

21 February 2025

SLR Ref No.: 810.V15584.00001 Mackenzie DP PC28 Further Submission 20250221

Plan Changes 28-30, Variations, and Designations – to the Mackenzie District Plan  
Mackenzie District Council

PO Box 52, Main Street  
Fairlie 7949

By email: [districtplan@mackenzie.govt.nz](mailto:districtplan@mackenzie.govt.nz)

SLR Project No.: 810.V15584.00001

**RE: Further Submission on Plan Change 28**

**Pursuant to Clause 6 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991**

---

**Submitter:**

bp Oil New Zealand Limited	Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited	Z Energy Limited <sup>1</sup>
PO Box 99 873	PO Box 1709	PO Box 2091
Auckland 1149	Auckland 1140	Wellington 6140

Hereafter referred to as the **Fuel Companies**

**Address for Service:**

SLR Consulting New Zealand

PO Box 911310  
Victoria St West  
Auckland 1142

Attention: Georgia Alston

Phone: 027 381 8487

Email: [Georgia.alston@slrconsulting.com](mailto:Georgia.alston@slrconsulting.com)

---

<sup>1</sup> On behalf of the wider Z group, including the Z Energy and Caltex operations in New Zealand.

## Introduction

- 1 bp Oil New Zealand Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited, and Z Energy Limited (the Fuel Companies) were a submitter (submitter number 01) on the Mackenzie Proposed Plan Change 28 (PC28).
- 2 The Fuel Companies' interest in the proposed plan change is greater than the interest of the general public.
- 3 The Fuel Companies further submissions are as contained in the attached Table in Schedule A.
- 4 The Fuel Companies wish to be heard in support of this submission.
- 5 If others make similar submissions the Fuel Companies may be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with them at any hearing.
- 6 The Fuel Companies could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

Signed on behalf of Z Energy Limited, bp Oil New Zealand Limited and Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited

Ngā mihi,  
**SLR Consulting New Zealand**



**Georgia Alston**  
Project Consultant - Planning  
[Georgia.alston@slrconsulting.com](mailto:Georgia.alston@slrconsulting.com)

Attachments    Schedule A



## Schedule A

Table 1: Fuel Companies further submissions and relief to Mackenzie District Plan Change 28

Original Submitter	Original submission number	Provision	Relief sought by original submitter (additions in underline, deletions in strikethrough)	Position of the Fuel Companies	Reason for position and relief sought
<b>Contaminated Land Chapter</b>					
Canterbury Regional Council	50.10	Introduction	<p>Amend Introduction as follows:</p> <p>...Resource consent may be required from the district council under the NESCS. This chapter does however contain objective and policy guidance for assessing resource consents which are required under the NESCS. <u>Resource consent may also be required from the regional council for some activities taking place on potentially contaminated and contaminated land.</u></p>	Neutral	The Fuel Companies have an interest in this matter but neither support or oppose the proposed change.
<b>Hazardous Substances Chapter</b>					
Meridian Energy Limited	39.03	HAZS-O1	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>The benefits of the use and storage of hazardous substances are recognised while protecting human health and the environment <del>from by minimising</del> risks associated with these activities.</p>	Support	The Fuel Companies request that this submission point be accepted on the basis that it adds specificity and clarity to the objective.
<b>Natural Hazards Chapter</b>					
Canterbury Regional Council	50.30	Rules – New Rule	<p>Insert new rule as follows:</p> <p><u>NH-RX Above ground earthworks, new buildings and structures in the Flood Hazard Assessment Overlay</u></p>	Oppose	The Fuel Companies oppose the proposed rule by Canterbury Regional Council. The Fuel Companies are concerned about the burden of proof that would be needed to demonstrate



Original Submitter	Original submission number	Provision	Relief sought by original submitter (additions in underline, deletions in strikethrough)	Position of the Fuel Companies	Reason for position and relief sought
			<p><u>Activity Status: PER</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p class="list-item-l1">1. <u>Flooding will not be worsened on another property through the diversion or displacement of floodwaters</u> <u>Activity status when compliance is not achieved with RX.1: RDIS</u></p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <p class="list-item-l1">1. <u>The likely extent of flooding on the site</u></p> <p class="list-item-l1">2. <u>The potential for the activity to exacerbate flooding on any other site</u></p> <p class="list-item-l1">3. <u>The extent to which the earthworks or new building or structure impedes the free passage of floodwater.</u></p>		<p>compliance with the permitted activity to show that flooding is not worsened on any property.</p> <p>The rule would essentially require a flood hazard assessment for earthworks of any scale and would be extremely onerous. In many cases, where there are 'aboveground' earthworks there will also be below ground excavations on the same site, so no net change in floodway capacity. In addition, there may be existing barriers (such as buildings and fences) that prevent or minimise the effect of floodwater displacement, particularly in urban areas.</p> <p>The requested rule is not needed to achieve the NH policies added by PC28 and the Fuel Companies request that submission point 50.30 be rejected.</p>

