Appendix A - Decisions on Submissions
Topic 2: Whole of Plan and Repeated Submissions

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
Whole of Plan Submissions				
S137.001 Hugh Gardyne	Whole of Plan	There is no benefit for council to continue this work until the government is clear on RMA reforms and the consequential regulation required by Councils. Delete Chapter 2 - Matters of National Significance (reference to Operative Plan) until new government decides on RMA reforms. Seeks a resolution of Council to write to the Minister of RMA reform to seek guidance on the time of revised legislation.	Rejected	
S66.001 Groundswell NZ	Whole of Plan	Pause the Gore District Plan until the failings off the RMA have been addressed and clarity around the NPS-IB and the RMA replacement the NBA. Refer to original submission for full details	Rejected	
S66.002 Groundswell NZ	Whole of Plan	If our submission for the Proposed Gore District Plan to be paused is not accepted, then our submission would be the sections relating to the RMA Section 6 zoning issues outlined in full submission paused. Failing that submission our third preference and submission would be for all Section 6 zonings, policies and related rules be removed altogether for failing to meet the purpose of the RMA. This includes the new SASM classification and policies. We submit natural, historic, and cultural values be protected through an alternative mechanism that is outcomes focused and supports and empowers property owners, rather than penalizing them. One alternative option is a non-statutory plan that sits outside the formal plan but is referenced as meeting the Councils RMA requirements, including Section 6. Groundswell NZ are promoting an environmental policy approach based on integrated and holistic outcomes and actions focused framework in a manner that addresses the environmental issues relevant to that property. A core component of this is advisors working in partnership with property owners to identify key environmental risks, threats and opportunities, and an action plan based on the most urgent priorities tailored to each individual property owners resources.	Rejected	
S3.114 Stoney Creek Station Limited S18.116 Reaby Downs Farm Ltd S19.116 Karen Temple S20.116 Sarah and Peter Barclay S24.116 Helen McIntosh S68.118 John Baynes S113.114 Trudy Bokser S116.114 Nathan Bokser S117.114 Greg Bokser S118.114 AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust S127.150 Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	Whole of Plan	Withdraw the requested provisions as outlined in the letter to the Chief Executive of Gore District Council dated 7 November 2023. Concerned about lack of consultation and that many of the more problematic provisions have immediate legal effect and therefore must be complied with until a decision is made on the PGDP.	Rejected	
FS31.002 Department of Conservation		*Disallow S3.114 Stoney Creek Station Limited. The D-G understands that small scale clearance may be required in relation to farming activities however would have concerns regarding the absence of any thresholds. The areas identified for SNAs contain*		

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
		significant indigenous biodiversity and so are of national importance (RMA Part 2, Section 6(c)) that require protection. Accordingly, the permitted activities within an SNA should occur within a much tighter threshold than outside of an SNA. As noted in the overview of the ECO chapter, SNAs are intended to be mapped within the plan as part of a future variation to the plan. This plan variation process will allow for consultation with tangata whenua, landowners and other interested parties. Decline the submission.		
S136.001 Jenny Campbell	Whole of Plan	All environmental decisions made in consultation with Tangata Whenua	Accepted in Part	
S136.002 Jenny Campbell	Whole of Plan	All environmental decisions be nature based solutions	Accepted in Part	
S136.003 Jenny Campbell	Whole of Plan	Every environmental decision and policy be made and viewed through a Climate Change lens.	Accepted in Part	
S136.004 Jenny Campbell	Whole of Plan	No new mines, no previous mines being re-opened. This improves the health of people & in particular old & people who are more susceptible to lung and breathing impacts from polluted air.	Rejected	
S136.005 Jenny Campbell	Whole of Plan	Restore habitat for all, native species which are often on the endangered list. These cover native plants which are in turn habitats for our endangered invertebrates, birds and fish	Accepted in Part	
S136.013 Jenny Campbell	Whole of Plan	Towns need upgraded infrastructure to ensure drains are up to standard to prevent discharges of sewage in to the environment & rivers in particular	Rejected	
S136.022 Jenny Campbell	Whole of Plan	Vegetation clearance needs to be done under rules e.g. exotic forests.	Rejected	
S136.023 Jenny Campbell	Whole of Plan	All new developments eg for housing, transport and industry need to be in appropriate places eg not close to rivers or other large water areas or run- off areas eg on steep slopes, by lakes, on drained wetlands, near estuaries.	Accepted in Part	
S138.007 Port Blakely Limited	Whole of Plan	That the Proposed Plan be rejected in its current form;	Accepted in Part	
S138.008 Port Blakely Limited	Whole of Plan	That the Proposed Plan be amended to reflect the issues raised in this submission;	Accepted in Part	
S138.010 Port Blakely Limited	Whole of Plan	That the relevant Proposed Plan objectives and policies be amended as required to support and implement the particular relief described above;	Accepted in Part	
S138.011 Port Blakely Limited	Whole of Plan	Such other relief as may be required to give effect to this submission, including alternative, consequential or necessary amendments to the Proposed Plan that address the matters raised by Port Blakely.	Accepted in Part	
S138.009 Port Blakely Limited	Whole of Plan	That the Proposed Plan be amended to incorporate the equivalent regulation of the NES-CF or otherwise amend or delete the rule so that the equivalent NES-CF regulation applies instead of the Proposed Plan rule;	Accepted in Part	

Appendix A - Decisions on Submissions
Topic 2: Whole of Plan and Repeated Submissions

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
S139.093 Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	Whole of Plan	Hokonui Rūnanga Inc supports all the provisions in the proposed plan as notified except for the amendments requested to the stated provisions, as set out in the submissions table and schedule and form part of the submission.	Accepted in Part	
S139.040 Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	Whole of Plan	Wherever possible the plan provisions should specify the particular effects of concern to mana whenua to ensure the plan provisions are clear and that appropriate effects are identified and assessed, including when Hokonui Rūnanga Inc may be an affected party. Amend references to 'Ngāi Tahu values' with more detailed description of particular effects to be avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Accepted in Part	
S139.091 Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	Whole of Plan	Wherever possible the plan provisions should specify the particular effects of concern to mana whenua to ensure the plan provisions are clear and that appropriate effects are identified and assessed, including when Hokonui Rūnanga Inc may be an affected party. Make consequential amendments to rules that refer to 'Ngai Tahu cultural values' by adding the words: "as identified in the objectives and policies for this zone and listed in MW2.3"	Accepted in Part	
FS22.050 Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates		*Allow S139.040, S139.091*		
S146.001 Southland District Council	Whole of Plan	SDC thanks Gore District Council for the opportunity to comment. SDC congratulates those involved for their excellent work and supports in part the proposed Plan, with some issues being discovered during review. No significant cross-boundary issues were identified, only possible differences in the NFL section were identified. The proposed District Plan will bring positive outcomes to Gore communities and the Southland region as a whole. Specific decisions requested are described in the specific sections of this document.	Noted. No relief sought	
S103.031 McNab Management Ltd	Whole of Plan	Supports all provisions in the proposed plan as notified except for the amendments requested	Accepted in Part	
S4.001 Susan Coulman	Whole of Plan	There is a current need for facilitating smaller footprint dwellings and the district plan can allow for and encourage these. It is one of the pillars of future home ownership. The now elderly, baby boom generation are for the most part downsizing their accommodation as they plan for the years ahead. The single dwelling on a large section is an outdated model, the future trend is towards better designed compact living. Allow for more than one dwelling on a property where there is servicing infrastructure either on-site or off-site. Allow for caravans and motorhomes without self-containment certification. Reduce the amount of space required to subdivide properties.	Accepted in Part	
S59.002 Adrienne Crispin	Whole of Plan	Less rules and restrictions. The Council and Government seem to be eroding our rights more and more with unworkable regulations, they should listen to the people more.	Rejected	
S68.004 John Baynes	Whole of Plan	The District Plan is a comprehensive document governing various aspects within the district, which may unintentionally contain errors or adverse effects. Recognising the	Accepted in Part	

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
		potential permanence of the Plan, there should be a mechanism for the council to address and modify identified conditions that require adjustment.		
S123.020 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Whole of Plan	Recommend including a hyperlink to the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (the Act) online where the Act is referred to, as has been added on page 183, throughout the GDP. A link to the Act would allow plan users ease of access and create awareness of the purpose and provisions of the Act, including any landowner responsibilities under the archaeological provisions.	Accepted in Part	
S123.029 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Whole of Plan	HNZPT advocates for robust provisions to be established to ensure that residential intensification will not be at the expense of Gore's historic heritage. The construction of a greater number, and potentially taller buildings close to a heritage structure could result in its heritage values being put at risk. This includes issues associated with construction, such as vibration, and potential long-term conservation and liveability problems associated with loss of sunlight, overshadowing and damp. Although development on the site of the heritage item may still be subject to resource consent requirements, permitted development on an adjacent property may have as detrimental an effect. Measures such as increased setbacks or reduced heights may assist in mitigating adverse effects on a neighbouring heritage item. HNZPT recommends that appropriate standards are applied to sites adjoining a scheduled historic heritage item or area under the District Plan, as historic heritage is a section 6 matter and also a qualifying matter under the NPS-UD.	Rejected	
S134.013 Andrea McMillan & Tony Harpur	Whole of Plan	All matters in the PDP relating to the WTP and buffer (and any ancillary matters) are withdrawn from the PDP; all associated objectives, policies and rules that relate WTFs and buffers are amended to reflect their removal.	Accepted in Part	
S149.032 Yrless	Whole of Plan	Expresses concern relating to uncertainty of RMA reform, the integrity of the process and lack of consultation. Integrating the Gore District Subdivision and Land Development Bylaw into the plan would provide a single place for the public to access information about development constraints, two approaches is confusing and not best practice. The zoning introduced is too complex and of limited utility given the size of the district. Amend with lesser number of zones.	Rejected	
FS22.055 Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates		*Disallow S149.032 Oppose - while we agree that it is redundant to replicate (or sometimes contradict) that information in both the Subdivision and Land Development Bylaw and the District Plan, we believe the best practice approach (as undertaken by most councils) is to remove engineering standards from the district plan as they are engineering matters not resource consent matters. The proposed approach would require resource consent (adding extra cost and taking up council and applicants time for no benefit) for many things which are not planning matters at all but simple matters of engineering detail. Incorporating that detail into the district plan also means any amendment of engineering standards (including design practices, changes of approved*		

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
		material standards, references to other national standards etc) would require a formal district plan change to make amendments.		
S149.029 Yrless	Whole of Plan	Amend Residential, Commercial, and Mixed Use zones to revert to a simple approach.	Rejected	
S152.002 Nigel Cowburn	Whole of Plan	The whole plan lacks any meaningful treatment of modern Best Management stormwater Practice e.g. Sustainable Drainage aka SuDS, LID, or Sponge City.	Accepted in Part	
S152.011 Nigel Cowburn	Whole of Plan	Plan rules need to be prescriptive and to function needs to be able to survive a lowest tender build (comment in relation to permeability controls). Forbid lowest tender acceptance and use NZTA's tender assessment criteria.	Rejected	
S152.017 Nigel Cowburn	Whole of Plan	The overview is more wordy than it needs to be, and makes it hard to read, in particular in relation to natural values. Riparian aspects are out of date. happy to see that plant species in flood control areas allows for the use of exotics as this is an engineering issue, and setting it to native only (as in some other jurisdictions) would impede successful design. Variable width riparian should be emphasised through text as it would put the function where it needs to be (tends to be headwaters and gully heads) and free up productive land. Retain allowance for use of exotics in flood control areas	Rejected	
S156.001 New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	Whole of Plan	S32 Report does not provide rationale and justification for the approach taken to the setback rules for agricultural aviation.	Accepted	
FS5.1 Hamish Weir FS18.1 NZ Helicopter Association		Allow S156.001 NZ Agricultural Aviation Association		
S3.117 Stoney Creek Station Ltd S18.119 Reaby Downs Farm Ltd S19.119 Karen Temple S20.119 Sarah and Peter Barclay S24.119 Helen McIntosh S68.121 John Baynes S113.117 Trudy Bokser S116.117 Nathan Bokser S117.117 Greg Bokser S118.117 AW+ JA Johnston Family Trust S127.153 Peters Farm Ltd Karen Peters	Whole of Plan	Amend as per submission. The provisions in general fail to recognise the presence of established farming activities within the district that have low environmental effects yet provide significant social, cultural and economic benefits. Farming in particular is subject to significant increases in the level of restriction when compared with other land uses, and subject to unworkable provisions that have been developed without input from the farming community. These restrictions are particularly restrictive in ONLs and are not practical for farming activities and creates uncertainty and cost to rural landholders that is not proportionate to the potential environmental effects. Amend as per submission.	Accepted in Part	
FS31.003 Department of Conservation	Whole of Plan	*Disallow S3.117 The D-G understands that one of the principal functions of the rural environment is to provide for productive rural activities, however the Council are also required to identify and protect outstanding natural landscapes and features as required under Part 2, s6(c) of the RMA.*		
S101.103 Transpower New Zealand Limited	Whole of Plan	Support in part the PDP as it relates to the National Grid, and particularly the extent to which the provisions of the PDP give effect to the NPS on Electricity Transmission 2008. The specific details of Transpowers submission, and decisions sought in relation to the	Accepted in Part	

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
		PDP are set out in Appendix A of the submission. It is Transpower's submission that the Proposed District Plan goes a long way to achieving the statutory requirement set out above but that further amendments to the Proposed District Plan are required.		
S68.001 John Baynes	Whole of Plan	Supports the Stoney Creek Station Ltd submission verbatim. Has read the submission and supports it in full, considers it more efficient to support it than writing own submission.	Accepted in Part	
S68.002 John Baynes	Whole of Plan	Adopt content of the Federated Farmers of New Zealand submission as expert advice.	Accepted in Part	
S68.003 John Baynes	Whole of Plan	Support the Federated Farmers of New Zealand submission.	Accepted in Part	
S115.001 Kevin Robertson	Whole of Plan	Supports Federated Farmers Submission Practical and common-sense ideas are needed to achieve successful outcomes	Accepted in Part	
General Submissions on Issues				
S60.178 Ronald Crispin S68.296 John Baynes S115.176 Kevin Robertson S126.175 Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand S143.187 Rural Ratepayers Group S148.188 Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	SASM	The SASM chapter employs an approach whereby the entire District is considered a 'site'. The s 32 report refers to a trigger approach, with resource consent applications acting as 'triggers' for the Council to consider the impact on Ngāi Tahu cultural values. SFF acknowledges the Māori view of guardianship over land, areas of interest and landscapes. However, the rights of landowners are paramount and must be prioritised. The plan's approach to requiring assessment against cultural values for consents for normal farming operations will only drive conflict as it regulates and restricts even the most minor activities. See Appendix A for complete submission. We have assessed the Plan and identified that there are 91 rules or standards which include a matter of discretion and/or control as assessment against Ngāi Tahu cultural values . We assume that the Council considers all of these 91 rules/standards as 'high risk' and therefore requiring assessment against cultural values. In this respect, we feel that the s 32 report has not accurately captured the council's intent to not hinder farming operations by triggering cultural assessment for day- to-day primary production activities.	Accepted in Part	
FS20.021 Hokonui Rūnanga Inc.		*Disregard S126.175. The submitters reasoning the private property rights are paramount is erroneous in law; and will not achieve the purpose of the RMA or give effect to the Southland Regional Policy Statement*		
S139.039 Hokonui Rūnanga Inc	SASM	Mana whenua elected not to identify 'sites of cultural significance' in the plan because mana whenua have an enduring relationship with all of the District. All whenua and wai has whakapapa, history, mauri and meaning for mana whenua. Identifying sites as culturally significant implies other areas are not. Mana whenua determine which land uses may be appropriate in any situation considering matters such as whakapapa, natural capital, relationship with other areas in a broader cultural landscape, past and current land uses, mauri of the area and effects of the proposed activity on mauri. However, there are some policies in the plan that refer to the effects of activities on 'Sites of Cultural Significance.' Delete all references to 'sites of cultural significance' and replace with 'or	Accepted in Part	

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
		significant effects on the values mana whenua associate with the area'. Work with Hokonui Rūnanga Inc on a variation and guidance from a mana whenua perspective.		
FS5.9 Hamish Weir	SASM	*Disregard S139.039 in part. Submitter is concerned that this will result in consultation for all Resource Consents which will place a significant cost burden on applicants and the Rūnanga. . Defining the relevant sites would give applicants clarity and restrict consultation to appropriate matters*		
FS30.038 Transpower NZ Ltd		*Allow S139.039. Allow the submission to the extent that a variation is developed to address culturally significant sites.*		
FS26.001 Mercury Ltd		*Allow S139.039. Mercury support Hokonui Rūnanga Inc approach to Mana whenua determining which land uses may be appropriate considering matters such as whakapapa, natural capital, relationship with other areas in a broader cultural landscape, past and current land uses, mauri of the area and effects of the proposed activity on mauri.*		
S60.183 Ronald Crispin S68.301 John Baynes S115.181 Kevin Robertson S126.180 Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand S143.192 Rural Ratepayers Group S148.193 Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	Existing Use Rights	The Plan communicates the RMA requirements regarding existing use rights, as per s 10 and 10A. However, we find the application of both 'existing use rights' and 'lawfully established' to be inconsistent throughout the Plan with neither term being defined.	Accepted in Part	
S126.179 Southland Federated Farmers of New Zealand S60.182 Ronald Crispin S148.192 Alistair & Bernadette Hunt S143.191 Rural Ratepayers Group S115.180 Kevin Robertson S68.300 John Baynes	Financial Contributions	The Efficiency and Effectiveness Report 2022 recommends the ability to collect financial contributions be incorporated into the District Plan. SFF strongly supports the use of financial contributions to fund infrastructure. The concept of 'growth pays for growth' is relevant because in the instance where financial contributions are not in place it is farmers who pay the majority share of infrastructure as a major contributor to rates. A targeted financial contribution system ensures that developers pay their fair share towards new infrastructure, for example as growth occurs in greenfield areas.	Rejected	
S140.014 Robina Johnston		Financial contributions should offset future costs in the specific location of the activity, further work needed on what is appropriate and consideration should be given of commercial vs non-commercial activities. Payment should be in part at key steps.	Rejected	
S69.008 Ian Davidson- Watts		The District Plan is a valuable tool to provide for well planned and executed growth and development in a sustainable way. Supports the overall objectives and policies of the plan that values important natural and cultural assets and manages development. Concerned at the current lack of development contributions policy. New development without financial contributions places extra burden on existing ratepayers for maintaining and improving infrastructure.	Rejected	

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
FS22.054 Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates		Disallow in part S69.008 Oppose (in part) - while development contributions may potentially be appropriate if maintained at a low enough level (relative to land values and construction costs) that they do not stifle development, Gore has had problems in the past with development being stifled by excessive development/financial contributions which were out of proportion to relatively low property values, making development unviable and preventing growth. It is worth considering that new property development typically results in more rate-paying property contributing to infrastructure etc.		
FS5.6 Hamish Weir		Disallow in part S69.008 While I agree with Ian's concerns around cost falling on rate payers, I am concerned that this will considerably reduce subdivision consents for a period of time until all those consented without contributions are given effect to. This lag will cause a supply restriction which will put upward pressure on property values. I would request that any Policy is formulated on a study of the current costs to rate payer of no contributions. I suspect that the increase in number of rate payers across the district is offsetting these costs. Specific consideration should be given to all of these matters before any Policies are implemented.		
S60.184 Ronald Crispin S68.302 John Baynes S115.182 Kevin Robertson S126.181 Southland Federated Farmers of NZ S143.193 Rural Ratepayers Group S148.194 Alistair & Bernadette Hunt	Wellbeing	Throughout the Plan, 'well-being' is referred to as wellbeing. Under both the Local Government Act 2002 and the Resource Management Act 1991 this is captured as 'well-being'. The Plan should align with the legislation. Change wellbeing to <u>well-being</u>	Accepted	Yes
S136.011 Jenny Campbell	Wilding Trees	Tend to produce wildings over adjacent native forest & farm land. Planting of exotics must not be given resource consent. e.g., Pinus contorta, Pinus - other species, firs, eucalyps. Decrease the number of pine plantings & strictly adhere to banning planting on steep slopes as well as requiring each company to chip all waste & slash at each logging site. Instead encourage planting of natives encouraging diversity of species.		
S85.001 Environment Southland	Wilding Trees	Exotic wilding tree species have the potential to cause widespread adverse ecological, amenity, economic and cultural effects. Establish a new chapter similar to chapter 34 of the QLDC PDP. Douglas Fir and other wilding species outlined in the QLDC chapter should be prohibited from being planted in the Gore District		
FS31.001 Department of Conservation		*Support S85.001 Environment Southland. NZ's Wilding Conifer Management Strategy aims to prevent the spread of wilding conifers by 2030 and identifies the role of Territorial Authorities to establish appropriate rules in district plans to ensure that landowners avoid high risk plantings in high spread areas. Any provisions proposed would need to exclude commercial forestry which is managed under the NES for commercial forestry 2023.*		
FS11.006 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		*Support S85.001 Environment Southland. Wilding plants have the potential to damage known and unknown archaeological sites. It is preferable that the planting of exotic species is avoided at archaeological sites and protection is provided from future wilding.*		

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
		HNZPT also recommends that the effects of wilding exotic trees on archaeology are managed through an additional chapter in the District Plan.		
FS5.2 Hamish Weir		*Support S85.001 Environment Southland in part. I support establishment of exotic forestry in locations where they do not replace productive rural activities, can suppress weed species and produce timber. A balance needs to be struck between allowing forestry in appropriate locations without resource consents and preventing entire productive farms being converted into 'carbon farms'. Carbon farming should be a prohibited activity in my view and all trees should be planted with a view to harvesting.*		
FS20.006 Hokonui Runanga Inc		*Support S85.001 Environment Southland in part. Wilding spread needs to be managed to achieve the purpose of the Act.*		
FS10.005 Port Blakely Limited		*Oppose S85.001 Environment Southland Unnecessary duplication, wilding pine is already regulated by the NES-CF and the Southland Regional Pest Management Plan.*		
S99.027 Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	Non-Complying Default Rules	A majority of the zone chapters have rules stating that "any activities not listed" are non-complying activities". This is rather severe and a significant change in approach from the ODP which provides a discretionary activity status. Amend those rules stating that "any activities not listed" are non- complying activities to be discretionary activities.	Rejected	
S147.026 New Zealand Defence Force		Zone rules have a default non-complying activity status when it is not a specified activity. This is considered unnecessary, particularly where activities are of low scale and may have minor effects and amend to Discretionary	Rejected	
FS5.10, FS 5.8 Hamish Weir		*Support S99.027 Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates and S147.026 New Zealand Defence Force. Discretionary is the appropriate status*		
FS29.002, FS29.001 Silver Fern Farms Limited		*Support S99.027 Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates and S147.026 New Zealand Defence Force. Non-complying default activity status for unspecified activities may not be appropriate in all circumstances. Needs a more nuanced approach.*		
FS26.003 Mercury Ltd		*Support S99.027 Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates. Supports the approach in the operative Plan, which defaults to a discretionary activity status for activities not listed.*		
FS21.002, FS21.001 Yrless Limited		*Support S99.027 Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates and S147.026 New Zealand Defence Force. Applying a non-complying status to an activity can attract significant costs for activities that have minor/less than minor environmental effects. Amend the plan to limit non- complying status to those activities requiring that level of control.*		
FS22.048 Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates		*Allow S147.026 New Zealand Defence Force. Support - we agree that the activity status for non specified activities should be discretionary, as non-complying is an impractically high test to impose for activities GDC have not yet considered.*		
S101.023 Transpower New Zealand Limited	Notes	INFR: district plan must give effect to any National Policy Statement (NPS) and Section 44A of the RMA, directs local authorities to ensure that there are no duplications or conflicts between the provisions of a National Environmental Standard (NES) and a proposed plan ~~National Environmental Standard (NES)~~. NES's must be observed and	Rejected	

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
		enforced by local authorities. Section 43B of the RMA directs that a NES prevails over District Plan rules unless a NES expressly ~~stated~~ states that it does not. The National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission 2008 must be given effect to in respect of District Plan provisions that recognise and provide for the National Grid; manage the effects of the National Grid and manage the effects of other activities on the National Grid. The Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009 include a suite of provisions that provide for the operation, maintenance and upgrading of existing transmission lines. These provisions prevail over any similar provisions in the District Plan.		
S101.061 Transpower New Zealand Limited		NFL: mend Note 1 as follows: "The provisions in this chapter apply in addition to the provisions of the other chapters in the District Plan and the plan should be read as a whole. This chapter also implements other chapters in the District Plan that do not have specific rules such as Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori and Mana Whenua. Infrastructure activities are provided for in the Infrastructure Chapter and the rules in this chapter do not apply to infrastructure activities.	Rejected	
S101.078 Transpower New Zealand Limited		LLRZ: Amend Note 1 as follows: "The provisions in this chapter apply in addition to the provisions of the other chapters in the District Plan and the plan should be read as a whole. This chapter also implements other chapters in the District Plan that do not have specific rules such as Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori and Mana Whenua. Infrastructure activities are provided for in the Infrastructure Chapter and the rules in this chapter do not apply to infrastructure activities."	Rejected	
S101.081 Transpower New Zealand Limited		GRZ: Amend Note 1 as follows: "The provisions in this chapter apply in addition to the provisions of the other chapters in the District Plan and the plan should be read as a whole. This chapter also implements other chapters in the District Plan that do not have specific rules such as Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori and Mana Whenua. Infrastructure activities are provided for in the Infrastructure Chapter and the rules in this chapter do not apply to infrastructure activities."	Rejected	
S101.084 Transpower New Zealand Limited		GRUZ: mend Note 1 as follows: "The provisions in this chapter apply in addition to the provisions of the other chapters in the District Plan and the plan should be read as a whole. This chapter also implements other chapters in the District Plan that do not have specific rules such as Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori and Mana Whenua. Infrastructure activities are provided for in the Infrastructure Chapter and the rules in this chapter do not apply to infrastructure activities.	Rejected	
S101.087 Transpower New Zealand Limited		RLZ: Amend Note 1 as follows: "The provisions in this chapter apply in addition to the provisions of the other chapters in the District Plan and the plan should be read as a whole. This chapter also implements other chapters in the District Plan that do not have specific rules such as Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori and Mana Whenua. Infrastructure activities are provided for in the Infrastructure Chapter and the rules in this chapter do not apply to infrastructure activities.	Rejected	

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
S101.089 Transpower New Zealand Limited		GIZ: Amend Note 1 as follows: "The provisions in this chapter apply in addition to the provisions of the other chapters in the District Plan and the plan should be read as a whole. This chapter also implements other chapters in the District Plan that do not have specific rules such as Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori and Mana Whenua. Infrastructure activities are provided for in the Infrastructure Chapter and the rules in this chapter do not apply to infrastructure activities.	Rejected	
S101.091 Transpower New Zealand Limited		FDZ: Amend Note 1 as follows: "The provisions in this chapter apply in addition to the provisions of the other chapters in the District Plan and the plan should be read as a whole. This chapter also implements other chapters in the District Plan that do not have specific rules such as Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori and Mana Whenua. Whilst temporary events are provided for in this Chapter, the remaining Temporary Activities rule apply. Infrastructure activities are provided for in the Infrastructure Chapter and the rules in this chapter do not apply to infrastructure activities." Amend Note 1 to include: "Rule INFR-R7 applies to activities and development near the National Grid.	Rejected	
Repeated Submissions				
S77.002, S77.003, S77.004, S77.005, S77.006, S77.007, S77.008, S77.009, S77.010, S77.011, S77.012, S77.013, S77.014, S77.015, S77.016, S77.017, S77.018 New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association	Relocatable Buildings	Additional provisions sought: LLRZ, GRZ, MRZ, GRUZ, RLZ, SETZ, NCZ, LCZ, MUZ, TCZ, LIZ, GIZ, SARZ, AIRPZ, MPZ, CCZ, FDZ Permitted activity performance standards and criteria for relocation of second hand buildings: a. Any relocated building intended for use as a dwelling must have previously been designed, built and used as a dwelling. b. A building pre-inspection report shall accompany the application for a building consent for the destination site. That report is to identify all reinstatement works that are to be completed to the exterior of the building. c. The building shall be located on permanent foundations approved by building consent, no later than 2 months of the building being moved to the site. d. All other reinstatement work required by the building inspection report and the building consent to reinstate the exterior of any relocated dwelling shall be completed within 12 months of the building being delivered to the site. Without limiting (c) (above) reinstatement work is to include connections to all infrastructure services and closing in and ventilation of the foundations. e. The proposed owner of the relocated building must certify to the Council that the reinstatement work will be completed within the 12-month period.	Accepted	Yes

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
		Restricted Discretionary activity status for relocated buildings that do not meet the permitted activity status standards. OR The inclusion of the words "new or relocated buildings" to the activity rules for residential activities/units. Reason: "Residential Activity and Residential Units" is provided for as a permitted activity where compliance with standards is achieved. However, standards within the PGDP only refer to buildings that are "new". The approach used is supported on the basis of the decision of Environment Court - New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Inc v The Central Otago District Council.		
FS14.024, FS14.039, FS14.040, FS14.041, FS14.042, FS14.043, FS14.044, FS14.045, FS14.046, FS14.047, FS14.048, FS14.049, FS14.050, FS14.051, FS14.052, FS14.053 NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi		Disallow S77.002, S77.003, S77.004, S77.005, S77.006, S77.007, S77.008, S77.009, S77.010, S77.011, S77.012, S77.013, S77.014, S77.015, S77.016. S77.017, S77.018 New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Relocated second-hand dwellings may be used for a noise sensitive activity. The permitted activity performance standards and criteria listed by NZHHA in its submission does not give any certainty that a relocated second-hand dwelling will be able to comply with the requirements of NOISE-S3, whereby that standard seeks to manage noise impacts on the noise sensitive activity. The New Zealand Transport Agency is concerned that the proposed provision by NZHHA would enable second hand dwellings, that do not have acoustic treatment that complies with NOISE-S3 requirements, to be relocated to within a proximity of the state highway network where noise sensitive activities undertaken within that dwelling would be adversely impacted by noise arising from the operation of the highway. We suggest that the performance standards proposed by NZHHA either include measures to ensure compliance with NOISE-S3, otherwise we consider that noise effects may not be appropriately managed. In its original submission, the New Zealand Transport Agency sought amendments to rule NOISE-R7 to expressly include relocated buildings used for noise sensitive activities to manage noise impacts on activities relocating to within a proximity of the road network where they could be adversely impacted by noise generated from the use of the existing state highway network.		
FS28.063, FS28.070 Kainga Ora		Allow in part S77.003, S77.004 New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Kāinga Ora supports the recognition of relocatable buildings as a permitted activity, however, considers that a more efficient change to include relocatable buildings is to amend the definition for Residential Activity and Residential Units to include relocatable buildings and all references to 'new' removed from the relevant rules.		

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
S110.049 (GRUZ), S110.051 (RLZ), S110.081 (AIRPZ), S110.070 (SARZ), S110.078 (NOSZ), S110.065 (GIZ), S110.058 (LIZ), S110.019 (INFR) Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	Setbacks from SNAs	Additional Standard sought Setbacks from a Significant Natural Area (all activities) Permitted activity 1. Any building or structure is set back 10 metres from the closest boundary of any Significant Natural Area Activity status where compliance is not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. Effects on Significant Natural Area values and indigenous biodiversity values. 2. Impact of the activity on any rare or threatened indigenous species or taonga species and how any potential impact could be avoided remedied or mitigated. 3. The activity has a functional need to be located in the area.	Rejected	
FS25.135 Stoney Creek Station Ltd		*Disallow S110.049 Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc*		
FS17.087,FS17.090 Federated Farmers		*Disallow S110.049, S110.051 Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc. Under the PDP, the definition of 'fence' 'means any structure'. It is not reasonable for farmers to apply for resource consent if they wish to fence off a SNA at less than 10m from the SNA. Fencing SNAs provide many positive benefits for protecting the SNA.*		
FS31.021 Department of Conservation		Supports S110.070 Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc		
FS5.166, FS5.190, FS5.182, FS5.176 Hamish Weir		*Reject Submissions S110.049 , S110.078, S110.065, S110.058 Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc*		
FS30.069 Transpower NZ Ltd *FS21.066 Yrless Ltd* *FS24.023 Contact Energy Ltd*		*S110.019 Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc*		
S110.059 (GIZ-P4) S110.052 (LIZ-P3) Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	Ecological Corridors	Add to Policies: Matters of discretion 3. Cause adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity or ecological corridors.	Accepted in Part	
S110.060, S110.061, S110.062, S110.063, S110.064 Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc		GIZ-R1 – R5 Add: 3. There is no more than minor adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity or ecological corridors.		
FS5.177, FS5.178, FS5.179, FS5.180, FS5.181 Hamish Weir *FS29.058, FS29.060, FS29.061, FS29.062, FS29.063 Silver Fern Farms Ltd*		*Disallow S110.060, S110.061, S110.062, S110.063, S110.064 Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc*		
S110.053, S110.054, S110.055, S110.056, S110.057 Royal Forest and Bird Society of NZ Inc	Ecological Corridors	LIZ-R10 – R14 Add: the extent and scale of adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity or ecological corridors.		

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
S124.048, LLRZ-S2; S124.068, GRZ S124.099, MRZ; S124.116, GRUZ S124.128, RLZ; S124.139, SETZ S124.161, NCZ; S124.182, LCZ S124.202, MUZ; S124.225, TCZ S124.246, LIZ; S124.261, GIZ S124.262, NOSZ; S124.263, SARZ S124.275, AIRPZ; S124.291, MPZ S124.300, CCZ; S124.311, FDZ S124.317, DEV; S124.316,DEV2 In excess of 200 submissions were also lodged to rules referred to in chapters above seeking reference to the new standard sought in each chapter	Services and SNZ PAS 4509:2008	Amend as follows: 1. Where available any residential unit and buildings for non-residential activities shall be connected to a Council reticulated water supply. 2. Where available any residential unit and buildings for non-residential activities shall be connected to a Council reticulated wastewater network. 3. Where Council reticulated water supply is unavailable, any residential unit and buildings for non-residential activities must: (a) be connected to a community drinking water supply; or (b) be connected to a private drinking water supply; or (c) store 45,000 litres of potable water on-site from another source. 4. Where Council reticulated wastewater is unavailable, any residential unit and buildings for non-residential activities must: (a) be provided with an on-site wastewater treatment and disposal system. 5. All developments must have an independent water supply for firefighting that is compliant with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice'. Fire and Emergency support the provision for residential units and buildings to either be connected to a council reticulated water supply or if a water supply is unavailable, buildings and units must be connected to private drinking water supply or store 45,000l litres of potable water on-site from another source. However, Fire and Emergency seek that provision within the servicing standard is given to firefighting water supply in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008	Accepted in Part	
FS20.017, FS20.014, FS20.046, FS20.048, FS20.049, FS20.050, FS20.051, FS20.052, FS20.053, FS20.015 Hokonui Rūnanga Inc		A blanket rule is not appropriate. Support changes to rules in part but note that not all MPZ will have buildings.		
S124.027, SUB-R1; S124.028, SUB-R5; S124.029, SUB-R6; S124.030, SUB-R7 Fire and Emergency NZ	Services and SNZ PAS 4509:2008	Amend as follows: 9. Provision for servicing, including water supply, firefighting water supply in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008, wastewater treatment and disposal, stormwater design and disposal, electricity and telecommunications. Fire and Emergency support the requirement to have the provision for servicing including firefighting water supply. However, Fire and Emergency seek that specific firefighting water supply is provided for in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice - SNZ PAS 4508:2008.	Rejected	
FS5.89, FS5.100, FS5.107 Hamish Weir		Opposes S124.027, S124.028, S124.030 Specific standards that could out date should not be included		
S124.067, GRZ-R13; S124.088, MRZ-R13 S124.112, GRUZ-R19; S124.124, RLZ-R12 S124.156, NCZ-R12; S124.178, LCZ-R16 S124.220, TCZ-R16; S124.298, CCZ-R7	Emergency Servies Facility	Emergency service facilities should be provided for as a permitted activity which will be subject to the performance standards.	Rejected	

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
S124.318, LLRZ-RX; S124.047, LLRZ-R9 Fire and Emergency NZ				
S124.069, GRZ-S3; S124.095, MRZ-S2 S124.115, GRUZ-S8; S124.125, RLZ-S2 S124.140, SETZ-S3; S124.158, NCZ-S3 S124.180, LCZ-S4; S124.197, MUZ-S1 S124.223, TCZ-S4; S124.240, LIZ-S1 S124.273, AIRPZ-S2; S124.287, MPZ-S1 S124.299, CCZ-S1 Fire and Emergency NZ	Exemption from Standards	Amend as follows: Excluding emergency service facilities. Fire stations are typically single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are usually able to comply with the height standards in a district plan. However, as part of Fire and Emergency fire station operational requirements many stations include a multipurpose tower or pole between 12-15m in height. Fire and Emergency towers are typically either lattice towers that can support a siren, aerials and hose drying or are platform towers that can support all the above plus be used for firefighter training. Similarly, poles can support sirens, aerials and hose drying activities. Examples of these structures are attached as Appendix B. The frequency of towers or poles being required at stations is generally dependent on locational and operational requirements of each station. Some existing fire station sites across the country have aerial and sirens mounted on the roof of the building which is not ideal, and Fire and Emergency are slowly rectifying this with the construction of towers and poles. Ideally all stations would have a tower or structure. Fire and Emergency therefore seek an exemption from the height standard for emergency service facilities which encompasses communication towers and poles.	Rejected	
S124.050 LLRZ-S4; S124.070 GRZ-S4 S124.096 MRZ-S3; S124.141 SETZ-S4 S124.157 NCZ-S2; S124.179 LCZ-S3 S124.288 MPZ-S2; S124.198 MUZ-S2 S124.012 INFR-S3 Fire and Emergency NZ		Amend as follows: Except that: This standard does not apply to communication towers and poles for emergency service facilities. Fire and Emergency seeks an exemption for communication towers and poles regarding height in relation to boundary standards.	Rejected	
S124.114 GRUZ-S5; S124.126 RLZ-S4 S124.289 MPZ-S4; S124.320 FDZ-S3 Fire and Emergency NZ		Amend as follows: Except that Emergency service facilities are exempt from this rule. Fire and Emergency request that emergency service facilities (as proposed) are excluded from the minimum setback from road boundary rule. Where are setback is greater than 8-10m, this will result in increased civil costs, land parcel size and can create fire separation issue at rear boundaries The exclusion would support the logistical and operational requirements of Fire and Emergency	Rejected	
S124.113 GRUZ-S2; S124.127 RLZ-S6 S124.290 MPZ-S6; S124.310 FDZ-S2 Fire and Emergency NZ		Amend Except that emergency service facilities are exempt from this rule. Fire and Emergency note that the minimum building coverage for a volunteer fire station is 250m^2 and up to 1500m^2 for a career fire station. Fire and Emergency are concerned that 1.5% building coverage for per site would not provide for emergency service facilities should they need to construct a new fire station in the GRUZ in future. Typically, Fire and Emergency purchase land from 2000m2 to 4000m2 to facilitate the construction and operation of new emergency service facilities. Therefore 1.5% building coverage on a 2000m2 site would provide for 30m2 of building coverage. This would not facilitate a volunteer fire station or a career fire station and would limit their ability to expand in future. It is requested that this rule is amended for emergency services facilities in the GRUZ.	Rejected	

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
S124.160 NCZ-S10 Fire and Emergency NZ		Amend as follows: Note: Emergency service facilities are exempt from this rule Emergency service facilities operate 24 hours a day. As such the restriction pertaining to hours of operation is not suitable for emergency service facilities. Fire and Emergency therefore seek and exemption for emergency service facilities to provide for the logistical and operational requirements for Fire and Emergency.	Rejected	
S132.109, LLRZ-R3; S132.117, GRZ-R1; S132.118, GRZ-R2; S132.120, GRZ-S5; S132.123, MRZ-R1; S132.124, MRZ-R2; S132.125, MRZ-R3; S132.126, MRZ-R4; S132.127, MRZ-R5; S132.128, MRZ-R6; S132.129, MRZ-R8; S132.130, MRZ-R9; S132.131, MRZ-R10; S132.132, MRZ-R11; S132.133, MRZ-R12; S132.134, MRZ-R13; S132.140, GRUZ-R1; S132.141, GRUZ-R2; S132.142, GRUZ-R3; S132.143, GRUZ-R4; S132.144, GRUZ-R8; S132.145, GRUZ-R9; S132.146, GRUZ-R10; S132.147, GRUZ-R13; S132.148, GRUZ-R14; S132.149, GRUZ-S4; S132.152, RLZ-R2; S132.153, RLZ-R4; S132.154, RLZ-R5; S132.155, RLZ-R8; S132.156, RLZ-R9; S132.157, RLZ-S4; S132.159, SETZ-P2; S132.162, SETZ-R1; S132.163, SETZ-R9; S132.164, SETZ-R2; S132.165, SETZ-R4; S132.166, SETZ-R6; S132.167, SETZ-R7; S132.168, SETZ-R10; S132.169, SETZ-S5; S132.171, NCZ-R1; S132.172, NCZ-R2; S132.173, NCZ-R3; S132.174, NCZ-R4; S132.175, NCZ-R5; S132.176, NCZ-R6; S132.177, NCZ-R7; S132.178, NCZ-R8; S132.179, NCZ-R9; S132.180, NCZ-S4; S132.183, LCZ-R1; S132.184, LCZ-R2; S132.185, LCZ-R3; S132.186, LCZ-R4; S132.187, LCZ-R5; S132.188, LCZ-R6; S132.189, LCZ-R7; S132.190, LCZ-R8; S132.191, LCZ-R9; S132.192, LCZ-R11; S132.193, LCZ-R13; S132.194, LCZ-R14; S132.196, LCZ-S5; S132.212, MUZ-R11; S132.213, MUZ-S3; S132.216, TCZ-R1; S132.217, TCZ-R2; S132.218, TCZ-R3; S132.219, TCZ-R4;	Setback from Rail Corridor	KiwiRail seeks an amendment to the rule to insert a "no build" setback within 5m of the railway corridor for new buildings and structures on sites adjoining the railway corridor. This is to ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing access to the railway corridor, minimizing the risks of physical interference with railway operations and avoiding health and safety hazards for residents. Amend provisions as follows: Where: Any new or extended building or structure complies with (*relevant standards* as listed in each submission).	Accepted in Part	Yes

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
S132.220, TCZ-R5; S132.221, TCZ-R6; S132.222, TCZ-R11; S132.223, TCZ-R7; S132.227, TCZ-S5; S132.230, LIZ-S4; S132.233, GIZ-P5; S132.242, LLRZ-R1; S132.243, LLRZ-R2; S132.244, GRZ-R3; S132.245, GRZ-R4; S132.246, GRZ-R5; S132.247, GRZ-R6; S132.248, GRZ-R8; S132.249, GRZ-R9; S132.250, GRZ-R10; S132.251, GRZ-R11; S132.252, GRZ-R12; S132.253, GRZ-R13; S132.254, NCZ-R11; S132.255, NCZ-R12; S132.256, NCZ-R13 KiwiRail Ltd				
S132.114, LLRZ; S132.119, GRZ; S132.135, MRZ; S132.150, GRUZ; S132.158, RLZ; S132.170, SETZ; S132.181, NCZ; S132.197, LCZ; S132.214, MUZ; S132.228, TCZ; S132.231, LIZ; S132.235, GIZ; S132.236, SARZ KiwiRail Ltd	Setback from Rail Corridor	Additional provisions sought: KiwiRail is concerned that without appropriate setback requirements, there is significant risk of adverse health and safety effects impacting people locating in proximity to the railway corridor. KiwiRail recommend that the following standard be applied over all zones for setback from rail corridor. Requests new standard LLRZ-S10 be added. Amend as follows: setback from rail corridor All activities 1. Any Building or structure must not be located within a 5m setback from a boundary with a rail corridor. Activity status where compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary Matters of discretion: 1. The safe and efficient operation of the rail network. 2. Compatibility with the surrounding environment. 3. The reason for the reduced setback.	Accepted in Part	Yes
FS27.026 Alliance Group Limited FS29.057 Silver Fern Farms Limited FS5.153 Hamish Weir		Oppose S132.233, GIZ-P5 Oppose S132.233, GIZ-P5 Oppose S132.119, GRZ		
S132.233 KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	Setback from Rail Corridor	Amend GIZ-P5 as follows: Require a level of on-site amenity, particularly at zone interfaces, consistent with the purpose of the zone by: .5. requiring appropriate setbacks from the rail network that do not impede on its safe, efficient operation.	Rejected	
FS27.026 Alliance Group Ltd *FS29.057 Silver Fern Farms Ltd*		*Disallow S132.233 KiwiRail Holdings Ltd. Policy GIZ-P5 addresses amenity and there is no clear effects-based need for a setback from rail lines in this regard.*		
S132.136 KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	Setback from Rail Corridor	KiwiRail supports GRUZ-O2 in ensuring there is a very low degree of built form well setback from properties and roads but seeks to include rail. KiwiRail are seeking a 'no build within 5m from the rail corridor boundary' in the standards section of each zone, in	Accepted in Part	Yes

Submitter (S) Further Submitter (FS)	Provision	Summary of Decision Requested	Decision	Alter Plan
		addition the Railway noise control overlay is requested to be 100m from the rail corridor boundary. The setback is to ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing access to the railway corridor, minimizing the risks of physical interference with railway operations and avoiding health and safety hazards for residents. Amend GRUZ-O2 as follows: The character and qualities of the General Rural zone comprise: 2. A very low degree of built form, well setback from other properties, rail corridor and roads; and		
S132.195, LCZ-R10; S132.201, MUZ-R1; S132.202, MUZ-R2; S132.203, MUZ-R3; S132.205, MUZ-R4; S132.206, MUZ-R5; S132.207, MUZ-R6; S132.208, MUZ-R7; S132.209, MUZ-R8; S132.210, MUZ-R9; S132.211, MUZ-R10; S132.224, TCZ-R8; S132.225, TCZ-R9; S132.226, TCZ-R10; S132.234, GIZ-R9 KiwiRail Ltd	Noise Standard NOISE-S3	KiwiRail generally supports the inclusion of provisions for complying with noise standard for acoustic treatments for alterations to existing buildings where occupancy relates to noise sensitive activities. KiwiRail recommends that the rule also refers to the standard provided at Appendix A of this submission (refer to full submission point 98). Amend as follows: Where: 1. Any new, extended or converted Building containing a noise sensitive activity complies with Noise-S3 (acoustic treatment) and Noise- SX (KiwiRail noise standard attached at Appendix A)	Rejected	