

FURTHER SUBMISSION ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGES 23 and 27 TO THE MACKENZIE DISTRICT PLAN

Form 6

Clause 8 First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

**TO: Mackenzie District Council
PO Box 52, Main Street
Fairlie 7949**

Attention: Mackenzie District Plan Change Submission

By email only: districtplan@mackenzie.govt.nz

Mackenzie District Plan Change Submission

Name of Submitter:

1 Lisburn Farms Limited (**LFL**)

Address: c/- Tavendale and Partners Limited
Level 3, Tavendale and Partners Centre
329 Durham Street North
PO Box 442
Christchurch 8140

Contact: Hayden and Lisa Watson / Johanna King

Phone: (03) 685 8229/ 021 917 140

Email: l.h.watson@farmside.co.nz / johanna.king@tp.co.nz

Proposals this further submission is on:

2 This is a further submission in support of or in opposition to various submissions made on Proposed Plan Changes 23 and 27 to the Mackenzie District Plan.

Submitter's interest in the proposals

3 LFL has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has, for the reasons given at paragraphs 7-13 of its original submission (dated 26 January 2024).

Further submission details

4 LFL seeks:

- a) the parts of the submissions it supports to be allowed in accordance with Appendix 1; and
- b) the parts of the submissions it opposes be disallowed in accordance with Appendix 1.

- 5 Alternately, LDL seeks that the proposed plan changes 23 and 27 be otherwise amended to address the concerns raised in this further submission and any consequential amendments.

Wish to be heard:

- 6 Do you wish to be heard in support of your further submission?

☒ Yes ☐ No

- 7 If others are making a similar further submission would you consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing?

☒ Yes ☐ No



Lisburn Farms Limited

Hayden and Lisa Watson / Johanna King

Date: 1 March 2024

Further submission – Plan Change 23					
Submitter	Parts of submission supported or opposed		Oppose/Support	Reasons	Decision(s) sought on the submission point(s)
	Point	Plan Provision			
Herman Frank Submitter number: PC23.06	6.04	NFL-R1	Oppose in full	LFL disagrees with the relief sought insofar as it requests no pastoral intensification or agricultural conversion within ONLs. Farming is entirely appropriate, and to be encouraged, in the GRUZ, and where extensive ONLs are proposed over existing pastoral farming and intensive farming operations, a blanket ban or discouragement of farming activities is not promoting sustainable management of natural and physical resources.	Disallow
	6.05	NFL-R5	Oppose in full	<p>LFL disagrees with the request that earthworks within an ONL be a non-complying activity.</p> <p>LFL also disagrees with the submitter's request to reduce the ONL Permitted Activity rule volume & area thresholds to 100m³ and 100m². Such low volumes are unreasonable and not supportive of farming in the GRUZ. As set out in LFL's original submission (at 23.37.12), the notified plan rules are unnecessarily burdensome enough on landowners, especially farmers who significantly rely on the ability to undertake earthworks for fencing, tracking, etc.</p>	Disallow
South Canterbury Province Federated Farmers of New Zealand Submitter number: PC23.07	27.22	NFL-P7	Support in full	LFL agrees with the requested relief to remove the word "traditional" from references to <i>traditional pastoral farming</i> in this Policy NFL-P7. The current phrasing limits farmers in the district to old, and potentially outdated, farming concepts and methods. By removing the word "traditional", farmers will be enabled to implement and explore new, modern, ideas and technologies involved in modern-day farming, without the policy framework discouraging same.	Allow
	27.26	NFL-R5.2	Support in full	LFL prefers the relief sought in its original submission (at 23.37.12) but in the alternative agrees with this requested relief to increase the area to 1,000m ² and reducing the timeframe to 12 months. To do so reflects what was previously in the draft chapter provisions and provides adequate flexibility for landowners.	Allow
	27.31	NFL-S1.1	Support in part	<p>LFL agrees with the submission insofar as it relates to increasing the height limit to 25 meters for grain silos.</p> <p>In respect of the submitter's request for a proposed height limit of 5 meters, LFL prefers the relief sought in its original submission (at 23.37.14), but in the alternative agrees with submission point 27.31. The proposed amendments allow for greater storage ability and increased efficiency for farming operations.</p>	Allow

	27.32	NFL-S2	Support in full	LFL agrees with the submission to increase the building footprint to 150m ² . For rural properties, most farm buildings will significantly exceed the notified building footprint of 50m ² and an increase to this figure provides enough size to construct meaningful structures.	Allow
Matthew and Victoria Simpson Submitter number: PC23.39	39.01	ONL	Support in full	LFL prefers the relief sought in its original submission (at 23.37.16) but in the alternative agrees that ONL 3 – Hunters Hills, Dalgety, Rollesby Range (Eastern Mackenzie) be drawn at 900 masl. Much like the submitter, LFL considers this a practical solution given the fencing already in place and the need to balance farming activities with landscape values in the area.	Allow
Milward Finlay Lobb Limited Submitter number: PC23.48	48.03	GRUZ-S1	Support in full	LFL agrees insofar as the submitter requests the removal of the 10ha minimal area required from GRUZ-S1(3)(c), to better recognise and preserve land use options for existing smaller titles.	Allow
	48.04	GRUZ-S1	Support in full	LFL agrees that NC activity status is too restrictive where compliance with GRUZ-S1 is not achieved. As such, it supports the requested change to DIS status.	Allow
Wolds Station Limited Submitter number: PC23.50	50.05	NFL-P7	Support in full	LFL agrees that the policy wording should be strengthened to better reflect and acknowledge the contribution farming makes to areas mapped as ONL.	Allow
Grampians Station Limited Submitter number: PC23.52	51.14	NFL-P11	Support in full	LFL agrees pasture maintenance is an important measure (including stock grazing) to halt the spread of wildings conifers.	Allow

Further submission – Plan Change 27					
Submitter	Parts of submission supported or opposed		Oppose/Support	Reasons	Decision(s) sought on the submission point(s)
	Point	Plan Provision			
Road Metals Company Limited Submitter number: 27.25.	25.02	SUB-S1.9	Support in full	LFL prefers the relief sought in its original submission (at 27.26.02) but in the alternative would support a R-DIS pathway being inserted for subdivision between 100ha and 200ha in ONL areas (outside of Te Manahuna / Mackenzie Basin ONL). Provision for an alternative consenting pathway enables councils to maintain control over subdivision while providing landowners with an appropriate framework to apply under.	Allow