted in Part  Bryan Finnerty (No 226.26) Accepted in Part  Miriam Gillingham (No 227.26) Accepted in Part  Rural Community Group (No 180.28) Rejected  P John Chuman (No 181.27) Rejected  Bryan Finnerty (No 226.27) Rejected  Miriam Gillingham (No 227.27) Rejected  Rural Community Group (No 180.29) Accepted in Part  P John Chuman (No 181.28) Accepted in Part  Bryan Finnerty (No 226.28) Accepted in Part  Miriam Gillingham (No 227.28) Accepted in Part  Michael Plowman (No 211.17) Accepted in Part  Velma Siemonek (No 212.9) Rejected  Donald Leslie Siemonek (No 214.4) Rejected  Ruapehu District Council Staff (No 268.5) Accepted in Part  <b>Further Submissions:</b>  Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.40) – to 121.1 Accepted in Part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.3 Protected Areas Policy – PA2.1 Introduction</b>			
		<p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.22) – to 121.1 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Enterprising Taumarunui Incorporated (No 1106.23) – to 131.2 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.44) – to 131.2 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.81) – to 180.26 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.37) – to 180.26 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.80) – to 180.27 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International (No 1106.36) – to 180.27 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.79) – to 180.28</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International (No 1106.35) – to 180.28</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.78) – to 180.29 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International (No 1106.34) – to 180.29 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Oio Farms (No 1004.1) – to 211.17</p> <p>Heather McKinnon (No 1021.2) – to 211.17 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Ken Malcolm (No 1022.2) – to 211.17 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Donald Siemonek (No 1024.2) – to 211.17 Accepted in Part Accepted in Part</p> <p>John Chumun (No 1025.2) – to 211.17 Accepted in Part</p> <p>John Chumun (No 1026.2) – to 211.17 Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.3 Protected Areas Policy – PA2.1 Introduction</b>			
		Kevin Siemonek (No 1027.2) – to 211.17 Accepted in Part Velma Siemonek (No 1028.2) – to 211.17 Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.98) – to 211.17 Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.55) – to 211.17 Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.4 Protected Areas Policy - General</b>			
None	Some amendments are recommended to the objectives and policies of the Protected Areas zone as a result of other submissions. It is thus necessary to accept the Horizons submission in part.	Horizons Regional Council (No 280.6) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.5 Protected Areas Policy – PA2.2 Degradation of Values</b>			
<b>Protected Areas – Policy PA2.2.3(a)</b> None	<b>Protected Areas – Policy PA2.2.3(a)</b> Amending the policy as requested largely repeats the purpose of the RMA and reduces the specificity of the policy. In my view there is little benefit to the PPC from making the proposed amendment, as these matters would be considered in assessing any proposal that required resource consent.	The Department of Conservation (No 191.14) Rejected The Department of Conservation (No 191.15) Accepted in Part The Department of Conservation (No 191.16) Accepted in Part The Department of Conservation (No 191.17) Accepted in Part Skotel Alpine Resort Ltd (No 259.1)	
Protected Areas – Policy PA2.2.3(d) That policy PA2.2.3(d) is amended to read as follows	<b>Protected Areas – Policy PA2.2.3(d)</b> The amendments proposed will retain the intent of	<b>Further Submissions:</b> Ruapehu Alpine Lifts Ltd (No 1092.4) – to 191.14 Rejected	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p><b>4.5 Protected Areas Policy – PA2.2 Degradation of Values</b></p>			
<p>(additions <u>underlined</u>):</p> <p><u>“To maintain and enhance amenity values by ensuring that the adverse effects of inappropriate subdivision, landuse and development are avoided, remedied or mitigated so as not to compromise the characteristics and features that create amenity value in the Protected Area Zone.”</u></p> <p>Protected Areas – Policy PA2.2.3(f) That policy PA2.2.3(f) is amended to read as follows: <u>“To recognise Tongariro National Park, and in particular the volcanoes as an outstanding natural feature, and to require protection of the Park and the volcanoes from the adverse effects, if any, associated with land use and development.”</u></p> <p>Protected Areas – Policy PA2.2.3(h) That policy PA2.2.3(h) is reworded to read as follows: <u>“To ensure that the use and development of resources avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on historic heritage in the Protected Areas Zone.”</u></p> <p>Recreation facilities in National Parks None</p>	<p>the policy (to maintain and enhance amenity values in the Protected Area Zone) while ensuring it is balanced to reflect the purpose of the RMA.</p> <p><b>Protected Areas – Policy PA2.2.3(f)</b> The amendments proposed will reinforce the protection of the Tongariro National Park and the volcanoes as an outstanding natural feature while recognising that not all landuse and development will generate adverse effects.</p> <p><b>Protected Areas – Policy PA2.2.3(h)</b> The amendments proposed will retain the intent of the policy (to protect historic heritage in the Protected Areas Zone) while ensuring it is balanced to reflect the fact that the RMA does not encourage blanket protection of any one specified resource.</p> <p><b>Recreation facilities in National Parks</b> The policy stream sought by the submitter, that focuses on the provision of facilities in the Protected Areas Zone to ensure visitor enjoyment is maintained and enhanced, is neither necessary or appropriate for inclusion in the PPC. The District Plan is primarily concerned with the management of natural and physical resources in</p>	<p>Mighty River Power (No 1035.13) – to 191.15 Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.90) – to 191.15 Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.47) – to 191.15 Accepted in Part Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (No 1046.38) – to 191.15 Accepted in Part NZ Wind Energy Association (No 1047.14) – to 191.15 Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.89) – to 191.16 Accepted Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.46) – to 191.16 Accepted Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (No 1046.39) – to 191.17 Accepted in Part NZ Wind Energy Association (No 1047.16) – to 191.17 Accepted in Part Mighty River Power (No 1035.14) – to 191.17 Accepted in Part Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo (No 1083.11) – to 259.1 Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo ki Tongariro (No 1084.11) – to 259.1 Ruapehu Alpine Lifts Ltd (No 1092.3) – to 259.1</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.5 Protected Areas Policy – PA2.2 Degradation of Values</b>			
	a manner that achieves the purpose of the RMA. Whether adequate visitor facilities are provided is a matter than it is more appropriately dealt with at a policy level through the various planning documents required to be prepared and implemented by DOC in their capacity as administrators of the National Parks and the majority of other land within the Protected Areas Zone.		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.6 Protected Areas Policy Section – PA2.3</b>			
<p>Protected Areas – New Policy – Positive Effects of Skifields</p> <p>That a new policy be inserted in PA2.3.3 as follows: <u>“to recognise the positive effects of some development and use of the Tongariro National Park and including the Ruapehu skifields on the district’s economic and social wellbeing and recreational values.”</u></p> <p>Protected Areas – Policy Section PA2.3.3</p> <p>That Policy PA2.3.3(f) be modified as follow: <u>“To promote the upgrading of existing facilities or new facilities which replace existing facilities and that improve environmental outcomes, including energy efficiency and amenity values”.</u>)</p> <p><b>Protected Areas – New Policy – Environmental</b></p>	<p><b>Protected Areas – New Policy – Positive Effects of Skifields</b></p> <p>The jobs and income generate a significant benefit to the Ruapehu District economically and socially, as well as being major recreational assets. The inclusion of a policy that recognises these benefits is appropriate and will give effect to the aspects of Objective PA 2.3.2 that promote the use and development of the Protected Areas Zone by individuals and groups as a recreational resource.</p> <p><b>Protected Areas – Policy Section PA2.3.3</b></p> <p>Both new and/or upgraded facilities provide the opportunity to improve design for energy efficiency and amenity values. For example, a more suitable building location could assist in assure better landscape and amenity outcomes</p> <p><b>Protected Areas – New Policy –</b></p>	<p>Mighty River Power Limited (No 75.13) Rejected</p> <p>Sue Slegers (No 140.3) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Edge to Edge Ltd (No 141.1) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Cheal Consultants (No 171.3) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Further Submissions:</p> <p>Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.52) – to 75.13</p> <p>Ruapehu Alpine Lifts Ltd (No 1092.1) – to 140.3 Accepted in Part</p> <p>ECCA ( no 1046.28 re: 75.13) Rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.6 Protected Areas Policy Section – PA2.3</b>			
<p><b>Offsetting</b> None</p>	<p><b>Environmental Offsetting</b> The panel accepts that while recognition and assessment of the merits of any off-setting approach in some locations in the District, the proposal to offset adverse environmental effects within the Tongariro National Park has the potential to undermine significant environmental values particularly in the Tongariro National Park.</p> <p>The Park is significant both nationally and internationally for its environmental and cultural values, and world heritage recognition could be withdrawn if these values are undermined.</p>		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.7 Protected Areas Rules – General</b>			
<p>Protected Areas – Rules Recommended Amendments to Plan Change Text That the term “energy generation activity” be replaced by the term “electricity generation activity” in Rules PA3.2.1.4(e), PA3.3.1.3(e), PA3.4.1.3(e), PA3.5.1.3(e) and PA 3.6.1.4(f)</p> <p><b>Protected Areas – Noise Standards</b> None</p>	<p><b>Protected Areas – Rules</b> The replacement of the term “electricity generation activity” with the term “energy generation activity” in the relevant Protected Areas rules will correct a drafting error and ensure consistency with the terminology used in the remainder of the PPC.</p> <p><b>Protected Areas – Noise Standards</b> The proposed noise standards for the Protected Areas Zone recognise the acoustic environment that exists within the zone. The “natural quiet” of the majority of the areas within the Protected Areas zone is a matter that contributes significantly to peoples appreciation of the amenity values and quality of the environment within the</p>	<p>Mighty River Power Limited (No 75.31) Accepted Telecom New Zealand (No 109.19) Rejected Ruapehu Alpine Lifts (No 260.3) Accepted Genesis Energy (No 279.6) Rejected Further Submissions: Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.53) – to 75.31 Accepted (1045.55 re: 279.6) Rejected Mighty River Power (No 1035.24) – to 279.6 Rejected EECA (1046.57 re: 271.6) Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.7 Protected Areas Rules – General</b>			
<p><b>Protected Areas – Energy Generation Activity Status</b> None</p>	<p>zone. It is appropriate that any activity that cannot comply with the noise standards gain resource consent where an assessment of the acoustic effect of the activity on the environment can be undertaken.</p> <p><b>Protected Areas – Energy Generation Activity Status</b> It is appropriate that energy generation activity retain non-complying status in the Protected Areas zone, to properly recognise the quality and sensitivity of the environment within the zone. Requiring Energy Generation Activity to gain consent as a non-complying activity in the Protected Areas Zone will allow the rigour provided by the s104 gateway test to be applied to such proposals, and for the objectives and policies of the Protected Areas zone to be afforded the maximum possible weight in the consenting process. Given the sensitivity and quality of the environments within the Protected Areas Zone, this is considered appropriate in resource management terms.</p>		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.8 Protected Areas Rules – PA3.1 Rule Statement</b>			
<p>That the wording of the “District Plan Zones” list on the Maps Legend is altered as follows: “Protected Areas – Conservation Protected Areas – Reserve”</p>	<p>The amendments to the legend to the Proposed Plan Change maps and the retention of the sentence advising of the probable need for DOC approval of most activities within the Protected Areas zone will provide clarity for plan users, and</p>	<p>Rural Community Group (No 180.42) Rejected P John Chuman (No 181.41) Rejected The Department of Conservation (No 191.33) Accepted Bryan Finnerty (No 226.41) Rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.8 Protected Areas Rules – PA3.1 Rule Statement</b>			
	ensure that DOC's statutory role as the administrator of the majority of the land within the Protected Areas zone is recognised	Miriam Gillingham (No 227.41) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.54) – to 191.33 Accepted Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.77) – to 180.42 Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.33) – to 180.42 Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.9 Protected Areas Rules – PA3.2.1 List of Permitted Activities</b>			
None	The permitted activities in Rule PA3.2.1.1 appropriately recognise the range of activities that occur in the Amenity Policy Area.	Sue Slegers (No 140.4) Accepted Edge to Edge (No 141.2) Accepted The Department of Conservation (No 191.34) Accepted Ruapehu Alpine Lifts Ltd (No 260.2) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.10 Protected Areas Rules – PA3.2.2 General Conditions and Specific Conditions</b>			
None	The standard is a trigger for requiring an assessment of the effects of a building proposal within the Amenity Policy Areas which is important in ensuring that the quality of the environment in the area is maintained and where possible enhanced.	Sue Slegers (No 140.5) (No 140.6) Both rejected Edge to Edge (No 141.3) Rejected Skotel Alpine Resort Ltd (No 259.2) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ruapehu Alpine Lifts Ltd (No 1092.2) – to 141.3 Rejected Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo (No 1083.12) – to 259.2 Accepted Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo ki Tongariro (No 1084.12) – to 259.2 Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.11 Protected Areas Policy – PA3.2.3 Specific Conditions</b>			
Protected Areas – Rules - Condition PA3.2.3.1(b)(ii) None	<b>Protected Areas – Rules - Condition PA3.2.3.1(b)(ii)</b> The standard is a trigger for requiring an assessment of the effects of a building proposal within the Amenity Policy Areas which is important in ensuring that the quality of the environment in the area is maintained and where possible enhanced.	Sue Slegers (No 140.7) Rejected Edge to Edge (No 141.4) Rejected Skotel Alpine Resort Ltd (No 259.3) Rejected Ruapehu District Council Staff (No 268.14) Accepted Further Submissions: Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo (No 1083.13) – to 259.3 Accepted Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo ki Tongariro (No 1084.13) – to 259.3 Accepted	
Protected Areas – Rules - Condition PA3.2.3.3(a) That Condition PA3.2.3.3(a) be amended to read as follows: (a) Shall not exceed the height limit for the Zone by more than <del>3m</del> <u>10.5m in height</u>	<b>Protected Areas – Rules - Condition PA3.2.3.3(a)</b> The amendment sought appropriate as it rectifies a plan drafting error, in that there is no specified general height limit in the Protected Areas Zone. The amended height limit proposed for domestic scale renewable energy structures is reasonably formulated to be 3 metres higher than the permitted standard height for Residential Activities in the zone		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.12 Protected Areas Rules – PA3.7 Assessment Criteria</b>			
That the following criteria be added to Protected Areas Rule PA 3.7.1: <u>“(j) The degree to which the proposal provides for amenities and services for public use and enjoyment.</u>	The addition of the assessment criteria is appropriate as the RMA requires consideration of positive effects as well as adverse effects. The addition of the criteria as sought will not unduly weight the overall list of criteria toward consideration of positive effects.	Sue Slegers (No 140.8) Accepted Edge to Edge (No 141.5) Accepted Skotel Alpine Resort Ltd (No 259.4) Accepted <b>Further Submissions:</b> Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo (No 1083.14) – to 259.4 Rejected Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo ki Tongariro (No 1084.14) – to 259.4 Rejected	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.13 Protected Areas Rules – PA3.2.3.2</b>			
<p>That Rule PA3.2.3.2(a)(ii) be modified as follows:</p> <p>ii) <u>No Club Accommodation Activity shall provide more than 34 beds, except where a club provides written evidence to the Council that another club has permanently transferred their unbuilt bed capacity to it, and it meets the other permitted activity requirements, including the limitation of no more than 20m<sup>2</sup> addition to an existing building, including the limitation of no more than a 20m<sup>2</sup> addition to an existing building.</u></p>	<p>The bunk capacity standard, in conjunction with past individual lodge sewerage treatment requirements, has influenced the current built environment at Whakapapa/ Iwikau. The number of lodges, of a range of sizes reflecting their bunk capacity, with spacious areas between them, has created the amenity in the current village. As such it is considered appropriate to retain a limit on bunk numbers, but with some flexibility, given the costs smaller lodges with unbuilt bed capacity face from the community sewerage scheme. It is anticipated that the written evidence would be legal documents clearly certifying the permanent transfer of unbuilt bed capacity from one lodge to another lodge, and lodged with the Council.</p>	<p>Ruapehu Mountain Clubs Association (No 27.2) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.14 Protected Areas Rules – PA3.6 Reserves Under the RMA</b>			
<p>That the land parcels gazetted as reserve and administered by Ruapehu District Council within the Turoa Alpine Village development be zoned “Reserve – Protected Areas”.</p> <p>That the following be added to the list of permitted activities in Rule PA3.6.1.1: “(d) <u>Grazing of land by sheep, cows or horses</u>”</p>	<p>The open space surrounding the Turoa Village development is appropriately catered for by way of Rule PA 3.6. It is also appropriate for the Council owned land within the village that is gazetted as reserve to be subject to Protect Areas (Reserve) zoning, rather than the current residential zoning.</p> <p>The insertion of the grazing clause sought by RDC will allow the continuation of existing Council maintenance practices on reserves.</p>	<p>Turoa Village Residents Association Incorporated (No 31.1) Accepted David Holland (No 9.20) Accepted Ruapehu District Council Staff (No 268.15) Accepted <b>Further Submissions:</b> Turoa Village Residents' Association Incorporated (No 1089.6) – to 9.20 Accepted</p>	





## BUFFER ZONE

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.1 Issue RU2.4 and associated policy stream			
None	<p><b>Reasons for Recommendation</b></p> <p>The buffer provisions do not seek to create a “sterile” zone within which no activity at all can take place. The purpose of the buffer provisions is to ensure that around the margins of the specified conservation areas a rigorous assessment of the potential effects of certain activities can be undertaken through the resource consent process.</p> <p>Some landowners whose properties abut or are in close proximity to the conservation estate and in particular, Tongariro National Park, fear that they will be restricted in the developments they can undertake. The continuation of farming activities are not affected by the buffer provisions. The provisions confer no rights upon DOC or any other party to exert control over farming and other productive activities.</p> <p>As with any land ownership in this country, rights and responsibilities go hand-in-hand; any guardianship of land is only temporary. Inappropriate development decisions can have long-term consequences beyond the current owner’s lifetime. The rights of land owners to continue with their farming practices and to earn a living from the land are unaffected. The rules of the Plan affect new development. The hearings</p>	<p>Rural Community Group (No 180.10) Rejected  P John Chuman (No 181.10) Rejected  Velma Siemonek (No 212.6) Rejected  Donald Leslie Siemonek (No 214.3) Rejected  Bryan Finnerty (No 226.10) Rejected  Miriam Gillingham (No 227.10) Rejected  Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (No 284.13) Rejected  Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (No 287.6) Rejected  Adventure Headquarters (No 184.2) Rejected  Property Rights in New Zealand Inc (273.1) Rejected  Tukia Group Ltd (No 282.6) Rejected</p> <p><b>Further Submissions:</b>  Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.171) - to 287.6 Rejected  Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.127) - to 287.6 Rejected  NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.57) - to 287.6 Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.1 Issue RU2.4 and associated policy stream</b>			
	panel regard these district plan rules as appropriate measures to help safeguard the cultural, conservation and landscape values of the area for future generations.		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Objective RU2.4.2(a)</b>			
None	<p>The buffer objective does not seek to create a “sterile” zone within which no activity at all can take place. The purpose of the buffer provisions is to ensure that around the margins of the specified conservation areas a rigorous assessment of the potential effects of certain activities can be undertaken through the resource consent process.</p> <p>Some landowners whose properties abut or are in close proximity to the conservation estate and in particular, Tongariro National Park, fear that they will be restricted in the developments they can undertake. The continuation of farming activities are not affected by the buffer provisions. The provisions confer no rights upon DOC or any other party to exert control over farming and other productive activities.</p> <p>As with any land ownership in this country, rights and responsibilities go hand-in-hand; any guardianship of land is only temporary. Inappropriate development decisions can have long-term consequences beyond the current</p>	<p>Rural Community Group (No 180.10) Rejected  P John Chuman (No 181.10) Rejected  Bryan Finnerty (No 226.10) Rejected  Miriam Gillingham (No 227.10) Rejected  Rural Community Group (No 180.12) Rejected  P John Chuman (No 181.12) Rejected  Bryan Finnerty (No 226.12) Rejected  Miriam Gillingham (No 227.12) Rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Objective RU2.4.2(a)</b>			
	owner's lifetime. The rights of land owners to continue with their farming practices and to earn a living from the land are unaffected. The rules of the Plan affect new development. The hearings panel regard these district plan rules as appropriate measures to help safeguard the cultural, conservation and landscape values of the area for future generations.		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.3 Issue RU2.4, Policy RU2.4.3</b>			
None	<p>Issue RU2.4 and policy RU 2.4.3 are appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA. They allow the effects of development around the margins of specified conservation land to be assessed with a high degree of rigour and provide clear guidance for plan users and decision makers.</p> <p>The range of permitted activities which are "captured" by the buffer landuse rule have been reduced to exclude forestry.</p>	<p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 274.9) Rejected            NZ Forest Managers Ltd (No 293.7) Rejected  <b>Further Submissions:</b>            Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.188) – to 293.7 Rejected            Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.144) – to 293.7 Rejected            NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.26) – to 274.9 Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.4 RU2.4, RU2.5, RU2.6</b>			
None	The buffer provisions will only take effect if a subdivision is sought or an activity is proposed which falls under Rule 3.2.3(g) (as recommended to be altered) are sought to be undertaken. The specific circumstances of the submitters sites can be factored into the consideration of any resource	Ewan Starkey & Tim Sklenars (No 248.1) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.4 RU2.4, RU2.5, RU2.6	<p>consent application lodged for an activity that requires consent under the buffer provisions.</p> <p>Policy stream RU 2.5 is necessary to support the management of development in the high quality environment adjoining SH47 in a manner that achieves the purpose of the RMA, while Policy stream RU 2.6 addresses the valid resource management issue of reverse sensitivity effects.</p>		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.5 Issue RU2.4, Rule RU3.2.3(g), Rule SU3.2.1.3(c)			
None	<p>It is not the role of Council to undertake consultation on behalf of applicants with parties deemed to be affected by an application for resource consent, be that DOC or any other party.</p> <p>The buffer provisions do not restrict the ability of private landowners to voluntarily initiate conservation initiatives such as QEII covenants. The buffer provisions will only take effect should an activity be captured by the buffer rules.</p>	<p>Norman &amp; Jacqui Whiteside (No 197.2) Rejected  Emma Frances Whiteside (No 199.2) Rejected  Kerry Fitchett (No 200.2) Rejected  Mark Woods (No 201.2) Rejected  Sean Antrobus (No 202.2) Rejected  Jim &amp; Audrey Walker (No 203.2) Rejected  <b>Further Submissions:</b>  Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.94) – to 199.2 Accepted in Part  Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.51) – to 199.2 Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.6 Issue RU2.4, Rule SU3.2.1.3(c)			
That Outcome RU2.4.1 be deleted.	<p>It has previously been recommended that the Outcomes in all of the policy sections should be deleted, as they hold no statutory status.</p>	<p>Brent &amp; Noeline Bishop (No 78.1) Rejected  Brent &amp; Noeline Bishop (No 78.2) Accepted  Brent &amp; Noeline Bishop (No 78.3) Rejected  Brent &amp; Noeline Bishop (No 78.4) Rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.6 Issue RU2.4, Rule SU3.2.1.3(c)</b>			
	Issue RU2.4 and the policy stream that flows from it are appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA. They allow the effects of development around the margins of specified conservation land to be assessed with a high degree of rigour and provide clear guidance for plan users and decision makers.	Brent & Noeline Bishop (No 78.5) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.7 Outcome RU2.4.1</b>			
That Outcome RU2.4.1(a) be deleted	It has previously been recommended that the Outcomes in all of the policy sections should be deleted, as they hold no statutory status.	Rural Community Group (No 180.11) Accepted The Department of Conservation (No 191.10) Accepted P John Chuman (No 181.11) Accepted Alf J Sivyer (No 242.1) Bryan Finnerty (No 226.11) Accepted Miriam Gillingham (No 227.11) Accepted Heather McKinnon (No 213.1) Accepted Michael Plowman (No 211.14) Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.8 Objective RU2.4.2</b>			
That Objective RU2.4.2 be amended to read as follows:  RU2.4.2 <u>OBJECTIVE</u>  (a) <u>To ensure the effects of land use in areas in close proximity to conservation land avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the environment including landscape values, biodiversity values and</u>	The amendment to the objective better reflects the structure and purpose of the RMA while retaining the original intent.	The Department of Conservation (No 191.11) Rejected Mighty River Power Limited (No 75.7) Accepted Ben Carmichael (No 156.1) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.49) – to 191.11 Accepted Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.17) – to 75.7	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.8 Objective RU2.4.2</b>			
<u>general amenity values of Conservation Land.</u>		Accepted Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.12) – to 75.7 Accepted Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.47) – to 75.7 Accepted Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (No 1046.24) – to 75.7 Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.9 RU2.4.2 &amp; RU3.2.3(g)</b>			
None	Objective RU2.4.4(a) and the policies that flow from it are appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA. They allow the effects of development around the margins of specified conservation land to be assessed with a high degree of rigour and provide clear guidance for plan users and decision makers.  Rule SU3.2.3(g) is an appropriate and easily implementable method of giving effect to Objective RU2.4.4(a) and the policies that flow from it.	Graham Murray Carmichael (No 129.1) Rejected Annie Carmichael (No 133.2) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.10 Policy RU2.4.3</b>			
None	Rural activities (the definition of which includes farming) are not captured by the buffer provisions.  Amendments proposed to policy RU 2.4.3(a) in response to other submissions and further	EM Wheeler (No 238.1) Rejected Rural Community Group (No 180.13) Accepted in Part P John Chuman (No 181.13) Accepted in Part Bryan Finnerty (No 226.13) Accepted in Part	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.10 Policy RU2.4.3</b>			
	<p>submissions will allow the policy to better recognise the RMA requirement to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, allow for consideration of the positive effects of a proposal.</p>	<p>Miriam Gillingham (No 227.13) Accepted in Part Bruce James Cranston (No 300.1) Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.11 Policy RU2.4.3, Rule RU3.2.3</b>			
None	<p>Policy RU2.4.3 is appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA. It allows the effects of development around the margins of specified conservation land to be assessed with a high degree of rigour and provide clear guidance for plan users and decision makers.</p> <p>Amendments proposed to Rule RU3.2.3 in response to other submissions and further submissions have been recommended that amongst other things exclude forestry from being captured by the rule. Papakainga development is not captured by the amendments.</p>	<p>Ngati Rangi Trust (No 255.3) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.12 Policies RU2.4.3(a) &amp; RU2.4.3(b)</b>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.12 Policies RU2.4.3(a) &amp; RU2.4.3(b)</b>			
<p>That policies RU 2.4.3(a) and RU 2.4.3(b) be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>(a) <u>Require applications for resource consents for activities within 500m of the Conservation Land identified in Policy 2.4.2(b) to demonstrate that adverse effects from inappropriate subdivision, use and development on the valued characteristics, of these areas, especially landscape, biodiversity and amenity values, of these areas will be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u></p> <p>(b) To specifically recognise <u>the values associated with the areas of Conservation Land listed below</u>, and to avoid, <u>remedy or mitigate</u> the risks posed to these areas by <u>inappropriate landuse and development and any associated domestic pets, animal pests and pest plants</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Otamarautara Stream Scenic Reserve</li> <li>• Pukepoto Ecological Area</li> <li>• Erua Forest Sanctuary</li> <li>• Waimarino Scientific Reserve</li> <li>• Tongariro National Park</li> <li>• Pokaka Scenic Reserve</li> <li>• Rangataua No.2 Conservation Area</li> <li>• Mangamingi Stream Conservation Area</li> <li>• Tongariro Conservation Area</li> <li>• Rangataua Conservation Area</li> <li>• Erua Conservation Area</li> <li>• Pureora Forest Park (and public conservation land contiguous with the Park)</li> </ul>	<p>The amendments proposed to the policies will allow the policies to better recognise the RMA requirement to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, and make it more specific as to the conservation areas listed and the effects that are sought to be addressed.</p>	<p>Mighty River Power Limited (No 75.8) Accepted in Part  Trustpower Ltd (No 74.7) Accepted in Part  The Department of Conservation (No 191.13) Accepted in Part  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 225.4) Accepted in Part  The Department of Conservation (No 191.12) Accepted in Part  Alf J Sivyer (No 241.2) Accepted in Part  AJ Paget (No 138.1) Accepted in Part  JE Fahey (No 175.1) Rejected  Cheal Consultants (No 171.4) Rejected  Rural Community Group (No 180.14) Rejected  P John Chuman (No 181.14) Rejected  Bryan Finnerty (No 226.14) Rejected  Miriam Gillingham (No 227.14) Rejected  <b>Further Submissions:</b>  Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (No 1046.25) – to 75.8 Accepted in Part  Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.16) – to 75.8 Accepted in Part  Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.11) – to 75.8 Accepted in Part  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.45) – to 74.7 Accepted in Part  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.51) – to 191.13 Accepted in Part  Mighty River Power (No 1035.17) – to 225.4 Accepted in Part  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.50) – to 191.12 Accepted in Part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p><b>4.13 RU2.4.3.1 - Explanation of Policy</b></p>			
<p>Recommended Amendments to Plan Change Text That RU2.4.3.1 <u>Explanation of Policy</u> be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>The policy (and where applicable associated rules) is aimed at ensuring that development within the Rural Zone in close proximity to Conservation Land (National Parks, Forest Parks, Scenic Reserves and Conservation Areas etc) <u>does not</u> detract from the valued characteristics of these areas, <u>including section 6 Matters of National Importance</u>. However, the provisions do not apply to rural activities, which under the associated rules (RU3.2.3) do not require consent.</p> <p>In general, it is not intended that these provisions will prevent development within these areas. Rather, the resource consent process will be used to ensure that any development that does occur does not detract from the landscape, biodiversity and general amenity characteristics of the adjoining Conservation Land.</p> <p>In areas specifically at risk from development on its boundary and/or highly sensitive to development, for example the Tongariro National Park and the Erua Conservation Area, a 500m wide buffer is provided around the boundary of these areas. Within this 500m buffer, specific rules will apply to development. Again, this is not intended to prevent all development, but will ensure that where development does occur it does not adversely impact on these highly significant areas.</p>	<p>The sentence that is recommended to be deleted displays an element of pre-judgement that is better removed from the explanation.</p> <p>The policy explanation section in question is important to clarify for plan users the intent of the buffer policy stream beginning with Issue RU 2.4. This policy stream of which the explanation forms part is appropriate to achieve the purpose of the RMA.</p>	<p>DC Aitken (No 154.1) Rejected Rural Community Group (No 180.17) Rejected P John Chuman (No 181.17) Rejected Miriam Gillingham (No 227.16) Bryan Finnerty (No 226.17) Rejected Miriam Gillingham (No 227.17) Rejected Rural Community Group (No 180.15) Rejected Rural Community Group (No 180.16) Rejected Rural Community Group (No 181.15) Rejected Rural Community Group (No 181.16) Rejected Bryan Finnerty (No 226.15) Rejected Miriam Gillingham (No 227.15) Rejected Bryan Finnerty (No 226.16) Rejected Heather McKinnon (No 213.2) Rejected Luke Green (No 216.1) Rejected Errol Vincent (No 220.2) Rejected Michael G Peterson (No 228.2) Rejected Trustpower Ltd (No 74.8) Accepted Sharon Adams (No 111.1) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.46) – to 74.8 Accepted Enterprising Taumarunui Incorporated (No 1010.1) – to 111.1</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.13 RU2.4.3.1 - Explanation of Policy</b>			
DOC <u>and other relevant landowners and stakeholders may be considered an affected party.</u>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.14 Rule RU3.2.3(g)</b>			
<p>RU3.2.1 <u>Permitted Activities</u></p> <p>The following activities are Permitted Activities provided they comply with the General Conditions outlined in section RU3.3, and the relevant Specific Conditions outlined in section RU3.4 below, <u>and do not fall under Rules RU3.2.3(e) <i>Development within 500m of Tongariro National Park</i>, and RU 3.2.3(f) <i>Development within 500m of other identified Conservation Land or RU 3.2.3 (g) Development fronting or within 1000m of State Highway 47</i></u></p> <p>-</p> <p>(a) Rural Activity  (b) Residential Activity  (c) Commercial Activity  .....</p> <p><u>RU3.2.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities</u></p> <p>(vi) <u>Any activity which is identified as a Discretionary Activity under rule RU 3.2.3 (e), (f), or (g).</u></p> <p><u>RU3.2.3 Discretionary Activities</u></p> <p>(e) <u>Development within 500m of Tongariro National Park</u></p>	<p>In relation to the Tongariro National Park, amendments have been made to enable a restricted range of core activities to occur within these areas. This includes rural and some residential activity, along with forestry.</p> <p>On the remaining identified Conservation land, the amendments to the rule result in a more targeted list of activities being captured, that have the potential to generate more than minor adverse effects on adjoining conservation land, whilst still allowing the rule to give effect to the objectives and policies it is derived from.</p> <p>The reasons set out under recommendation 4.18 are also relevant to the hearings panel decisions on the submissions and further submissions set out above.</p>	<p>R and S Forbes (No 275.7) Accepted in Part  National Park Community Board (No 90.4) Accepted in Part  David Griffiths (No 80.1) Accepted in Part  Alan &amp; Julie Whale (No 98.2) Accepted in Part  Ernslaw One Ltd (No 274.13) Accepted in Part  NZ Forest Managers Ltd (No 293.11) Accepted in Part  Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board (No 112.3) Accepted in Part  Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board (No 112.4) Accepted in Part  Murray Horn (No 19.1) Accepted in Part  Kathleen Murdoch (No 113.1) Accepted in Part  Ashley Cole (No 137.24) Accepted in Part  WM &amp; CE O'Donnell (No 142.2) Accepted in Part  Winston Oliver (No 79.7) Accepted in Part  Steve Fahey &amp; Joss Richardson (No 169.1) Accepted in Part  Steve Fahey &amp; Joss Richardson (No 169.2) Accepted in Part  Steve Fahey &amp; Joss Richardson (No 169.3) Accepted in Part  Ian Shaw (No 192.1) Accepted in Part  Ian Shaw (192.2) Accepted in Part  Michael Plowman (No 211.8) Accepted in Part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p><b>4.14 Rule RU3.2.3(g)</b></p>			
<p><u>Any activity which:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>Is listed as either a:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>Permitted Activity (under Rule RU3.2.1); or</u></li> <li>2. <u>Restricted Discretionary Activity (under Rule RU3.2.2); and</u></li> </ol> <p>(ii) <u>Is located within 500m of the Tongariro National Park.</u></p> <p><u>Exceptions: The following activities are exempt from this rule:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Rural Activities;</u></li> <li>• <u>Residential Activities located on an identified building platform approved through a subdivision consent, or one residential dwelling per site on an existing site;</u></li> <li>• <u>Forestry Activities;</u></li> <li>• <u>Waste disposal activity for the purpose of disposing farm and domestic waste for not more than one site, located on that site;</u></li> <li>• <u>Earthworks Activity;</u></li> <li>• <u>Domestic Scale Renewable Energy Activity, and Domestic Scale Non-Renewable Energy Activities.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Advice Notes:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>The exceptions to the Rule (detailed above), for example, Rural Activities, will continue to be classed as a Permitted Activity so long as the Activity complies with the General and</u></li> </ol>		<p>Marian Sivyver (No 242.1) Accepted in Part            Laura M Sivyver (No 243.4) Accepted in Part            David Edhouse (No 269.1) Accepted in Part            Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (No 284.42) Accepted in Part            Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (No 287.10) Accepted in Part            Murray Horn (No 297.1) Accepted in Part            AJ Paget (No 138.2) Accepted in Part            Sue Slegers (No 140.13) Accepted in Part            Sue Slegers (No 140.25) Accepted in Part            Cheal Consultants (No 171.18) Accepted in Part            Cheal Consultants (No 171.19) Accepted in Part            AJ Learmonth (No 237.1) Accepted in Part            Ohakune 2000 Inc (No 244.1) Accepted in Part            The Department of Conservation (No 191.26) Accepted in Part            Ruapehu District Council Staff (No 268.6) Accepted in Part            Dale L Sivyver (No 240.1) Accepted in Part            Kevin John Siemonek (No 215.1)</p> <p><b>Further Submissions:</b>            NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.30) – to 274.13 Accepted in Part            Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.192) – to 293.11 Accepted in Part            Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.148) – to 293.11 Accepted in Part            David Whale (No 1038.4) – to 112.3 Accepted in Part            Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo (No 1083.3) – to 112.3 Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p><b>4.14 Rule RU3.2.3(g)</b></p> <p><u>Specific Conditions set out in RU3.3 and RU 3.4, and the other relevant provisions of the District Plan.</u></p> <p><u>2. For any application submitted under the above rule, evidence of consultation with affected parties including owners and managers of adjoining land/nearby land is to be provided.</u></p> <p>Relevant Objectives and Policies - RU2.2, RU2.3, RU2.4.</p> <p>(f) <u>Development within 500m of other identified Conservation Land</u> Any of the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Industrial Activity</li> <li>(ii) Exploration Activity</li> <li>(iii) Extraction Activity</li> <li>(iv) Prospecting Activity</li> <li>(v) Transfer Station Activity</li> <li>(vi) Motorised Land Activity</li> </ul> <p>that are located within 500m of the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Otamarautara Stream Scenic Reserve</li> <li>• Pukepoto Ecological Area</li> <li>• Erua Forest Sanctuary</li> <li>• Waimarino Scientific Reserve</li> <li>• <del>Tongariro National Park</del></li> <li>• Pokaka Scenic Reserve</li> </ul>		<p>Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo ki Tongariro (No 1084.3) – to 112.3 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo (No 1083.4) – to 112.4 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo ki Tongariro (No 1084.4) – to 112.4 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.34) – to 112.4</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.19) – to 112.4 Accept in Part</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.1) – to 19.1</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.1) – to 19.1</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.22) – to 79.7</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.23) – to 79.7</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.16) – to 79.7 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.17) – to 79.7 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.75) – to 169.3 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.31) – to 169.3 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Department of Conservation (No 1050.9) – to 169.3</p> <p>NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.61) – to 287.10</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.175) – to 287.10 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.131) – to 287.10 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Sharon Adams (No 1051.1) – to 138.2 Accepted in Part</p> <p>David Whale (No 1038.5) – to 171.18 &amp; 171.19</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.14 Rule RU3.2.3(g)</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rangataua No.2 Conservation Area</li> <li>• Mangamingi Stream Conservation Area</li> <li>• Tongariro Conservation Area</li> <li>• Rangataua Conservation Area</li> <li>• Erua Conservation Area</li> <li>• Pureora Forest Park (and public conservation land contiguous with the Park)</li> </ul> <p>Advice Note:</p> <p>Note 1: <u>For any application submitted under the above rule, evidence of consultation with affected parties including owners and managers of adjoining land/nearby land is to be provided.</u></p> <p>Note 2: Tongariro National Park is not included in the above list as the activities are covered under Rule RU3.2.3(e) (above).</p> <p>Relevant Objectives and Policies - RU2.4.2 and RU2.4.3</p>		<p>Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd - (No 1044.104) to 237.1 Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd - (No 1106.61) to 237.1 Accepted in Part Department of Conservation (No 1050.11) – to 244.1 Accepted in Part David Griffiths (No 1033.2) – to 191.26 Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.77) to 268.6 Accepted in Part Department of Conservation (No 1050.12) to 268.6 Accepted in Part NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.16) to 268.6 Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.121) to 268.6 Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.15 RU3.2.3(g) &amp; SU3.2.1.3(c)</b>			
That the relevant planning maps be amended to accurately reflect the location of conservation areas listed in Rules	The planning maps should accurately reflect the location of conservation areas listed in Rules	Owhango Residents & Ratepayers Society Inc (No 182.1) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.15 RU3.2.3(g) &amp; SU3.2.1.3(c)</b>			
<p>RU3.2.3(g) and SU3.2.1.3(c).</p> <p>That the advice note to Rule RU3.2.3(e) and SU3.2.1.3(c) be revised to read as follows:</p> <p><u>“For any application submitted under the above rule, evidence of consultation with affected parties including owners and managers of adjoining land/nearby land is to be provided.”</u></p>	<p>RU3.2.3(g) and SU3.2.1.3(c). Any inconsistency will lead to confusion for plan users.</p> <p>The policies have been amended to clarify that the conservation land referred to are the sites referenced in the policies.</p> <p>The retention of buffer provisions for subdivision around the Tongariro National Park is appropriate to recognise the outstanding conservation values and environmental quality of the Tongariro National Park, and recognise its dual world heritage status.</p> <p>The reasons set out under recommendation 4.18 are also relevant to the hearings panel decisions on the submissions and further submissions set out above.</p>	<p>Owhango Residents &amp; Ratepayers Society Inc (No 182.2) Accepted in Part  Owhango Residents &amp; Ratepayers Society Inc (No 182.3) Rejected  Owhango Residents &amp; Ratepayers Society Inc (No 182.4) Accepted  Owhango Residents &amp; Ratepayers Society Inc (No 182.5) Rejected  Owhango Residents &amp; Ratepayers Society Inc (No 182.6) Accepted in Part  Owhango Residents &amp; Ratepayers Society Inc (No 182.7) Accepted in Part  Ross &amp; Christine Wallis (No 187.1) Accepted in Part  Rodney J &amp; Brenda Caldw (No 186.1) Accepted in Part  Off the Grid Properties Ltd (No 247.1) Accepted in Part  Trevor Schroeder (No 253.1) Accepted in Part  Ashley Cole (No 137.12) Accepted in Part  Tukia Group Ltd (No 282.9) Accepted in Part  <b>Further Submissions:</b>  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.48) – to 182.4 Accepted  Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.82) – to 182.7 Accepted in Part  Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.39) – to 182.7 Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.16 Support for Buffer and Assessment Criteria RU3.5</b>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.16 Support for Buffer and Assessment Criteria RU3.5</b>			
<p>That Assessment Criteria RU 3.5.1(c) be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>(a) Development Adjoining identified Conservation Land (referred to in RU3.2.3(e) and (f)):</p> <p>(i) Whether any development adjoining these areas, has been designed in a manner that will not detract from the valued characteristics of the area (including but not limited to the design and location of dwellings or structures, orientation and layout of subdivisions, and any covenants and consent notices proposed as part of a subdivision).</p> <p>(ii) Whether a landscape mitigation plan has been provided to ensure the adverse visual effects of the proposal when viewed from these identified areas, are avoided or mitigated to minor levels.</p> <p>(iii) The impact of the development, and subsequent use, on biodiversity values. Specific consideration will be given to measures proposed to ensure pest plant and animal species are not introduced into Conservation Land as a result of the development, along with measures to ensure that stormwater and wastewater do not affect water quality.</p> <p>(iv) Whether the Department of Conservation <u>and any other affected party have</u> <del>has</del> been consulted with regarding the development, and the outcome of that consultation.</p>	<p>The amendment is appropriate to recognise that parties other than DOC may be affected by applications subject to Rule RU3.2.3(g) and SU 3.2.1.4 (c).</p>	<p>Derek and Christine Kelly (No 65.2) Accepted            Max Crockett (No 234.1) Accepted in Part            NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.4) – to 65.2 Rejected            Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.44) – to 65.2 Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.16 Support for Buffer and Assessment Criteria RU3.5</b>			
The assessment criteria SU 3.2.2 (h)			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.17 Support, Opposition and Comments on the 500m Buffer with no Specific Reference to Policy or Rules</b>			
As per recommendations in sections 4.14 and 4.18 of this report.	<p>The amendments to the buffer zone rules in relation to the other identified Conservation areas, will target activities that have the potential to generate more than minor adverse effects on adjoining conservation land, whilst still allowing the rule to give effect to the objectives and policies it is derived from.</p> <p>In relation to development within 500m of the Tongariro National Park, amendments have been made to ensure that a range of rural and residential activities can continue to occur in this area, while ensuring that the values of the Park are appropriately protected.</p> <p>The amendments proposed to the relevant buffer policies will allow the policies to better recognise the RMA requirement to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects, and make it more specific as to the conservation areas listed and the effects that are sought to be addressed.</p> <p>The buffer provisions apply only in the rural zone and do not affect any other zones such as the residential or urban settlement zones that in places immediately adjoin conservation land.</p>	<p>SE Williams (No 24.2) Accepted in Part  Angela Fergusson (No 93.1) Accepted in Part  Andrew Harland (No 20.1) Accepted in Part  Jeremy Stubbs (No 39.1) Accepted in Part  Earl Rutherford &amp; Brenda Solon (No 41.3) Accepted in Part  Frank Taylor (No 54.1) Accepted in Part  Vivien L Pohl (No 219.1) Accepted in Part  JM Duff (No 72.1) Accepted in Part  Elizabeth Ellicock (No 76.1) Accepted in Part  CRS &amp; LA Lagocki (No 77.1) Accepted in Part  Farina Brady (No 83.1) Accepted in Part  Donald Borck (No 84.1) Accepted in Part  Christina Borck (No 85.1) Accepted in Part  Chevington Trust (No 97.1) Accepted in Part  David Watts (No 116.1) Accepted in Part  Tania Taylor (No 128.1) Accepted in Part  Denise Blair (No 132.1) Accepted in Part  WM &amp; CE O'Donnell (No 142.1) Accepted in Part  AR &amp; AC Aanensen (No 157.1) Accepted in Part  Bryan M McAnnalley (No 160.1) Accepted in Part  Rodney Blackburn (No 166.1) Accepted in Part  DJ Blackburn (No 167.1) Accepted in Part  SR Blackburn (No 168.1) Accepted in Part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.17 Support, Opposition and Comments on the 500m Buffer with no Specific Reference to Policy or Rules</b>			
	<p>The buffer provisions are consistent with the Tongariro National Park Management Plan in terms of its intent to ensure that development around the external margins of the park is managed to ensure park values are maintained.</p> <p>The reasons set out under recommendation 4.18 are also relevant to the hearings panel decisions on the submissions and further submissions set out above.</p>	<p>Susan Anderson (No 178.1) Accepted in Part  Dennis Anderson (No 179.1) Accepted in Part  Rural Community Group (No 180.19) Accepted in Part  Rural Community Group (No 180.20) Accepted in Part  Rural Community Group (No 180.21) Accepted in Part  Rural Community Group (No 180.22) Accepted in Part  Rural Community Group (No 180.24) Accepted in Part  Rural Community Group (No 180.25) Accepted in Part  P John Chuman (No 181.18) Accepted in Part  P John Chuman (No 181.19) Accepted in Part  P John Chuman (No 181.20) Accepted in Part  P John Chuman (No 181.21) Accepted in Part  P John Chuman (No 181.23) Accepted in Part  P John Chuman (No 181.24) Accepted in Part  Stephen Martin (No 188.1) Accepted in Part  John Hotter (No 196.4) Accepted in Part  The Department of Conservation (No 191.3) Accepted in Part  P &amp; S Svensson (No 210.1) Accepted in Part  Bryan Finnerty (No 226.18) Accepted in Part  Bryan Finnerty (No 226.19) Accepted in Part  Bryan Finnerty (No 226.20) Accepted in Part  Bryan Finnerty (No 226.21) Accepted in Part  Bryan Finnerty (No 226.24) Accepted in Part  Miriam Gillingham (No 227.18) Accepted in Part  Miriam Gillingham (No 227.19) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.17 Support, Opposition and Comments on the 500m Buffer with no Specific Reference to Policy or Rules</b>			
		<p>Miriam Gillingham (No 227.20) Accepted in Part  Miriam Gillingham (No 227.21) Accepted in Part  Miriam Gillingham (No 227.24) Accepted in Part  CC &amp; NM Gebbie Ltd (No 235.14) Accepted in Part  Ruapehu Property.com Ltd (No 236.14) Accepted in Part  Hakan Svensson (No 264.1) Accepted in Part  The Department of Conservation (No 191.4) Accepted in Part  <b>Further Submissions:</b>  David Whale (No 1038.1) – to 20.1 Accepted in Part  Sharon Adams (No 1054.1) – to 20.1 Accepted in Part  David Whale (No 1038.2) – to 39.1 Accepted in Part  NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.1) – to 39.1 Accepted in Part  Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.4) – to 41.3 Accepted in Part  Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.2) – to 41.3 Accepted in Part  NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.2) – to 41.3 Accepted in Part  Sharon Adams (No 1053.1) – to 54.1 Accepted in Part  NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.3) – to 54.1 Accepted in Part  NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.5) – to 72.1 Accepted in Part  Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.18) – to 76.1</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.17 Support, Opposition and Comments on the 500m Buffer with no Specific Reference to Policy or Rules</b>			
		Accepted in Part David Griffiths (No 1033.1) – to 191.3 Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.86) – to 191.3 Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.43) – to 191.3 Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.85, .42) – to 191.4 Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.88) – to 191.4 Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.13) – to 76.1 Accepted in Part Sharon Adams (No 1052.1) – to 76.1 Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.19) – to 77.1 Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.14) – to 77.1 Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.18 Rule SU3.2.1.3(c)</b>			
<p>That subdivision Rule SU3.2.1.3(c) be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>SU3.2.1.4 <u>Non-Complying Activities</u>                      The following activities are Non-Complying Activities:                      (c) Any subdivision within a <del>complying building platform</del> within 500 metres of <u>Tongariro National Park.</u></p>	<p>The proposed 500 metre buffer around the conservation estate drew a wide spectrum of submissions. The rationale for distinguishing this area from the rest of its rural surrounds included the desirability for both Department of Conservation and nearby landowners/ stakeholders to have the opportunity to participate in influencing the Council's decisions for proposals that might affect cultural, amenity/landscape or</p>	<p>David Griffiths (No 80.2) Accepted in Part                      The Department of Conservation (No 191.36) Accepted in Part                      Oio Farms Ltd (No 262.1) Accepted in Part                      Alan &amp; Julie Whale (No 98.6) Accepted in Part                      Ohakune 2000 Inc (No 244.2) Accepted in Part                      WM &amp; CE O'Donnell (No 142.3) Accept in Part  <b>Further Submission:</b>                      Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.32) – to 98.6</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p><b>4.18 Rule SU3.2.1.3(c)</b></p> <p>Advice Note: It is recommended that evidence of consultation with DOC is provided with any such application.</p> <p>Relevant Objectives and Policies - RU2.4.2(a) and RU2.4.3(a)</p> <p><i>Please note: the advice note relating to DOC has been amended as a separate recommendation.</i></p>	<p>conservation values. In addition, the status of Tongariro National Park as a UNESCO World Heritage Site includes an expectation of a buffer area to reduce negative influences on the site itself.</p> <p>There were numerous written submissions on the subject. Taking into account the written submissions, Council's advisors modified their recommendations in a report for the hearings at the end of August 2011. A number of people and organisations took the time to come and present to the hearings panel. This provided further insight into the depth of feeling about this area.</p> <p>Broadly, the panel concluded that proposals for subdivision and for certain types of development located in close proximity to the conservation estate and in particular, Tongariro National Park, should provide for notification and the opportunity for participation by the public and the Department of Conservation. The method for providing for this to happen does not have to be a line on the map. The intention of protecting the biodiversity, cultural and landscape values of the conservation estate, and in particular the World Heritage site, can be included in the written rules of the Plan. Utilising the wide variety of submissions and concerns raised, the following are broadly the provisions decided upon:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Council's policy for notifying applications for discretionary and non-complying</li> </ol>	<p>Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.18) – to 98.6 Accepted in Part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.18 Rule SU3.2.1.3(c)	<p>consent will be clearer in the District Plan, particularly in relation to Tongariro National Park</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>2. Subdivision within 500 metres of Tongariro National Park will be a non-complying activity (SU3.2.1.3).</li><li>3. Subdivision within 500 metres of the rest of the conservation estate will be a discretionary activity (SU3.2.1.2)</li><li>4. The 500 metre area in which these provisions apply will be stated in rules rather than shown on a map.</li><li>5. Development within 500 metres of Tongariro National Park will be a discretionary activity, with the exception of the following activities which will continue to be Permitted (subject to the standard conditions):<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Rural Activities;</li><li>b. One residential dwelling per site, or where subdivision consent is granted, housing on approved building platform/s;</li><li>c. Forestry Activities;</li><li>d. Waste Disposal Activity for the purpose of disposing farm and domestic waste for not more than one site, located on that site;</li><li>e. Earthworks Activity;</li><li>f. Domestic Scale Renewable Energy Activity and Domestic Scale Non-Renewable Energy</li></ol></li></ol>		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.18 Rule SU3.2.1.3(c)	<p style="text-align: center;">Activities</p> <p>6. Certain development with 500 metres of other identified Conservation Land will be a discretionary activity. These developments include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) Industrial activity</li> <li>(b) Exploration activity</li> <li>(c) Extraction activity</li> <li>(d) Prospecting activity</li> <li>(e) Transfer Station activity</li> <li>(f) Motorised Land activity</li> </ul> <p>Consent is also required for these activities within 500m of the Tongariro National Park (under Rule RU3.2.3(e)).</p> <p>The reasons for the hearing panel's decisions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ UNESCO World Heritage Centre recognises Tongariro National Park for its cultural and landscape significance. Responsibilities and privileges accompany this status. The <b>2005 -2008 Operational Guidelines</b> for such sites include the following clauses:  <u>Boundaries for Effective Protection</u>            103. Wherever necessary for the proper conservation of the property, an adequate buffer zone should be provided.            104. For the purposes of effective protection of the nominated property, a buffer zone is an area surrounding the nominated property which has</li> </ul>		





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.18 Rule SU3.2.1.3(c)	<p>complementary legal and/or customary restrictions placed on its use and development to give an added layer of protection to the property. This should include the immediate setting of the nominated property, important views and other areas or attributes that are functionally important as a support to the property and its protection. The area constituting the buffer zone should be determined in each case through appropriate mechanisms. Details on the size, characteristics and authorized uses of a buffer zone, as well as a map indicating the precise boundaries of the property and its buffer zone, should be provided in the nomination.</p> <p>105. A clear explanation of how the buffer zone protects the property should also be provided.</p> <p>106. Where no buffer zone is proposed, the nomination should include a statement as to why a buffer zone is not required.</p> <p>107. Although buffer zones are not normally part of the nominated property, any modifications to the buffer zone subsequent to inscription of a property on the World Heritage List should be approved by the World Heritage Committee</p>		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.18 Rule SU3.2.1.3(c)	<p>The Department of Conservation's <b>Management Plan of Tongariro National Park 2006-2016</b> follows through in its recognition of the concept of the buffer zone. In addition, the Manganui o te ahi a River is protected through a National Water Conservation Orders, and there are large areas of land surrounding the National Park that is within the Conservation Estate. These measures help to maintain the habitats of endangered birds and rare plants.</p> <p>The hearings panel regard the District Plan rules applied to land and water margins around the perimeter of the Tongariro National Park area as the best available tools to provide for the thorough consideration warranted of any proposed subdivision or potentially adverse development. At the very least, notification and public consultation will ensure that consideration is given on how best to avoid, remedy or mitigate potential adverse effects. This buffer zone measure supports the universal value of the Tongariro National Park and its status as a world heritage site. It accords with the responsibilities of having a world heritage site within the boundaries of the District.</p> <p>➤ As a non-complying activity, proposals to</p>		





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.18 Rule SU3.2.1.3(c)	<p>subdivide will be considered thoroughly. Decision-makers will need to be satisfied that the adverse effects on the environment will be minor and that the activity will not be contrary to the objectives and policies of the Plan. Subdivision provides for separate land ownership and this includes the presumption that further development can take place on that land – at the very least, further buildings erected. Further buildings in close proximity to the Tongariro National Park may not be appropriate in all areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>➤ Proposed subdivisions and certain types of development in proximity to the conservation estate also warrant careful consideration as these also can threaten conservation and landscape values. A discretionary consent process is an adequate safeguard for each application to be considered carefully.</li><li>➤ Developments such as excavation activities and transfer stations include effects which, if not controlled, could threaten the ecological and amenity values of the area. The discretionary consent provision ensures that a robust process of consideration is accorded.</li><li>➤ We are also conscious of ensuring that the rules establish an appropriate permitted baseline for future</li></ul>		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.18 Rule SU3.2.1.3(c)	<p>development to be assessed against, given the landscape and biodiversity values of the area; while wanting to ensure that land owners can continue to undertake reasonable activities on their land.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Some landowners whose properties abut or are in close proximity to the conservation estate and in particular, Tongariro National Park, fear that they will be restricted in the developments they can undertake. As with any land ownership in this country, rights and responsibilities go hand-in-hand; any guardianship of land is only temporary. Inappropriate development decisions can have long-term consequences beyond the current owner's lifetime. The rights of land owners to continue with their farming practices and to earn a living from the land are unaffected. The rules of the Plan affect new development. The hearings panel regard these district plan rules as appropriate measures to help safeguard the cultural, conservation and landscape values of the area for future generations.</li> <li>➤ Unfortunately some submitters have misunderstood the potential effect on land owners of the notified consent process for subdivision and development within the buffer area. This has</li> </ul>		





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.18 Rule SU3.2.1.3(c)</b>			
	<p>unnecessarily alarmed some people. While owners wishing to develop their land may rather do it without consulting others, land owners themselves would probably wish to be consulted if a neighbour undertook certain types of development in proximity to them. The consultation that is desirable cannot be guaranteed without the appropriate rules in the plan.</p> <p>➤ The hearings panel heard concern about limited resources accorded the Department of Conservation to manage the conservation estate. These inadequacies impact upon neighbouring land owners as they do on the public generally. From pest control through to effective responses to notified applications, it is apparent that the limited resources of DOC should be of concern to all New Zealanders if the values of the conservation estate are to be retained.</p>		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.19 Policy Stream RU2.5 - Development Fronting or Within 1000m of SH47</b>			
None	Policy stream RU 2.5 is necessary to support the management of development in the high quality environment adjoining SH47 in a manner that achieves the purpose of the RMA.	NZ Transport Agency (NZTA) (No 208.2) Accepted Michael Plowman (No 211.15) Rejected Ernslaw One Ltd (No 274.10) Rejected NZ Forest Managers Ltd (No 293.8) Rejected Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.19 Policy Stream RU2.5 - Development Fronting or Within 1000m of SH47</b>			
		New Zealand (No 284.14) Rejected Tukia Group Ltd (No 282.7) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.27) to 274.10 Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.145) to 293.8 Rejected Department of Conservation (No 1050.23) to 284.14 Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.20 Rule RU3.2.3(h) - Development Fronting or Within 1000m of SH47</b>			
<p>That Rule RU3.2.3(g) be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>(g) <u>Development fronting or within 1000m of State Highway 47</u>            Any activity listed within Rule RU3.2.1 'Permitted Activities' and RU3.2.2 '<del>Controlled</del> <u>Restricted Discretionary</u> Activities' fronting SH47 or within 1000m of SH47.</p> <p>This rule specifically excludes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rural Activities</li> <li>Residential Activities which are accessory and secondary to a legally established Rural Activity; and</li> <li>The erection of a dwelling on any site which was in existence on the date that a decision was made on this Plan (subject to compliance with the relevant conditions for a Permitted Activity);</li> </ul>	<p>Rule RU3.2.3(h) is the principal method to give effect to policy stream RU2.5. As such it is a critical regulatory tool to ensure the sustainable management of the SH 47 area.</p> <p>In light of the sensitivity of the environment of the area, discretionary status is appropriate and will allow a full and unrestricted assessment of the effects of a proposal requiring consent rule 3.2.3(h).</p> <p>The activities exempted by the amendments are all standard rural activities, or in the case of forestry have other existing or recommended rules to control their landscape and visual effects.</p>	Sue Slegers (No 140.14) Accepted in Part Michael Plowman (No 211.9) Rejected Max Crockett (No 234.2) Accepted Christopher Gebbie (No 236.19) Accepted in Part AJ Learmonth (No 237.3) Accepted Ruapehu District Council Staff (No 268.7) Accepted Ruapehu District Council Staff (No 268.8) Accepted Ernslaw One Ltd (No 274.14) Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (No 284.43) Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (No 287.11) Accepted in Part Anthony Joyce (No 293.12) Tukia Group Ltd (282.1) Accepted in Part Tukia Group Ltd (No 282.10) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p><b>4.20 Rule RU3.2.3(h) - Development Fronting or Within 1000m of SH47</b></p>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Waste disposal activity for the purpose of disposing of farm and domestic waste for not more than one site, located on that site;</u></li> <li>• <u>Earthworks Activity;</u></li> <li>• <u>Domestic Scale Renewable Energy Activity, and Domestic Scale non-renewable energy activities; and</u></li> <li>• <u>Forestry Activities</u></li> </ul> <p><u>so long as the activity complies with the General and Specific Conditions set out in RU3.3 and 3.4.</u></p> <p>Relevant <u>Objective and Policies</u> Assessment Criteria: RU2.5.2 and RU2.5.3</p>		<p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.59) – to 234.2 Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.102) – to 234.2 Rejected</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.122) – to 268.7 Rejected</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.78) – to 268.7 Rejected</p> <p>Department of Conservation (No 1050.24) – to 268.7 Accepted</p> <p>Department of Conservation (No 1050.25) – to 268.8 Accepted</p> <p>Horticulture NZ (No 1073.14) – to 268.8 Accepted</p> <p>NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.31) – to 274.14 Rejected</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.162) – to 284.43 Rejected</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.118) – to 284.43 Rejected</p> <p>Horticulture NZ (No 1073.15) – to 284.43 Rejected</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.176) – to 287.11 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International (No 1106.132) – to 287.11 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Horticulture NZ (No 1073.16) – to 287.11 Accepted in Part</p> <p>NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.62) – to 287.11 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.193) – to 293.12 Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.20 Rule RU3.2.3(h) - Development Fronting or Within 1000m of SH47			
		Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.149) to 293.12 Rejected	





## OUTSTANDING NATURAL FEATURES AND LANDSCAPES (ONFL)

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.1 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes - General</b>			
<p>(i) That section NL2.1 be amended to read as follows (additions <u>underlined</u>, deletions struckthrough):</p> <p>NL2.1 <u>Introduction</u></p> <p>The Ruapehu District contains a number of outstanding natural features and landscapes (ONFL). The majority of natural and landscape features are volcanic land forms and scenic river valleys. These features and landscapes are widely appreciated by the district, regional, national and international communities.</p> <p>Section 6 of the Act requires the Council, in exercising its powers and functions under the Act in relation to managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources, to recognise and provide for the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. This is a matter of national importance.</p> <p>The Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council also has responsibilities with regard to these matters. These have been addressed in the Proposed “One Plan” (combined Regional Policy Statement, Regional Plan and Regional Coastal Plan). Within this document a list of ONFL has been developed, these include the following areas, which are within</p>	<p><b>List of ONFL areas</b></p> <p>The inclusion of the Tongariro National Park as an ONFL in the Ruapehu District Plan will give effect to the Proposed One Plan and Councils responsibilities under section 6 of the RMA. – Grant to add words</p> <p><b>Activity Status – ONFL areas</b></p> <p>The discretionary activity status for industrial activity, prospecting, exploration or extraction activities, motorised land activities, electricity generation activities, transfer stations, and airport activities is appropriate to ensure that a full assessment of the potential effects of such activities is required in order for them to establish within an ONFL.</p>	<p>Ashley Cole (No 137.19) Accepted in Part            Ohakune 2000 Inc (No 244.3) Rejected            Horizons Regional Council (No 280.11) Accepted in Part</p> <p><b>Further Submissions:</b></p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.53) – to 137.19 Accepted in Part            Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.26) – to 137.19 Accepted in Part            Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.80) – to 244.3 Rejected            Horticulture NZ (No 1073.35) – to 280.11 Accepted in Part            Federated Farmers of New Zealand (No 1076.40) – to 280.11 Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.1 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes - General</b>			
<p>the District:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Whakapapa River and River Valley;</li> <li>• The Whanganui National Park;</li> <li>• <u>The Manganui O te Ao River and River Valley;</u></li> <li>• The Kaimanawa Ranges;</li> <li>• <u>The Tongariro National Park; and</u></li> <li>• <u>The Rangitikei River and River Valley</u></li> </ul> <p>In addition, the following landscapes have been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Rangipo Desert;</li> <li>• The Hautapu River;</li> <li>• The Raketapauma wetland (previously known as Kutaroa and Otahupitara Swamps or Irirangi Swamp); and</li> <li>• The Whanganui River and River Valley (in addition to the National Park).</li> <li>• <u>The SH47 lahar mounds</u></li> </ul> <p><del>Land within the Protected Areas Zone has not been identified or mapped as an Outstanding Natural Feature or Landscape (simply to avoid duplication). However, some of the Objectives and Policies below also apply to these areas, e.g. the Tongariro National Park.</del></p> <p>(ii) That the following text be inserted into Policy NL 2.2.3(c)</p>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.1 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes - General</b>			
<p>(viii) <u>Tongariro National Park (particularly the volcanoes) and specifically its:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. <u>visual and scenic characteristics, particularly its visual prominence; and</u></li><li>2. <u>recreational values; and</u></li><li>3. <u>scientific value, particularly the volcanic landscape; and</u></li><li>4. <u>ecological value, particularly the mountainous ecology and the extensive tussock grasslands and wetlands supporting rare indigenous flora; and</u></li><li>5. <u>cultural values and importance to tangata whenua.</u></li></ol> <p>(ix) <u>Rangitikei River and River Valley, specifically its:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>(i) <u>visual and scenic characteristics, particularly its gorges, and the Rangitikei alluvial terraces and high bluffs; and</u></li><li>(ii) <u>scientific and educational value.</u></li></ol> <p>(x) <u>Lahar mounds immediately to the north of SH47, specifically;</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <u>the geological, scientific and historical values</u></li></ul> <p>(iii) That the following text be inserted into the NL2.2.3.1 Explanation of Policies</p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.1 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes - General</b>			
<p><u>Tongariro National Park</u>  <u>Tongariro National Park was the first National Park within New Zealand and has been accorded dual World Heritage status by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature recognising the Park's important Maori cultural and spiritual associations, as well as its outstanding volcanic and environmental features.</u></p> <p><u>Rangitikei River and Valley</u>  <u>The Rangitikei River and its valley has outstanding scenic values produced by its incised gorges, high bluffs and alluvial terraces. The river and its valley also contains elevated scientific and educational values produced by its sedimentary and alluvial environment.</u></p> <p><u>SH47 Lahar Mounds</u>  <u>These distinctive "lumpy" mounds provide a physical and visual record to the explosive nature of the volcanic activities that formed the landscape of the Central North Island. While the existing setting of the mounds is highly modified through ongoing farming activities, the mounds themselves still retain their geological, scientific and historic sense of place.</u></p> <p>(iv) That the following text be inserted into the Protected Areas Zone rules:</p> <p><u>PA3.1A RELATIONSHIP TO OUTSTANDING NATURAL FEATURES AND LANDSCAPES</u></p>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.1 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes - General</b>			
<p><u>RULES</u></p> <p><u>In the event of conflict between any rules associated with Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and the Protected Areas Zone rules, the Protected Areas Zone rules shall prevail.</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – Extent of ONFL Overlay for Manganui o te Ao River , Correlation between Policy and ONFL Mapping, and and Policies NL2.2.3(V) and NL1.3(D)</b>			
<p>i) That policy NL 2.2.3(c)(v) be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>The Manganui O te Ao River and <u>its margins river valley</u> <del>valley</del>, including the Makatote and Mangatururu Rivers and their <u>margins</u> valleys, and the Waimarino and Orautoha Streams, <del>(but not the Waimarino and Orautoha valleys, nor and the Ruatiti Stream or valley) and its margins,</del> specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 its scenic qualities provided by its river gorges and riparian margins;</li> <li>2 its importance in providing a habitat for the blue duck; and</li> <li>3 its outstanding wild and scenic characteristics and wildlife and fisheries values.</li> </ol> <p>The River is protected by a national water conservation order.</p> <p>The extent of the Outstanding Natural Features and</p>	<p>The Manganui o Te Ao River and its margins is clearly an outstanding natural feature but not the extensive area of grazed hill country included within the ONFL boundaries as notified in the Proposed Plan Change. The hill country provides the wider context for the river, but in itself it is not unique to this environment and does not meet the criteria for an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape.</p>	<p>Winston Oliver (No 79.11) Accepted            Douglas Prince &amp; Chrissy Renata (No 121.2) Accepted            SJ Merson (No 122.2) Accepted            JE Fahey (No 177.1) Accepted in Part            Stephen Martin (No 188.2) Accepted            Albert &amp; Tony Voelkerling (206.1) Accepted            Velma Siemonek (212.11) Accepted            Heather McKinnon (213.3) Accepted in Part            Kevin John Siemonek (215.2) Accepted            Luke Green (216.2) Accepted            Kevin Kavanagh (252.1) Accepted            David Watts (No 214.5) Accepted  <b>Further Submissions:</b>            Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.39) – to 121.2 Accepted in Part            Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.21) – to 121.2 Accepted in Part            Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.84) – to 188.2 Accepted            Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.96) – to 206.1</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – Extent of ONFL Overlay for Manganui o te Ao River , Correlation between Policy and ONFL Mapping, and and Policies NL2.2.3(V) and NL1.3(D)</b>			
<p><u>Landscapes notation as it applies to the Manganui-o-te-ao river as shown on the planning maps should be read as incorporating the “riverscape” of the waterways included in the notation. The ‘riverscape’ is defined to mean:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Escarpment faces (eg those high vertical walls) adjoining and adjacent to the waterway when viewed from the waterway.</u></li> <li>• <u>The river/stream bed and associated shingle banks and floodplains.</u></li> <li>• <u>Areas of vegetation whether native or exotic that adjoin the waterway and, when viewed from the waterway, form the immediate ridgeline . This could mean that in some instances areas of vegetation contained on land held in private ownership will be regarded as part of the riverscape for assessment purposes.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>The Outstanding Natural Features and Landscape notation excludes any land that appears visually as grazed pastoral hill country that is distinctively different in terms of vegetation cover, landuse (eg predominantly farming activity) and landform scale to that within the ‘riverscape’. The pastoral and hill country excluded from the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscape notation is that which is not unique to the area in question, and is characteristic of such pastoral and hill country found throughout the Ruapehu District.</u></p> <p>(ii) That the planning maps be amended to reflect the revised extent of the Manganui O te Ao River</p>		<p>Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.112) – to 252.1 Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.68) – to 252.1 Accepted in Part (1106.53 re: 206.1) Accepted in Part (1106.41 re: 188.2) Accepted in Part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – Extent of ONFL Overlay for Manganui o te Ao River , Correlation between Policy and ONFL Mapping, and and Policies NL2.2.3(V) and NL1.3(D)</b>			
ONFL overlay.			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.3 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – View Shaft Protection and Recognition of Land as ONFL</b>			
<p>(i) That the relevant planning maps be amended to include a viewshaft protection notation.</p> <p>(ii) That the following text be added to Rule RU 3.3 of the PPC:</p> <p><u>RU 3.3.10 State Highway 4/Tongariro National Park Viewshaft</u></p> <p><u>(a) No object including any part of a building, structure, tree or plantation of trees, or other object or plant growth shall penetrate the viewshaft recession plane as delineated on planning maps (insert relevant map reference) and Appendix (insert relevant reference)</u></p> <p>NL2.2.3</p> <p><u>(x) Lahar mounds immediately to the north of State Highway 47, specifically:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Their geological, scientific and historic values.</u></li> </ul> <p><i>Finally, add the following text to the bottom of the second list of bullet points under NL 2.1</i></p> <p>The State Highway 47 Lahar Mounds</p>	<p>i) The viewshaft in question has local, national and international importance. Formalising protection of it through the application of a viewshaft overlay would achieve Councils responsibilities under section 6(b) and section 7(c) of the RMA, and give effect to the sustainable management purpose of the RMA as set out in section 5.</p> <p>(ii) The lahar mounds adjacent to SH47 retain their geological, scientific and historic sense of place and qualify for protection as an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape.</p>	<p>NPVPAI (No 46.11) Accepted in Part ME (Peggy) Shelbourne (No 139.11) Accepted Sue Slegers (No 140.1) Accepted in Part Sue Slegers (No 140.2) Accepted in Part Sue Slegers (No 140.28) Accepted in Part CC &amp; NM Gebbie Ltd (No 235.19) Accepted in Part Melanie Cameron (No 257.14) Accepted in Part</p> <p><b>Further Submissions:</b> Teina Taylor (No 1048.11) to No 46.11 Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.55) to No 139.11 Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.27) to No 139.11 Rejected Pukenui Lodge &amp; Ruapehu Prop Ltd (No 1064.9) to No 139.11 Accepted Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.103) to No 235.19 Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.60) to No 235.19 Rejected Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.114) to No 257.14 Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.70) to No 257.14 Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.3 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – View Shaft Protection and Recognition of Land as ONFL</b>			
<p>(b) That the following text be inserted into the NL2.2.3.1 Explanation of Policies <u>State Highway 47 Lahar Mounds</u></p> <p><u>These distinctive “lumpy” mounds provide a physical and visual record of the explosive nature of the volcanic activities that formed the landscape of the central north Island. While the existing setting of the mounds is highly modified through ongoing farming activities, the mounds themselves still retain their geological, scientific and historic sense of place.</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.4 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes - Maps</b>			
<p><b>Planning Maps reflecting Policies</b> None</p> <p><b>Whakapapa River – Extent of ONFL</b> Recommended Amendments to Plan Change Maps</p> <p>(i) That the planning maps be amended to reflect the revised extent of the Whakapapa River ONFL overlay.</p> <p>(ii) That policy NL 2.2.3(f)(i) be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>(i) Whakapapa River and river valley, including</p>	<p><b>Planning Maps reflecting Policies</b> The amendments to the extent of the ONFL overlays will ensure that the maps are more accurately representative of the relevant policies.</p> <p><b>Whakapapa River – Extent of ONFL</b> The Whakapapa River and its margins is clearly an outstanding natural feature but not the extensive areas of pasture covered farmland included within the ONFL boundaries as notified in the Proposed Plan Change.</p>	<p>Property Rights in New Zealand Inc (No 273.2) Accepted in Part          Laura M Sivyer (No 243.2)          Ernslaw One Ltd (No 274.31) Accepted in Part          New Zealand Defence Force (No 277.2) Rejected          New Zealand Defence Force (No 277.4) Rejected          King Country Energy Limited (No 246.8) Accepted in Part          King Country Energy Limited (No 246.7) Accepted in Part  <b>Further Submissions:</b>          Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.125) – to 273.2</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p><b>4.4 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes - Maps</b></p>			
<p>all of the river catchment, specifically:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. its recreational and scenic values; and</li> <li>2. its importance in providing a habitat for the blue duck.</li> </ol> <p><u>The extent of the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscape notation as it applies to the Whakapapa River as shown on the planning maps should be read as incorporating the “riverscape” of the waterway. The ‘riverscape’ is defined to mean:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Escarpment faces (eg those high vertical walls) adjoining and adjacent to the waterway when viewed from the waterway.</u></li> <li>• <u>The river/stream bed and associated shingle banks and floodplains.</u></li> <li>• <u>Areas of vegetation whether native or exotic that adjoin the waterway and, when viewed from the waterway, form the immediate ridgeline. This could mean that in some instances areas of vegetation contained on land held in private ownership will be regarded as part of the riverscape for assessment purposes.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>The Outstanding Natural Features and Landscape notation excludes any land that appears visually as grazed pastoral country that is distinctively different in terms of vegetation cover, landuse (eg predominantly farming activity) and landform scale to that within the ‘riverscape’. The pastoral country excluded from the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscape notation is that which is not unique to the area in question, and is characteristic of such pastoral</u></p>		<p>Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.81) – to 273.2 NZ Forest Managers (No 1074.48) to No 274.31 Accepted in Part Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.81) to No 277.2 Rejected Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.13) to 277.4 Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.4 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes - Maps</b>			
<p><u>country found throughout the Ruapehu District.</u></p> <p><u>Particularly in the areas south of Owhango where pastoral farming use occurs, the riverscape does not extend west of the cadastral property boundaries where they adjoin the Whakapapa River.</u></p> <p><b>ONFL mapping and Forestry Activities</b> That the planning maps be amended to reflect the revised extent of the ONFL overlays as recommended.</p> <p><b>Defence Area Maps</b> None</p> <p><b>Whanganui River ONFL extent – Piriaka Power Station</b> That urban features map 6 be amended so that the Whanganui River ONFL overlay matches current legal description boundaries adjacent to the Piriaka power scheme powerhouse.</p>	<p><b>ONFL mapping and Forestry Activities</b> The amendments to the extent of the ONFL overlays will ensure that plantation forestry sites are not mapped as ONFL's.</p> <p><b>Defence Area Maps</b> There is little implication for the NZDF activities undertaken in accordance with the military training designation of the Rangipo Desert ONFL overlay, as designations override the landuse provisions of District Plans.</p> <p>Amending the PPC maps to remove the ONFL notation "Rangipo Desert" from the maps covering Waiouru Military Training Area would be inconsistent with the approach taken of labelling other ONFL's on the planning maps. NZDF could not identify any alternative extent of the Rangipo Desert ONFL.</p> <p><b>Whanganui River ONFL extent – Piriaka Power Station</b> It is important that the current boundaries of the river with adjoining sites in the vicinity of the Piriaka Power Scheme powerhouse are</p>		





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.4 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes - Maps</b>			
	accurately shown on the planning maps. However, the deletion of the ONFL notation from the strip within the waterway that corresponds with the location of the power scheme weirs would create inconsistency within the ONFL overlay.		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.5 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes Policy – NL2.1 Introduction</b>			
(i) That the Rangipo Desert be referred to Rangipo Desert throughout the plan change texts: <u>(Te Onetapu)</u>	The insertion of the correct te reo term for the Rangipo Desert into the PPC maps will recognise te reo while not creating confusion for plan users.	Rural Community Group (No 180.37) Rejected P John Chumun (No 181.36) Rejected Michael Plowman (No 211.21) Accepted in Part Bryan Finnerty (No 226.36) Rejected Miriam Gillingham (No 227.36) Rejected Ngati Rangī Trust (No 255.7) Accepted in Part	
(ii) That the Whangaehu River and its margins within the Tongariro National Park be shown as ONFL on the relevant planning maps.	The Whangaehu River and its margins within the boundaries of the Tongariro National Park has sufficient characteristics and values to be afforded ONFL status.	<b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.76) – to 180.37 Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.32) – to 180.37 Rejected Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.97) – to 211.21 Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.54) – to 211.21 Accepted in Part Mighty River Power (No 1035.22) – to 255.7 Accepted in Part Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.75) – to 255.7 Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.6 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – NL2.2 - Issues</b>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.6 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – NL2.2 - Issues</b>			
That Issue NL 2.2(b) be deleted.	<p>Issue NL2.2(a) is valid and will only become live to the assessment of an activity if the activity requires resource consent. Farming activity in its own right is not captured by any of the PPC rules which may flow from the policy stream within which the issue is located.</p> <p>Issue NL 2.2(b) is duplicative of provisions more appropriately placed elsewhere in the PPC, particularly RU 2.4 in the Rural Zone policy provisions.</p>	<p>WM &amp; CE O'Donnell (No 142.4) Accepted  Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.29) Accepted in Part  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 225.5) Accepted  <b>Further Submissions:</b>  Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.60) – to 142.4 Accepted  Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.29) – to 142.4 Accepted  Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.156) – to 284.29 Accepted  Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.112) – Accepted to 284.29</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.7 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – NL2.2.1 Outcomes</b>			
Deletion of the outcome.	The recommendation of the miscellaneous chapters report was to delete all outcomes.	<p>Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (No 284.30) Rejected  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 225.5) Accepted  <b>Further Submissions:</b>  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.76) – to 284.30 Accepted</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.8 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – NL 2.2.2 Objective and NL 2.2.3 Policies</b>			
<p>(i) That Policy NL 2.2.3(a) be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>(a) To protect outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development both within and</p>	<p>(i) The amendments to policy NL 2.2.3 are appropriate because this chapter focuses on Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes, which are a matter of national importance. The inclusion of the need to</p>	<p>Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (No 284.31)  Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (No 284.32)  Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p><b>4.8 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – NL 2.2.2 Objective and NL 2.2.3 Policies</b></p>			
<p><u>nearby</u> those identified areas. In determining inappropriate subdivision, use and development the following will be taken into account - the degree to which the activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) would adversely affect the values specified in Policy NL 2.2.2(c); and</li> <li><del>(ii) would adversely affect the values specified in Policy NL 2.2.3(c); and</del></li> <li>(ii) is necessary to provide for the social or economic well being of communities, or to provide essential utilities or services to the public; and</li> <li>(iii) <u>avoids any significant adverse cumulative effects on the characteristics and values of those outstanding natural features and landscapes</u></li> </ul> <p><u>while ensuring that, in all cases, any modification of the features or landscapes is consistent with the purpose of the Act</u></p> <p>(ii) That policy NL2.2.3(b) be deleted.</p>	<p>consider cumulative adverse effects is appropriate and consistent with the Proposed One Plan. Policy iii was included in the notified Plan Change and supported through the submission process. The new infrastructure chapter provides sufficient weighting for locational constraints.</p> <p>(ii) Policy NL 2.2.3(b) is duplicative of provisions more appropriately placed elsewhere in the PPC, particularly RU 2.4 in the Rural Zone policy provisions.</p>	<p>New Zealand (No 284.33)            Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand(No 284.34) Accepted in Part            Mighty River Power Limited (No 75.19) Accepted            Mighty River Power Limited (No 75.20) Accepted in Part            TrustPower Ltd (No 74.13)            Laura M Sivyer (No 243.1) Accepted in Part            Ngati Rangi Trust (No 255.8) Accepted in Part            Taranaki Fish and Game Council (No 261.9) Accepted in Part            Meridian Energy Ltd (No 225.5) Accepted in Part            Meridian Energy Ltd (No 225.6)            Genesis Energy (No 279.8)            Horizons Regional Council (No 280.12) Accepted            Transpower New Zealand Ltd (No 288.7)            Powerco Limited (No 289.7)  <b>Further Submissions:</b>            Genesis Energy (No 1040.16) – to 289.7            Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.9) – 74.13 Accepted in Part            Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.153) – to 284.34 Accepted in Part            Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.155) – to 284.31 Rejected            Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.109) – to 284.34 Accepted in Part            Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.154) – to 284.33 Accepted in Part            Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.110) –</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.8 Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes – NL 2.2.2 Objective and NL 2.2.3 Policies</b>			
		<p>to 284.33 Accepted in Part  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.77) – to 284.31  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.78) – to 284.33  Genesis Energy (No 1040.13) – to 75.20  Accepted in Part  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.74) – to 75.20  Accepted in Part  Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (No 1046.30) – to 75.19 Accepted  Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (No 1046.31) – to 75.20 Accepted in Part  King Country Energy Ltd (No 1049.2) – to 75.20  Accepted in Part  King Country Energy Ltd (No 1049.5) – to 74.13  Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.9) – to 74.13  Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.4) – to 74.13  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.73) – to 74.13  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.79) – to 288.7  Meridian Energy Ltd (No 1045.82) – to 289.7  Ernslaw One Ltd (No 1044.116) – to 261.9  Accepted in Part  Trustpower Ltd (No 1082.14) – to 289.7  Winstone Pulp International Ltd (No 1106.4) – to 74.13 Accepted in Part</p>	





## RIPARIAN MANAGEMENT

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.1 Riparian Management Policy - General</b>			
None	The rule statement in section RP3.1 confirms that the rules for Riparian Management and Public Access provisions apply to subdivision, and the creation of access strips. Issues of trespassing, the safety of blue ducks and the provisions of toilets are not district plan matters.	Michael Plowman (211.20) Rejected Alf J Sivyer (241.4) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.105 to 241.4) Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.62 to 241.4) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.1 Introduction</b>			
That the following sentence be added after the last paragraph of RP2.1:  <u>The Council also recognises that in certain circumstances public access to waterways will not be appropriate, where this raises health and safety concerns, or where public access could compromise significant ecological or in-stream values.</u>	This addition recognises that health and safety issues may result in public access being inappropriate. This matter is addressed in policy RP2.4.3(d).	Mighty River Power Limited (75.15) Accepted in Part Rural Community Group (180.35) Accepted P John Chumun (181.34) Accepted Bryan Finnerty (226.34) Accepted Miriam Gillingham (227.34) Accepted Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.24) Accepted <b>Further Submissions:</b> Meridian Energy Limited (1045.36 to 75.15), (1045.69 re: 65.15) Accepted in Part King Country Energy Limited (1049.4 to 75.15) Accepted in Part Trustpower Limited (1082.3 to 75.15) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.3 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.2 Loss of Values</b>			
That Issue RP2.2(a) be amended as follows:	This amendment to RP2.2(a) to refer to	Mighty River Power Limited (75.16) Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.3 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.2 Loss of Values</b>			
<p>Loss of values associated with <del>the margins of wetlands, and lakes and rivers</del> <u>and their margins</u> caused by inappropriate <del>activities</del> <u>subdivision, use and development</u>.</p> <p><b>That Objective RP2.2(b) be amended as follows:</b>            Preservation of the natural character of <del>the margins of wetlands, and lakes and rivers</del> <u>and their margins</u> and the protection of those <u>wetlands, lakes and rivers and their margins</u> from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</p> <p><b>That policy RP2.2.3 be amended as follows:</b>            (a) <u>To promote land management practices along the margins of wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins that:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) <u>provide for the preservation of the natural character of those wetlands, lakes and rivers and their margins from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</u></li> <li>(ii) <u>provide for the protection of significant ecological, cultural, intrinsic and amenity values from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</u></li> <li>(iii) <u>are consistent with the purpose of the Act.</u></li> </ul> <p><b>That the explanation to policy RP2.2.3.1 be amended as follows:</b>  <u>This policy seeks to retain the natural character of the margins of wetlands and lakes and rivers by promoting the protection of these through sustainable land management practices, including reducing sediments and other contaminants moving over land and into waterways and</u></p>	<p>“subdivision, use and development” instead of “activities” ensures consistency with the language of the RMA and is clearer for plan users. The amendment to policy stream RP2.2 to refer to “wetlands, lakes and rivers and their margins” provides for the consideration of ecological matters such as the protection of the habitats of species and reducing the overland movement of sediments while enabling integrated management of resources with the Regional Council.</p>	<p>Taranaki Fish and Game Council (261.6) Accepted  <b>Further Submissions:</b>            Horticulture NZ (1073.33 to 75.16) Accepted</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.3 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.2 Loss of Values</b>			
protecting the habitats of species.			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.4 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.2.3</b>			
None	A policy which recognises that some activities are dependent on access to, or which use the water resource and therefore need to be located within riparian margin is not regarded as necessary and does not relate to the corresponding objective (RP2.2.2) which is concerned with the natural character of such areas.	Mighty River Power Limited (75.17) Rejected Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.25) Accepted <b>Further Submissions:</b> Meridian Energy Limited (1045.70 to 75.17) Rejected Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.29 to 75.17) Rejected Trustpower Limited (1082.4 to 75.17) Rejected Genesis Energy Limited (1040.12 to 75.17) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.5 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.3 Poor Riparian Management</b>			
That the following issue, objective, policy and explanation be amended as follows:  RP2.3 <u>Issue</u> (a) Poor riparian management causing the degradation of water quality in <u>wetlands</u> , lakes and rivers resulting from the adverse effects of the use, development or protection of land.  RP2.3.2 <u>Objective</u> (a) Ensure land use activities do not adversely affect	Intensification of land use can have effects on water quality that are difficult for the Regional Council to directly manage through rules relating to discharges. Section 31 enables Council's to address these broader environmental issues associated with land use and subdivision, and enables integrated management of resources.  In relation to Taranaki Fish and Game, it is agreed, given section 6 of the Act, that it would be appropriate to refer also to wetlands.	Winston Oliver (79.6) Accepted in Part Ashley Cole (137.17) Rejected Taranaki Fish and Game Council (261.7) Accepted Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.26) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Meridian Energy Limited (1045.72 to 284.26) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.5 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.3 Poor Riparian Management</b>			
<p>water quality in <u>wetlands</u>, lakes and rivers.</p> <p>RP2.3.3 <u>Policy</u></p> <p>(a) To promote land management practices along the margins of <u>wetlands</u>, lakes and rivers that avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of land use on water quality, including:</p> <p>(i) the retention and planting of riparian vegetation.</p> <p>(ii) the retirement from grazing of riparian margins while giving due consideration to the benefit of flood management.</p> <p>(b) To include, as appropriate, conditions on resource consents requiring methods to be implemented to achieve the Objective RP 2.3.2(a).</p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.6 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.4.3(c)</b>			
<p>That the following river be added to RP2.4.3(c)</p> <p>(xxvi) <u>Whangaehu River</u></p>	<p>The Whangaehu River should be included in the list of strategically important rivers in RP3.4.3(c) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is the only river of its type in the country, being a medicinal sulphuric river.</li> <li>• The Whangaehu catchment is the second largest catchment in the District.</li> <li>• The phenomenon of lahars should be recognised rather than demonised</li> <li>• The Whangaehu is of cultural and spiritual importance for Ngati Rangi.</li> <li>• The river originates within the Tongariro National Park with its headwaters being</li> </ul>	<p>Ashley Cole (137.18) Accepted in Part  Ngati Rangi Trust (255.6) Accepted  Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.28) Accepted in Part  <b>Further Submissions:</b>  Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.113 to 255.6) Rejected  Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.69 to 255.6) Rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.6 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.4.3(c)</b>			
	<p>the crater lake of Mt Ruapehu.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Health and safety matters can be dealt with on a case by case basis and in ways which do not necessarily prevent access.</li> </ul>		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.7 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.4.3(d)</b>			
<p>That policy RP2.4.3(d) be amended as follows:</p> <p>(d) <u>To recognise that in certain circumstances public access to waterways will not be appropriate, where this raises health and safety concerns (for example around hydro-generation operational areas), or where public access could compromise significant ecological values.</u></p>	<p>The addition to policy RP2.4.3(d) will provide further clarity for plan users that hydro-generation operational areas can pose health and safety risks to the public.</p>	<p>Mighty River Power Limited (75.18) Accepted in Part                      Rural Community Group (180.36) Accepted in Part                      P John Chumun (181.35) Accepted in Part                      Bryan Finnerty (226.35) Accepted in Part                      Miriam Gillingham (227.35) Accepted in Part                      Genesis Energy Limited (279.7) Accepted  <b>Further Submissions:</b>                      Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.82 to 180.36) Accepted in Part                      Meridian Energy Limited (1045.71 to 279.7) Accepted                      Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.38 to 180.36) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.8 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.4 Public Access</b>			
<p>That issue RP2.4 be amended as follows:</p> <p>RP2.4 Issue</p> <p>(a) Facilitation of public access to <u>and along</u> waterways <del>where demand exists.</del></p>	<p>The insertion of “and along” to issue RP2.4, outcome RP2.4.1 and objective RP2.4.2 clarifies that it is desirable to provide public access to waterways and alongside them also. This is consistent with the purpose of esplanade reserves</p>	<p>Fish and Game – Auckland/Waikato Region (209.2) Rejected                      Max Crocket (233.1) Accepted in Part                      Taranaki Fish and Game Council (261.8) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.8 Riparian Management Policy – RP2.4 Public Access</b>			
<p><b>That objective RP2.4.2 be amended as follows:</b>  RP2.4.2 Objective  (a) To maintain, and enhance <del>where appropriate,</del> public access to <u>and along</u> identified waterways.</p> <p><b>That the explanation of policies RP2.4.3.1 be amended as follows:</b>  <u>That the objectives and policies are supported by assessment criteria to guide Council's decision on what esplanade areas are appropriate to secure. The policies seek to provide for public access and recreational values to, and along, significant waterways within the District, where this is consistent with conservation values.</u></p>	<p>and strip outlined in section 229 of the act. The deletion of "where demand exists" from issue RP2.4 is appropriate as demand for public access is unlikely to exist where such access is not provided.</p>	<p>Ernslaw One Ltd (274.11) Rejected  Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.27) Rejected  NZ Forest Managers Ltd (293.9) Rejected  <b>Further Submissions:</b>  Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.159 to 284.27 and 1044.190 to 293.9) Both Rejected  Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.115 to 284.27 and 1106.146 to 293.9) Both Rejected  Trustpower Limited (1082.9 to 261.8) Rejected  NZ Forest Managers (1074.28 to 274.11) Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.9 Riparian Management Rules - General</b>			
<p>None</p>	<p>The requirements of the Riparian Management are applicable to all land in the Ruapehu District where road stopping and subdivision occur as noted by the rule statement in section RP3.1.</p>	<p>Bryan McAnnalley (161.1) Accepted in Part  Fish and Game Auckland/Waikato Region (209.3) Accepted in Part  Taranaki Fish and Game Council (261.12a) Accepted in Part  <b>Further Submissions:</b>  Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.70 to 161.1 and 1044.117a to 261.12a) Both Rejected  Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.30 to 161.1 and 1106.73a to 261.12a)Both Rejected  Trustpower Limited (1082.10a to 261.12a) Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
------------------------	---------------	------------------	-------------





#### 4.10 Riparian Management Rules – RP3.3 General Conditions

**That RP3.3.1(b) be amended as follows:**

- (b) Circumstances in which Esplanade Strips may be created (discretion as to whether an esplanade reserve shall be created lies with Council).
  - (i) In respect of any subdivision of land outside of any urban zone, in which that allotment abuts any part of a river set out in Schedule of Identified Waterways in section RP3.6 then an esplanade strip may be required to be set aside.
  - (ii) Where an esplanade strip has been created its width shall be 20 metres.

Relevant Assessment Criteria: RP3.5.1, RP3.5.2 and RP3.5.4

Advice Note: It is recommended that subdividers consult with Council's property staff prior to the lodgement of an application where this condition triggers the potential for the creation of an esplanade strip or esplanade reserve.

**That RP3.3.2(a) be amended as follows:**

- (a) Circumstances in which Esplanade Reserves or Esplanade Strips may be created (discretion as to whether an esplanade reserve shall be created lies with Council).
  - (i) An esplanade reserve may be created in regard to any subdivision of land which includes or adjoins any part of a river specified in the Schedule of Identified Waterways in section RP3.6 of this Plan and which is located within an urban zone.
  - (ii) An esplanade strip may be created in regard

As the Ruapehu District Council has a relatively low rating base it will not necessarily always have the resources to both compensate land owners and then manage esplanade strips or reserves when they are created. Therefore it is intended that Council will retain discretion as to whether an esplanade strip or reserve will be created. The additions above seek to clarify this and advise subdividers that consultation with Council is desirable.

Ashley Cole (137.39) Accepted in Part  
 Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.69) Rejected  
**Further Submissions:**  
 Ernslaw One Limited (1044.161 to 284.69) Rejected  
 Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.117 to 284.69) Rejected

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.10 Riparian Management Rules – RP3.3 General Conditions</b>			
<p><u>to any subdivision of land which includes or adjoins any part of a river specified in Schedule of Identified Waterways in section RP3.6 of this Plan and which is located in any zone other than an identified urban zone.</u></p> <p>(iii) <u>Any esplanade reserve or strip required in RP3.3.2(a) (i) or (ii) above, shall be 20 metres in width.</u></p> <p><u>Relevant Assessment Criteria: RP3.5.1, RP3.5.2 and RP3.5.4</u></p> <p><u>Advice Note: It is recommended that subdividers consult with Council's property staff prior to the lodgement of an application where this condition triggers the potential for the creation of an esplanade strip or esplanade reserve.</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.11 Riparian Management Rules – RP3.3.2 Subdivision &gt;4ha</b>			
<p>That RP3.3.2 be amended to include the following as point (iv)</p> <p>(iv) <u>The requirement for an esplanade reserve of esplanade strip will be waived where the subdivision is for a boundary adjustment.</u></p>	<p>It is reasonable to provide an exemption for “boundary adjustments” given that the status quo is maintained insofar as no additional sites are created and only a small number of subdivision applications will meet this definition.</p>	<p>Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.68) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.12 Riparian Management Rules – RP3.5 Assessment Criteria</b>			
<p>None</p>	<p>The assessment criteria provide guidance as to where it <u>may</u> be appropriate to waiver the requirements of the conditions outlined in section</p>	<p>Ashley Cole (137.40) Rejected Taranaki Fish and Game Council (261.12b and 261.13)Both Rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.12 Riparian Management Rules – RP3.5 Assessment Criteria</b>			
	<p>RP3.3 and RP3.4. This is just part of the assessment with consideration of potential effects, the relevant objectives and policies and the requirements of the RMA also being required for a resource consent application.</p>	<p>Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.70) Rejected  <b>Further Submissions:</b>                      Trustpower NZ Limited (1082.10b to 261.12b and 1082.12 to 261.13) Both Accepted                      Ernslaw One Limited (1044.117b to 261.12b and 1044.160 to 284.70) Both Accepted                      Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.73b to 261.12b and 1106.116 to 284.70) Both Accepted</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.13 Riparian Management Rules – RP3.6 Schedule of Identified Waterways</b>			
<p>That RP3.6 be amended to include the following river:</p> <p>(z) <u>Whangaehu River</u></p>	<p>As noted in section 4.6 of this report, the Whangaehu River should be included in the list of strategically important rivers in RP3.4.3(c) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is the only river of its type in the country, being a medicinal sulphuric river.</li> <li>• The Whangaehu catchment is the second largest catchment in the District.</li> <li>• The phenomenon of lahars should be recognised rather than demonized</li> <li>• The Whangaehu is of cultural and spiritual importance for Ngati Rangi.</li> <li>• The river originates within the Tongariro National Park with its headwaters being the crater lake of Mt Ruapehu.</li> <li>• Health and safety matters can be dealt with on a case by case basis and in ways which do not necessarily prevent access.</li> </ul>	<p>Taranaki Fish and Game Council (261.14) Rejected                      Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.71) Rejected  <b>Further Submissions:</b>                      Ernslaw One Limited (1044.165 to 284.71) Rejected                      Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.121 to 284.71) Rejected                      Horticulture NZ Limited (1073.34 to 284.71) Rejected</p>	





# FORESTRY

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.1 Definition – Forestry and Shelterbelts</b>			
<p>That the definition of forestry be amended as follows:</p> <p>Forestry <u>Activities</u>: The <u>land preparation</u>, planting, management and harvesting of trees for the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>the production of timber or other produce from the trees</u>; or</li> <li>• <u>carbon sequestration purposes</u>; or</li> <li>• <u>planting and management of trees for soil or water conservation, shelter or scientific purposes</u>,</li> </ul> <p>where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>the closely planted area of trees regardless of species, is in excess of 1.0ha in area, or</u></li> <li>• <u>the trees are planted in a continuous length in excess of 20 metres. This includes shelter belts.</u></li> <li>• <u>in this context 'continuous' means trees planted in such a manner that upon maturity they will be interlinked and/or form a closed canopy.</u></li> <li>• <u>in relation to shelter belts, trees which do not exceed the following height envelope are excluded from the definition of forestry:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <u>Height envelope: 2m plus the horizontal distance to the boundary (to a maximum distance of 25m).</u></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>The definition of forestry should provide for all activities that can be reasonably expected to occur as part of normal plantation forestry. The renaming of this definition to refer to “forestry activities” will ensure consistency with the rules section of the plan, particularly the rural zone.</p>	<p>Richard Hoadley (66.7a) Ernslaw One Ltd (274.4) Accepted Horticulture New Zealand (281. 4) Tukia Group Ltd (282.4) Accepted Federated Farmers (284.4) Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (287.2) NZFM (293.4) Accepted</p> <p><b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.132 in relation to 281.4, 1044.141 in relation to 282.4 Accepted, 1044.147 in relation to 284.4 Accepted, 1044.167 in relation to 287.2 and 1044.185 in relation to 293.4) Winstone Pulp International (1106.88 in relation to 281.4, 1106.97 in relation to 282.4 Accepted, 1106.103 in relation to 284.4, 1106.123 in relation to 287.2 Accepted and 1106.141 in relation to 293.4) NZ Forest Managers (1074.21 in relation to 274.21 Accepted and 1074.53 in relation to 287.2 Accepted)</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Forestry Activities – Specific Conditions RU3.4.12</b>			
<b>Recommended Amendments to Plan Change Text</b>	In terms of the forestry setback from urban zone	R Hoadley (66.17) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Forestry Activities – Specific Conditions RU3.4.12</b>			
<p>The a new condition be included in RU3.4.1(a) as follows:</p> <p><b><u>RU3.4.1 Forestry Activities</u></b></p> <p><u>“(v) No forestry activities shall be undertaken in the Future Urban Area.”</u></p>	<p>rule, the hearings panel consider that the recommended 75m setback be retained. This setback ensures that potential adverse effects from forestry on urban areas in terms of amenity (e.g. sense of enclosure and shading of the urban area by forestry, noise during harvesting), safety(e.g. in the event of tree fall, and at forest harvest) and fire risks are adequately mitigated.</p> <p>The hearings panel notes that the 75m forestry from urban zone setback has proven to be an efficient and effective mechanism during the life of the Operative District Plan.</p> <p>The hearings panel heard and considered a range of evidence in relation to the recommended rule governing forestry setbacks from adjoining properties. In the Ruapehu District, this is principally an issue with regard to farming activities adjoining forestry. The forestry setback and activity status provisions of the Proposed Plan Change were the fourth biggest issue in terms of numbers of submissions received. This, along with the experiences of those landowners in the District, indicates that the Operative Ruapehu District Plan forestry setback provisions are inadequate to properly regulate the adverse effects of forestry on adjoining land uses.</p> <p>There is limited scientific evidence available on the effects of exotic forestry on the productive potential of soils and pasture growth rates. The</p>	<p>W Oliver (79.9) Accepted in Part National Park Community Board (90.3) Accepted in Part GM Carmichael (129.3) Rejected D Blair (132.3) Rejected A Carmichael (133.1) Rejected A Cole (137.27) Accepted in Part S Slegers (140.15) Accepted in Part J Beck (147.1) Rejected M Hayes (148.1) Rejected L Brown (149.1) Rejected J Topp (151.1) Rejected E Walker (152.1) Rejected B Carmichael (156.4) Accepted R Richards (165.1) Rejected Rural Community Group (180.38) Accepted in Part PJ Chumun (181.37) Accepted in Part S Martin (188.4) Accepted DM Berry (190.1) Accepted in Part K Malcolm (195.1) Rejected J and A Walker (203.3 Rejected, 203.4 Accepted in Part and 203.5 Accepted in Part) C Baines (204.1) Rejected NZTA (208.18) Rejected V Siemonek (212.14) Accepted DL Siemonek (214.6) Accepted KJ Siemonek (215.3) Accepted L Green (216.3) Accepted VL Pohl (219.5) Accepted in Part WPI (222.4) Rejected D Tidswell (223.1) Rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Forestry Activities – Specific Conditions RU3.4.12</b>			
	<p>hearings panel attention was drawn by forestry industry submitters to a report prepared in July 1997 by Sue Quilter of Ag Research<sup>1</sup>. Those submitters asserted that the report provided conclusive evidence that there was no effect of exotic forestry further than 5m from the edge of a tree trunk. Upon consideration of the report the hearings panel is unable to agree with that assertion. The hearings panel notes the report's conclusion that:</p> <p>“Statistically supportable differences in soil moisture, overall pasture production, production of the major pasture components, and contamination of pasture due to trees, occurs at distances greater than 5m but less than 10m from the outer edge of tree trunks”</p> <p>However the panel also notes the report's following conclusion that:</p> <p>“The trend is for lower production and needle contamination out to distances greater than 25m but less than 35m from trees”.</p> <p>The latter conclusion aligns with the evidence presented to the hearings panel by several submitters who own and operate drystock farms adjoining production forests in the Ruapehu</p>	<p>B Finnerty (226.37) Accepted in Part  M Gillingham (227.37) Accepted in Part  EM Wheeler (239.1) Rejected  AWHI (249.5) Rejected  RDC staff (268.11) Accepted  PRINZ (273.3) Accepted  Ernslaw One Ltd (274.1 Rejected, 271.16 Rejected, 274.17 Rejected, 274.18 Rejected, 274.19 Rejected and 274.20 Accepted)  Horticulture New Zealand (281.24) Rejected  Tukia Group Ltd (282.12 Rejected, 282.13 Rejected and 282.14 Accepted in Part)  Federated Farmers (284.47 Accepted in Part and 284.48 Rejected)  Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (287.14) Rejected  NZFM (293.14 Accepted in Part, 293.15 Rejected and 293.16 Rejected)  MJ Rogers (311.1) Rejected  <b>Further Submissions:</b>  Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.7 Rejected, 1044.144 Rejected, 1044.179 (1104.110 re 249.5) Rejected, 1044.195 Accepted in Part, 1044.196 Rejected, 1044.197 Rejected, 1044.21 Rejected, 1044.83 Accepted in Part, 1044.109 Rejected, 1044.120 Accepted in Part, 1044.145 Rejected, 1044.146 Accepted in Part and 1044.164 Accepted in Part)  Winstone Pulp International (1106.3 Rejected,</p>	

<sup>1</sup>Quilter, S.J. July 1997. Boundary Effects of Trees on Pasture – Final Trial Report. AgResearch, Gisborne.

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Forestry Activities – Specific Conditions RU3.4.12</b>			
	<p>District. The hearings panel notes that the elevation, soil types, topography, and markedly more temperate climate of the Ruapehu District is significantly different to the Gisborne area and the two farms northeast of Gisborne at approximate 100 metres altitude where the Quilter report trial was undertaken. Accordingly, the effects of frost and reduced sunlight produced by forestry on pasture production and quality and soil fertility are more marked in the Ruapehu District. The hearings panel thus considers that the Quilter report has somewhat limited use in considering the effects of plantation forestry in the Ruapehu District. However, no other scientific evidence seems to be available.</p> <p>The hearings panel heard from submitters that the limbs of unpruned exotic forestry tree species can routinely grow to be 16-17 metres long. In the case of trees located next to pastoral activities, the limbs are commonly longest and heaviest on the “pastoral” side of the trees given the greater sunlight received on that side. Clear evidence was produced of such tree limbs and trees themselves sagging or falling and breaking fences and blocking access tracks on adjoining farm properties. It is apparent to the hearings panel that there is a lack of incentive for forestry companies to regularly prune tree limbs adjacent to boundaries, or to play their part in ensuring that boundary fences are maintained, in partnership with farmer neighbours who wish to contain stock</p>	<p>1106.100 Rejected, 1106.135 Rejected, 1106.151 Accepted in Part, 1106.152 Rejected, 1106.153 Rejected, 1106.15 Rejected, 1106.40 Accepted in Part, 1106.3, 1106.66 Rejected, 1106.76 Rejected, 1106.101 Rejected, 1106.102 and 1106.120)</p> <p>NZ Forest Managers (1074.37 re: 274.20, 1074.6 Accepted, 1074.7 Accepted, 1074.8 Accepted, 1074.9 Accepted, 1074.10 Accepted, 1074.11 Accepted, 1074.12 Accepted in Part, 1074.13 Accepted in Part, 1074.14 Accepted, 1074.15 Accepted, 1074.17 Rejected, 1074.18 Accepted in Part, 1074.33 Accepted in Part, 1074.34 Accepted in Part and 1074.65 Accepted in Part)</p> <p>Horticulture NZ (1073.19 Accepted, 1073.18 (1073.22 re: 284.48) Accepted in Part, 1073.20 (1074.35 re: 274.18) (1074.36 re: 274.19) Rejected and 1073.2 Rejected)</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Forestry Activities – Specific Conditions RU3.4.12</b>			
	<p>from entering large forestry areas. The hearings panel was shown photographic examples of mature forestry trees at the top of a boundary ridge left unharvested at the end of a production cycle because they have not been pruned or are less accessible, despite the issues these pose for farming neighbours. The hearings panel also heard of issues where boundary fencing was removed to support tree harvesting, but paddocks were unavailable to stock for significant periods given delays in reinstating of fences.</p> <p>The hearings panel also heard evidence on abortion rates due to stock eating wilted pine needles from fallen branches However, it is also noted that at times farming and forestry can work well together, for example, in terms of appropriate spraying regimes that avoid damage to the other party's land.</p> <p>Forestry company argument about carbon sequestration earnings loss have been overstated to the panel given that a 30% cover at maturity for an area of forest is the requirement to qualify and that the current unit rate for the sale of carbon credits is down to around \$15/unit.</p> <p>Finally, the hearings panel does not accept that the unplanted 25m forestry setback is by default an area within which no productive activity can be undertaken. Arrangements for leasing to graze are not uncommon given modern electric fencing technology. Other uses such as silage or</p>		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.2 Forestry Activities – Specific Conditions RU3.4.12			
	<p>haymaking are also possible.</p> <p>In conclusion, the hearings panel heard convincing evidence that mature pine forest affects adjoining land by reducing soil productivity from a combination of factors, including shade, pine needle contamination, and water absorption. There are clear reverse sensitivity issues between forestry and farming. In addition to the above, forestry is vulnerable to stock invasion at the early stages of growth while farming activities are at risk from tree or limb failure, with adverse effects on boundary fences, adjacent farm tracks, spraying and stock straying. These can be exacerbated, given farmings short term seasonal operational focus, and forestry's longer term perspective.</p> <p>While some account of a long rotation cycle should be a factor, a setback regime which reinforces a negotiated relationship between forestry and pastoral land users or Road Controlling Authorities has merit. We therefore conclude that the setback should remain as proposed at 25m. Likewise the hearings panel is satisfied that the setbacks from road and existing dwellings rules should remain as recommended. It is noted that the rule includes exceptions to this distance whereby the activity status becomes a permitted activity should written approval of affected land owners or the Road Controlling Authority be received by Council. This rule reinforces an appropriate dialogue between land</p>		





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Forestry Activities – Specific Conditions RU3.4.12</b>			
	owners for a reduction in setbacks to work well.		

# RURAL SUBDIVISIONS

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.1 All Zones: SU2.1 Introduction</b>			
No change	The submission is in support of the proposed Introduction. No submissions have been received in opposition.	Ruapehu and Whanganui Federated Farmers (No. 284.16) Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 All Zones: SU2.2 Subdivision - General</b>			
Amend Policy SU2.2.3(f) as follows:  (f) To encourage building sites (and subsequent houses) to be sited to maximise solar gain, <u>and retain landscape features, including trees.</u>	The amendments to the subdivision policy (SU2.2.3(f)) will help to encourage the appropriate siting of buildings associated with subdivision. This will help to ensure that these buildings are better integrated into the surrounding environment.  All other submissions support the proposed provisions.	Richard Hoadley (No. 66.14) Accepted in Part Taranaki Fish and Game (No. 261.4) Accepted in Part Horizons Regional Council (No. 280.8) Accepted in Part Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers (No. 284.17) Accepted in Part The Oil Companies (No. 290.1) Accepted in Part Accepted in Part <b>Further Submission:</b> DOC (1045.59 re: 288.3) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.3 All Zones – SU2.2 Infrastructure and Subdivision</b>			
Amend as follows:  <b>SU 2.2 Issue</b> (a) Subdivisions and the subsequent development, both individually and cumulatively, adversely affecting the: (i) <u>The character of wetlands, lakes and rivers;</u>	The proposed changes are considered to be consistent with both the NPS on Electricity Transmission and Horizons One Plan, and will ensure that consideration is given to the location of significant infrastructure and utilities when subdivision applications are assessed.	Transpower NZ Ltd (No. 288.3) Accepted in Part PowerCo. Ltd (No. 289.3) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Mighty River Power (1035.33 re: 289.3) Accepted in Part Meridian (1045.60 re: 289.3, 1045.59 re: 288.3) Both Accepted in Part	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p><b>4.3 All Zones – SU2.2 Infrastructure and Subdivision</b></p>			
<p>(ii) Landscape values of outstanding natural features and landscapes; and</p> <p>(iii) Areas of significant indigenous vegetation and the habitat of indigenous fauna,</p> <p>(iv) <u>Significant infrastructure and utilities, including high voltage electricity transmission network</u></p> <p><b>SU2.2.1 OUTCOME (a) – (c)</b> (Note this was a recommendation of the Miscellaneous Requests Chapter)</p> <p><b>Objective SU2.2.2</b> (e) <u>To ensure that existing infrastructure and activities are taken into account in the assessment of subdivision applications, and any incompatible use or activity that would affect the continued use or operation of the infrastructure or activity is avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u></p> <p><b>Policy SU2.2.3</b> (g) <u>o manage subdivision to ensure that potential reverse sensitivity effects from incompatible development on lawfully established activities are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u></p> <p><b>SU2.2.3.1 Explanation of Policies</b> <u>Policy (g) seeks to manage incompatible development and reverse sensitivity effects associated with subdivision and associated development near existing lawfully established activities, and near activities that are consented, but are as yet, not constructed.</u></p>		<p>NZ Wind Energy Association (1047.17) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.3 All Zones – SU2.2 Infrastructure and Subdivision</b>			
<p><u>Such activities will include existing and consented infrastructure and activities, for example, the electricity generation and transmission network, the road and rail networks, utilities, rural activities such as farming, and horticulture, amongst others.</u></p> <p><u>It is important that the location, nature, scale and requirements for the operation of regionally significant infrastructure should be taken into account at an early stage and when changes can be more readily made in response to identified issues.</u></p> <p><u>Where subdivision applications are likely to affect existing infrastructure, Council encourages applicants to consult the relevant agencies at an early stage in the process, for example, where subdivisions are proposed in close proximity to the National Grid it is recommended that applicants contact Transpower New Zealand Limited directly to discuss their proposal.</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.4 All Zones: SU2.2 Wetlands, Lakes and Rivers</b>			
No change	The provisions are considered to be consistent with section 6 of the RMA.	Ashley Cole (No. 137.15) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.5 All Zones: SU2.2.2(a) Objective re: Natural Areas</b>			
To preserve and protect significant natural areas ...	The requested wording suggests that a subdivision itself must preserve and protect. The proposed wording is better at articulating the	DOC (No. 191.18) Accepted in Part	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.5 All Zones: SU2.2.2(a) Objective re: Natural Areas</b>			
	objective to preserve and protect significant natural areas. However, DOC are correct, there is a typographical error that needs correcting.		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.6 All Zones: SU2.2.3(c) Policy re: Servicing and Access</b>			
No change	The submission is in support of the proposed policy. No submissions have been received in opposition	NZTA (No. 208.13) Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.7 Rural Subdivision - Objectives and Policies: SU2.3 General</b>			
<p>SU2.3.2 <u>Objectives</u></p> <p>(b) <u>To manage subdivision within the Rural Zone to avoid development detracting from the features that make the district unique, namely the:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) <u>Landscapes;</u></li> <li>(ii) <u>Productive capacity of rural land;</u></li> <li>(iii) <u>Natural environment, e.g. the flora and fauna;</u></li> <li>(iv) <u>Waterways; and</u></li> <li>(v) <u>Rural and/or natural character.</u></li> </ul> <p>(c) <u>To ensure that development does not place undue pressure on existing infrastructure, including the road network'.</u></p> <p><u>SU2.3.3</u>  <u>SU2.3.3 Policies</u></p> <p>(c) <u>To manage subdivision within the rural zone to</u></p>	<p>The amendments in relation to Objective SU2.3.2 simply clarify that infrastructure in the Rural Zone includes all of the road network.</p> <p>The additional bullet point within Policy SU2.3.3(c) provides a specific reverse sensitivity policy within the Rural Subdivision provisions. This is consistent with the approach taken in both the Rural and Network Utilities Policies of the plan change, and should provide greater recognition of and protection of existing activities and infrastructure within the rural zone.</p> <p>Amendments are also proposed to the explanatory text in association with these changes.</p> <p>The amendments to the Outstanding Natural</p>	<p>Mighty River Power Ltd (No. 75.14) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Ashley Cole (No. 137.16) Rejected</p> <p>Rural Community Group (No. 180.33) Accepted in Part</p> <p>John Chuman (No. 181. 33) Accepted in Part</p> <p>DOC (No. 191.19 - .23)191.23 Accepted 191.19-22 Accepted in Part</p> <p>NZTA (No. 208.14) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Bryan Finnerty (226. 33) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Miriam Gillingham (227.33) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Michael G Peterson (No. 228.1) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Atihau-Whanganui Incorporation (No. 249.3) Accept in Part</p> <p>Horizons Regional Council (No. 280.9) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Horticulture NZ (No. 281.20) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.7 Rural Subdivision - Objectives and Policies: SU2.3 General</b>			
<p>ensure that such subdivision:</p> <p>(iv) <u>does not adversely affect lawfully established activities and activities allowed by unimplemented resource consents requiring a rural location.</u></p> <p>(v) <u>avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on, or reduction of, the productive capacity of the rural zone especially class III and IV land.</u></p> <p>(f) <u>Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes</u> <i>Add the following text to the end of SU 2.3.3 (f)</i></p> <p><u>It is recognised and anticipated that rural activities within the Rural Zone form part of this landscape and will continue to occur within these areas.</u></p> <p><b>Explanation of Policies:</b> <u>The intent of the rural subdivision rules is to provide limited opportunity for subdivision within rural areas. However, the intention of the provisions is to balance the demand for rural residential development while avoiding adverse cumulative affects on the rural zone:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>ensuring that subdivision does not result in reverse sensitivity issues.</u></li> <li>• <u>And avoids adverse cumulative effects on rural zone.</u></li> </ul>	<p>Features Policy recognises that rural activities are anticipated within the Outstanding Natural Landscapes (where rurally zoned), and within close proximity of the identified Conservation Areas. This approach is consistent with the associated rules which do not restrict rural activities within these areas.</p>	<p>Ruapehu and Whanganui Federated Farmers (No. 284.18 – 23) 284.18-.20,.22 Accepted in Part , 284.21 &amp; 2.3 Rejected PowerCo. (289.3) Accept in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Mighty River Power (1035.15 re: 191.22, 1035.27 re: 284.18, .19, .21)(1035.28 re: 284.19) Accepted in Part (1035.29 re: 284.21) rejected. Ernslaw One (1044.51 re: 137.16) Rejected, (1044.92 re: 191.19 - .22,) Accept in Part (1044.111 re: 249.3) Accept in Part, (1044.163 re: 284.22) Accepted Meridian (1045.56 re: 75.14) Accept in Part (1045.57 re: 249.3,)Accept in Part (1045.58 re: 281.20) Accept in Part Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.40 re: 191.22) Accept in Part Horticulture NZ (1073.26 re: 75.14) Accept in Part , (1073.27 re: 191.19) Accept in Part, (1073.28 re: 280.9) Accept in Part. Winstone Pulp International (1106.24 re: 137.16) Rejected (1106.48 re: 191.19,) Accepted in Part (1106.67 re: 249.3) Accepted in Part (1106.119 re: 284.22) Accepted in Part DOC (1050.28 re: 284.21) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
------------------------	---------------	------------------	-------------





#### 4.8 Rural Subdivision Rules – General/Controlled Activity Standard

Add new Controlled Activity rule SU3.2.1.1(c)

(c) Subdivision of a site with a Computer Freehold Register issued prior to X (being the date of a decision by Council on this plan) where:

- a maximum of 2 sites are created (for purposes of clarification this means that a total of 2 sites can be created as a result of the subdivision), and
- the minimum net site area of any site created is 1 hectare, and
- the average net site area of all sites created by the subdivision must be at least 50 hectares, and
- the proposed subdivision complies with the General Conditions for subdivision (SU3.2.2) and is not identified as a discretionary or non-complying activity under any other rule.

Council has reserved control of the Matters of Control set out in SU3.2.3.1 Controlled Activities.

##### SU3.2.1.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities

The following activities are Restricted Discretionary Activities provided they comply with the General Conditions outlined in section SU3.2.2.

Applications will be assessed against the relevant Assessment Criteria outlined in Section SU3.2.3.2 below:

(i) Any Controlled Activity Subdivision, which complies with Rule SU3.2.1.1(c) but fails to meet one or more of the general conditions

There is merit in allowing a small amount of subdivision as a Controlled Activity, to facilitate the adjustment of existing land holdings and family circumstances. The recommended Controlled Activity rule will meet the objectives and policies for subdivision in the Rural Zone, and is consistent with the land use rules.

David Griffiths (No. 80.3) Accepted in Part  
 Cheal (No. 171.17) Accepted in Part  
 Jim and Audrey Walker (No. 203.1) Accepted in Part  
 JC Simpson (No. 194.3) Accepted in Part  
 Horizons Regional Council (No. 280.20) Accepted in Part  
 Ruapehu and Whanganui Federated Farmers (No. 284.61) Accepted in Part  
**Further Submissions:**  
 Winstone Pulp International (1106.87 re: 280.20) Accepted  
 Ernslaw One (1044.131 re: 280.20) Accepted

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.8 Rural Subdivision Rules – General/Controlled Activity Standard</b>			
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>outlined in SU3.2.2.</u></p> <p><b>Amend SU3.2.2 General Conditions as follows:</b>  Compliance with the following Conditions is required for <u>Controlled Activity subdivision complying with SU3.2.1.1(c); and for all Discretionary Activities as outlined in Rule SU3.2.1.2 above ....</u></p> <p><b>Amend SU3.2.2.2 Servicing:</b>  Each new lot .....</p> <p>Relevant Assessment Criteria: SU 3.2.3.2 (c).  <b>Insert the following after SU3.2.2.5:</b>  Advice Note: Outstanding Natural Features and Landscape</p> <p><u>Plan users considering compliance with the general standards set out above should also take account of the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes Overlay.</u></p> <p>Advice Note: Subdivision within 32m of the Transmission Corridor is classed as Restricted Discretionary Activity under Rule SU3.2.1.2</p> <p><u>Relevant Assessment Criteria: SU3.2.3.2(c)</u></p> <p><b>Amend Assessment Criteria SU3.2.3.2(b)(vii) as follows:</b>  ‘The cumulative effect of the development on the character of the area, <u>including the effects of development as a result of recent subdivision.</u></p>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p><b>4.8 Rural Subdivision Rules – General/Controlled Activity Standard</b></p>			
<p><b>And amend SU2.3.3.1 ‘Explanation of Policies’ as follows:</b></p> <p><u>General Rural Subdivision</u>  <u>The Rural Subdivision rules provide for limited rural subdivision as a Controlled Activity. The Controlled Activity Rule is intended to allow for inheritance or retirement lots; and also provides for very limited rural lifestyle development. The rule is set at a density (50ha average, with a maximum of one additional allotment) whereby it is anticipated that rural character will be maintained.</u></p> <p><u>The Rural Subdivision rules generally class the majority of subdivisions as Discretionary Activities. As such, Council can, based on its assessment of the objectives and policies, either grant or refuse resource consent.</u></p> <p><u>The intent of the rural subdivision rules is to provide limited opportunity for subdivision within rural areas. However, the intention of the provisions is to balance the demand for rural residential development while avoiding adverse cumulative affects on the rural zone.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ....</li> </ul> <p>It is worth highlighting here that rural subdivision will in most cases be classed as a Discretionary Activity, and as such, Council will have the ability to refuse consents, or may only be willing to consent to a lower number of allotments, where the application does not comply with the above policies ....</p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.8 Rural Subdivision Rules – General/Controlled Activity Standard</b>			
<p>When assessing applications, consideration will also be given to the cumulative effects of development, <u>including recent subdivision. For example, should consent be granted for a Controlled Activity subdivision, the effect of this subdivision will be taken into consideration should a subsequent Discretionary Activity consent be sought.</u></p> <p>SU3.2.3 <u>Assessment Criteria</u>  SU3.2.3.1 <u>Controlled Activities</u></p> <p>Controlled Activities – Matters over which Council has reserved Control.</p> <p>(c) <u>Whether the shape and area of the sites is adequate to provide for the reasonable needs of the site including building platforms, setbacks and parking areas, while avoiding, remedying and mitigating adverse effects on landscape and indigenous flora and fauna.</u></p> <p>(h) <u>whether reverse sensitivity is a concern and how this will be effectively managed</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.9 Rural Subdivision Rules – Restricted Discretionary Activity Rule</b>			
<p>Add the following:</p> <p><u>SU3.2.1.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities</u>  <u>The following activities are Restricted Discretionary Activities provided they comply with the General</u></p>	<p>The proposed amendments are considered to be consistent with Policy 10 of the NPS on Electricity Transmission, and Policy 3-1 of the One Plan. In addition, the approach will help to avoid reverse sensitivity effects from new development (on</p>	<p>Transpower (No. 288.3(b)) Accepted in Part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.9 Rural Subdivision Rules – Restricted Discretionary Activity Rule</b>			
<p><u>Conditions outlined in section SU3.2.2.</u></p> <p><u>Applications will be assessed against the relevant Assessment Criteria outlined in Section SU3.2.3.2 below:</u></p> <p>(b) <u>ny subdivision that complies with SU3.2.1.1 Controlled Activities, but is within 32m of the centerline of a high voltage transmission line (as shown on the Planning Maps).</u></p> <p><u>Relevant Assessment Criteria: SU3.2.3.2(i)</u></p> <p><u>SU3.2.1.3 Discretionary Activities</u></p> <p><u>SU3.2.3.2 Restricted Discretionary, Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities</u></p> <p><u>Restricted Discretionary Activities will be assessed only in respect of the relevant assessment criteria applicable to the rule or conditions with which the activity was unable to comply.</u></p> <p><u>Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities ....</u></p> <p>(j) <u>Subdivision within the Transmission Corridor</u></p> <p>a. <u>The extent to which the subdivision design mitigates the effects on the lines, for example, through the location of roads and reserves under the line, or through lot layout;</u></p> <p>b. <u>The ability for maintenance and inspection</u></p>	<p>recently subdivided land) on the National Grid, and will help to highlight issues associated with the proximity of development in relation to the transmission lines at an early stage.</p>		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.9 Rural Subdivision Rules – Restricted Discretionary Activity Rule</b>			
<p>c. <u>of the transmission line, including ensuring access for the same;</u></p> <p>d. <u>The extent to which the design and development will minimise risk or injury and/or property damage from the lines;</u></p> <p>e. <u>The extent to which potential adverse effects including visual impacts are mitigated, for example, through the location of building platforms and landscape design;</u></p> <p>f. <u>The location of any building platforms;</u></p> <p>g. <u>Compliance with New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001); and</u></p> <p>h. <u>The outcomes of any consultation with the affected utility operator.</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.10 Rural Subdivision Rules – SU3.2.1.2 Discretionary Activities (Classification)</b>			
None	Because of the diverse nature of the rural environment and the need to consider a wide range of site specific issues, it is not appropriate to make rural subdivision a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Furthermore, the way the existing assessment criteria are written, means they cannot be applied to a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Ruapehu and Whanganui Federated Farmers (No. 284.62) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.11 Rural Subdivision Rules – SU3.2.1.2(a) Rural Subdivision Rule</b>			
Amend Rule SU3.2.1.2(a) to read	The rural subdivision Discretionary Activity rule is	David Holland (No. 9.25) Rejected	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.11 Rural Subdivision Rules – SU3.2.1.2(a) Rural Subdivision Rule</b>			
<p>(a) Subdivision of a site with a Computer Freehold Register issued prior to X (being the date of a decision by Council on this plan) or <u>a new title that was created under this District Plan by way of an amalgamation, boundary adjustment or a Controlled Activity Subdivision</u> where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) a maximum of 5 new sites are created (for purposes of clarification this means that a total of 5 sites can be created as a result of the subdivision), and</li> <li>(ii) the minimum net site area of any site created is 5,000m<sup>2</sup>, and</li> <li>(iii) the average net site area for all sites created by the subdivision must be at least 4 hectares.</li> </ul>	<p>an acceptable method for achieving the rural Objectives and Policies which seek to promote rural land use and maintain character and amenity values, by managing the density and nature of rural land occupation. They have been designed to allow for consideration of some future subdivision, while restricting the degree and scale to which existing properties can be further subdivided, to avoid over intensification of land occupation in any particular location.</p>	<p>Dorothy Battersby (No. 18.1) Rejected                      Jeremy Stubbs (No. 52.1) Rejected                      Frank Taylor (No. 53.1) Rejected                      Derek Kelly (No. 65.1)                      Alan Newman (No. 70.1) Rejected                      Philip and Maureen Garland (No. 88.1) Rejected                      A &amp; J Whale (No. 98.4)                      Phillip &amp; Kerry Parkes (No. 102.1) Rejected                      Annette Mason (No. 116.2) Rejected.                      Tania Taylor (No. 127.1) Rejected                      Graham Carmichael (No. 129.1) Rejected                      Denise Blair (No. 132.2) Rejected                      Annie Carmichael (No. 133.2) Rejected                      Wayne Gunnell (No. 136.2) Rejected                      Sue Slegers (No. 140.11, .24) Both Rejected                      Ben Carmichael (No. 156.2) Rejected                      DOC (No. 191.35) Accepted in Part                      Lucy Conway (No. 218.1) Accepted                      Max Crockett (No. 231.1)                      Toni Waho (No. 251.1) Rejected                      Mel Cameron Landscape Architecture (No. 257.13) Accepted                      Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers (No. 284.63 Accepted in Part, .66 Rejected)                      Bruce Cranston (No. 301.1) Rejected                      Bernice Frost (No. 310.1) Rejected                      Plateau Surveyors (No. 313.2) Rejected</p>	
<b>4.12 Rural Subdivision Rules – SU3.2.2 General Conditions</b>			
<p>Advice Note relating to Regional Council Consents</p>	<p>Regional Council Advice Note – the</p>	<p>NZTA (No. 208.24) Accepted</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p><b>4.12 Rural Subdivision Rules – SU3.2.2 General Conditions</b></p>			
<p>Amend SU3.2.2.2 Servicing ..... <u>Advice Note: All Servicing will also need to comply with the requirements of the Horizons Regional Council One Plan rules. Regional Council standards will also need to be met.</u></p> <p><u>Transport Advice Note:</u> That the following text is added to SU3.2.2.1(a), SU3.3.2.2, SU3.4.2.1, SU3.5.2.1:</p> <p>'Advice Notes: The NZ Transport Agency will be considered an affected party for any subdivision application that requires access to a State Highway. (It is recommended that evidence of consultation with NZ Transport Agency is provided with any such application).</p> <p><u>The New Zealand Railways Corporation (KiwiRail) may be considered an affected party for any subdivision application that increases the use of an existing public or private level crossing, or requires a new crossing of the railway. (If applicable, it is recommended that evidence of consultation with New Zealand Railways Corporation (KiwiRail) is provided with any such application).</u></p> <p><u>Servicing</u> SU3.2.3.1 Controlled Activities is amended as follows:</p> <p>(b) Whether the site can be adequately serviced in terms of sewer, water, and stormwater, <u>and</u></p>	<p>recommended changes will simply provide consistent wording and is supported.</p> <p><u>No complaints covenant</u> - the use of “no complaints covenants” is not appropriate in the general rural environment, and there is sufficient opportunity to consider the wider implication of reverse sensitivity at the time of assessing a subdivision application.</p> <p><u>Transport Advice Note</u> – the proposed changes will simply provide greater clarity for plan users.</p> <p><u>Servicing</u> – the proposed amendments to the Assessment Criteria will ensure consideration is given to power supply when consents are conditioned.</p>	<p>Horizons Regional Council (280.21) Accepted Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers (No. 284.65) Rejected PowerCo. Ltd (No. 289.3(c)) Accepted in part NZ Railways Corporation (No. 292.12) Accepted in Part</p> <p><b>Further Submissions</b> Ernslaw One (1044.157 re: 284.65) Rejected Horticulture NZ (1073.29 re: 284.65) Rejected Winstone Pulp International (1106.1 re: 284.6513) Rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.12 Rural Subdivision Rules – SU3.2.2 General Conditions</b>			
<p><u>where necessary electricity</u>, including whether the on-site sewer waste disposal meets the standards specified in the Horizons Regional Council One Plan rules. NZS 4404 '<i>Land Development and Subdivision Engineering</i>' (or any subsequent updates) will be used as a guide for all subdivision engineering requirements.</p> <p>Please note: This assessment criteria has been further amended elsewhere in the report.</p> <p>SU3.2.3.2 Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities is amended as follows:</p> <p>(c) Servicing                      (i) <u>Whether or not it is considered necessary to provide electricity to the site.</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.13 Rural Subdivision Rules – SU3.2.2.3 Building Platform</b>			
None	It is important to identify future building platforms at the time of subdivision especially in the case of small lots where building location options may be limited. Any subdivision of land for other purposes can be dealt with at the time of subdivision assessment.	Ashley Cole (No. 137.34) Rejected Horticulture NZ (1073.30) Accepted Federated Farmers (1076.32) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
------------------------	---------------	------------------	-------------

#### 4.14 Rural Subdivision Rules – SU3.2.2.4 High Voltage Transmission Lines

<p>Recommended the following text is deleted.</p> <p>Note: Section 4.9 above recommends subdivision provisions relating to the National Grid.</p>	<p>The amendments recommended in Section 4.9 above, will ensure consideration is given to subdivision in close proximity to the National Grid. The notified text is unclear as to whether Condition SU3.2.2.4 only applied to the National Grid, or to other 'high voltage' lines. However, in reading the other associated rules it would appear that the only relates to the National Grid.</p>	<p>David Holland (No. 9.30) Accepted in Part  <b>Further Submissions:</b>                  Transpower (1091.1) Accepted in Part                  Meridian (1045.61) Accepted in Part</p>	
---	---	--	--

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
------------------------	---------------	------------------	-------------

#### 4.15 Rural Subdivision Rules – Assessment Criteria – Controlled Activities

None	The submissions support the Assessment Criteria however these have been modified as a result of other submissions.	NZTA (No. 208.28) Accepted in Part Horizons Regional Council (No. 280.22) Accepted in Part	
------	--	---	--

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
------------------------	---------------	------------------	-------------

#### 4.16 Rural Subdivision Rules – Assessment Criteria: Stormwater

<p>Add the following to the Assessment Criteria for SU3.2 Rural Zone, SU3.3 Residential SU3.4, Commercial Zone SU3.7 Protected Areas Zone And Active Reserve Zone, SU3.5 Industrial Zone, SU3.6 Urban Settlement Zone:</p> <p><u>Whether the consent of the downstream landowners' has been obtained where stormwater flows are proposed to connect to adjoining landowners stormwater disposal systems.</u></p>	<p>The additional text will act as a trigger for those making and assessing applications, and will hopefully act as a method to prevent subdivision resulting in changes in stormwater flows affecting adjoining properties.</p>	<p>NZ Railways Corporation (No. 292.13) Accepted</p>	
--	--	--	--

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
------------------------	---------------	------------------	-------------

#### 4.17 Rural Subdivision Rules – Assessment Criteria – Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities

	Amendments to SU2.3.2.3(i) to require	Trustpower Ltd (No. 74.25) Accepted	
--	---------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	--





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.17 Rural Subdivision Rules – Assessment Criteria – Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities</b>			
<p>(a) <u>Rural Amenity</u></p> <p>(i) <u>Whether the development is at a scale that is consistent with the landscape values rural character and amenity of the surrounding environment.</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>Whether a landscape mitigation and maintenance plan has been submitted with the application that avoids or mitigates to minor levels any adverse visual and amenity effects on landscape values and rural character.</u></p> <p>(iii) <u>Whether potential conflicts between adjoining land uses will be avoided by future buildings and activities being sufficiently separated from one another.</u></p> <p>(iv) <u>Whether the subdivision design and layout avoids linear development.</u></p> <p>(v) <u>The impact of the subdivision on indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna.</u></p> <p>(g) <u>The cumulative effect of the development on the character of the area, including the effects of development as a result of recent subdivision.</u> (Subdivision and development adjoining identified Conservation Land (as per SU3.2.1.34(c)).</p> <p>(i) Whether any subdivision and development adjoining these areas has been designed in a manner that will not detract from the valued characteristics of the area (including but not limited to the design and location of dwellings or structures, orientation and</p>	<p>assessment of subdivision and development adjoining an electricity generation activity is appropriate given the level of investment and national significance of such infrastructure. There is already sufficient assessment criteria to deal with rural character and amenity, which includes the landscape, and reverse sensitivity issues, when processing a discretionary subdivision, which by its definition requires assessment of all issues.</p>	<p>Mighty River Power Ltd (No. 75.33) Accepted in Part                      Ashley Cole (No. 137.35) Rejected                      DOC (No. 191.37 – 42) Rejected                      Michael Plowman (No. 211.18) Rejected                      Velma Siemonek (No. 212.17) Rejected                      Donald Siemonek (No. 214.9) Rejected                      Meridian Energy Ltd (No. 225.20) Accepted in Part                      Horticulture NZ (No. 281.26) Rejected  <b>Further Submissions:</b>                      Ernslaw One (1044.13 re: 74.25) Accepted,                      ( 1044.136 re: 281.26) Rejected                      Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.16 re: 74.25) Accepted                      Winstone Pulp International (1106.8 re: 74.25) Accepted , (1106.92 re: 281.26) Rejected                      (1106.49 re: 191.42) Accepted in Part                      Meridian (1045.62 re: 75.33) Accepted in Part                      Federated Farmers (1076.33 - .35 re: 191.38 - .40) Accepted in Part                      Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.50 re: 225.20) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.17 Rural Subdivision Rules – Assessment Criteria – Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities			
<p>layout of subdivisions, and any covenants and consent notices proposed as part of a subdivision).</p> <p>(ii) Whether a landscape mitigation plan has been provided to ensure the adverse landscape visual effects of the proposal when viewed from Conservation Land, are adequately addressed.</p> <p>SU3.2.3.2(i)</p> <p>Subdivision and development of a site adjoining an operational <u>or consented</u> windfarm, <u>or other electricity generation activity and infrastructure</u></p> <p><u>The extent to which the proposed subdivision may affect any operational windfarm, or other electricity generation activity and infrastructure taking into account:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>The frequency, character, and intensity of the relevant adverse effect</u></li> <li>• <u>The degree of effect of the relevant existing windfarm or other electricity generation activity in its particular environment having regard to such factors as noise and visual amenity</u></li> </ul> <p>(iii) <u>The extent to which any actual or potential reverse sensitivity effects of the subdivision on the windfarm or other electricity generation activity can be mitigated by way of design, house orientation and insulation, earthworks, planting or moving the proposal (either by increasing the separation from the existing activity, or by changing the bearing</u></p>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.17 Rural Subdivision Rules – Assessment Criteria – Discretionary and Non-Complying Activities</b>			
<p>(iv) <u>from the relevant existing activity by moving a proposed house site within a lot).</u>  <u>Whether the owner/operator of the windfarm or other electricity generation operator has been consulted with, and the outcome of that consultation.</u></p> <p>Explanation: The assessment criteria acknowledges that subdivision in the rural zone has the potential to generate adverse effects in terms of reverse sensitivity on <u>operational windfarms or other electricity generation activity</u> on adjoining sites. Windfarms are a nationally significant renewable energy generation source and as such warrant a degree of protection from adjoining subdivision that may inhibit their operation and the national benefits that brings. The approach set forth does not alter the status of a subdivision if it adjoins a windfarm site <u>or other electricity generation activity</u> (<del>all subdivision in the rural zone remains discretionary</del>) but instead requires consideration of the ways in which the subdivision can mitigate its effects on the windfarm <u>or other electricity generation activity</u> via a range of measures.</p>			

# RURAL ZONE POLICY

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.1 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.1 Introduction</b>			
None	That the PPC already adequately recognises within the Energy section that energy generation activities, including renewable energy facilities, may be appropriately located in the rural environment due to their scale and form and the location of natural and physical resources. Additional recognition of this issue is not required within the Rural Zone Policy section.	TrustPower Limited (74.3) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Mighty River Power (1035.3) Rejected Genesis Energy (1040.5) Rejected Meridian Energy Limited (1045.19) Rejected Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.2) Rejected New Zealand Wind Energy Association (1047.5) Rejected Horticulture New Zealand (1073.10) Rejected Transpower New Zealand Limited (1091.2) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.1 Introduction</b>			
Paragraph four of RU2.1 Introduction:  These same features are also utilised by people, partaking in the recreation and tourism opportunities which exist in the rural areas. However, the establishment of these activities should avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the rural environment. <u>Council recognises that the location of incompatible or sensitive land uses, adjacent to lawfully established activities that require a rural location, can adversely affect the operation and viability of these existing activities.</u>	The proposed change provides for specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects within RU2.1 Introduction as there are specific objectives and policies in relation to this matter identified later in the Rural Policy section under RU2.6.	Mighty River Power Limited (75.4) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Genesis Energy (1040.9) Accepted in Part Meridian Energy Limited (1045.22) Accepted in Part Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.21) Accepted in Part Horticulture New Zealand (1073.9) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
------------------------	---------------	------------------	-------------





**4.3 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.1 Introduction**

<p>Paragraph three and paragraph four of RU2.1 Introduction</p> <p>The rural areas of the District support significant activities including farming, <u>horticulture</u> and forestry. These are important to both the District and the national economy. The Council wishes to see these activities continued. Therefore, in general terms the rural areas are recognised as places where rural activities should be subject to minimal control, provided the activities are managed sustainably and do not generate unacceptable environmental effect.</p> <p>The rural environment also offers a range of lifestyle opportunities. It provides a low density environment offering rural scenery and a rural lifestyle. These aspects are often sought by people wishing to reside in the rural environment. These same features are also utilised by people partaking in the recreation and tourism opportunities which exist in the rural areas. However, the establishment of these activities should avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the rural environment, including reverse sensitivity effects on existing activities.</p>	<p>The changes to proposed to RU2.1 “Introduction” acknowledge the issues surrounding reverse sensitivity effects and provide clarity in relation to the contribution of horticultural activities within the District.</p>	<p>Horticulture New Zealand (281.13) Accepted in Part</p>	
--	--	---	--

<b>WHAT - Recommendations</b>	<b>WHY - Reasons</b>	<b>WHO - Submitters</b>	<b>WHERE- pg #</b>
<b>4.4 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.1 Introduction</b>			
<p>None</p>	<p>The submissions and further submissions were all in support of RU2.1 Introduction.</p>	<p>Michael Plowman (211.3) Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (274.8) Accepted in Part Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.9) Accepted in Part Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (287.5) Accepted in Part NZ Forest Managers Ltd (293.6) Accepted in</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.4 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.1 Introduction</b>			
		Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> NZ Forest Managers Ltd (1074.25 in relation to 274.8) Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.170 in relation to 287.5) Accepted in Part NZ Forest Managers Ltd (1074.56 in relation to 287.5) Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.126 in relation to 287.5) Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.187 in relation to 293.6) Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.143 in relation to 293.6) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.5 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2</b>			
None	Suitable objectives and policies in relation to energy generation have already been incorporated within the Energy section of the PPC. These provisions apply to all zones within the District, including the Rural Zone.	TrustPower Ltd (74.5) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.6 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2</b>			
None	The “values of the rural environment” are identified within the supporting objective and policies of RU2.2 as well as the other objectives and policies of the Rural Policy section of the Plan. A specific definition of these rural “values” is	TrustPower Ltd (74.4) Horticulture New Zealand (281.14)	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.6 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2</b>			
	not required and may be detrimental to overall plan interpretation.		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.7 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.2</b>			
None	The current wording of Objective RU2.2.2 accurately reflects that the rural environment contains a range of activities whilst emphasising the need to ensure the rural environment is sustainably managed.	Horticulture New Zealand (281.15) Accepted <b>Further Submissions:</b> TrustPower Ltd (1082.13) Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.8 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3</b>			
<p>RU2.2.3 POLICIES</p> <p>(a) <u>To ensure that activities established in the rural zone are based on the natural resources of the rural environment and are environmentally sustainable. This shall be achieved by ensuring that:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) <u>amenity values are maintained and enhanced;</u></li> <li>(ii) <u>the quality of the rural environment is maintained and enhanced; and</u></li> <li>(iii) <u>the adverse on site and off site effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated.</u></li> </ul>	The wording chosen is consistent with the Act.	Horticulture New Zealand (281.16) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.9 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3</b>			
None	Suitable objectives and policies in relation to energy generation, and specifically renewable	Mighty River Power Limited (75.5) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.9 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3</b>			
	energy, have already been incorporated within the Energy section of the PPC. These provisions apply to all zones within the District, including the Rural Zone. Additional specific policies are not required to be added to RU2.2.3.	Meridian Energy Ltd (1045.23) Rejected Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.22) Rejected TrustPower Ltd (1082.1) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.10 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(a)</b>			
None	That the addition of the words “as far as practicable” to RU2.2.3(a) would result in lack of strong direction or create the potential for ambiguity within the policy.	TrustPower Ltd (74.6) Rejected Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.10) Accepted <b>Further Submissions:</b> Mighty River Power Ltd (1035.5) Rejected Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.4) Rejected New Zealand Wind Energy Association (1047.7) Rejected King Country Energy (1049.6) Rejected Department of Conservation (1050.18 in relation to 74.6) Accepted Department of Conservation (1050.19 in relation to 284.10) Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.11 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(a)</b>			
None	The first sentence of paragraph three of RU2.1 cannot be read in isolation from the remainder of the paragraph. Policy RU2.2.3(a) is not contrary to the sentiments expressed within RU2.1 as rural activities established within the rural zone will be	John Chumun (180.7 and 181.7) Rejected Emma Whiteside (199.3) Rejected Kerry Fitchett (200.3) Rejected Mark Woods (201.3) Rejected Sean Antrobus (202.3) Rejected	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.11 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(a)</b>			
	based on the natural resources of the rural environment.	Brian Finnerty (226.7) Rejected Miriam Gillingham (227.7) Rejected Michael Peterson (228.1) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Limited (1044.94 in relation to 199.3) Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.51 in relation to 199.3)	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.12 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(c)</b>			
None	That the noise effects of normal farm machinery are already adequately addressed by the Rural rules section of the plan, reiteration of the exemption for permitted activities is not required within Policy RU2.2.3(c).	Ashley Cole on behalf of Murumuru Farms Limited (No. 137.9) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.13 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(e)</b>			
<b>RU2.2.3</b> <u>To ensure that the risk of fire to people, property, and significant areas of indigenous flora and fauna is minimised.</u>	That the level of risk potential for serious fire damage is the same in both “high risk” and “low risk” areas and ensuring the risk is minimised in all areas is appropriate.	New Zealand Fire Service Commission (207.4) Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.14 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(f)</b>			
None	The policy allows for consideration of the value of the rural environment and can avoid unnecessary effects on this environment from the inappropriate location of buildings, roads and structures. Where	Ashley Cole on behalf of Murumuru Farms Limited (No. 137.10) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.14 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(f)</b>			
	these activities require a resource consent, policy RU2.2.3(f) allows for the careful consideration of these activities in relation to the effects they may have on existing natural features.		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.15 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3(g)</b>			
<b>RU2.2.3</b> (g) <u>Stormwater treatment and management systems are designed to integrate into the landscape, to minimise stormwater run-off resulting from development and to protect water quality, and any associated ecosystems and habitats.</u>		Taranaki Fish and Game Council (261.2) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Department of Conservation (1050.16) Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.119) Accepted in Part Horticulture New Zealand (1073.12) Accepted in Part TrustPower Ltd (1082.8) Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.75) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.16 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3.1</b>			
None	The submitters are essentially in support of the explanation contained within RU2.2.3.1 however notes that reference to the buffer zone is not required. There is no intention to include reference to a buffer zone within either Policy RU2.2.3(f) or the explanations of the policies under RU2.2.3.1.	John Chumon on behalf of Rural Community Group (180.8) Accepted in Part John Chumon (181.8) Accepted in Part Brian Finnerty (226.8) Accepted in Part Miriam Gillingham (227.8) Accepted in Part Michael Peterson (228.1) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
------------------------	---------------	------------------	-------------





**4.17 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3.1**

<p>In relation to fire, Council recognises that many rural areas are relatively isolated, and in the event of a fire it is likely that it will be some time before fire appliances can attend a fire. However, council recognizes that the risk of fire in rural areas is relatively low and does not wish to place undue emphasis on this issue. As such, Council will assess applications on a case-by-case basis, taking into account the risks, including the isolation of the property in relation to fire stations, and risks to adjoining properties and significant areas of indigenous flora and fauna along with any mitigation measures. <u>In relation to applications for subdivision consent within the Rural zone it is noted that 4509:2008 'New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Code of Practice' will be used as a guide for the provision of firefighting requirements (including firefighting water supply and access) to all new lots.</u></p>	<p>Specific reference to SNZ PAS 4509 should not be provided within the explanation of RU2.2 as this matter is already adequately addressed within the subdivision section of the Plan.</p>	<p>New Zealand Fire Service Commission (207.5) Accepted in Part  <b>Further Submissions:</b>                  Department of Conservation (1050.14) Accepted in Part                  Richard Hoadley (1057.4) Accepted in Part                  Horticulture New Zealand (1073.11) Accepted in Part</p>	
---	---	---	--

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.18 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.1</b>			
None	That RU2.2(a) and RU2.2.1 as currently drafted seek to avoid “unsustainable” use of natural and physical resources. This is in complete accordance with the provisions of the Act which seek the “sustainable management” of these same resources.	Michael Plowman (211.2 and 211.5) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.19 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3.1</b>			
Paragraph four of RU2.2.3.1 <u>Policy (f) addresses the location of buildings, roads and</u>	The change to the text should be made to ensure that these sentences make grammatical sense and to provide clarity for Plan users so that they	Velma Siemonek (212.5) Accepted Horticulture New Zealand (281.17) Accepted Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.11)	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.19 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2.3.1</b>			
<u>structures. There are a number of buildings and structures which can be constructed without the need for resource consent, for example, farm sheds. However, where consent is required for new buildings, roads and structures this policy aims to ensure that they are sited to minimise the impact on the natural environment.</u>	are aware that there are both buildings and structures that can be constructed without the need for resource consent.	Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Department of Conservation (1050.15 in relation to 212.5) Accepted Department of Conservation (1050.17 in relation to 281.17) Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.20 Rural Zone – Policy – RU2.2.3.1</b>			
None	Policy (f) does not restrict the location of a farmhouse within a property. It would only be considered if the activity required resource consent in the case of an encroachment into the boundary setback or the like.	Alf Sivyer (241.1) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.21 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.2 and RU2.4</b>			
None	That although both submissions are noted, due to their general nature no additional amendments to the Plan text are recommended. Specific submissions in relation to the buffer will be addressed within a separate planning report addressing buffer related issues.	Taranaki Fish and Game Council (261.3) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.118) Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.74) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.22 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3</b>			
None	The submissions support the current drafting of RU2.3.	Emily Jasmine (115.1) Accepted in Part Rural Community Group (180.9) Accepted in Part John Chumun (181.9) Accepted in Part	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.22 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3			
		Emma Whiteside (199.4) Accepted in Part Kerry Fitchett (200.4) Accepted in Part Mark Woods (201.4) Accepted in Part Sean Antrobus (202.4) Accepted in Part Brian Finnerty (226.9) Accepted in Part Miriam Gillingham (227.9) Accepted in Part Michael Peterson (228.1) Accepted in Part Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.12) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Department of Conservation (1050.22 in relation to 284.12) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.23 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3			
None	The submissions support the current drafting of RU2.3.	Emily Jasmine (115.1) Accepted in Part Rural Community Group (180.9) Accepted in Part John Chumun (181.9) Accepted in Part Emma Whiteside (199.4) Accepted in Part Kerry Fitchett (200.4) Accepted in Part Mark Woods (201.4) Accepted in Part Sean Antrobus (202.4) Accepted in Part Brian Finnerty (226.9) Accepted in Part Miriam Gillingham (227.9) Accepted in Part Michael Peterson (228.1) Accepted in Part Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.12) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Department of Conservation (1050.22 in relation to 284.12) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.24 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3</b>			
None	Some recognition of the productive capacity of soils is provided for in the Rural Subdivision Chapter.	Ashley Cole on behalf of Murumuru Farms Ltd (137.11) Accepted in Part Horizons Regional Council (280.9) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submission:</b> Horticulture New Zealand (1073.28 in relation to 280.9) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.25 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3</b>			
<p>RU2.3.3.1</p> <p>Policies (a) and (b) are general policies aimed at retaining rural character and <u>amenity given that rural activities already provide for a range of activities.</u></p> <p><u>Rural character and amenity may include the characteristics identified below. However it is recognised that each specific site has a unique character, and the final determination of a sites “character” will be made on a case by case basis, dependent upon the actual environment of the specific site for which resource consent is sought.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>A predominance of natural features, with a high ratio of open space relative to the built environment;</u></li> <li>• <u>Significant areas of vegetation in pasture, crops, forestry and/or indigenous vegetation;</u></li> <li>• <u>A rural working production environment;/ landscape.</u></li> <li>• <u>Presence of farmed animals;</u></li> <li>• <u>Noises, smells and effects associated with the use</u></li> </ul>	That providing a description of rural character within the explanation of the policy will provide guidance for applicants as to what typically constitutes rural character, without limiting the policy itself or the ability to determine rural “character” on a site by site basis.	Horticulture New Zealand (281.18) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.139) Accepted in Part Meridian Energy Ltd (1045.11) Accept in Part (1045.26 re: 281.18) Rejected Department of Conservation (1050.21) Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.95) Accepted in Part	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.25 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3</b>			
<p>of rural land for a wide range of agricultural, horticultural and forestry purposes;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Low population densities relative to urban area;</u></li> <li>• <u>Existence of some narrow and/or unsealed road; and</u></li> <li>• <u>General lack of urban infrastructure, for example, generally no footpaths or street lighting and no reticulated water or sewerage facilities.</u></li> </ul>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.26 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3 and Rural Policy in General</b>			
None	That the PPC as drafted is not contrary to the purpose and principals of the Act and as no amendments are sought by the submission points no additional change to the PPC are required	Adventure Headquarters (184.1 and 184.4) Both Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.27 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3.3 (a) and (c)</b>			
<p>Policy 2.3.3</p> <p>(a) To manage the effects of <del>non-rural activities that are not permitted</del> within the Rural Zone to ensure that rural character and rural amenity is maintained, especially on the periphery of urban areas.</p> <p>(c) To avoid <del>non-rural activities that are not permitted</del> within the Rural Zone, that either individually or cumulatively could result in the inefficient use of existing urban community infrastructure, or would result in the inefficient expansion, upgrading, or development of community infrastructure in the vicinity of an urban zone, (excluding in the</p>	The amendments will allow for those activities that are not permitted within the rural zone to be considered in accordance with the appropriate policies.	<p>Mighty River Power Limited (75.6) Accepted in Part</p> <p><b>Further Submissions:</b></p> <p>Genesis Energy Ltd (1040.10) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Meridian Energy Ltd (1045.24) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.23) Accepted in Part</p> <p>King Country Energy (1049.3) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Horticulture New Zealand (1073.13) Accepted in Part</p> <p>TrustPower Ltd (1082.2) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.27 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.3.3 (a) and (c)</b>			
townships of Ohura and Pipiriki – see policy (d) below).			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.28 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.5</b>			
None	That policy RU2.5.3(a)(iv) already addresses the concerns as raised by NZTA.	New Zealand Transport Agency (208.2) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.29 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.5</b>			
None	The Objective and Policies as drafted will assist in reducing the potential for development in close proximity to State Highway 47 to adversely affect the natural and landscape values associated with Tongariro National Park and National Park Village. Proposed alterations to the rules of the Rural Zone will address a number of the concerns raised within the submissions.	Michael Plowman (211.15) Rejected Ernslaw One Ltd (274.10) Rejected Tukia Group Ltd (282.7) Rejected Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.14) Rejected Rejected NZ Forest Managers Ltd (293.8) <b>Further Submissions:</b> NZ Forest Managers Ltd (1074.27 in relation to 274.10) Rejected Department of Conservation (1050.23 in relation to 284.14) Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.189 in relation to 293.8) Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.145 in relation to 293.8) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.30 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.6</b>			
None	The submissions and further submissions support	Michael Plowman (211.16) Accepted	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.30 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.6</b>			
	the current drafting of RU2.6.	Winstone Pulp International Ltd (222.3) Accepted A J Learmonth (237.2) Accepted Atihau-Whanganui Incorporation (249.1) Accepted Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (287.7) Accepted <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.101 in relation to 222.3) Accepted Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.172 in relation to 287.7) Accepted NZ Forest Managers Ltd (1074.58 in relation to 287.7) Accepted Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.128 in relation to 287.7) Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.31 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.6 Reverse Sensitivity</b>			
RU2.6.3.1 <u>Explanation of Policies</u>  <u>Reverse sensitivity means the vulnerability of an existing legally established and/or consented activity to challenge from occupants and/or operators of other activities located in the vicinity which are sensitive to adverse environmental effects that may be lawfully generated by the existing activity. This creates the potential for the operation of the existing legally established and/or consented activity to be constrained</u>  This policy seeks to ensure that the functioning of legally established and/or consented activities that have the	That including an explanation of what reverse sensitivity means would assist to clarify the potential issues that may arise from reverse sensitivity effects.	Horticulture New Zealand (281.19) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.138) Accepted in Part Meridian Energy Ltd (1045.27) Accepted in Part Transpower Ltd (1091.9) Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.94) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.31 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.6 Reverse Sensitivity</b>			
<p>potential to generate adverse effects, are not compromised by the inappropriate location or design of sensitive activities such as residential development or visitor accommodation. In particular this policy seeks to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recognise that sensitive activities must take into account the existing surrounding environment when being established.</li> <li>• Provide protection to existing lawfully established activities that have the potential to generate adverse effects. The Rural Rules specifically provide protection to established factory farms, boarding kennels, the Karioi and Tangiwai Mills, and the High Voltage Transmission Lines.</li> <li>• Recognise that reverse sensitivity issues may occur in the rural environment.</li> </ul>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.32 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.6 No Complaints Covenants</b>			
None	The inclusion of additional objectives and policies within the Rural Zone - Policy which made provision for “no complaints covenants” would be inappropriate. There is sufficient opportunity to consider the reverse sensitivity effects of, or in relation to, an activity at the time of assessing a resource consent application. RU2.6.2 and RU2.6.3 as currently drafted allow for this assessment to occur.	Horticulture New Zealand (284.15) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.158) Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.114) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.33 Rural Zone – Policy - Objective RU2.6.2(a) and Policy RU2.6.3(b)</b>			





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p><b>4.33 Rural Zone – Policy - Objective RU2.6.2(a) and Policy RU2.6.3(b)</b></p>			
<p>RU2.6.2                      (a) <u>To avoid, remedy or mitigate the potential for lawfully established activities to be adversely affected by the introduction of sensitive activities adjacent to them.</u></p> <p>RU2.6.3  <u>To ensure activities that are potentially sensitive to the adverse external effects of existing lawfully established activities in rural areas are appropriately sited, managed or restricted to avoid or mitigate these effects.</u></p>	<p>The change to RU2.6.2 is required to correct a grammatical error.                      Recognition of existing lawfully established activities is required to ensure that new activities that are potentially sensitive to the effects of these activities are appropriately sited, managed or restricted to avoid or mitigate these effects</p>	<p>TrustPower Ltd (74.11) Accepted in Part                      Mighty River Power Ltd (75.10) Accepted in Part                      Genesis Energy Ltd (279.1) Accepted in Part  <b>Further Submissions:</b>                      Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.11 in relation to 74.11) Accepted in Part                      Meridian Energy Ltd (1045.21 in relation to 74.11) Accepted in Part                      EECA (1046.6 in relation to 74.11) Accepted in Part                      Transpower Ltd (1091.3 in relation to 74.11) Accepted in Part                      Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.6 in relation to 74.11) Accepted in Part                      Genesis Energy Ltd (1040.11 in relation to 75.10) Accepted in Part                      Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.15 in relation to 75.10) Accepted in Part                      Meridian Energy Ltd (1045.25 in relation to 75.10) Accepted in Part                      Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.10 in relation to 75.10) Accepted in Part                      Mighty River Power Ltd (1035.23 in relation to 279.1) Accepted in Part                      Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.127 in relation to 279.1) Accepted in Part                      EECA (1046.54 in relation to 279.1) Accepted in Part                      NZWEA (1047.10 in relation to 279.1) Accepted in Part                      Transpower Ltd (1091.8 in relation to 279.1) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.33 Rural Zone – Policy - Objective RU2.6.2(a) and Policy RU2.6.3(b)			
		Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.83 in relation to 279.1) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.34 Rural Zone – Policy - RU2.6.2			
None	The submissions and further submissions support the current drafting of RU2.6.2.	TrustPower Ltd (74.9 and 74.10) Accepted Mighty River Power Ltd (75.9) Accepted Velma Siemonek (212.7) Accepted <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.10 in relation to 74.9) Accepted King Country Energy Ltd (1049.7 in relation to 74.9) Accepted Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.5 in relation to 74.9) Accepted Mighty River Power Ltd (1035.6 in relation to 74.10) Accepted Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.12 in relation to 74.10) Accepted EECA (1046.5 in relation to 74.10) Accepted NZWEA (1047.9 in relation to 74.10) Accepted King Country Energy Ltd (1049.8 in relation to 74.10) Accepted Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.7 in relation to 74.10) Accepted EECA (1046.26 in relation to 75.9) Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
4.35 Rural Zone – Policy - General Comments			
None	That although the submission and further	Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (287.1)	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.35 Rural Zone – Policy - General Comments</b>			
	submissions are noted, due to their general nature no additional amendments to the Plan text are recommended. Specific submissions in relation to the buffer will be addressed within a separate planning report addressing buffer related issues.	Accepted <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.166) Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.122) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.36 Rural Zone – Policy – General Comments</b>			
None	Although the submission and further submissions are noted, due to their general nature no additional amendments to the Plan text are recommended. Specific submissions in relation to the buffer will be addressed within a separate planning report addressing buffer related issues.	Horizons Regional Council (280.2) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.130) Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.86) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.37 Rural Zone – Policy – General Comments</b>			
None	Although the submission and further submissions are noted, due to their general nature no additional amendments to the Plan text are recommended.	NZ Forest Managers Ltd (293.1) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.182) Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.138) Rejected	

# RURAL RULES AND DEFINITIONS

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.1 Rural Zone Rule Statement: RU3.1</b>			
None	The Rule Statement provides clear direction to Plan users to refer to the other sections of the proposed Plan Change in the consideration or assessment of a proposal.	Mighty River Power (75.28) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Meridian Energy Ltd (1045.29) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Rural Zone Rules Permitted Activities: RU3.2.1</b>			
None	The list of permitted activities in RU3.2.1 is an appropriate summation of the activities that are envisaged or anticipated in the Rural zone of the Ruapehu District, and reinforces the appropriateness of the activities subject to compliance with the relevant conditions.	Solid Energy New Zealand Limited (69.6) Rejected Trustpower Limited (74.22) Accepted Sue Slegers (140.16) Rejected Michael Plowman (211.7) Accepted Ernslaw One Ltd (274.12) Rejected Genesis Energy (279.2) Accepted Horticulture New Zealand (281.22) Rejected Tukia Group Ltd (282.8) Rejected Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of NZ (284.41) Accepted Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (287.8) Accepted NZ Forest Managers Ltd (293.10) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.13) to 74.22 Accepted King Country Energy Limited (1049.9) to 74.22 Accepted Federated Farmers of NZ Ltd (1076.29) to 140.16 Accepted	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.2 Rural Zone Rules Permitted Activities: RU3.2.1</b>			
		Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.58) to 140.16 Accepted Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.28) to 140.16 Rejected NZ Forest Managers (1074.29) to 274.12 Rejected Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.55) to 279.2 Accepted NZ Forest Managers (1074.59) to 287.8 Accepted Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.173) to 287.8 Accepted Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.129) to 287.8 Accepted Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.191) to 293.10 Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.147) to 293.10 Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.3 Rural Zone Rules: General</b>			
None	The rules section outlines the specific activities that are anticipated in the zone and confirms their activity status. It sets out the various conditions and assessment criteria with which a land use activity in the Rural Zone must comply, and is an important means of managing the environmental effects of an activity, and implementing the overall policy framework (including the objectives and policies) of the District Plan.	Horizons Regional Council (280.16) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.129) Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.85) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.4 Rural Zone Rules Permitted Activities: RU3.2.1(n) and RU3.2.3(a)(ii)</b>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.4 Rural Zone Rules Permitted Activities: RU3.2.1(n) and RU3.2.3(a)(ii)</b>			
None	No amendments are required to RU3.2.3 to include additional objectives and policies. The Rule Statement at the start of the Rural zone chapter (RU3.1) recognises that the Rural zone rules are to be 'read in conjunction with <u>all other rules in the plan</u> ' and 'Consideration shall also be made to <u>all Objectives and Policies which may be relevant</u> to any proposed activity subject to this section ....'. The proposed Rule Statement clearly directs users of the plan to consider all of the rules, objectives and policies that may be relevant to a proposal or application.	Mighty River Power Limited (75.29) Accepted <b>Further Submission:</b> Genesis Energy (1040.15) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.5 Rural Zone Rules Discretionary Activities: RU3.2.3</b>			
<p>That RU3.2.3 be amended as follows:</p> <p>RU3.2.3 <u>Discretionary Activities</u> The following activities are Discretionary Activities.</p> <p>Applications will be assessed against but not limited to, the relevant Assessment Criteria outlined in section RU3.5.</p> <p>(a) <u>Any of the following activities that are provided for as a Permitted Activity by Rule RU3.2.1, but fail to meet one or more of the General Conditions outlined in section RU3.3 or the Specific Conditions outlined in section RU3.4:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>Waste Disposal Activities</u></p>	Changing the status of forestry activities from discretionary to restricted discretionary partly recognises the benefits of forestry, and their place within the Rural zone.	<p>Trustpower Ltd (74.23) Accepted Genesis Energy (279.3) Accepted Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (287.9) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.14, .56) to 74.23 Accepted NZ Forest Managers (1074.60) to 287.9 Accepted in Part Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.174) to 287.9 Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.130) to 287.9 Accepted in Part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.5 Rural Zone Rules Discretionary Activities: RU3.2.3</b>			
<p><u>Relevant Objectives and Policies - RU2.2 and RU2.3</u>  (ii) <u>Electricity Generation Activities</u></p> <p><u>Relevant Objectives and Policies - RU2.2.2(a) and RU2.2.3(c)</u>  (iii) <u>Extraction Activities</u></p> <p><u>Relevant Objectives and Policies - RU2.2.2(a) and RU2.2.3(c) and (d)</u>  (iv) <u>Temporary Military Training Activities</u></p> <p><u>Relevant Objectives and Policies - RU2.2.2(a) and RU2.2.3(c)</u>  (v) <u>Airport Activities</u></p> <p><u>Relevant Objectives and Policies - RU2.2.2(a) and RU2.2.3(c)</u></p> <p>That RU3.2.2 be amended as follows:</p> <p><u>RU3.2.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities</u></p> <p><u>The following activities are Restricted Discretionary Activities. Such activities may be considered without the need to obtain written approval from affected parties and without the need for notification.</u></p> <p><u>Applications will be assessed against and conditions imposed only in respect of the subject matter of the Assessment Criteria noted below the General or Specific Condition(s) with which the activity is unable to comply.</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Any activity that is provided for as a Permitted</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.5 Rural Zone Rules Discretionary Activities: RU3.2.3</b>			
<p><u>Activity by Rule RU3.2.1 but fails to meet one or more of the General Conditions outlined in section RU3.3 or the Specific Conditions outlined in section RU3.4 excluding:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) <u>Waste Disposal Activities</u></li> <li>(ii) <u>Electricity Generation Activities</u></li> <li>(iii) <u>Extraction Activities</u></li> <li>(iv) <u>Temporary Military Training Activities</u></li> <li>(v) <u>Airport Activities</u></li> </ul> <p><u>That RU3.5.1(a)(iii) be amended as follows:</u></p> <p>(iii) <u>Whether the amenity, privacy and access to daylight will be maintained by preventing tall and/or obtrusive buildings, and structures and forestry activities from being located close to boundaries.</u></p> <p>Note: assessment criteria have been amended elsewhere in the recommendations.</p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.6 Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.1 Front Yard</b>			
<p>That Rule RU3.3.1 be amended as follows:</p> <p>(a) For sites of 3000m<sup>2</sup> in area or greater, all buildings, <del>except for farm sheds</del>, shall be setback a minimum of 10m from the front boundary adjoining a local road or collector road.</p> <p>(b) For sites of 3000m<sup>2</sup> in area or greater, all buildings, <del>except for farm sheds</del>, shall be setback a minimum of 30m from the front boundary adjoining any road other than a local road or collector road.</p>	<p>Farm sheds should be subject to the same setback requirements as other buildings. Traffic safety and visibility along public roads is an important consideration in the siting of <i>all</i> buildings.</p>	<p>NZ Transport Agency (208.17) Accepted in Part  Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.44) Rejected  Further Submissions:  Ruapehu District Council (1085.1) to 208.17 Accepted  Ruapehu District Council (1085.2) to 284.44 Accepted  Z Transport Agency (1104.1) to 284.44 Accepted</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.7 Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.2 Side and Rear Yards</b>			
None	If the yard setbacks are too onerous, then options for locating buildings in complying locations are restricted. For smaller sites, it may not be possible to comply with a 25 metre setback, particularly in relation to all site boundaries.	Horticulture New Zealand (281.23) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.8 Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.3 Density</b>			
<p>That RU3.3.3 be amended as follows:</p> <p><u>RU3.3.3 Density</u></p> <p>(a) The maximum density of development shall be one dwelling per hectare of net site area.</p> <p>(b) Each dwelling shall be provided with not less than 2,000m<sup>2</sup> of land associated with it.</p> <p>(c) The minimum separation distance between any two dwellings shall be 20 metres.</p> <p>(d) Not more than two dwellings shall be erected on any one site with an area of less than 100 hectares, and no more than four dwellings shall be erected on any one site with an area of 100 hectares or more.</p> <p><u>Except</u></p> <p>(e) Where a site with an area of less than 1 hectare was in existence on the date this Plan was notified the density of development permissible shall be a single dwelling per site.</p> <p>(f) <u>Where a site of less than 1 hectare is approved under the rural subdivision rules SU3.2.1.3 or</u></p>	<p>The amendments proposed to RU3.3.3 are necessary to eliminate the anomaly whereby a second resource consent is required for the construction of a house on a site subdivided under the rural subdivision rules.</p>	<p>Maureen Parr (1.1) Rejected                      Richard Hoadley (66.15) Rejected                      Winston Oliver (79.8) Rejected                      Alan &amp; Julie Whale (98.4) Accepted in Part                      Ashley Cole (137.25) Rejected                      Sue Slegers (140.17) Rejected                      Cheal Consultants (171.6) Accepted in Part                      The Department of Conservation (191.27) Accepted                      Ruapehu District Council Staff (268.9) Accepted                      Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.45) Rejected                      Plateau Surveyors (313.1) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.8 Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.3 Density</b>			
<u>SU3.2.4, the density of development permissible shall be a single dwelling per site.</u>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.9 Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.4 Height</b>			
None	<p>At this point I am unable to recommend that the submission by Airways Corporation be accepted. Further information is required to better understand the relief sought by Airways Corporation. A definition of a Non-Directional Beacon (NDB) and details regarding the number and location of NDB's within the Ruapehu District are required.</p> <p>Limiting the height of buildings within an ONF&amp;L to one storey is not supported. In some cases it may be more appropriate for buildings to be more than one storey high, as they have the potential to occupy less of a footprint than a larger single storey building, and may therefore have less of an effect on the ONF&amp;L.</p>	<p>Airways Corporation of New Zealand (120.1) Rejected  Claudia Zimmer (205.2) Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.10 Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.5 Noise</b>			
<p>RU3.3.5: Noise</p> <p>(a) The Leq noise level and maximum noise level (Lmax) arising from any activity measured at the boundary of any site within the Residential, Urban Settlement or Protected Areas Zone, or at the notional boundary of any dwelling, or any building</p>	<p>The proposed corrections to the numbering and layout of RU3.3.5(b) will correct an existing anomaly; while the exclusion added under RU3.5.3(a) to note that Wind Turbine Noise is assessed under RU3.5.3(c) will provide greater clarity for plan users.</p>	<p>Ashley Cole (137.26) Rejected  Ernslaw One Ltd (274.15) Rejected  Genesis Energy (279.4) Accepted in Part  Tukia Group Ltd (282.11) Rejected  Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.46) Rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.10 Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.5 Noise</b>			
<p>used for a Visitor Accommodation activity, other than the site generating the noise, shall not exceed the following limits:</p> <p>(i) Monday to Saturday 7.00am to 10.00pm inclusive – 55dBL<sub>Aeq</sub> (15 min);</p> <p>(ii) All other times and on public holidays – 45dBL<sub>Aeq</sub> (15 min);</p> <p>(iii) 10.00pm to 7.00am and on public holidays: maximum noise 75dB L<sub>AFmax</sub></p> <p><u>Except</u></p> <p>(iv) Normal seasonal rural activities such as horticultural crop_harvesting or haymaking may exceed the noise control rule.</p> <p>(v) <u>Wind turbine noise, which is provided for in (c) below.</u></p> <p>(c) <u>Measurement and assessment of noise from Wind Turbine Generators shall comply be in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6808:2010 Acoustics – Wind Farm Noise.</u></p>		<p>Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (287.12) Rejected</p> <p>NZ Forest Managers Ltd (293.13) Rejected</p> <p>Meridian Energy Limited (225.16) Accepted in Part</p> <p><b>Further Submissions:</b></p> <p>NZ Forest Managers (1074.32) to 274.15 Rejected</p> <p>Meridian Energy Limited (1045.37) to 279.4 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Horticulture NZ (1073.17) to 284.46 Rejected</p> <p>NZ Forest Managers (1074.63) to 287.12 Rejected</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.177) to 287.12 Rejected</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.133) to 287.12 Rejected</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.194) to 293.13 Rejected</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.150) to 293.13 Rejected</p> <p>Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.49) to 225.16 Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.11 Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.7 Human Remains</b>			
This submission was addressed at the Heritage Hearing.	This submission was addressed at the Heritage Hearing.	NZ Historic Places Trust (No. 258.16)	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.12 Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.8 Transportation</b>			
None	The provisions of the PPC are not retrospective.	Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (287.13)	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.12 Rural Zone General Conditions: RU3.3.8 Transportation</b>			
	Any legally established activity that is currently being undertaken and is utilising existing access points, regardless of whether they comply or not with the relevant PPC rules, can rely on existing use rights.	Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> NZ Forest Managers (1074.64) Rejected Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.178) Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.134) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.13 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.2 - Visitor Accommodation</b>			
That RU3.4.2 be amended as follows:  <u>RU3.4.2 Visitor Accommodation, Education, and Recreation and Community Activities</u> ....  Relevant Assessment Criteria: RU3.5.1(a) (i), <u>(ii)</u> , <u>(iii)</u> , (vi), (ix) and (x), and RU3.5.1(f)	The proposed limitation of ten guests within the Rural Zone is considered to provide an appropriate balance, in enabling some small scale tourist accommodation facilities to operate within the Rural Zone, while any larger facility will require resource consent to ensure that any adverse effects can be appropriately assessed. In the Council's experience the adverse effects of more than 10 guests needs to be managed. The comparison to DOC huts is not valid because these are only accessible by foot or boat and are located to provide for safety of Park users.  The proposed amendments are undertaken in relation to submission 268.21.	Wayne Gunnell (No. 136.1) Rejected Adventure Headquarters (No. 184.3) Rejected Vivien Pohl (No. 219.2) Accepted Dale Sivyver (No. 240.2) Rejected Alf Sivyver (No. 241.3) Rejected Marian Sivyver (No. 242.3) Rejected Laura Sivyver (No. 243.3) Rejected Further Submissions: Enterprising Taumarunui Incorporated (FS: 1009.1 re: 136.1) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.14 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.3 Commercial Activities</b>			
None	It is considered the proposed Commercial Activity Standards provide an appropriate balance, enabling limited commercial activity to occur within	Sue Slegers (140.18) Rejected Dale L Sivyver (240.3) Rejected Laura M Sivyver (243.5) Rejected	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.14 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.3 Commercial Activities</b>			
	the Rural Zone (helping to support economic wellbeing of the farming community), while through the limitations in terms of size and types of activities, ensuring that the effects, for example, on rural character and traffic safety, are managed. Enabling larger commercial activities would increase the potential for effects, and as such is not supported.		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.15 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.5 Prospecting and Exploration Activities</b>			
None	Council's consultation process must be in accordance with the provisions set out in the Resource Management Act (RMA). Persons undertaking activities listed as 'permitted activities' are not required to consult under the RMA.	Solid Energy New Zealand Limited (69.7) Accepted Tuwharetoa Maori Trust Board (112.8) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo (1083.8) to 112.8 Rejected Te Runanganui o Ngati Hikairo ki Tongariro (1084.8) to 112.8 Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.16 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.6 Extraction Activities</b>			
Recommended Amendments to Plan Change Text That RU3.4.6(a) is amended as follows:  (i) Extraction of material shall not exceed 1,000m <sup>3</sup> per site in any one calendar year measured in its non-compacted form. This restriction does not apply when the material extracted is to be used for rural activity or forestry activities within the site	Rule 3.4.6(a) is amended to provide for extraction activities where the material is used for rural or forestry purposes within the site from which is was extracted. For example, in the construction of farm or forestry access tracks. Rule 3.4.6(b) is deleted. Activities within the bed of a river or lake are the responsibility of the Horizons Regional Council, and the proposed	Solid Energy New Zealand Limited (69.8) Rejected Winston Oliver (79.10) Accepted Jim & Audrey Walker (203.9) Rejected Michael Plowman (211.10) Rejected Ernslaw One Ltd (274.25 Accepted in Part, 274.26 Rejected, 274.27 Rejected, 274.28 Accepted and 274.29 Rejected)	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.16 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.6 Extraction Activities</b>			
<p>from which it was extracted.</p> <p>That RU3.4.6(b) is amended as follows:</p> <p>(i) <u>No extraction activity shall be located within 100 metres of any site boundary.</u></p> <p>(ii) No extraction activity, including stockpiling and crushing, shall occur <del>within the bed of a water body</del> within 20m...</p> <p>(iii) No extraction activity shall be located within 500 metres of any urban zone.</p> <p>That RU3.4.6(d) be deleted:</p> <p><del>Information</del></p> <p>(i) <del>No less than ten working days prior to the commencement of any extraction activity, the person or organisation undertaking the extraction activity, shall for monitoring purposes, provide written notice to the Ruapehu District Council setting out the intention to extract, the location of the extraction and the amount of material which will be removed.</del></p> <p>That RU3.4.6(e) be amended as follows:</p> <p><del>(d)(e)</del> ...</p>	<p>wording is inconsistent with a permitted activity rules in the Horizons One Plan.</p> <p>Rule 3.4.6(d) is deleted as the rule is impracticable and unlikely to ever be complied with.</p>	<p>Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.49 Accepted in Part and 284.50 Rejected)</p> <p>Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (287.15) Rejected</p> <p><b>Further Submissions:</b></p> <p>Meridian Energy Limited (1045.31) to 79.10 Accepted</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.95) to 203.9 Rejected</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.52) to 203.9 Rejected</p> <p>NZ Forest Managers (1074.42) to 274.25 Accepted in Part</p> <p>NZ Forest Managers (1074.43) to 274.26 Rejected</p> <p>Meridian Energy Limited (1045.34) to 274.26 Rejected</p> <p>NZ Forest Managers (1074.44) to 274.27 Rejected</p> <p>Meridian Energy Limited (1045.35) to 274.27 Rejected</p> <p>NZ Forest Managers (1074.45) to 274.28 Accepted</p> <p>Meridian Energy Limited (1045.36) to 274.28 Accepted</p> <p>NZ Forest Managers (1074.46) to 274.29 Rejected</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.150) to 284.49 Rejected</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.106) to 284.49 Rejected</p> <p>Meridian Energy Limited (1045.38) to 284.49 Rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.16 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.6 Extraction Activities</b>			
		Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.105) to 284.50 Rejected Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.149) to 284.50 Rejected Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.180) to 287.15 Rejected Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.136) to 287.15 Rejected Meridian Energy Limited (1045.43) to 287.15 Rejected NZ Forest Managers (1074.66) to 287.15 Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.17 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.7 – Motorised Land Activity, &amp; Definition: Motorised Land Activity</b>			
None	Given the potential for both visual and amenity affects associated with motorised land activities, it is considered reasonable to control this activity within Outstanding Landscapes. It is however, worth noting that the extent of the ONF&L's in the predominantly farming areas of the District is recommended to be reduced.	Winston Oliver (No. 79.4) Accepted in Part Rural Community Group (No. 180.39) Rejected John Chumun (No. 181.38) Rejected Bryan Finnerty (No. 226.38) Rejected Miriam Gillingham (No. 227.38) Rejected Michael Peterson (No. 228.1) Rejected Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of NZ (No. 284.51 & .52) Both Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.18 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.8 Waste Disposal Activities</b>			
None	While NZTA have raised a valid point, the District Plan provisions for 'waste disposal activities' are <i>'for the purpose of disposing farm and domestic waste for not more than one site, located on that site'</i> (RU3.2.1). As such, a stock truck effluent disposal site would not be assessed under the	NZ Transport Agency (208.19) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.18 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.8 Waste Disposal Activities</b>			
	waste disposal activity rules.		

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.19 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.9 Electricity Generation Activities</b>			
<p>That RU3.4.9(a)(iii) be amended as follows:            (iii) <u>No more than two electricity generation activities shall be established on any one site.</u></p> <p>That RU3.4.9(a)(iv) be amended as follows:            (iv) <u>No pipes for the conveyance of water shall exceed 200 millimetres in diameter unless the pipe is located below ground.</u></p> <p>That RU3.4.9(f) be amended as follows:            No Electricity Generation Activity may be located within an area identified as an 'Outstanding Natural Feature or Landscape' (these are identified on the Planning Maps), unless it complies with the permitted activity standards for Electricity Generation Activities as listed above except for domestic scale renewable and non-renewable energy activities.</p>	<p>The permitted activity standards for Electricity Generation Activities (RU3.4.9) are not unduly onerous, and allow for individual landowners to provide/generate their own electricity on site. However, amendments are proposed to RU3.4.9(a)(iii),(iv) and (f)(i) to enable landowners greater flexibility with respect to the design and scale of their domestic scale electricity generation activity.</p>	<p>Bryan M McAnnalley (162.1) Rejected            Rural Community Group (180.40) Accepted in Part            P John Chumun (181.39) Accepted in Part            Jim &amp; Audrey Walker (203.6 and 203.7) Both Accepted in Part            Claudia Zimmer (205.1) Rejected            Michael Plowman (211.11) Rejected            Bryan Finnerty (226.39) Accepted in Part            Miriam Gillingham (227.39) Accepted in Part            King Country Energy Limited (246.12) Rejected            Genesis Energy (279.5) Accepted            Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand (284.53 Accepted in Part, 284.54 Accepted and 284.55 Accepted in Part)  <b>Further Submissions:</b>            Meridian Energy Limited (1045.32) to 211.11 Accepted in Part            Meridian Energy Limited (1045.39) to 284.53 Rejected            Meridian Energy Limited (1045.40) to 284.54 Accepted            Meridian Energy Limited (1045.41) to 284.55 Accepted in Part            NZ Wind Energy Association (1047.1)1 to 284.55 Rejected (1047.15 RE: 279.3) Accept            Mighty River Power (1035.30) to 284.55</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.19 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.9 Electricity Generation Activities</b>			
		Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.20 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.10 Earthworks</b>			
<p>That Rule RU3.4.10 be amended to read as follows:</p> <p><u>Earthworks Activities</u></p> <p>(a) Noise</p> <p>(i) Noise from earthworks shall comply with Condition RU3.3.5.</p> <p><del>(ii) Earthworks shall only occur between 07:00am and 10:00pm Monday to Saturday inclusive, excluding public holidays.</del></p> <p>(b) Appearance</p> <p>(i) All earthworks sites shall be kept tidy and shall be reinstated as soon as practically possible so as to avoid a prolonged visual change in the character of the area.</p> <p><del>(c) Separation</del></p> <p><del>(i) No earthworks activity, including stockpiling, shall occur within 20 metres of the banks of a waterway.</del></p> <p><del>(c)(d)</del> Volume</p> <p>(i) No more than 1000m<sup>3</sup> of material measured in its non-compacted form, within one certificate of title, shall be removed from the site, in any calendar year unless</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the earthworks are identified in and provided for through an approved subdivision or land use consent <u>or</u></li> <li><u>The material is not transported on a</u></li> </ul>	<p>There is no need to retain a standard limiting the hours of earthworks, as compliance with the district wide noise standards will ensure acoustic effects of any earthworks activity are minor.</p> <p>The regional council already controls earthworks in proximity to waterways, and monitors forestry related earthworks, so it is appropriate to make necessary amendments to the PPC provisions to avoid duplication of function.</p> <p>The earthworks permitted to be removed from the site must be consistent with the volume permitted in the excavation rule. This will enable a greater amount of material can be shifted within the private roading networks of farms or forestry.</p>	<p>Ashley Cole (137.28) Accepted in Part            Meridian Energy Limited (225.17) Accepted            Ernslaw One Ltd (274.21, 274.22, 274.23 and 274.24) All Accepted in Part            Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand 284.56 Accepted in Part            Hancock Forest Management (NZ) Ltd (287.16) Accepted in Part            NZ Forest Managers Ltd (293.17) Accepted in Part</p> <p><b>Further Submissions:</b>            Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.52) to 137.28 Accepted in Part            Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.25) to 137.28 Accepted in Part            Horticulture NZ (1073.23) to 274.21 Accepted in Part            NZ Forest Managers (1074.38) to 274.21 Accepted in Part            NZ Forest Managers (1074.39) to 274.22 Accepted in Part            Meridian Energy Limited (1045.33) to 274.22 Accepted in Part            NZ Forest Managers (1074.40) to 274.23 Accepted in Part            NZ Forest Managers (1074.41) to 274.24 Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.20 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.10 Earthworks</b>			
<p><u>public road</u></p> <p><del>(d)</del>(e) Vegetation Removal</p> <p>(i) Where vegetation clearance occurs in association with earthworks, disturbed areas shall be re-vegetated within 12 months of the earthworks being undertaken.</p> <p>Advice Note: <u>Consent may be required from the Regional Council for vegetation clearance.</u></p> <p>Relevant Assessment Criteria: RU3.5.1(a) (iv), (vi), (viii), and (xi)</p>		<p>Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.148) to 284.56 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.104) to 284.56 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Meridian Energy Limited (1045.42) to 284.56 Accepted in Part</p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.181) to 287.16 Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.21 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.13 Airport Activities</b>			
<p>That RU3.4.13(c) be deleted</p>	<p>The deletion of RU3.4.13(c)(i) will allow the practical operation of rural airstrips while restricting use for agricultural purposes.</p>	<p>Winston Oliver (47.1 and 47.2) Both Rejected</p> <p>Ashley Cole (137.29 Rejected, 137.30 Accepted in Part and 137.31 Accepted in Part)</p> <p>Ben Carmichael (156.3) Rejected</p> <p>Rural Community Group (180.41) Rejected</p> <p>P John Chumun (181.40) Rejected</p> <p>Stephen Martin (188.3) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Jim &amp; Audrey Walker (203.8) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Michael Plowman (211.12 and 211.15) Both Rejected</p> <p>Velma Siemonek (212.15) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Heather McKinnon (213.4) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Donald Leslie Siemonek (214.7) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Luke Green (216.4) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Bryan Finnerty (226.40) Rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.21 Rural Zone Specific Conditions: RU3.4.13 Airport Activities</b>			
		Miriam Gillingham (227.40) Rejected Ruapehu and Wanganui Federated Farmers of New Zealand 284.57 and 284.58 Both Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Horticulture NZ (1073.24) to 284.57 Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.22 Rural Zone Assessment Criteria: RU3.5</b>			
<p>That the following be inserted into RU3.5.1(g)</p> <p><b>(xv)</b> <u>The contribution that the proposed energy generation activity will make to the achievement of energy policy objectives and/or renewable energy generation targets of the New Zealand government.</u></p> <p><b>(xvi)</b> <u>The local, regional and national benefits to be derived from renewable energy generation and use.</u></p> <p>The following text be inserted into RU 3.5.1 (a)</p> <p><b>(xvii)</b> The functional requirements of the building and activity that require it to be located within the rural zone.</p> <p>That the following be inserted as RU3.5.1(g):</p> <p>(g) <u>Electricity Generation Activities</u></p> <p>(i) <u>The benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable energy resources including:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Contributions to the reduction in greenhouse gases</u></li> </ul>	<p>The proposed amendments will provide greater certainty for plan users, particularly in the assessment of Electricity Generation Activities. The inclusion of specific assessment criteria for Electricity Generation Activities is consistent with the format of the remainder of the Proposed Plan Change, whereby similar criteria or conditions are provided for specific activities. Amending the Proposed Plan Change to recognise the positive benefits of an activity is consistent with the RMA.</p> <p>The assessment criteria for airport activities are considered to be appropriate to address the range of effects that the activity could potentially generate. Having no assessment criteria at all would be inconsistent with the structure of the PPC and would not provide guidance to plan users and decision makers in assessing resource consents for airport activities.</p>	Trustpower Limited (74.24) Accepted Mighty River Power Limited (75.30) Accepted in Part NZ Transport Agency (208.20) Accepted Horticulture New Zealand (281.25) Rejected The Department of Conservation (191.29 Rejected and 191.30 Accepted) Michael Plowman (211.13) Rejected Meridian Energy Limited (225.18) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Mighty River Power (1035.11) to 74.24 Accepted Meridian Energy Limited (1045.28) to 74.24 Accepted Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.15) to 74.24 Accepted NZ Wind Energy Association (1047.12) to 74.24 Accepted Meridian Energy Limited (1045.30) to 75.30 Accepted Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.22 Rural Zone Assessment Criteria: RU3.5</b>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Reduced dependency on imported energy sources</u></li> <li>• <u>Reduced exposure to fossil fuel volatility</u></li> <li>• <u>Security of electricity supply for current and future generations</u></li> </ul> <p>(ii) <u>The extent to which the location and design of the activity is constrained by functional, operational and technical requirements.</u></p> <p>That RU3.5.1(c) be amended as follows:  (c) Development Adjoining identified Conservation Land (referred to in RU3.2.3(e) and (f)):</p>		(1046.33) to 75.30 Accepted Federated Farmers of New Zealand Limited (1076.30) to 281.25 Rejected Federated Farmers of New Zealand Limited (1076.31) to 191.29 Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.23 Definition: Airport/Rural Airstrip</b>			
<p>That the definition of Airport/Rural Airstrip be amended as follows:</p> <p><u>Airport/Rural Airstrip Activity:</u>  Means an area or place set aside for the take off or landing of light aircraft for commercial, <u>agricultural</u> or recreational activities <u>including ancillary storage and loading activities other than for private domestic use by the owners and occupiers of the holding on which the airstrip is sited</u> and approved for such purposes in terms of the current Civil Aviation Regulations. Such an <u>airstrip airport</u> shall not be used for any other aircraft purposes. <u>This definition excludes airports for private domestic use by the owners and occupiers of the holding on which the airport is sited.</u></p>	<p>The amendments ensure that the definition name reflects the activity that is provided for in the rules section, that agricultural related activities and ancillary storage and loading activities are provided for and clarifies that the civil aviation requirements are to be met for all activities.</p>	Winston Oliver (79.1) Accepted in Part Airways Corporation of New Zealand (120.4) Accepted in Part Ashley Cole (137.1) Accepted in Part Horticulture New Zealand (281.1) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Federated Farmers (1076.6 in relation to 281.1) Accepted in Part	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.24 Definition: Building</b>			
No changes	The definition of a building differs from the definition outlined in the Building Act 2004 as the PPC is concerned with different issues. Stock yards and races are appropriate to include in the definition of a “building” in that they have the potential to generate the same adverse effects as any other “building”	David Holland (9.36) Rejected Winston Oliver (79.1) Rejected Ashley Cole (137.2) Rejected <b>Further Submissions:</b> Federated Farmers (1076.7 in relation to 79.1 and 1076.8 in relation to 137.2) Both Rejected Terrence & Moyrene Patterson (1077.9 in relation to 9.36) Rejected Steve Bonnici, Janette Campbell & Barry Hare (1078.9 in relation to 9.36) Rejected Allan Bonnici & Sandra McInnes (1079.9 in relation to 9.36) Rejected Robert & Nicole Brodnax (1080.9 in relation to 9.36) Rejected Tracey Haszard & Phil Sargent (1081.9 in relation to 9.36) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.25 Definition: Domestic Scale Non Renewable Energy</b>			
That the following definition of Domestic Scale Non Renewable Energy Activity:  <u>Small scale non-renewable energy device providing energy supply capacity to a single dwelling or business premises. For example, a diesel generator.</u>	The inclusion of the definition of Domestic Scale Non Renewable Energy Activity will add clarity to Rules RU3.2.3(e) – (g).	Ruapehu District Council Staff (268.2) Accepted <b>Further Submissions:</b> Federated Farmers of New Zealand (1076.10) Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.26 Definition: Dwelling</b>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.26 Definition: Dwelling</b>			
None	The definition of a dwelling appropriately includes shearer's quarters which generate the same effects as any other residential use.	Ashley Cole (137.3) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.27 Definition: Earthworks</b>			
<p>That the definition of earthworks be amended as follows:</p> <p>Means the alteration or disturbance of land contours, including excavation, backfilling, moving, removing, placing, replacing, cutting or filling of soil or earth and the stripping of <del>vegetation</del> and topsoil. Also includes the removal of such material to another site. Excludes those activities meeting the definition of an "Extraction Activity", foundation piling, cultivation of land, <u>harvesting of horticultural crops</u>, the digging of holes for the erection of posts, the construction of fence lines, or the planting of trees, landscaped area and gardens.</p>	<p>It is not appropriate to include the stripping of vegetation in the definition in that its inclusion could result in the need for consent where vegetation of no identified value with no associated ground disturbance. Other rules in the PPC and the Operative District Plan control vegetation removal. Harvesting of horticultural crops should be listed in the exclusion alongside cultivation of land, as both activities are similar in nature.</p>	<p>Ashley Cole (137.4) Accepted in Part  King Country Energy Limited (246.2) Accepted in Part  Ernslaw One Ltd (274.5) Rejected  Horticulture New Zealand (281.2) Accepted  Tukia Group Ltd (282.5) Rejected  Federated Farmers (284.2) Rejected  NZ Forest Managers (293.5) Rejected</p> <p><b>Further Submissions:</b>  Mighty River Power (1035.19 in relation to 246.2) Accepted in Part  Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.137 in relation to 281.2 Accepted and 1044.186 in relation to 293.5 Rejected)  Meridian Energy (1045.2 in relation to 246.2 Accepted in Part and 1045.3 in relation to 284.2 Rejected)  NZ Wind Energy Association (1047.1 in relation to 246.2) Accepted in Part  NZ Forest Managers (1074.22 in relation to 274.5) Rejected  Federated Farmers (1076.11 in relation to 274.5 Rejected, 1076.13 in relation to 281.2 Accepted and 1076.12 in relation to 282.5 Rejected)  Winstone Pulp International (1106.93 in relation</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.27 Definition: Earthworks</b>			
		to 281.2 Accepted and 1106.142 in relation to 293.5 Rejected)	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.28 Definition: Electricity Generation Activity</b>			
<p>That the definition of Electricity Generation Activity be amended as follows:</p> <p>Means activities, including exploration and investigations, undertaken for electricity production, and includes wind power, hydro electric generation and use of fossil fuels for the generation of electricity. <u>It includes ancillary activities and facilities such as associated maintenance and repair activities, exploration and investigations,</u> and excludes <u>earthworks, vegetation removal and</u> the transmission and reticulation of electricity, including substations.</p>	<p>The above changes clarify that ancillary activities and facilities are included in the definition of Electricity Generation Activity but earthworks, vegetation removal (which are separate activities where relevant conditions are set out) are excluded.</p>	<p>TrustPower (74.1) Accepted                      Mighty River Power (75.2) Accepted in Part                      Winston Oliver (79.3) Rejected                      King Country Energy (246.3) Accepted in Part                      Genesis Energy (279.20) Rejected  <b>Further Submissions:</b>                      Mighty River Power (1035.1 in relation to 74.1 Accepted and 1035.20 in relation to 246.3 Accepted in Part)                      Meridian Energy (1045.4 in relation to 74.1 Accepted, 1045.5 in relation to 75.2 Accepted in Part, 1045.6 in relation to 246.3 Accepted in Part and 1045.7 in relation to 279.20 Rejected)                      Energy Efficiency and Conservation Authority (1046.1 in relation to 74.1 and 1046.20 in relation to 75.2 Accepted in Part)                      NZ Wind Energy Association (1047.2 in relation to 74.1, 1047.3 in relation to 246.3 Accepted in Part and 1047.4 in relation to 279.20 Rejected)</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.29 Definition: Exploration Activity</b>			
<p>“Those activities undertaken following completion of prospecting activities, with the objective of discovering mineral <u>or gas</u> deposits, accurately defining and</p>	<p>It is reasonable to include gas in this definition given coal seam gas exploration and extraction is an emerging technology..</p>	<p>Solid Energy New Zealand Ltd (69.3) Accepted  Further Submission</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.29 Definition: Exploration Activity</b>			
quantifying them, and assessing the feasibility of mining.”		Enterprising Taumarunui (1045.8) Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.30 Definition: Extraction Activity</b>			
“The excavation of sand, gravel, rock or other minerals or gas from the earth and includes mining and the removal of overburden and the erection and maintenance of plant, machinery, buildings, and other works connected with such operations, excluding earthworks.”	<p>It is reasonable to include gas in this definition given coal seam gas exploration and extraction is an emerging technology</p> <p>Further, any extraction activity needed to clean up after a flood would be covered under emergency works and existing use rights under routine maintenance. It is appropriate that all extraction activities shall be considered on their own to ensure that either the relevant permitted activity conditions are met, or a resource consent obtained.</p>	<p>Solid Energy New Zealand Ltd (69.4) Accepted King Country Energy (246.4) Rejected</p> <p><b>Further Submissions:</b> Meridian Energy (1045.8 in relation to 246.4) Rejected</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.31 Definition: Factory Farming and Animal Boarding Facility Activity</b>			
<p>That the following definition be amended:</p> <p>Factory Farming and Animal Boarding Activity: <u>Means the commercial raising and keeping of animals and growing of fungi which is highly dependent on the input of food or fertiliser throughout the year from beyond the site and is predominantly carried out under building cover or outdoor enclosures. Includes boarding kennels or catteries, poultry farming (whether free range or indoors), rabbit farming, pig farming of more than 5 10 weaned pigs and mushroom farming.</u></p>	<p>The Hearings panel were not provided with sufficient information in evidence to justify substantial changes to definitions as notified. The adverse effects of such activities are significant depending on their locations.</p>	<p>Ashley Cole (137.5) Accepted in Part Horticulture New Zealand (281.3) Accepted Federated Farmers (284.3) Accepted in Part</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.31 Definition: Factory Farming and Animal Boarding Facility Activity</b>			
<u>Note: This excludes greenhouses and other buildings used for the growth of vegetative matter</u>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.32 Definition: Indigenous and Indigenous Riparian Vegetation</b>			
None	The definitions of Indigenous and Indigenous Riparian Vegetation are appropriate and clear.	Richard Hoadley (66.7b) Rejected Ashley Cole (137.7) Rejected Velma Siemonek (212.2) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.33 Definition: Industrial Activity</b>			
None	Separate definitions are provided for “Rural Activity” and “Industrial Activity”, and therefore a rural activity is not also an industrial activity.	Federated Farmers (284.6) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.34 Definition: Prospecting Activity</b>			
<p><u>“Those activities undertaken at an early stage of mineral or gas resource identification and definition, with the objective of appraising the mineral or gas potential of a large area using standard geological surveying techniques, and ranking any mineralisation identified as being worthy of more detailed exploration. Prospecting activities include the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Geological mapping, including remote sensing via aerial photography, satellite images studies etc.</u></li> <li>• <u>Geophysical survey, both aerial and ground.</u></li> <li>• <u>Geochemical surveys, including soil, stream</u></li> </ul>	. It is reasonable to include gas in this definition given coal seam gas exploration and extraction is an emerging technology	Solid Energy New Zealand Ltd (69.5) Accepted	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.34 Definition: Prospecting Activity</b>			
<p><u>sediment, rock, vegetation and/or water or gas sampling, using hand held methods of sample collection and access provision.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>Gridding and line surveying.</u></li> </ul> <p><u>Minimum impact activity as defined in Section 2(1) of the Crown Minerals Act 1991</u></p>			

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.35 Definition: Reverse Sensitivity</b>			
<p>That the following definition be included:</p> <p>Reverse Sensitivity:  <u>Means the vulnerability of an existing <del>lawfully established</del> legally established and/or consented activity to challenge from occupants and/or operators of other activities located in the vicinity which are sensitive to adverse environmental effects that may be lawfully generated by the existing activity. This creates the potential for the operation of the existing legally established or consenting activity to be constrained.</u></p>	<p>The definition of reverse sensitivity is appropriate to provide clarity for plan users</p>	<p>Horticulture New Zealand (281.10) Accepted  <b>Further Submissions:</b>  Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.140) Accepted  Meridian Energy (1045.10) Accepted in Part  Federated Farmers (1076.17) Accepted  Winstone Pulp International (1106.96) Accepted</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.36 Definition: Rural Activity</b>			
<p>That the definition of Rural Activity be amended as follows:</p> <p>Any activity for the production of primary produce directly from the land. It includes the breeding and keeping of livestock for the production of food, wool, skins or fur, horticulture, fruit or seed growing, flower production, and <del>market gardening</del> commercial vegetable production,</p>	<p>The changes to the definition of Rural Activity will ensure that correct terminology is used and clarifies that farm buildings and water supply and storage are secondary and accessory to rural activities.</p>	<p>Sue Slegers (140.12) Rejected  Michael Plowman (211.4) Accepted in Part  Ruapehu District Council Staff (268.3) Accepted in Part  Ernslaw One Ltd (274.2) Rejected  Horticulture NZ (281.7) Accepted in Part  Tukia Group Ltd (282.2) Rejected</p>	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<p><b>4.36 Definition: Rural Activity</b></p>			
<p>including the growing of plants in <u>glasshouses</u> <u>greenhouses</u> and tunnel houses and also includes activities that are secondary and accessory to rural activities <u>such as, farm buildings and water supply and storage</u>. Factory farming is specifically excluded from this definition.</p>		<p>Federated Farmers (284.8) Accepted in Part                      Hancock Forest Management (287.4) Rejected                      NZ Forest Managers (293.2) Rejected  <b>Further Submissions:</b>                      Heather McKinnon (1021.1 in relation to 211.4) Accepted in Part                      Ken Malcolm (1022.1 in relation to 211.4) Accepted in Part                      Donald Siemonek (1024.1 in relation to 211.4) Accepted in Part                      John Chumun (1025.1 in relation to 211.4) Accepted in Part                      John Chumun (1026.1 in relation to 211.4) Accepted in Part                      Kevin Siemonek (1027.1 in relation to 211.4) Accepted in Part                      Velma Siemonek (1028.1 in relation to 211.4) Accepted in Part                      Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.123 in relation to 268.3 Accepted in Part, 1044.143 in relation to 282.2 Rejected, 1044.169 in relation to 287.4 Rejected and 1044.183 in relation to 293.2 Rejected)                      NZ Forest Managers (1074.19 in relation to 274.2 Rejected and 1074.55 in relation to 287.4 Rejected)                      Federated Farmers (1076.19 in relation to 211.4 Accepted in Part, 1076.20 in relation to 274.2 Rejected, 1076.23 in relation to 281.7 Accepted in Part, 1076.21 in relation to 282.2 Rejected and 1076.22 in relation to 287.4 Rejected)                      Winstone Pulp International Ltd (1106.79 in relation to 268.3 Accepted in Part, 1106.99 in</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.36 Definition: Rural Activity</b>			
		relation to 282.2 Rejected, 1106.125 in relation to 287.4 Rejected and 1106.139 in relation to 293.2 Rejected)	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.37 Definition: Rural Character</b>			
<p>Insert the following definition</p> <p><u>“Rural Character includes but is not limited to the following elements:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>A predominance of natural features with a high ratio of open space relative to the built environment;</u></li> <li>• <u>Significant areas of vegetation in pasture, crops, forestry and/or indigenous vegetation;</u></li> <li>• <u>A rural working production environment;</u></li> <li>• <u>Presence of farmed animals;</u></li> <li>• <u>Noises, smells and effects associated with the use of rural land for a wide range of agricultural, horticultural and forestry purposes;</u></li> <li>• <u>Low population densities relative to urban areas;</u></li> <li>• <u>Existence of some narrow and/or unsealed roads;</u></li> <li>• <u>General lack of urban infrastructure, for example, generally no footpaths or street lighting and no reticulated water or sewerage facilities.</u></li> </ul>	<p>A rural character definition would be useful in terms of interpretation of objectives and policies and will therefore assist the analysis of consent applications.</p>	<p>Horticulture New Zealand (281.8) Accepted in Part</p> <p><b>Further Submissions:</b></p> <p>Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.135) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Federated Farmers (1076.24) Accepted in Part</p> <p>Winstone Pulp International (1106.91) Accepted in Part</p>	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.38 Definition: Site</b>			
None	No changes to the definition of site are	Ernslaw One Ltd (274.6) Rejected	





WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.38 Definition: Site</b>			
	recommended as this is likely to impact on a wide range of rules throughout the PPC.	<b>Further Submissions:</b> Department of Conservation (1050.7) Rejected NZ Forest Managers (1074.23) Rejected Federated Farmers (1076.25) Rejected	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.39 Definition: Vegetation Clearance</b>			
That the following definition be inserted into the PPC:  <u>Vegetation Clearance:</u> <u>Includes the burning, cutting, crushing, spraying and removal of all forms of vegetation including indigenous and exotic plants. It does not include that relating to routine cultivation, harvesting of horticultural crops or grazing, pruning or waste thinning operations or forestry (as defined).</u>	The above definition will clarify for plan users what is considered vegetation clearance.	Ernslaw One Ltd (274.3) Accepted in Part Tukia Group Ltd (282.3) Accepted in Part NZ Forest Managers (293.3) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> Ernslaw One Ltd (1044.142 in relation to 282.3 and 1044.184 in relation to 293.3) Both Accepted in Part Horticulture NZ (1073.8 in relation to 274.3) Accepted in Part NZ Forest Managers (1074.20 in relation to 274.3) Accepted in Part Winstone Pulp International (1106.98 in relation to 282.3 and 1106.140 in relation to 293.3) Both Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.40 Definition: Waste</b>			
That the following definition be inserted into the PPC:  Waste: <u>Means any matter, whether liquid, gas or solid, which is discharged, unwanted or discarded by the current generator or owner as having little or no economic value,</u>	The above definition will clarify for plan users what is considered waste.	Ernslaw One Ltd (274.7) Accepted in Part <b>Further Submissions:</b> NZ Forest Managers (1074.24) Accepted in Part Federated Farmers (1076.27) Accepted in Part	

WHAT - Recommendations	WHY - Reasons	WHO - Submitters	WHERE- pg #
<b>4.40 Definition: Waste</b>			
<u>and which may include materials that can be reused, recycled or recovered. It does not include rubbish temporarily stored awaiting collection or forestry wood residue where such is returned to forest skid areas.</u>			

