

**FURTHER SUBMISSION ON
PROPOSED PLAN CHANGES 23, 24, 25, 26 AND 27
TO THE MACKENZIE DISTRICT PLAN
UNDER THE FIRST SCHEDULE TO THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991**

To: Proposed Plan Changes 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27 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 23, 24, 25, 26 and 27 to the Mackenzie District Plan (**PC23, PC24, PC25, PC26 and PC27**) 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 PC23, PC24, PC25, PC26 and PC27 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 29th day of February 2024

FURTHER SUBMISSIONS OF MERIDIAN ON THE PROPOSED PC23, PC24, PC25, PC26, PC27 TO THE MACKENZIE DISTRICT PLAN

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 23 - GENERAL RURAL ZONE, NATURAL FEATURES AND LANDSCAPES, NATURAL CHARACTER					
Submitter Name	Sub No	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Relief sought
Director General of Conservation	7.04	Definition of Riparian margin	Oppose	<p>The Director General of Conservation has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Either remove the definition or amend the definition as follows, or words to like effect:</i></p> <p><i>means land adjacent to a waterbody which contributes to the natural functioning, quality and character of the waterbody and its ecosystem.”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes the deletion sought to the definition of riparian margin as it leaves the definition too vague to be enforceable.</p>	Either retain the definition as notified or delete the definition completely.
Opuha Water Limited	43.11	GRUZ-R13	Support in part	<p>Amongst other matters, Opuha Water Limited has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Amend matter of discretion (e) as follows:</i></p> <p><i>e. Effects on water quality and operational resilience of community water supplies <u>and renewable electricity generation facilities.</u>”</i></p> <p>Meridian supports this relief on the basis that it gives better effect to the NPSREG.</p>	Adopt the relief sought to matter of discretion e.

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 24 – SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MĀORI

Meridian makes no further submissions on PC24.

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 25 – RURAL LIFESTYLE ZONE

Submitter Name	Sub No	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Relief sought
Douglas McIntyre	10.01	RLZ-P4	Oppose	<p>The submitter has requested that RLZ-P4 be amended by adding the following:</p> <p><i><u>“4. The activities and buildings are small-scale and commensurate to the surrounding rural lifestyle activities.”</u></i></p> <p>Meridian opposes any increase to development potential in the RLZ. MEL are aware that the RLZ is constrained by access, servicing, and natural hazards.</p>	Decline relief sought.
Douglas McIntyre	10.02	RLZ-S4	Oppose	<p>The submitter has requested that RLZ-S4 be amended by adding the following:</p> <p><i><u>“2. In the Ohau River Precinct, the maximum building coverage of any site shall not exceed 500m².”</u></i></p> <p>Meridian opposes any increase to development potential in the RLZ. MEL are aware that the RLZ is constrained by access, servicing, and natural hazards.</p>	Decline relief sought.
Douglas McIntyre	10.03	Map Overlays	Oppose	<p>The submitter has requested that the map overlays be amended as follows:</p> <p><i><u>“Amend the precinct no build area as per the attached plan in Appendix B of the submission.”</u></i></p> <p>Meridian opposes any increase to development potential in the RLZ. MEL are aware that the RLZ is constrained by access, servicing, and natural hazards.</p>	Decline relief sought.

Douglas McIntyre	10.05	PREC4-P1(1)	Oppose	<p>The submitter has requested the following:</p> <p><i>“Amend PREC4-P1(1) as follows:</i></p> <p><i>To retain the natural values of the Ōhau River and its environs by providing for up to 50 150 allotments and residential units only on the terrace of the western block set back from the river (outside of the No Build Area);”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes any increase to development potential in the RLZ. MEL are aware that the RLZ is constrained by access, servicing, and natural hazards.</p>	Decline relief sought.
Douglas McIntyre	10.06	PREC4-P4	Oppose	<p>The submitter has requested the following:</p> <p><i>“Amend PREC4-P1 to include the following:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><u><i>7. Provide for a small-scale commercial activity that is commensurate to the surrounding rural lifestyle activities.”</i></u></p> <p>Meridian opposes any increase to development potential in the RLZ. MEL are aware that the RLZ is constrained by access, servicing, and natural hazards.</p>	Decline relief sought.
Douglas McIntyre	10.09	PREC4-R1	Oppose	<p>The submitter has requested the following:</p> <p><i>“Amend PREC4-R1 to include:</i></p> <p><u><i>Commercial Activity as a Restricted Discretionary Activity where:</i></u></p> <p><u><i>1. The building or structure is no greater than 150m2 in floor area; and</i></u></p> <p><u><i>2. The building is established following the development of 25 residential allotments in the area; and</i></u></p> <p><u><i>3. The building achieves the design controls of the Ohau River Precinct approved under a subdivision consent; and</i></u></p>	Decline relief sought.

				<p><u>4. The location of any building or structure is consistent with an approved Vegetation Management Plan.</u></p> <p><u>Council's matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>The location, design, scale and appearance of the building or structure.</u> <u>The adverse effects relating to rural lifestyle character and openness.</u> <u>The activities ability to support the rural lifestyle activity.</u> <u>The adequacy of any mitigation measures."</u> <p>Meridian opposes any increase to development potential in the RLZ. MEL are aware that the RLZ is constrained by access, servicing, and natural hazards.</p>	
Douglas McIntyre	10.10	PREC4-S1	Oppose	<p>The submitter has requested the following:</p> <p><i>"Amend PREC-S1 as follows:</i></p> <p><i>No more than 50 <u>150</u> residential allotments shall be created within the Ōhau River Precinct.</i></p> <p><i>Addition of:</i></p> <p><u><i>All building and hardstand surface areas shall not exceed 500m2 per site."</i></u></p> <p>Meridian opposes any increase to development potential in the RLZ. MEL are aware that the RLZ is constrained by access, servicing, and natural hazards.</p>	Decline relief sought.

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 26 – RENEWABLE ELECTRICITY GENERATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE					
Submitter Name	Sub No	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Relief sought
Meridian Energy Limited	18.29	Introduction to the REG chapter	Support with correction	<p>At submission point 18.29 Meridian has requested that the Introduction to the REG chapter specifically list the provisions in other chapters that apply to REG activities, in addition to the provisions in the REG chapter.</p> <p>In the Reasons for Relief given by Meridian they have correctly referred to the relevant provisions in Chapter 19 being the Objective, Policies 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8, and Rules 2.1.1 and 2.2.1, in so far as they apply to the Waitaki Power Scheme and the Opuha Scheme. However, in their relief sought they have also listed Policy 3, and this was an error.</p> <p>Meridian requests that this error be noted, and submit that the relief sought by Meridian is as per their submission point 18.29, with deletion of the reference to Policy 3 of Chapter 19.</p> <p>This relief is consistent with the Consent Memorandum that is signed by all parties to the appeals on PC18's "Renewable Energy Generation and Transmission Provisions" 1 August 2023 and is consistent with the Environment Court Consent Order dated 14 December 2023.</p>	Adopt the relief sought by Meridian as per their submission point 18.29, with the exception that reference to Policy 3 of Chapter 19 is deleted.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	1.09	REG-R7	Oppose	<p>FENZ has requested that REG-R7 require a firefighting water supply where a building or structure associated with renewable energy generation is proposed.</p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that it is not addressing a resource management function of a district council.</p>	Decline relief sought
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	1.10	New REG-MDX	Oppose	<p>FENZ has sought inclusion of new REG-MDX which reads:</p> <p><u><i>"REG-MDX Firefighting Water Supply</i></u></p> <p><u><i>a. The suitability of the water supply for the intended activities on the site.</i></u></p>	Decline relief sought

				<p><u>b. The method by which water will be supplied to each allotment for firefighting, taking into account a risk-based assessment. The assessment shall include (but need not be limited to) the:</u></p> <p><u>i. type of the water source;</u></p> <p><u>ii. available water pressure;</u></p> <p><u>iii. volume of any water storage; and</u></p> <p><u>iv. method of accessing the water for firefighting purposes.”</u></p> <p>FENZ also proposes that REG-MDX be a matter of discretion in Rule “REG-R7 Any Renewable Electricity Generation Activities Not Otherwise Listed”.</p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that it is not addressing a resource management function of a district council.</p>	
Director General of Conservation	3.02	Definition of “regionally significant infrastructure”	Oppose	<p>The Director General of Conservation has sought inclusion of “National, regional and local renewable electricity generation activities of any scale” in the definition of ‘regionally significant infrastructure’ on the basis that this is consistent with the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>While Meridian supports the sentiment of the relief sought, we consider such a change to the definition would lead to confusion given the construct of the plan. The REG chapter addresses REG activities, and the INF chapter does not apply to REG activities. The REG chapter does not refer to ‘regionally significant infrastructure’, while the INF chapter does. If the change sought was to be adopted, the result would not change the outcome since the INF provisions do not apply to REG, but the definition could lead to confusion for implementers of the plan.</p>	Decline relief sought and instead insert an advice note outlining why the definition differs from the definition of ‘Regionally significant infrastructure’ in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.
Director General of Conservation	3.07	Introduction and entire chapter	Oppose	<p>The Director General of Conservation has sought amendments to the Introduction to the REG chapter as follows:</p>	Decline relief sought

				<p><i>"The provisions in other chapters of this District Plan do not apply to activities managed in this chapter, except as follows:...</i></p> <p><i>... Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity, but excluding Policies 2 and 3..."</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that, concerning REG activities, the Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter sets objectives, policies and rules that address the Waitaki Power Scheme, the National Grid and the Opuha Scheme; and this chapter does not address new REG activities. The Consent Memorandum signed by the parties to the appeals on the REG and Transmission Provisions of PC18 (dated 1 August 2023) supports this and notes that, at the time of signing, a new chapter for REG activities (beyond those in PC18) was being developed and was to be notified in November 2023.</p> <p>The new REG chapter that has been notified includes policies REG-P4, REG-P5 and REG-P6 which provide policy direction to the management of new REG activities, including in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and other areas. The new REG chapter also includes REG-R5, REG-R6 and REG-R7 which address new REG activities, including in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and other areas.</p> <p>On this basis, no parts of the Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter should apply to REG activities, other than those that address the existing Waitaki Power Scheme and the Opuha Scheme.</p> <p>For completeness, REG-P4, REG-P5, REG-P6, REG-R5, REG-R6 and REG-R7 address the same activities as are identified in new Rule 1.2.5 that has been inserted into Chapter 19 by the notified version of PC26. The s32 report makes no reference to the need for Rule 1.2.5 and the assessment fails to identify the internal conflict in the plan that results from insertion of Rule 1.2.5. Further to this, Rule 1.2.5 is not consistent with the NPSREG or the NPSIB.</p> <p>Meridian's submission point 18.29 requests that the fifth paragraph to the Introduction of the REG chapter specifically identify the provisions in each of</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				<p>the other chapters in the plan that apply to REG activities. Concerning Chapter 19 these are limited to the Objective, Policies 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8, and Rules 2.1.1 and 2.2.1. Note that Meridian's submissions are referring to the version of Chapter 19 that is contained in the Environment Court's Consent Order dated 14 December 2023. On this basis, Meridian's submission excludes Rules 1.2.5, 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 in Chapter 19 from being applied to new REG activities. As a consequential effect of Meridian's submission, Rule 1.2.5 becomes redundant and good planning practice would lead to its deletion. At the same time, Meridian's relief resolves the internal planning conflict between Rule 1.2.5 and the REG chapter.</p> <p>Meridian notes that the Consent Memorandum also acknowledged that the NPSIB was released by the Government after the parties had attended Environment Court assisted mediation and signed the mediation agreement. The NPSIB had not been released when Mackenzie District Council notified PC18 and therefore PC18 had not been prepared to give effect to the NPSIB. The parties were not aware of the NPSIB's contents when they attended mediation and signed their agreement. The NPSIB states that <i>"Nothing in this National Policy Statement applies to the development, operation, maintenance or upgrade of renewable electricity generation assets and activities"</i>. The Mackenzie District Council now needs to give effect to the NPSIB, and Meridian considers that extending the application of Chapter 19 provisions to new REG activities is not consistent with the NPSIB or the NPSREG.</p>	
Director General of Conservation	3.08	REG-O2	Oppose	<p>The Director General of Conservation has sought the following amendment:</p> <p><i><u>"The adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities are appropriately managed avoided as far as practicable within sensitive areas and Sites of Natural Significance [or significant natural areas], and otherwise are minimised."</u></i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that it is not consistent with Policy C2 of the NPSREG and the broader package of national policy direction. Meridian considers that the management of potential adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities needs to recognise (amongst other matters) the</p>	Decline relief sought

				national significance of renewable electricity generation activities and have particular regard to the operational needs of such activities and the need to locate the activity where the renewable energy resource is available.	
Director General of Conservation	3.09	REG-P6	Oppose	<p>The Director General of Conservation has sought the following amendment:</p> <p><i>“Provide for renewable electricity generation activities (not otherwise specified in REG-P4) within areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features, Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, riparian areas, or within area of Highly Productive Land, where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. there is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be in that location;</i> <i>2. adverse effects on the values of the area are avoided as far as practicable, including through site, route or method selection, design measures and other management methods;</i> <i>3. adverse effects that cannot be avoided are <u>minimised or remedied</u> or mitigated, where practicable;</i> <i>4. regard is had to any offsetting measures or environmental compensation, where there are residual adverse effects that cannot be avoided, <u>minimised or remedied</u> or mitigated; and</i> <p><i>following application of 1. - 4. above, there are no <u>more than minor residual significant</u> adverse effects remaining.”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes the relief sought on the basis that it is not consistent with Policy C2 of the NPSREG. Policy C2 provides for the potential effects of renewable electricity generation activities to be “avoided, remedied or mitigated” and where there are effects remaining after these steps, decision makers are required to have regard to offsetting measures or environmental compensation.</p>	Decline relief sought

				Further to this, clause 1.3(3) of the NPSIB states that “ <i>Nothing in this National Policy Statement applies to the development, operation, maintenance or upgrade of renewable electricity generation assets and activities</i> ” meaning it is not appropriate to insert components of the NPSIB into provisions addressing REG activities that are not consistent with the NPSREG.	
Director General of Conservation	3.10	REG-R4	Oppose	<p>The Director General of Conservation has sought the following amendment:</p> <p>“Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The development <u>is within the footprint of the existing hydroelectric power station and</u> will not result in an increase in the maximum operating level of a lake or water storage area authorised at the date this rule was notified, or create a new lake or water storage area.” <p>Alternatively, the Director General of Conservation seeks that the activity status is changed to Discretionary.</p> <p>Meridian opposes both options of relief sought by the Director General of Conservation. The rule is limited to development of new renewable electricity generation activities where the activity is associated with an existing hydroelectric power station and the matters of control (REG-MD1) address (amongst other matters) potential effects on landscape values; the nature of effects on indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna; adverse effects on the environment from construction; landscaping; revegetation; and earthworks. This is appropriate given the potential effects will be readily identifiable and manageable, the activity is to be undertaken in a highly modified environment, and there will potentially be significant efficiencies in increasing the generation capacity without establishing a new renewable electricity scheme in a less disturbed area.</p>	Decline relief sought
Helios Energy Limited	4.02	Definition of Regionally	Oppose	Helios Energy Limited seeks to include “ <i>Electricity generation</i> ” in the definition for ‘regionally significant infrastructure’.	Decline relief sought and instead insert an

		significant infrastructure		While Meridian supports the sentiment of the relief sought, we consider such a change to the definition would lead to confusion given the construct of the plan. The REG chapter addresses REG activities, and the INF chapter does not apply to REG activities. The REG chapter does not refer to 'regionally significant infrastructure', while the INF chapter does. If the change sought was to be adopted, the result would not change the outcome since the INF provisions do not apply to REG, but the definition could lead to confusion for implementers of the plan.	advice note outlining why the definition differs from the definition of 'Regionally significant infrastructure' in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.
Nova Energy Limited	6.06	Definition of Regionally significant infrastructure	Oppose	<p>Nova Energy Limited seeks to insert "<i>national, regional and local renewable electricity generation activities of any scale</i>" into the definition of 'regionally significant infrastructure'.</p> <p>While Meridian supports the sentiment of the relief sought, we consider such a change to the definition would lead to confusion given the construct of the plan. The REG chapter addresses REG activities, and the INF chapter does not apply to REG activities. The REG chapter does not refer to 'regionally significant infrastructure', while the INF chapter does. If the change sought was to be adopted, the result would not change the outcome since the INF provisions do not apply to REG, but the definition could lead to confusion for implementers of the plan.</p>	Decline relief sought and instead insert an advice note outlining why the definition differs from the definition of 'Regionally significant infrastructure' in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.
NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	8.06	Definition of Upgrade	Oppose	<p>The NZTA has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>"In relation to <u>infrastructure and</u> renewable electricity generation activities <u>and infrastructure</u>, means activities undertaken to increase the capacity, operational efficiency, security or safety of existing <u>infrastructure</u> assets and activities."</i></p>	Decline relief sought

				<p>Meridian notes that the term “<i>upgrade</i>” is used in only two INF provisions in PC26. These are INF-R3 which addresses ‘minor upgrades in relation to the Opuha Dam’; and INF-MD3 which addresses activities in the Electricity Distribution Corridor and includes in the matters of discretion the “<i>adverse effects or risks on the on-going efficient operation, maintenance, development and upgrade of the electricity distribution network</i>”.</p> <p>Concerning the REG provisions, the term “<i>upgrade</i>” is used in REG-R2, which addresses the “<i>Upgrade of an existing hydroelectric power station and associated structures associated with the Opuha Scheme, or within the existing footprint or core sites of the Waitaki Power Scheme</i>”; and REG-R3, which addresses the “<i>Upgrade of an existing structure within an operating easement of the Waitaki Power Scheme</i>”.</p> <p>It appears to Meridian that the definition of “<i>Upgrade</i>” was designed to address REG activities and REG infrastructure only. Meridian sees little (if any) benefit in broadening the definition to apply more broadly to ‘all infrastructure’.</p>	
Simpson Family Holdings Ltd	9.02	REG-O1	Support in part	<p>Simpson Family Holdings Ltd has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Include two new objectives as follows:</i></p> <p><u><i>Recognise the functional and operational needs associated with the location and design of energy renewable electricity generation.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>To provide for the development, operation, maintenance and upgrade of new and existing renewable electricity generation.</i></u></p> <p><i>Or similar”</i></p> <p>Meridian supports drawing attention, within the provisions in PC26, to the matters generally listed in the relief. However, Meridian considers that these matters sit better as policies than objectives in the plan and some adjustment would be needed to ensure that they are consistent with the NPSREG.</p>	Adopt the relief sought, in general, but adopt matters as policies rather than objectives and amend them to ensure consistency with the NPSREG.

Simpson Family Holdings Ltd	9.06	REG-P5 & REG-P6	Oppose in part	<p>Simpson Family Holdings Ltd has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Amend REG-P6 as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Provide for renewable electricity generation activities (not otherwise specified in REG-P4) within areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features, Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, riparian areas, or within area of Highly Productive Land, where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. there is a functional need or operational need for the activity to be in that location;</i> <i>2. adverse effects on the values of the area are avoided as far as practicable feasible, including through site, route or method selection, design measures and other management methods;</i> <i>3. adverse effects that cannot be avoided are remedied or mitigated, where practicable;</i> <i>4. regard is had to any offsetting measures or environmental compensation, where there are <u>significant</u> residual adverse effects that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated; and</i> <i>5. following application of 1. - 4. above, there are no significant adverse effects remaining.”</i> <p><i>“Or combine Policies REG-P5 and P6. Or similar”.</i></p> <p>Meridian does not support changing “practicable” to “feasible”. Meridian notes that while it may be technically feasible to avoid an adverse effect, it may not be financially possible to implement the technically feasible option. Meridian considers that use of “feasible” would leave the policy unnecessarily restrictive since it would fail to consider what cost is too high, and it would fail to apply the notion of proportionality where the effort to offset adverse effects should be a proportional response to the outcomes to be secured. For this reason, Meridian considers that “practicable” should be retained.</p> 	<p>Insert “significant” into 4. and decline the remaining relief sought</p>
-----------------------------	------	-----------------	----------------	---	---

				<p>Meridian does not support combining Policies REG-P5 and REG-P6. There are subtle but important differences between the management of potential effects in both policies. For example, within the areas listed in REG-P6, the decision maker must not simply have regard to the functional and operational needs of the REG activity, rather it must be shown that 'there is' a functional need or operational need for the activity to be undertaken in that location.</p> <p>Meridian does support inserting "<i>significant</i>" into 4.</p>	
Simpson Family Holdings Ltd	9.10	Section 19 Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Oppose	<p>Simpson Family Holdings Ltd has sought that rule 1.3.2 of Chapter 19 be amended so that it does not apply to "<i>a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 1.2.3</i>".</p> <p>Meridian understands from the explanation that is provided by the submitter that they intend for this to read "<i>a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 1.2.5</i>".</p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that Rules 1.2.5, 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 should not apply to REG activities.</p> <p>Concerning REG activities, Chapter 19 sets objectives, policies and rules that address the Waitaki Power Scheme, the National Grid and the Opuha Scheme; and this chapter does not address new REG activities. The Consent Memorandum signed by the parties to the appeals on the REG and Transmission Provisions of PC18 (dated 1 August 2023) supports this and notes that, at the time of signing, a new chapter for REG activities (beyond those in PC18) was being developed and was to be notified in November 2023.</p> <p>The new REG chapter that has been notified includes policies REG-P4, REG-P5 and REG-P6 which provide policy direction to the management of new REG activities, including in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and other areas. The new REG chapter also includes REG-R5, REG-R6 and REG-R7 which address new REG activities, including in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and other areas.</p>	Decline the relief sought.

				<p>On this basis, no parts of Chapter 19 should apply to REG activities, other than those that address the existing Waitaki Power Scheme and the Opuha Scheme.</p> <p>For completeness, REG-P4, REG-P5, REG-P6, REG-R5, REG-R6 and REG-R7 address the same activities as are identified in new Rule 1.2.5 that has been inserted into Chapter 19 by the notified version of PC26. The s32 report makes no reference to the need for Rule 1.2.5 and the assessment fails to identify the internal conflict in the plan that results from insertion of Rule 1.2.5. Further to this, Rule 1.2.5 is not consistent with the NPSREG or the NPSIB.</p> <p>Meridian's submission point 18.29 requests that the fifth paragraph to the Introduction of the REG chapter specifically identify the provisions in each of the other chapters in the plan that apply to REG activities. Concerning Chapter 19 these are limited to the Objective, Policies 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8, and Rules 2.1.1 and 2.2.1. Note that Meridian's submissions are referring to the version of Chapter 19 that is contained in the Environment Court's Consent Order dated 14 December 2023. On this basis, Meridian's submission excludes Rules 1.2.5, 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 in Chapter 19 from being applied to new REG activities. As a consequential effect of Meridian's submission, Rule 1.2.5 becomes redundant and good planning practice would lead to its deletion. At the same time, Meridian's relief resolves the internal planning conflict between Rule 1.2.5 and the REG chapter.</p> <p>Meridian notes that the Consent Memorandum also acknowledged that the NPSIB was released by the Government after the parties had attended Environment Court assisted mediation and signed the mediation agreement. The NPSIB had not been released when Mackenzie District Council notified PC18 and therefore PC18 had not been prepared to give effect to the NPSIB. The parties were not aware of the NPSIB's contents when they attended mediation and signed their agreement. The NPSIB states that <i>"Nothing in this National Policy Statement applies to the development, operation, maintenance or upgrade of renewable electricity generation assets and activities"</i>. The Mackenzie District Council now needs to give effect to the NPSIB, and Meridian</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

				considers that extending the application of Chapter 19 provisions to new REG activities is not consistent with the NPSIB or the NPSREG.	
Environmental Defence Society	10.04	REG-P4	Oppose	<p>The Environmental Defence Society has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Include environmental limits, for example those set out in INFP7(1) - (5) and require avoidance of adverse effects if limits cannot be achieved.”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes the relief sought on the basis that it is not consistent with Policy C2 of the NPSREG.</p>	Decline relief sought
Environmental Defence Society	10.05	REG-P5	Oppose	<p>The Environmental Defence Society has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Include environmental limits for landscape and indigenous biodiversity in the policy (for example those set out in INF-P7(1) - (5) for indigenous biodiversity), and require avoidance of adverse effects if limits cannot be achieved.</i></p> <p><i>Amend to make clear what the relationship between this policy and policy REG-P6 is.”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes the relief sought on the basis that it is not consistent with Policy C2 of the NPSREG.</p>	Decline relief sought
Environmental Defence Society	10.06	REG-P6	Oppose	<p>The Environmental Defence Society has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Include environmental limits for landscape and indigenous biodiversity in the policy (for example those set out in INF-P7(1) - (5) for indigenous biodiversity), and require avoidance of adverse effects if limits cannot be achieved.</i></p> <p><i>Amend to make clear what the relationship between this policy and policy REG-P6 is.”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes the relief sought on the basis that it is not consistent with Policy C2 of the NPSREG.</p>	Decline relief sought

Environmental Defence Society	10.07	REG-MD4	Oppose	<p>The Environmental Defence Society has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Include an additional matter of discretion requiring consideration of the effects on indigenous biodiversity.”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief because the relief sought is not necessary since REG-R7 identifies “Any Renewable Electricity Generation Activities Not Otherwise Listed” as a discretionary activity in areas of “significant indigenous vegetation or significant habitat of indigenous fauna” (amongst other sensitive areas)”; and outside of such sensitive areas discretion is limited to REG-MD4 which includes (amongst other matters) “The appropriateness of measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects”, “The effectiveness of any proposed offsetting or compensation measures” and “The nature of any adverse effects on the environment from construction...”.</p>	Decline relief sought
Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	12.08	REG Introduction	Oppose	<p>TRONT has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“The provisions in other chapters in this District Plan do not apply to activities managed in this chapter, except as follows:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i><u>Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori</u></i> • <i>Natural Hazards...”</i> <p>Meridian opposes the relief sought on the basis that SASM matters have been addressed in the REG chapter, and these matters appropriately reflect the relationship between the NPSREG and Part 2 of the Act.</p>	Decline relief sought
Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	12.12	REG-R5	Oppose	<p>TRONT has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Activity status when compliance is not achieved with R5.1 or R5.3: RDIS</i></p> <p><i>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <i><u>Any potential or actual adverse effects of the proposal on mana whenua values;</u></i> 	Decline relief sought

				<p>b. <i>Any functional or operational reason for an extended timeframe.</i></p> <p>c. <i>The appropriateness of measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects.</i></p> <p><i>Activity status when compliance is not achieved with R5.2: RDIS</i></p> <p>a. <u><i>Any potential or actual adverse effects of the proposal on mana whenua values.</i></u></p> <p>b. <i>The location, design, scale and appearance of the building or structure..."</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that it is too broad and uncertain in its content, and that SASM matters have been appropriately addressed in the notified REG provisions.</p>	
Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	12.13	REG-MD1	Oppose	<p>TRONT has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>"REG-MD1 Existing Hydroelectric Power</i></p> <p>a. <u><i>Any potential or actual adverse effects of the proposal on mana whenua values.</i></u></p> <p>b. <i>The nature of any visual effects of the building or structure on the skyline and open landscape..."</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that it is too broad and uncertain in its content, and that SASM matters have been appropriately addressed in the notified REG provisions.</p>	Decline relief sought
Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	12.16	REG-MD4	Oppose	<p>TRONT has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>"REG-MD4 New Renewable Electricity Generation</i></p> <p>a. <u><i>Any potential or actual adverse effects of the proposal on mana whenua values.</i></u></p>	Decline relief sought

				<p><i>b. The appropriateness of measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects...</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that it is too broad and uncertain in its content, and that SASM matters have been appropriately addressed in the notified REG provisions.</p>	
Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	12.17	REG-P5, REG-P6 and REG-R7	Oppose	<p>TRONT has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Amend the status of Rule REG-R7 from DIS to NC.</i></p> <p><i>Amend the policies to reflect the concerns raised in this submission point and support the NC activity status.”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that a NC activity status is not consistent with Policy C2 of the NPSREG.</p>	Decline relief sought
Forest and Bird	13.01	Introduction	Oppose	<p>Paragraph 16 of Forest and Bird’s submission (under the heading “<i>Relationship between chapters of the plan</i>” seeks the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Amend the chapters so that consideration of the whole of the EIB, NATC and NFL chapters applies to the activities within the REG and INF chapters and that all chapters are consistent with PC 13.”</i></p> <p>Forest and Bird has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Include the entirety of the EIB chapter in the list. Include the NFL and NATC Chapters in the list. Include the Zone Chapters in the list.”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief as it is too encompassing and is not consistent with the NPSREG, the NPSIB and the broader package of national policy direction.</p> <p>Meridian also opposes this relief on the basis that, concerning REG activities, the Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter sets objectives, policies and rules that address the Waitaki Power Scheme, the National Grid and the Opuha Scheme; and this chapter does not address new REG activities. The Consent Memorandum signed by the parties to the appeals on the REG and Transmission Provisions of PC18 (dated 1 August 2023) supports this and notes that, at the</p>	Decline relief sought

				<p>time of signing, a new chapter for REG activities (beyond those in PC18) was being developed and was to be notified in November 2023.</p> <p>The new REG chapter that has been notified includes policies REG-P4, REG-P5 and REG-P6 which provide policy direction to the management of new REG activities, including in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and other areas. The new REG chapter also includes REG-R5, REG-R6 and REG-R7 which address new REG activities, including in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and other areas.</p> <p>On this basis, no parts of the Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter should apply to REG activities, other than those that address the existing Waitaki Power Scheme and the Opuha Scheme.</p> <p>For completeness, REG-P4, REG-P5, REG-P6, REG-R5, REG-R6 and REG-R7 address the same activities as are identified in new Rule 1.2.5 that has been inserted into Chapter 19 by the notified version of PC26. The s32 report makes no reference to the need for Rule 1.2.5 and the assessment fails to identify the internal conflict in the plan that results from insertion of Rule 1.2.5. Further to this, Rule 1.2.5 is not consistent with the NPSREG or the NPSIB.</p> <p>Meridian's submission point 18.29 requests that the fifth paragraph to the Introduction of the REG chapter specifically identify the provisions in each of the other chapters in the plan that apply to REG activities. Concerning Chapter 19 these are limited to the Objective, Policies 1, 4, 5, 7 and 8, and Rules 2.1.1 and 2.2.1. Note that Meridian's submissions are referring to the version of Chapter 19 that is contained in the Environment Court's Consent Order dated 14 December 2023. On this basis, Meridian's submission excludes Rules 1.2.5, 1.3.1 and 1.3.2 in Chapter 19 from being applied to new REG activities. As a consequential effect of Meridian's submission, Rule 1.2.5 becomes redundant and good planning practice would lead to its deletion. At the same time, Meridian's relief resolves the internal planning conflict between Rule 1.2.5 and the REG chapter.</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				<p>Meridian notes that the Consent Memorandum also acknowledged that the NPSIB was released by the Government after the parties had attended Environment Court assisted mediation and signed the mediation agreement. The NPSIB had not been released when Mackenzie District Council notified PC18 and therefore PC18 had not been prepared to give effect to the NPSIB. The parties were not aware of the NPSIB's contents when they attended mediation and signed their agreement. The NPSIB states that <i>"Nothing in this National Policy Statement applies to the development, operation, maintenance or upgrade of renewable electricity generation assets and activities"</i>. The Mackenzie District Council now needs to give effect to the NPSIB, and Meridian considers that extending the application of Chapter 19 provisions to new REG activities is not consistent with the NPSIB or the NPSREG.</p> <p>Further to the above, Paragraph 18 of Forest and Bird's submission (under the heading <i>"Effects Management Hierarchy"</i>) seeks the following relief:</p> <p><i>"A consistent effects management hierarchy is used. Limits to offsetting and compensation are set out. For effects on indigenous biodiversity the effects management hierarchy set out in the EIB chapter applies to all activities."</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that it is not consistent with Policy C2 of the NPSREG or the NPSIB.</p>	
Forest and Bird	13.03	REG-O2	Oppose	<p>Forest and Bird has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>"The adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities are appropriately managed <u>to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the environment.</u>"</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that it is not consistent with Policy C2 of the NPSREG.</p>	Decline relief sought
Forest and Bird	13.05	REG-P4	Oppose	<p>Forest and Bird has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>"Amend Policy REG-P4:</i></p>	Decline relief sought

				<p>“<u>Enable Provide</u> for the investigation and identification of renewable electricity generation sources and small-scale renewable electricity generation activities while managing adverse effects <u>on the environment relative to the sensitivity of the area in which they are located.</u>”</p> <p>Add a new policy:</p> <p><u>“Solar renewable energy generation in the Mackenzie Basin subzone:</u></p> <p><u>In recognition of the unique biodiversity and landscape, feature and character values of the Mackenzie Basin subzone, solar electricity generation is limited to that which can be placed on existing lawfully established buildings.”</u></p> <p>Add a new policy:</p> <p><u>“Wind turbines for renewable energy generation in the Mackenzie Basin subzone:</u></p> <p><u>In recognition of the unique biodiversity and landscape, feature and character values of the Mackenzie Basin subzone, Wind electricity generation is limited to small and community scale activities.”</u></p> <p>Add or amend rules so that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) solar not in line with the new policy above is an RDIS activity. b) wind for small or community scale of no more than 2 turbines is RDIS. c) where a) or b) are not complied with the activity is NC. d) include effects on indigenous biodiversity, natural landscape, features and character, and on cultural values as matters for discretion for a) and b).” <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that the two new policies sought and the ‘added or amended rules’ are not consistent with the NPSREG, and the</p>	
--	--	--	--	---	--

				'added or amended rules' are not consistent with the two new policies sought by Forest and Bird.	
Forest and Bird	13.06	REG-P5	Oppose	<p>Forest and Bird has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>"Amend REG-R5 to refer to ECO chapter policies for managing adverse effects of renewable electricity generation activities on indigenous biodiversity."</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that, concerning REG activities, the Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter sets objectives, policies and rules that address the Waitaki Power Scheme, the National Grid and the Opuha Scheme; and this chapter does not address new REG activities. The Consent Memorandum signed by the parties to the appeals on the REG and Transmission Provisions of PC18 (dated 1 August 2023) supports this and notes that, at the time of signing, a new chapter for REG activities (beyond those in PC18) was being developed and was to be notified in November 2023.</p> <p>The new REG chapter that has been notified includes policies REG-P4, REG-P5 and REG-P6 which provide policy direction to the management of new REG activities, including in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and other areas. The new REG chapter also includes REG-R5, REG-R6 and REG-R7 which address new REG activities, including in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and other areas.</p> <p>The Consent Memorandum also acknowledged that the NPSIB was released by the Government after the parties had attended Environment Court assisted mediation and signed the mediation agreement. The NPSIB had not been released when Mackenzie District Council notified PC18 and therefore PC18 had not been prepared to give effect to the NPSIB. The parties were not aware of the NPSIB's contents when they attended mediation and signed their agreement. The NPSIB states that <i>"Nothing in this National Policy Statement applies to the development, operation, maintenance or upgrade of renewable electricity generation assets and activities"</i>. The Mackenzie District Council now</p>	Decline relief sought

				<p>needs to give effect to the NPSIB, and Meridian considers that extending the application of Chapter 19 provisions to new REG activities is not consistent with the NPSIB or the NPSREG.</p> <p>On this basis, no parts of the Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter should apply to REG activities, other than those that address the existing Waitaki Power Scheme and the Opuha Scheme.</p>	
Forest and Bird	13.07	REG-P6	Oppose	<p>Forest and Bird has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>Amend REG-P6:</i></p> <p><i><u>“Provide Only consider providing for renewable electricity generation activities (not otherwise specified in REG-P4) within areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Features, Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori, riparian areas, or within area of Highly Productive Land, where:</u></i></p> <p><i><u>1A. adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity can be managed in accordance with the EIB objectives and policies; and</u></i></p> <p><i>1. there is a functional need or and operational need for the activity to be in that location;...”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that, concerning REG activities, the Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter sets objectives, policies and rules that address the Waitaki Power Scheme, the National Grid and the Opuha Scheme; and this chapter does not address new REG activities. The Consent Memorandum signed by the parties to the appeals on the REG and Transmission Provisions of PC18 (dated 1 August 2023) supports this and notes that, at the time of signing, a new chapter for REG activities (beyond those in PC18) was being developed and was to be notified in November 2023.</p> <p>The new REG chapter that has been notified includes policies REG-P4, REG-P5 and REG-P6 which provide policy direction to the management of new REG activities, including in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant</p>	Decline relief sought

				<p>habitats of indigenous fauna and other areas. The new REG chapter also includes REG-R5, REG-R6 and REG-R7 which address new REG activities, including in areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna and other areas.</p> <p>On this basis, no parts of the Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity chapter should apply to REG activities, other than those that address the existing Waitaki Power Scheme and the Opuha Scheme.</p> <p>Meridian notes that the Consent Memorandum also acknowledged that the NPSIB was released by the Government after the parties had attended Environment Court assisted mediation and signed the mediation agreement. The NPSIB had not been released when Mackenzie District Council notified PC18 and therefore PC18 had not been prepared to give effect to the NPSIB. The parties were not aware of the NPSIB's contents when they attended mediation and signed their agreement. The NPSIB states that <i>"Nothing in this National Policy Statement applies to the development, operation, maintenance or upgrade of renewable electricity generation assets and activities"</i>. The Mackenzie District Council now needs to give effect to the NPSIB, and Meridian considers that extending the application of Chapter 19 provisions to new REG activities is not consistent with the NPSIB or the NPSREG.</p>	
Forest and Bird	13.08	<p>REG-R1 All Zones</p> <p>REG-R2 All Zones</p>	Oppose	<p>Forest and Bird has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>"Include standards in REG-R1 and REG-R2 PER activities, for vegetation clearance to be limited to within 10m of existing lawfully established buildings or structures, and any vegetation clearance is limited to within 2m of existing fences and existing access tracks/roads.</i></p> <p><i>Include in REG-R2 PER a standard that the "upgrade" activities do not include any indigenous vegetation clearance above that set out above.</i></p> <p><i>For both rules, where PER compliance is not achieved the activity is RDIS or DIS to ensure discretion is provided for adverse effects on</i></p>	Decline relief sought

				<p><i>indigenous biodiversity, natural landscapes and features and natural character.”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief. REG-R1 address the operation and maintenance of an existing hydroelectric power station and associated structures and REG-R2 addresses the upgrade of an existing hydro-electric power station and structures associated with the Opuha Scheme, or within the existing footprint or core sites of the Waitaki Power Scheme. The clearance of indigenous vegetation associated with the operation, maintenance or refurbishment (which includes upgrade or renewal) of existing hydroelectric power stations and their associated structures is managed by the provisions in PC18. It is not necessary to add additional constraints through PC26.</p> <p>With respect to the clearance of vegetation that is not indigenous, it is unnecessarily restrictive to impose the limits on permitted activities as sought in Forest and Bird’s relief, and such relief would be inconsistent with the NPSREG, the NPSIB and the broader package of national policy direction.</p>	
Forest and Bird	13.09	REG-R3 All Zones	Oppose	<p>Forest and Bird has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Amend PER standard to:</i></p> <p><i>Where:</i></p> <p><i>Any modification or addition does not result in more than 20m² of additional land being utilised for buildings, structures and ancillary activities <u>in total over the life of this plan</u>, or the height of any existing building being increased by more than 2.5 metres.</i></p> <p><i>Where PER compliance is not achieved change the activity status to RDIS or DIS to ensure discretion is provided for adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, natural landscapes and features and natural character.”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief. REG-R3 addresses the upgrade of an existing structure within an operating easement of the Waitaki Power Scheme. ‘Upgrade’ is defined in PC26 as <i>“in relation to renewable electricity generation</i></p>	Decline relief sought

				<p><i>activities and infrastructure, means activities undertaken to increase the capacity, operational efficiency, security or safety of existing assets and activities</i>". The potential effects of the activity are minimised by the 'upgrade' being 'to an existing structure', for the purposes set out in the definition of upgrade and only within the Waitaki Power Scheme's operating easement. This approach is generally consistent with the NPSREG and the broader package of national policy direction.</p> <p>PC18 addresses the potential effects on indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna resulting from upgrades to the Waitaki Power Scheme, so no further discretion is needed in REG-R3 on this matter.</p> <p>The controlled activity status, when the permitted activity condition cannot be complied with, is appropriate. The matters of control address visual effects, adverse effects on the environment from construction, the location and scale and colour of the structure, landscaping and earthworks (amongst other matters). This provides comprehensive scope to manage any other potential effects of the activity through the conditions of the controlled activity consent. On this basis, Meridian opposes the relief seeking a change in activity status.</p>	
Forest and Bird	13.10	REG-R4	Oppose	<p>Forest and Bird has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>"Change activity status from CON to RDIS as a starting point. Where compliance is not achieved with RDIS standards then activity status should be NC."</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief. REG-R4 is limited to development of new REG activities that are associated with an existing hydroelectric power station, including associated structures. Since the matters of control address visual effects, effects on indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna, adverse effects on the environment from construction, the location and scale and colour of the structure, landscaping and earthworks (amongst other matters), and the activity can increase the capacity and efficiency of REG, Meridian considers that the rule (with some duplication removed i.e. the</p>	Decline relief sought

				duplication in REG-MD2 c. and i.) is generally consistent with the NPSREG and the broader package of national policy direction.	
Forest and Bird	13.12	REG-R5	Oppose	<p>Forest and Bird has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Reduce the duration to 12 months at the PER level.</i></p> <p><i>Add a condition that there is no vegetation clearance.</i></p> <p><i>Amend REG-R5 so that all the PER standards apply, e.g. for zones.</i></p> <p><i>“Where:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The investigation, identification or assessment activity is located on site for no more than 60 12 months-; and</i> <i>2. Any structure shall be set back from the road boundary, or internal boundary of any site in separate ownership, the equivalent distance to the height of the structure.”</i> <p><i>Similarly for other areas.”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief. Investigation activities are defined in PC26 as:</p> <p><i>“means the investigation, identification and assessment of potential sites and energy sources for renewable electricity generation by existing and prospective generators and includes the following structures and activities:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) erecting an anemometer mast;</i> <i>b) erecting weather stations for the measurement of meteorological conditions;</i> <i>c) digging test pits, drilling boreholes, constructing investigation drives and removing samples to investigate geological conditions;</i> <i>d) installing instruments into drill holes for monitoring groundwater levels and land movement;</i> 	Decline relief sought

				<p>e) erecting survey monuments and installing instruments to monitor land movement;</p> <p>f) erecting telemetry stations for the transmission of instrument data;</p> <p>g) installing microseismic stations to measure microseismic activity and ground noise;</p> <p>h) erection of signs or notices giving warning of danger; and</p> <p>i) security fencing associated with the above structures and activities."</p> <p>The potential effects that such activities can result in are limited, leading to a 12-month permitted period being unnecessarily restrictive.</p> <p>The RDIS status and matters of discretion (when the permitted activity conditions cannot be met) are considered appropriate and generally consistent with the NPSREG and the broader package of national policy direction.</p>	
Forest and Bird	13.14	REG-R7	Oppose	<p>Forest and Bird has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>"Amend Outside Areas Specified Below to DIS.</i></p> <p><i>Amend within specified areas to NC."</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief on the basis that it is inconsistent with the objective and policies of the NPSREG. Meridian considers that the RDIS status outside of the specified areas is appropriate and the matters of discretion REG-MD4 comprehensively addresses the management of potential effects of new REG activities. Meridian considers that the DIS status within the specified areas provides full opportunity to assess the application against the objectives and policies within the plan and against the broader national policy direction.</p>	Decline relief sought
Opuha Water Limited	16.03	Definition of Upgrade	Support	<p>Opuha Water Limited has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>"Amend the definition of "upgrade" as follows:</i></p>	Adopt the relief sought by Opuha Water Limited

				<p><i>In relation to renewable electricity generation activities and infrastructure, means activities undertaken to increase the capacity, operational efficiency, security of safety of existing assets and activities, <u>including new buildings and structures required for those purposes.</u></i></p> <p>Meridian supports this relief on the basis that there may be small ancillary buildings or structures that are needed to undertake any upgrade of REG assets and activities.</p>	
Canterbury Regional Council	19.01	Definition of Antenna	Oppose	<p>CRC has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>"Delete the definition and replace with:</i></p> <p><i><u>A device that receives or transmits radiocommunication or telecommunication signals, but not a small cell unit.</u></i></p> <p><i>(National Environmental Standards for Telecommunication Facilities Definition)"</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes this relief. Meridian considers that the definition in the notified version of PC26 is more comprehensive.</p>	Decline relief sought
Canterbury Regional Council	19.03	Definition of Regionally significant infrastructure	Oppose	<p>CRC has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>"Amend the definition:</i></p> <p><i>...h. electricity distribution network</i></p> <p><i><u>i. National, regional and local renewable electricity generation activities of any scale</u></i>".</p> <p>While Meridian supports the sentiment of the relief sought, we consider such a change to the definition would lead to confusion given the construct of the plan. The REG chapter addresses REG activities, and the INF chapter does not apply to REG activities. The REG chapter does not refer to 'regionally significant infrastructure', while the INF chapter does. If the change sought by CRC was to be adopted, the result would not change the outcome since the INF provisions</p>	Decline relief sought and instead insert an advice note outlining why the definition differs from the definition of 'Regionally significant infrastructure' in the Canterbury

				do not apply to REG, but the definition could lead to confusion for implementers of the plan.	Regional Policy Statement.
Canterbury Regional Council	19.06	REG-R2	Oppose	<p>CRC has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Add a definition:</i></p> <p><i><u>Core sites of the Waitaki Power Scheme are:</u></i></p> <p><i>Then list the sites MDC consider to be core sites.”</i></p> <p>Meridian notes that PC18 defines “core sites” as “<i>means land owned by Genesis Energy or Meridian Energy that is managed for hydro generation purposes associated with the Waitaki Power Scheme</i>”. Meridian considers that this definition is sufficiently clear and would support this definition equally applying to PC26. Meridian would not support differing definitions for “core sites” being applied in various chapters in the plan.</p>	Decline relief sought
Canterbury Regional Council	19.07	REG-R7 and REG-MD4	Oppose	<p>CRC has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“REG-MD4</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>b. The effectiveness of any proposed offsetting or compensation measures, <u>in accordance with the provisions of Section 19 (Ecosystem and Indigenous Biodiversity)</u>.”</i></p> <p>Meridian opposes the relief sought on the basis that the offsetting and compensation principles adopted in Chapter 19 predated the NPSIB. The NPSIB is explicit that nothing in the NPSIB applies to the development, operation, maintenance or upgrade of REG assets and activities. On this basis, it would not be consistent with national policy direction within the NPSREG and NPSIB to apply the Chapter 19 offsetting and compensation requirements to new REG activities.</p>	Decline relief sought

Director General of Conservation	3.04	INF-P4	Oppose	<p>The Director General of Conservation has sought the following amendment, or words of like effect:</p> <p><i>“...2. It is compatible with the values and anticipated character of the <u>wider surrounding</u> environment; ...”</i></p> <p>The Director General of Conservation notes that <i>“The reference in clause 2 to the “surrounding” environment could be interpreted as only applying outside the location of the development itself, which would not allow adequate assessment of environmental effects”</i>. Meridian does not agree with this concern and opposes the relief sought. Meridian considers that use of the term <i>“wider”</i> does not resolve the concern raised by the Director General of Conservation. Further to this, Meridian considers that <i>“wider”</i> has a broader meaning than <i>“surrounding”</i> and use of <i>“wider”</i> is not appropriate in this provision.</p>	Decline relief sought
NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	8.09	INF-O3	Support	<p>The NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Amend as follows:</i></p> <p><i>The efficient, <u>effective and safe</u> operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of regionally significant infrastructure is not constrained or compromised by other activities.”</i></p> <p>Meridian supports this relief since the effectiveness and safety of the activities listed is as important (if not of greater importance) as the efficiency of the activities listed.</p>	Adopt the relief sought by the NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi
NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	8.13	INF-P4	Support	<p>The NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Amend as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Manage infrastructure, including ancillary earthworks, so that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>its form, location and scale <u>minimises avoids, remedies or mitigates</u> of adverse effects on the environment; and ...”</i> 	Adopt the relief sought by the NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi

				Meridian supports this relief as it is more consistent with the requirements of the Act. Meridian notes that this position differs slightly from their submission on the same provision. Meridian prefers the relief sought by the NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi, however if this relief was not adopted then Meridian seeks insertion of a definition of “ <i>minimise</i> ” as set out in their submission on this provision.	
NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi	8.22	INF-R7	Support	<p>The NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Amend as follows:</i></p> <p><i>Where the activity complies with the following standards: INF-S1, EW-S4...”</i></p> <p>Meridian supports this relief for the same reasons as provided by the NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi.</p>	Adopt the relief sought by the NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 27 – EARTHWORKS, SUBDIVISION, PUBLIC ACCESS AND TRANSPORT					
Submitter Name	Sub No	Provision	Support/ Oppose	Reason	Relief sought
Opuha Water Limited	29.03	PA-P2	Support in part	<p>Opuha Water Limited has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>“Amend PC-P2 as follows (or to similar effect):</i></p> <p><i>Encourage opportunities and mechanisms to maintain and enhance public access to and along surface waterbodies, including for mahika kai, when a land use or subdivision consent application provides opportunities for access, with special consideration given to:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Those waterbodies listed in PA-SCHED2; and</i> <i>The creation of any allotment smaller than 4ha which adjoins a waterbody; <u>and</u></i> 	<p>Concerning PA-P2, insert new matter for special consideration as follows:</p> <p><i>“Encourage...with special consideration given to:...<u>3. The risks to human</u></i></p>

				<p><u>3. The implications of providing public access for health and safety obligations.”</u></p> <p>Meridian supports this relief on the basis that public access to and along waterbodies often comes with some human safety risks, particularly where there are REG assets located. Meridian agrees that special consideration should be given to the potential for human safety risks.</p> <p>At the same time, Meridian considers that the insertion in the relief sought could be improved to read:</p> <p><i>“3. The risks to human health and safety resulting from providing public access”</i></p>	<p><u>health and safety resulting from providing public access.</u></p>
Opuha Water Limited	29.04	PA-S1	Support in part	<p>Opuha Water Limited has sought the following relief:</p> <p><i>Amend PA-S1 to:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>(a) Align with the directive of PA-P1;</i> <i>(b) Clarify the public access requirements for allotments over 4ha in size or land use consent applications; and</i> <i>(c) Include health and safety considerations as a further matter of discretion.</i> <p>Meridian supports this relief on the basis that public access to and along waterbodies often comes with some human safety risks, particularly where there are REG assets located. Meridian agrees that the potential for human safety risks should be included in the matters of discretion listed.</p>	<p>Adopt the relief sought by Opuha Water Limited at (c) in their submission, i.e. <i>“Include health and safety considerations as a further matter of discretion”</i></p>

Address List for Further Submissions

<p>Fire and Emergency New Zealand ANZ Centre 267 High Street, Christchurch Central City, Christchurch, 8011 Lydia.shirley@beca.com</p>	<p>Canterbury Regional Council - Attn: Rachel Tutty PO Box 345, Christchurch 8140 regional.planning@ecan.govt.nz</p>
<p>Helios Energy Limited PO Box 52, Fairlie, 7949 sbrooks@heliosenergy.co.nz</p>	<p>Nova Energy Limited Level 15, The Todd Building, 95 Customhouse Quay, Wellington 6011 cpye@novaenergy.co.nz</p>
<p>Director-General of Conservation C/- Department of Conservation, Private Bag 4715, Christchurch Mail Centre, Christchurch 814 mbrass@doc.govt.nz</p>	<p>Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand PO Box 2516, Christchurch, 8140 n.snovink@forestandbird.org.nz</p>
<p>Simpson Family Holdings Ltd PO Box 3, Lake Tekapo, 7945 Andrew.simpson@thecairns.co.nz</p>	<p>NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi PO Box 1479, Christchurch 8140 Nick.Reuther@nzta.govt.nz</p>
<p>Opuha Water Limited C/- Gresson Dorman & Co P O Box 244, Timaru 7940 georgina@gressons.co.nz</p>	<p>Environmental Defence Society Incorporated (EDS) PO Box 91736, Victoria Street West, Auckland 1042 john@eds.org.nz</p>
<p>Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu PO Box 13-046, Christchurch Hemi.bedggood@ngaitahu.iwi.nz info@ngaitahu.iwi.nz</p>	<p>Douglas McIntyre C/- Carl Salmons Level 1, 47/49 Salisbury Street, Christchurch 8013 carl@landplay.co.nz</p>