

**FURTHER SUBMISSION ON  
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGES 28, 29 and 30  
TO THE MACKENZIE DISTRICT PLAN  
UNDER THE FIRST SCHEDULE TO THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

**To:** Proposed Plan Changes 28, 29 and 30 to the Mackenzie District Plan  
Mackenzie District Council  
PO Box 52  
Main Street  
Fairlie 7949  
[districtplan@mackenzie.govt.nz](mailto:districtplan@mackenzie.govt.nz)

**From:** Meridian Energy Limited  
PO Box 2146  
Christchurch 8140

Attention: Andrew Feierabend  
Phone: (03) 357 9731  
Mobile: 021 898 143  
Email: [andrew.feierabend@meridianenergy.co.nz](mailto:andrew.feierabend@meridianenergy.co.nz)

Meridian Energy Limited (**Meridian**) makes the specific further submissions on Proposed Plan Changes 28, 29 and 30 to the Mackenzie District Plan (**PC28, PC29 and PC30**) that are set out in the attached document.

Meridian would like to be heard in support of its submissions.

In accordance with Clause 8(1)(b) of the First schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**the Act**), Meridian has an interest in PC28, PC29 and PC30 that is greater than the interest of the general public.

Meridian could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

If other persons make a similar submission, then Meridian would consider presenting joint evidence at the time of the hearing.



---

Andrew Feierabend  
For and on behalf of Meridian Energy Limited

Dated this 24 day of February 2025

**FURTHER SUBMISSIONS OF MERIDIAN ON THE PROPOSED PC28, PC29 and PC30 TO THE MACKENZIE DISTRICT PLAN**

<b>PROPOSED PC28: Hazards and Risks, Historic Heritage, Notable Trees and Variation 1 to PC26 and Variation 1 to PC27</b>					
<b>Submitter Name</b>	<b>Sub No</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Support/ Oppose</b>	<b>Reason</b>	<b>Relief sought</b>
Springwater Trust	PC28.02.01	HI-R3	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to change the activity status for residential visitor accommodation in that part of the Rural Lifestyle Zone that is in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The change sought is from non-complying to permitted when a community response plan is completed in conjunction with Civil Defence and is made available to visitors on arrival at the accommodation, and the accommodation clearly displays actions required in the event of hydro inundation.</p> <p>Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter
Springwater Trust	PC28.02.02	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission requests that MDC apply a risk-based approach to ensuring that development in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay minimises risks to human health and property from hydro inundation, and that the Hydro Inundation provisions of PC28 be reconsidered following application of a risk-based approach.</p> <p>Meridian considers that a risk-based approach has been applied in the notified Hydro Inundation provisions. While the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter

				Inundation Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.	
Mary Murdoch	PC28.03.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks no additional control of activities at the Pūkaki Airport from what is in place today and application of a numerical measure of risk.</p> <p>Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter
Peter Finnegan	PC28.04.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>It is unclear what specific relief is sought, and whether the relief relates to the risk of flooding or the risk of hydro inundation.</p> <p>If the relief sought by the submitter is to "change the risk status" of hydro inundation at the Pūkaki Airport to "low risk", Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter
James Leslie	PC28.05.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	The submission seeks no additional control of activities at the Pūkaki Airport from what is in place today and application of a numerical measure of risk.	Decline the relief sought by the submitter

				Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.	
Anthony Honeybone	PC28.08.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to either delete the Hydro Inundation section or amend it to ensure a risk-based approach is applied.</p> <p>Meridian considers that a risk-based approach has been applied in the notified Hydro Inundation provisions. While the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter
Grant and Natasha Hocken	PC28.12.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to delete the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay and to instead apply a risk-based approach.</p> <p>Meridian considers that a risk-based approach has been applied in the notified Hydro Inundation provisions. While the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter

Mackenzie Properties Ltd	PC28.13.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to delete the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay and to instead apply a risk-based approach.</p> <p>Meridian considers that a risk-based approach has been applied in the notified Hydro Inundation provisions. While the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter
High Country Properties Ltd	PC28.14.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to delete the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay and to instead apply a risk-based approach.</p> <p>Meridian considers that a risk-based approach has been applied in the notified Hydro Inundation provisions. While the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter
Fat Albert Ltd	PC28.23.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission requests that statements be made about the unlikely probability of a hydro dam breach (including use of a numerical measure of risk) and that no more controls be applied to the Pūkaki Airport area than are in place today.</p> <p>Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter

				Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.	
John Ten Have	PC28.26.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission requests that no more controls be applied to the Pūkaki Airport area than are in place today.</p> <p>Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	PC28.27.17	HH-P2	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks to delete “<i>unacceptable</i>” from the policy.</p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief as it would leave the policy requiring that all adverse effects on historic heritage values are avoided. Meridian considers that this approach is too inclusive and unnecessarily restrictive. Meridian considers that avoidance of “<i>unacceptable adverse effects</i>” is appropriate and more consistent with the RMA and the NPS-REG.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	PC28.29.15	NH-P7	Oppose in part	<p>The submission seeks to amend NH-P7 so that “<i>Subdivision, land use and development of natural hazard sensitive buildings</i>” are “<i>avoided</i>” in the “<i>Fault Hazard (Subdivision) Overlay</i>” and the “<i>Ostler Fault Hazard Area Overlay</i>”.</p> <p>Meridian opposes the relief sought on the basis that ‘avoidance’ is unnecessarily restrictive and, concerning renewable electricity generation activities, the relief sought is not consistent with the NPS-REG. Meridian considers that NH-P7 as notified is appropriate as it requires ‘management’ of the risks “<i>to ensure land use enabled by subdivision does not result in an</i></p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter

				<p><i>unacceptable risk to people and property” (NH-P7, bullet 1) and ‘avoidance’ of the risks “if the subdivision, use or development increases risks associated with the surface fault rupture that cannot be mitigated to an acceptable level”.</i></p> <p>Meridian considers that this is a more appropriate risk-based approach.</p>	
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	PC28.29.18	NH-R4	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks that NH-R4 be retained, but that there is more ‘clarification on what appropriate measures that have been incorporated into the design to provide for the continued operation of the infrastructure’ entails.</p> <p>Meridian opposes this submission on the basis that there is insufficient detail of what the ‘clarification’ would contain and therefore Meridian is not able to determine the potential impact of the relief on its interests.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter.
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	PC28.29.19	NH-R6	Oppose	<p>The submission requests that NH-R6 be retained, but that there is ‘clarification on what appropriate measures that have been incorporated into the design to provide for the continued operation of the infrastructure’ entails and what ‘risks to the structural integrity of the critical infrastructure, major hazard facility, education facility or visitor accommodation activities can be appropriately managed’ entails.</p> <p>Meridian opposes this submission on the basis that there is insufficient detail in the relief sought to determine the potential impact of the relief on Meridian’s interests.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter.
Michael Beauchamp	PC28.30.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks to remove a property (not specifically identified) from the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay or alternatively to exclude the same property from the proposed rules that apply to the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay.</p> <p>In the absence of knowing which property the submitter is referring to Meridian notes the following. Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan’s Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter

				provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.	
Transpower New Zealand Ltd	PC28.31.08	NH-P5	Support	<p>The submitter seeks to insert a new bullet point into NH-P5 as follows:  <i>“x. enable the operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, upgrading of critical infrastructure where the infrastructure does not increase flood risk on surrounding properties;”</i></p> <p>Meridian supports this relief for the same reasons as provided by the submitter.</p> <p>In addition, Meridian would support enabling the <i>development</i> of critical infrastructure where the infrastructure does not increase flood risk on surrounding properties. This would be consistent with the relief sought in submission PC28.56.05 concerning NH-P4.</p>	Accept the relief sought by the submitter and consider inclusion of <i>“development”</i> in the new bullet.
Transpower New Zealand Ltd	PC28.31.11	NH-R6	Support	<p>The submitter seeks insertion of an additional matter of discretion, i.e. <i>“Any positive effects from the proposal”</i>.</p> <p>Meridian supports the relief sought for the same reasons as given by the submitter.</p>	Accept the relief sought by the submitter
Jason Wakelin	PC28.32.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission requests that if the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay is to be retained then guidance to the risk likelihood should be provided; and that no more controls be applied to the Pūkaki Airport area than are in place today.</p> <p>Guidance on hydro inundation risks would be helpful to landowners. However, Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan’s Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter



				assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.	
Chorus, Connexa, FortySouth, One NA and Spark	PC28.35.06	NH-O2	Oppose in part	<p>The submission requests that bullet 1 of NH-O2 be amended as follows:</p> <p><i>“1. Critical infrastructure is located and designed to be <u>as resilient as possible</u> to the effects of natural hazards, <u>while achieving the functional need or operational need of the critical infrastructure</u>.”</i></p> <p>Meridian supports the addition of the reference to functional need and operational need for the same reasons as provided by the submitter.</p> <p>Meridian opposes reference to “<i>as possible</i>” as this would lead to an unnecessarily onerous objective. Meridian prefers either no reference to “<i>as possible</i>” or use of “<i>as practicable</i>” in its place.</p>	Accept the part of the relief seeking to insert “ <i>while achieving the functional need or operational need of the critical infrastructure</i> ”; and reject the part of the relief seeking to insert “ <i>as possible</i> ”.
Elizabeth Shadbolt	PC28.37.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission requests that no more controls be applied to the Pūkaki Airport area than are in place today.</p> <p>Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan’s Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter
Brent Lovelock	PC28.41.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission requests that MDC not proceed with the notified Hydro Inundation provisions.</p> <p>Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter

				management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.	
Genesis Energy Limited	PC28.46.27	SUB-R7E	Support	Genesis seeks the insertion of a new matter of discretion addressing the potential for future activities on the site to raise or change the Potential Impact Classification (Low, Medium, High) under the Building Act 2004.  Meridian supports the relief sought for the same reasons as provided by Genesis in their submission.	Accept the relief sought by Genesis Energy Limited.
Chris White	PC28.47.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	The submission seeks a review of risks from Hydro Inundation prior to settling on regulatory change.  Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.	Decline the relief sought by the submitter.
Nick Ashley	PC28.48.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	The submission requests that the existing rules be retained.  Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a	Decline the relief sought by the submitter.

				resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.	
Alistair Shearer	PC28.53.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions associated with Lyford Land	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks deletion of the Hydro Inundation provisions that apply to Lyford Lane.</p> <p>Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter
Nova Energy Ltd	PC28.56.05	NH-P4	Support	<p>The submitter seeks to amend bullet 2 of NH-P4 to enable not just the <i>"operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, upgrading of critical infrastructure where the infrastructure does not increase flood risk on another site"</i> but also to enable the <i>"development"</i> of such infrastructure.</p> <p>Meridian considers that this amendment better supports achievement of NH-O1 and is more consistent with the RMA and the NPS-REG.</p>	Accept the relief sought by Nova Energy Ltd
Brent Mander	PC28.58.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission requests that the existing rules be retained.</p> <p>Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter

Rachel Trumper	PC28.59.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks no additional control of activities at the Pūkaki Airport. Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter
Anna Carr	PC28.60.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions associated with Lyford Land	Oppose	<p>The submissions seeks re-evaluation of the Hydro Inundation provisions relating to Lyford Lane.</p> <p>Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter
Neville Cunningham	PC28.63.01	All Hydro Inundation provisions	Oppose	<p>The submission seeks no additional control of activities at the Pūkaki Airport. Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan's Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay. The notified Hydro Inundation provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	Decline the relief sought by the submitter

Opuha Water Limited	PC28.64.10	NH-R5	Support	<p>The submitter seeks to amend NH-R5 to enable natural hazard mitigation works undertaken by operators of critical infrastructure. The relief sought by the submitter is inserting “<i>or an operator of critical infrastructure</i>” into NH-R5.2 and NH-R5.3.</p> <p>Meridian considers that this is necessary given the need to protect critical infrastructure from natural hazards, and that natural hazard mitigation works may not be seen to be part of the critical infrastructure itself (i.e. may not be seen to be regulated by NH-R4).</p>	Accept the relief sought by Opuha Water Limited
---------------------	------------	-------	---------	--	---

Proposed PC29 - Open Space & Recreation Zones, Noise, Signs & Temporary Activities, Variation 1 to PC23, Variation 2 to PC26 & Variation to PC27					
Submitter Name	Sub No	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Relief sought
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	PC29.04.06	New NOISE objective	Support	<p>The submitter seeks insertion of a new objective addressing reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>Meridian supports the new objective for the same reasons as given by the submitter.</p>	Accept the relief sought by New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association
New Zealand Helicopter Association (Tony Michelle)	PC29.05.04	New NOISE objective	Support	<p>The submitter seeks insertion of a new objective addressing reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>Meridian supports the new objective for the same reasons as given by the submitter.</p>	Accept the relief sought by New Zealand Helicopter Association
Nicki McMillan	PC29.09.01	New NOISE objective	Support	<p>The submitter seeks insertion of a new objective addressing reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	Accept the relief sought by the submitter

				Meridian supports the new objective for the same reasons as given by the submitter.	
Opuha Water Limited	PC29.28.03	NOISE – P2	Support	<p>The submitter seeks insertion of “critical infrastructure” in the list of activities that are to be protected from reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>Meridian supports this submission for the same reasons as given by the submitter.</p>	Accept the relief sought by Opuha Water Limited.
Opuha Water Limited	PC29.28.06	NOISE – R13	Support	<p>The submitter seeks insertion of noise “<i>generated by the use of motorised craft for infrastructure inspections or natural and physical resource monitoring required by statutory or regulatory instruments</i>” to the list of permitted activity conditions in NOISE-R13. The submitter also seeks that the permitted activity conditions 1(a) and 1(b) of NOISE-R13 include a clear reference to the time-period during which the stated noise limits apply. Concerning the latter, there appears to be a typo in the notified version of the provision.</p> <p>Meridian supports this submission for the same reasons as given by the submitter.</p>	Accept the relief sought by Opuha Water Limited.
Opuha Water Limited	PC29.28.07	NOISE – R17	Support	<p>The submitter seeks insertion of “or critical infrastructure” to the activities being protected from reverse sensitivity by NOISE-R17.</p> <p>Meridian supports this submission for the same reasons as given by the submitter.</p>	Accept the relief sought by Opuha Water Limited.

Proposed PC30 - Special Purpose Zones, Variation 2 to PC23, Variation 3 to PC26 and Variation 3 to PC27					
Submitter Name	Sub No	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Relief sought
Heliventures New Zealand Ltd	PC30.02.01 PC30.02.02 PC30.02.03 PC30.02.04 PC30.02.05 PC30.02.06 PC30.02.07	All provisions in PC30 that address residential, staff and commercial visitor accommodation at Pūkaki Airport	Oppose	<p>The submitter seeks to amend the objectives, policies, rules, standards and associated definitions to ensure that a suitable level of residential, staff and commercial visitor accommodation are enabled. The submitter offers some amendments to provisions but notes that they will provide more detailed amendments in their planning expert's evidence.</p> <p>The submitter is seeking to ensure that any residential, staff, visitor accommodation development is subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A higher gross floor space threshold.</li> <li>• Has a default restricted discretionary activity status, with matters of discretionary that guide the assessment of the application.</li> <li>• A no-complaints covenant registered on the site's record of title that would prevent owners and occupiers complaining or objecting to airport activity.</li> <li>• A management plan to ensure that customers are made aware of the no complaints covenant and kept safe from aircraft activities.</li> </ul> <p>Meridian opposes the submissions and relief sought.</p> <p>The submission of Heliventures New Zealand Ltd does not recognise the potential consequences of possible hydro inundation (as identified in the Hydro Inundation Chapter of PC28) on the activity that is the subject of their submission.</p> <p>Meridian considers that while the probability of a dam breach is very low, the potential consequences of a breach to life and property at the Pūkaki Airport warrant careful management of activities in the Mackenzie District Plan.</p>	Constrain activities undertaken at the Pūkaki Airport to core airport and airport related activities only, as set out in Meridian's submission on PC28 and PC30.

				<p>The notified Hydro Inundation and Airport Special Purpose Zone provisions do not prohibit activities in the Hydro Inundation Hazard Overlay and Airport Special Purpose Zone, rather where activities are not permitted, they require that the activity be appropriately assessed via a resource consent process. Meridian considers that this approach is appropriate.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--



### Address List of Submitters Referenced in this Further Submission

Submitter	Address for Service (email and postal)	
Alistair Shearer	<a href="mailto:alshearer00@gmail.com">alshearer00@gmail.com</a>	PO Box 471, Twizel 7999
Anna Carr	<a href="mailto:anna.carr@otago.co.nz">anna.carr@otago.co.nz</a>	PO Box 386 Twizel
Anthony Honeybone	<a href="mailto:anthony.honeybone@xtra.co.nz">anthony.honeybone@xtra.co.nz</a>	3/41 Arnold Street, Sumner, Christchurch
Brent Lovelock	<a href="mailto:brent.lovelock@otago.ac.nz">brent.lovelock@otago.ac.nz</a>	77 Eglinton Road, Dunedin
Brent Mander	<a href="mailto:base@zell.nz">base@zell.nz</a>	
Chorus, Connexa, FortySouth, One NZ & Spark	<a href="mailto:tom@incite.co.nz">tom@incite.co.nz</a>	C/- Tom Anderson, Incite, PO Box 2058, Wellington 6140
Chris White	<a href="mailto:chris@greenstonefund.com">chris@greenstonefund.com</a>	50 Rhoboro Road, Twizel 7901
Elizabeth Shadbolt	<a href="mailto:liz.shadbolt@outlook.com">liz.shadbolt@outlook.com</a>	9 Avro Avenue, Pukaki Airport, Twizel
Fat Albert Ltd (Alison and Keith Hatton)	<a href="mailto:alijhatton@gmail.com">alijhatton@gmail.com</a>	Alison & Keith Hatton, 6 Dakota Drive, Pukaki
Genesis Energy Limited	<a href="mailto:mhairi.rademaker@genesisenenergy.co.nz">mhairi.rademaker@genesisenenergy.co.nz</a>	Mhairi Rademaker, Genesis, PO Box 9180, Hamilton 3204
Grant and Natasha Hocken	<a href="mailto:grant@mackenzieproperties.co.nz">grant@mackenzieproperties.co.nz</a>	PO Box 70, Twizel
Heliventures New Zealand Limited	<a href="mailto:mark@perspective.net.nz">mark@perspective.net.nz</a>	Perspective Consulting Ltd, 15 Church Street, Timaru 7940
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	<a href="mailto:mbisnar@heritage.org.nz">mbisnar@heritage.org.nz</a>	Mitzie Bixnar, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, PO Box 4403, Christchurch Mail Centre 8140
High Country Properties Ltd	<a href="mailto:grant@mackenzieproperties.co.nz">grant@mackenzieproperties.co.nz</a>	Grant Hocken, High Country Properties Ltd, PO Box 70, Twizel
James Leslie	<a href="mailto:james@robel.co.nz">james@robel.co.nz</a>	PO Box 147 Twizel, 7944
Jason Wakelin	<a href="mailto:home@wakelifamily.co.nz">home@wakelifamily.co.nz</a>	PO Box 69174, Lincoln
John Ten Have	<a href="mailto:john.tenhave@gmail.com">john.tenhave@gmail.com</a>	4 Dakota Drive, Pukaki
Mackenzie Properties Ltd	<a href="mailto:grant@mackenzieproperties.co.nz">grant@mackenzieproperties.co.nz</a>	Grant Hocken, Mackenzie Properties Ltd, PO Box 70, Twizel
Mary Murdoch	<a href="mailto:mary@pukakiairlodge.co.nz">mary@pukakiairlodge.co.nz</a>	PO Box 352, Twizel 7944

Michael Beauchamp	<a href="mailto:mikezqn@gmail.com">mikezqn@gmail.com</a>	PO Box 342, Twizel
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake	<a href="mailto:resilience@naturalhazards.govt.nz">resilience@naturalhazards.govt.nz</a>	Sarah-Jayne McCurrach, Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tu Ake, PO Box 790, Wellington 6140
Neville Cunningham	<a href="mailto:contact@mtcooktrophyhunting.co.nz">contact@mtcooktrophyhunting.co.nz</a>	310 spur Road, RD5, Timaru 7975
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	<a href="mailto:eonzaaa@aviationnz.co.nz">eonzaaa@aviationnz.co.nz</a>	NZ Agricultural Aviation Association, PO Box 2096, Wellington, 6140, Attn: Tony Michelle
New Zealand Helicopter Association	<a href="mailto:eonzaaa@aviationnz.co.nz">eonzaaa@aviationnz.co.nz</a>	NZ Helicopter Association, PO Box 2096, Wellington, 6140, Attn: Tony Michelle
Nick Ashley	<a href="mailto:nickashley172@gmail.com">nickashley172@gmail.com</a>	64 Sioux Avenue, Wigram, Christchurch 8042
Nicki McMillan	<a href="mailto:nicki@heliventuresnz.com">nicki@heliventuresnz.com</a>	PO Box 241, Oamaru 9444
Nova Energy Ltd	<a href="mailto:atapsell@toddcorporation.com">atapsell@toddcorporation.com</a>	Adam Tapsell, Nova Energy Ltd, Level 15, The Todd Building, 95 Customhouse Quay, Wellington 6011
Opuha Water Limited	<a href="mailto:georgina@gressons.co.nz">georgina@gressons.co.nz</a> <a href="mailto:lucy@gressons.co.nz">lucy@gressons.co.nz</a>	C/- Gresson Dorman & Co, PO Box 244, Timaru 7940, Attn: Georgina Hamilton & Lucy O'Brien
Rachel Trumper	<a href="mailto:rachel.trumper@callplus.net.nz">rachel.trumper@callplus.net.nz</a>	627 Levels Plain Road, RD5, Timaru 7975
Springwater Trust	<a href="mailto:ray@hugoandbland.co.nz">ray@hugoandbland.co.nz</a>	Springwater Trust (Ray Parker), PO Box 328 Twizel 7944
Transpower New Zealand Ltd	<a href="mailto:ainsley@amconsulting.co.nz">ainsley@amconsulting.co.nz</a> <a href="mailto:environment.policy@transpower.co.nz">environment.policy@transpower.co.nz</a>	C/- Ainsley McLeod, 8 Aikmans Road, Merivale, Christchurch 8014