



## Further Submission on Proposed Plan Changes 28-30, Variations and Designations (Stage Four Review)

### Mackenzie District Plan

*Clauses 8 and 8A of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991*

**To:**

**Address:**

Mackenzie District Council

PO Box 52, Main Street

Fairlie 7949

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

**Submitter:**

**Contact Person:**

New Zealand Defence Force

Rebecca Davies, Principal Statutory Planner

**Address for Service:**

New Zealand Defence Force

C/- Tonkin + Taylor

PO Box 2083

Wellington 6140

Attention: Mikayla Woods

**Phone:**

+64 21 445 482

**Email:**

[rebecca.davies@nzdf.mil.nz](mailto:rebecca.davies@nzdf.mil.nz) / [mwoods@tonkintaylor.co.nz](mailto:mwoods@tonkintaylor.co.nz)

This is a further submission by the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) on Proposed Plan Changes to the Mackenzie District Plan (28-30, Variations and Designations (Stage Four Review)). A detailed further submission is attached.

NZDF represents a relevant aspect of the public interest<sup>1</sup>, and also has an interest in the Mackenzie District Plan that is greater than the interest the general public has. NZDF has military interests throughout New Zealand, including the designated Tekapo Military Training Area located within the Mackenzie District. In addition, NZDF may also undertake off-site temporary military training activities in the Mackenzie District.

NZDF **does** wish to be heard in support of its further submission.

If others make a similar further submission, NZDF will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

A copy of this further submission has been sent to each person who made the original submission.

Person authorised to sign  
on behalf of New Zealand Defence Force

Date: 24/02/2025

<sup>1</sup> Set out in section 5 of the Defence Act 1990

*Deletions are marked with ~~strikethrough~~ and additions with underline*

Submitter and number	Plan provision	NZDF position	Summary of submission	NZDF comment / reasons	Decision sought
<b><i>Plan Change 28 – Hazards and Risks, Historic Heritage and Notable Trees, Variation 1 to Plan Change 26, and Variation 1 to Plan Change 27</i></b>					
Natural Hazards Commission Toka Tū Ake  Sarah-Jayne McCurrach <a href="mailto:resilience@naturalhazards.govt.nz">resilience@naturalhazards.govt.nz</a>  29.06 29.10 29.14	New Definition – unacceptable risk from natural hazards  Objective NH-O1  Policy NH-P5	Support in part	The submitter seeks to define ‘unacceptable risk from natural hazards’, and a metric to consistently determine whether a risk is unacceptable.	NZDF is not opposed in principle to providing clarity around what is an unacceptable risk from natural hazards, but it is uncertain from the submission what that definition would be. Details regarding the metric are also uncertain.	If definitions are included and/or the objective and policy are amended NZDF requests these are clear and workable and provisions recognise practicality and constraints of critical infrastructure. Any metric will also need to be workable.
Canterbury Regional Council  Rachel Tutty/Amanda Thompson <a href="mailto:regional.planning@ecan.govt.nz">regional.planning@ecan.govt.nz</a>  50.20	Policy NH-O2	Support	The submitter seeks to amend NH-O2 to recognise that sometimes infrastructure needs to be in a specific location, even though it could be damaged should a natural hazard event occur.	NZDF supports amendment to the policy recognising that sometimes infrastructure has specific locational requirements.	Allow.
Chorus, Connexa, FortySouth, One NZ & Spark	Policy NH-O2	Support	The submitter seeks to amend NH-O2 to recognise that functional and operational need should be weighed up in any decision, as there are	NZDF supports amendment to the policy recognising that sometimes infrastructure has specific locational requirements.	Allow.

Submitter and number	Plan provision	NZDF position	Summary of submission	NZDF comment / reasons	Decision sought
Tom Anderson <a href="mailto:tom@incite.co.nz">tom@incite.co.nz</a> 35.06			instances where infrastructure may not be able to be located anywhere but in a natural hazard area, and there may be limitations as to how resilient that infrastructure can be to a natural hazard.		
<b><i>Plan Change 29 - Open Space and Recreation Zones, Noise, Signs and Temporary Activities, Variation 1 Plan Change 23, Variation 2 to Plan Change 26, and Variation 2 to Plan Change 27</i></b>					
Meridian Energy Ltd Andrew Feierabend <a href="mailto:andrew.feierabend@meridianenergy.co.nz">andrew.feierabend@meridianenergy.co.nz</a> 18.06	NOISE-R17	Support in part	The submitter seeks to extend the application of this rule to address noise sensitive activities within 500m of any critical infrastructure, to recognise that critical infrastructure, such as renewable electricity generation, can have functional needs and operational needs to be located in particular places and should be protected from reverse sensitivity effects.	NZDF supports the protection of critical infrastructure from reverse sensitivity effects.	Allow in part.