

**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

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

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

| PROPOSED PC28: Hazards and Risks, Historic Heritage, Notable Trees and Variation 1 to PC26 and Variation 1 to PC27 | | | | | |
|--|------------|---------------------------------|-----------------|---|--|
| Submitter Name | Sub No | Provision | Support/ Oppose | Reason | Relief sought |
| 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 | 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. 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 |
| 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.</p> <p>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 |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------|------------|---------------------------------|--------|--|--|
| | | | | <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> | |
| 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 |

| | | | | | |
|--|------------|---------------------------------|--------|---|---|
| | | | | <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". Meridian considers that this is a more appropriate risk-based approach.</i> | |
| 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:</p> <p><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</u> resilient <u>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 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|------------|-------|---------|--|---|
| Opupa 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 Opupa 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 | The submitter seeks insertion of a new objective addressing reverse sensitivity effects. | 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 “<i>critical infrastructure</i>” 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></p> <p>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 “<i>or critical infrastructure</i>” 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"> • A higher gross floor space threshold. • Has a default restricted discretionary activity status, with matters of discretionary that guide the assessment of the application. • A no-complaints covenant registered on the site's record of title that would prevent owners and occupiers complaining or objecting to airport activity. • A management plan to ensure that customers are made aware of the no complaints covenant and kept safe from aircraft activities. <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 | alshearer00@gmail.com | PO Box 471, Twizel 7999 |
| Anna Carr | anna.carr@otago.co.nz | PO Box 386 Twizel |
| Anthony Honeybone | anthony.honeybone@xtra.co.nz | 3/41 Arnold Street, Sumner, Christchurch |
| Brent Lovelock | brent.lovelock@otago.ac.nz | 77 Eglinton Road, Dunedin |
| Brent Mander | base@zell.nz | |
| Chorus, Connexa, FortySouth, One NZ & Spark | tom@incite.co.nz | C/- Tom Anderson, Incite, PO Box 2058, Wellington 6140 |
| Chris White | chris@greenstonefund.com | 50 Rhoboro Road, Twizel 7901 |
| Elizabeth Shadbolt | liz.shadbolt@outlook.com | 9 Avro Avenue, Pukaki Airport, Twizel |
| Fat Albert Ltd (Alison and Keith Hatton) | alijhatton@gmail.com | Alison & Keith Hatton, 6 Dakota Drive, Pukaki |
| Genesis Energy Limited | mhairi.rademaker@genesisenergy.co.nz | Mhairi Rademaker, Genesis, PO Box 9180, Hamilton 3204 |
| Grant and Natasha Hocken | grant@mackenzieproperties.co.nz | PO Box 70, Twizel |
| Heliventures New Zealand Limited | mark@perspective.net.nz | Perspective Consulting Ltd, 15 Church Street, Timaru 7940 |
| Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga | mbisnar@heritage.org.nz | Mitzie Bixnar, Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga, PO Box 4403, Christchurch Mail Centre 8140 |
| High Country Properties Ltd | grant@mackenzieproperties.co.nz | Grant Hocken, High Country Properties Ltd, PO Box 70, Twizel |
| James Leslie | james@robel.co.nz | PO Box 147 Twizel, 7944 |
| Jason Wakelin | home@wakelinfamily.co.nz | PO Box 69174, Lincoln |
| John Ten Have | john.tenhave@gmail.com | 4 Dakota Drive, Pukaki |
| Mackenzie Properties Ltd | grant@mackenzieproperties.co.nz | Grant Hocken, Mackenzie Properties Ltd, PO Box 70, Twizel |
| Mary Murdoch | mary@pukakiairlodge.co.nz | PO Box 352, Twizel 7944 |

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