

## **IMPORTANT NOTE:**

**The attached Report is an Addendum to the Planning Evidence and Recommendations Report on submissions to Chapter 3: Infrastructure Energy and Waste (Report No: 2008/EXT/908, July 2008).**

**The Addendum addresses submission points that were omitted from the original report.**

**The omitted submissions relate to management of Class I and II land, recognition of hydroelectricity generation, support for contaminated land policy and addition of glossary definitions for some terms.**



**Addendum to  
Infrastructure, Energy, and Waste  
Planning Evidence and  
Recommendations Report**



**January 2009**

Barry Gilliland  
Policy Advisor

January 2009  
ISBN: 978-1-877468-59-9  
Report No: 2009/EXT/908

**CONTACT** | 24hr Freephone 0508 800 800 | [help@horizons.govt.nz](mailto:help@horizons.govt.nz) | [www.horizons.govt.nz](http://www.horizons.govt.nz)

<b>SERVICE CENTRES</b>	<b>Kairanga</b> Cnr Rongotea & Kairanga-Bunnythorpe Rds Palmerston North	<b>REGIONAL HOUSES</b>	<b>Palmerston North</b> 11-15 Victoria Avenue	<b>DEPOTS</b>	<b>Levin</b> 11 Bruce Road
	<b>Marton</b> Cnr Hammond & Hair Sts		<b>Wanganui</b> 181 Guyton Street		<b>Taihape</b> Torere Road Ohotu
	<b>Taumarunui</b> 34 Maata Street				
	<b>Woodville</b> Cnr Vogel (SH2) & Tay Sts				

**POSTAL ADDRESS** | Horizons Regional Council, Private Bag 11025, Manawatu Mail Centre, Palmerston North 4442 | F 06 9522 929

# CONTENTS

<b>CONTENTS</b>	<b>i</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>LIST OF SUBMITTERS IN ADDENDUM TO CHAPTER 3: INFRASTRUCTURE, ENERGY AND WASTE</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>RECOMMENDATIONS ON SUBMISSIONS</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1    General submissions relating to Chapter 3 and omitted from IEW 1 – IEW_ADD	17
2.2    Submissions relating to Chapter 3 - Glossary General and omitted from Officers Report – IEW_ADD 2	11
<b>APPENDIX A</b>	<b>15</b>
A.1    Submission Points considered in Recommendation IEW_ADD 1 Table of Submitters, Submission Points and Recommendations	15 15
A.2    Submission Points considered in Recommendation IEW_ADD 2 Table of Submitters, Submission Points and Recommendations	19 19



# INTRODUCTION

This report is an addendum to the Planning Evidence and Recommendations Report on submissions to the Proposed One Plan, Chapter 3: Infrastructure, Energy and Waste. The purpose of the addendum is to address submission points unintentionally omitted from the Planning Evidence and Recommendations Report (Report No: 2008/EXT/908, July 2008).

The omitted submissions relate to land use management, recognition of hydroelectricity generation, support for contaminated land policy and addition of glossary definitions for some terms. This document contains the recommendations made by the Horizons Regional Council Planning Officer to the Hearing Panel, having considered these submission points.

The submission points and further submissions in this report have been assessed by the Horizons Regional Council Planning Officer after having regard to:

- The Infrastructure, Energy and Waste Planning Evidence and Recommendations Report
- The One Plan philosophy and intent
- The Section 32 Report
- Technical evidence
- Resource Management Act responsibilities
- Case law

The tables in Appendix A show whether a submission point has been accepted, accepted in part or rejected as a consequence of these recommendations. Accept in part means that only part of the decision requested in the submission has been accepted. Unless detailed otherwise, where the primary submission has been accepted it follows that further submissions supporting the primary submission have been accepted, and that further submissions opposing the primary submission have been rejected.

The recommendations on submission points do not have any statutory weight. Instead, they are intended to assist the Hearing Panel to (a) consider the merits of the Proposed One Plan in light of submissions received and to (b) assist submitters by setting out responses to the points raised.



## PART ONE: LIST OF SUBMITTERS IN ADDENDUM TO CHAPTER 3: INFRASTRUCTURE, ENERGY AND WASTE

The submitters and further submitters considered in this addendum to Chapter 3 are listed below. Further submission numbers are those listed as "X###".

Submission Number	Submitter
107	Margaret & Alan Cooper
220	Lionel West in association with Property Rights in NZ
318	Anne Judith Milne
358 and X511	Trust Power Limited
363	Meridian Energy Limited
386	Environmental Working Party
427	Nga Pae o Rangitikei
354	Gordon McKellar
395 and X527	Tararua-Aokautere Guardians Inc (T A G)
X531	Horticulture New Zealand
X519	Mighty River Power
X525	Genesis Power Ltd
272	Powerco Limited
369	Grant John Stephens
394	Mason Stewart
396	Sue Stewart
401	Alison Margaret Mildon
442	Robert Leendert Schraders
452	Paul & Monica Stichbury
467	Shona Paewai
468	Tony Paewai



# **PART TWO: RECOMMENDATIONS ON SUBMISSIONS**

## **2.1 General submissions relating to Chapter 3 and omitted from IEW 1 – IEW\_ADD 1**

### **2.1.1 Submissions summary**

Eleven submission points are evaluated in this recommendation. Although the submission points relate to different matters, they would have all been considered as part of recommendation IEW 1 of the Horizons Regional Council Planning Officers' Report for Chapter 3 had they not been omitted.

Seven submission points seek the addition of a policy framework to manage the loss of Class I and II land as a result of urban development. Anne Judith Milne (318/1, 2, 3 & 4) suggests that the issue, objective, policy and method from the operative Regional Policy Statement be carried over into the Proposed One Plan. Gordon McKellar (318/2) provides a draft rule for control of subdivision on Class I and II land.

I note that submission points of a similar nature have already been presented in the Horizons Planning Officers' Reports for Chapters 3 and 5. I cross-reference these here for completeness. Submission points made by James Edmund Fahey (109/2), Mary Gabrielle Fahey (110/2), Peter Graham Fahey (111/2), John Francis Fahey (112/2), Brian Booth (6/1), Chris Teo-Sherrell (181/6) and Pauline Joan Webb (420/1) were presented in recommendation IEW 1 of the Horizons Regional Council Planning Officers' Report for Chapter 3 (Report No: 2008/EXT/908). Submission points made by L M Terry (425/9) and J M & L C Whitelock & BJ & C J Whitelock (371/6) were presented in recommendation LM 1 of the Horizons Regional Council's Planning Officers' Report for Chapter 5 (Report No: 2008/EXT/887) and a submission from the Taranaki/Whanganui Conservation Board (374/11) was presented in recommendation LM 7 of the same report.

Two submission points were received seeking specific policy provision for hydro-electricity generation. Both submitters seek amendment to Chapter 6 in the first instance, although Meridian Energy Limited (363/61) seeks amendment to Chapter 3, with cross references back to other chapters, as an alternative approach to achieve the same outcome should the matter not be dealt with in Chapter 6.

Two submission points (Environmental Working Party, 386/62 and Nga Pae o Rangitikei, 427/62) appear to be misplaced. Both submissions support Contaminated Land Policy 3-12: Identification of contaminated land, and should have been presented and considered as part of recommendation IEW 20 of the Horizons Regional Council Planning Officers' Report for Chapter 3.

### **2.1.2 Legislative overview**

Section 30(1)(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991 gives regional councils the function of:

*“The preparation of objectives and policies in relation to any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land which are of regional significance.”*

Section 31(1)(a) of the Resource Management Act 1991 gives Territorial Authorities the function of:

*“The establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district.”*

and Section 31(2) states that:

*“The methods used to carry out any functions under subsection (1) may include the control of subdivision.”*

### 2.1.3 Evaluation

A number of submitters consider that the Proposed One Plan needs to address the loss of Class I and II land (also referred to as highly productive soils or versatile soils) as a result of urban development. I acknowledge that this is a potential resource management issue for consideration in the Proposed One Plan. The question is whether this issue is one of Regional significance and whether it is best dealt with at a regional or district scale.

The operative Regional Policy Statement (RPS) for Manawatu-Wanganui<sup>1</sup> identifies a number of issues related to land management. In general terms, these issues cover the adverse effects of activities on both vulnerable land classes and highly productive land classes. Two matters identified in the RPS as issues for highly productive land classes are not identified as issues in the Proposed One Plan. These are the loss of soil productivity due to soil compaction caused by inappropriate land use practices [Part *Issue L2: Loss of productive capability of land*, page 75] and the adverse effects from urban development, including urban encroachment onto adjacent land where it may result in the loss of Class I and II land [*Issue L6*, page 78]. Objectives, policies and methods are provided in response to these matters. Policies 5.1(b) and(c) and 5.2(f) in response to Objective 5 address loss of soil structure and productive capability of Class I and II land. Policy 6.1(b) in response to Objective 6 addresses the retention of options for future use of Class I and II land.

Although the loss of highly productive Class I and II land was identified as a significant issue in the operative Regional Policy Statement, I note that the narrative for Issue L6 states that *“The loss of this highly productive land, and the associated economic implications, is a significant issue for some parts of the Region.”* The fringes of urban areas such as Palmerston North, Wanganui, Levin and Feilding were identified as locations where this is most likely to occur. This may indicate that the issue could have been considered as localised within districts rather than widespread across the Region at that time.

---

<sup>1</sup> Manawatu-Wanganui Regional Council, 1998: *“Regional Policy Statement for Manawatu-Wanganui.”*

Loss of productivity due to soil compaction and urban encroachment was considered during drafting of the Proposed One Plan but was not considered to be a significant Region-wide issue. I note that although there are submissions seeking reinstatement in the Proposed One Plan of loss of highly productive land to urban encroachment, there are no submissions seeking that soil compaction due to inappropriate land use practices be addressed in the Proposed One Plan.

To assess whether the loss of Class I and II land is a current issue for the Region, I have evaluated information about changes in parcel size due to subdivision on Class I and II land during the five-year period July 2003 to July 2008 (shown in Table 1). Information about the area of Class I and II land was obtained from the Landcare Research Land Research Inventory/Land Use Capability Database. Urban areas were subtracted from the total to obtain an estimate of rural Class I and II land area available in each Territorial Authority. Changes in land parcel size were identified by comparing Core Record System dataset from Land Information NZ's "Landonline" system as at July 2003 and July 2008. Changes in land parcel size to less than 10 ha, 4 ha and 1 ha were overlaid on the Class I and II land area data to obtain an estimate of the area affected by the change.

For the purpose of this evaluation I have assumed the risk of loss of Class I and II land increases as parcel sizes reduce below 10 ha. Parcel changes to less than 4 ha and 1 ha are included for comparison. I note for example that Wanganui District Council<sup>2</sup> investigated a large area of Class I and II land in the Westmere area, north-east of Wanganui, and concluded that the results suggest that lots over 1 ha have only a minor impact on the productive use of the land area studied. Although it is not appropriate to extrapolate this result to the rest of the Region, it does provide an indicative benchmark for this evaluation.

**Table 1: Changes in land parcel size due to subdivision on Class I and II land in the period 2003-2008**

Territorial Authority	Area of rural Class I and II land hectares	% change to < 10 hectares	% change to < 4 hectares	% change to <1 hectare
Ruapehu	1,582	0.9%	0.2%	Nil
Wanganui	20,438	2.8%	1.6%	0.3%
Rangitikei	42,343	1.4%	0.6%	0.1%
Manawatu	78,815	1.6%	0.9%	0.2%
Palmerston North	5,286	4.2%	2.9%	1.2%
Horowhenua	24,868	1.9%	1.2%	0.2%
Tararua	31,882	0.8%	0.4%	0.1%
<b>OVERALL</b>	<b>205,214</b>	<b>1.6%</b>	<b>0.9%</b>	<b>0.2%</b>

The data indicate that the amount of Class I and II land within the boundaries of Ruapehu District and Palmerston North City is very low compared to the other districts. There also appears to be a low level of loss of this land over

<sup>2</sup> Wanganui District Council, 1994: "The Extent of Rural/Residential Development on Class I and II Land" in Wanganui District Plan, updated 2007.

the five-year period even assuming, in the worst-case scenario, that all land parcels subdivided into 10 hectare blocks are lost to productive use.

In my view this data does not support the argument that loss of Class I and II land is currently a regionally significant issue. In my view, it is also unlikely to become a significant issue during the life of the One Plan because:

- Except for Palmerston North the Region is experiencing negative or negligible levels of population growth<sup>3</sup>
- The impact of global scale financial issues will reduce the demand for rural subdivision in the short to medium term.

I have also evaluated how Territorial Authorities are managing urban development on highly productive soils in district plans for the Region. This information is summarised below.

Territorial Authority	Operative date	Issue Identified	Objective	Policies	Rules	AER
Ruapehu	2000	x	x	x	x	x
Wanganui	2006	ü	ü	ü	ü	ü
Rangitikei	2007	ü	ü	ü	ü	ü
Manawatu	2002	ü	ü	ü	ü	ü
Palmerston North	2006	ü	ü	ü	ü	ü
Horowhenua	1999	ü	ü	ü	ü	ü
Tararua	1998	ü	ü	ü	ü	ü

ü Management of Class I and II land provided for

x Management of Class I and II land not provided for

All Territorial Authorities except Ruapehu District Council, which has a very low amount of Class I and II land, have identified issues and provided objectives and policies that provide for conservation of Class I and II land. Implementation is achieved through rules for subdivision in rural zones in District Plans. I acknowledge that the preparation of these District Plans will have been influenced in part by the requirement for Territorial Authority District Plans to not be inconsistent with the objectives and policies in the Regional Council's operative Regional Policy Statement. In my opinion, management of Class I and II land is most appropriately done at a Territorial Authority level and I have seen no evidence that this approach will change during review of district plans. For example, the provisions relating to management of Class I and II land in the proposed Tararua District Plan are identical to the operative plan. I also note that the Regional Council is monitoring District Plan reviews and can make submissions on this matter in the future if necessary.

I note that Helen Marr has provided evidence on the overall philosophy of the Proposed One Plan in Recommendation OVR 1, she recommends that "*all recommendations and changes to the POP keep in mind the philosophy and intent of the POP since its inception, maintain the focus on the big four issues and links to community outcomes and LTCCP funding.*" I understand this to mean that to avoid dilution of Horizons' resources in addressing the big four issues during the life of the One Plan, evidence of a very pressing Region-

<sup>3</sup> Statistics NZ Census data 1996, 2001, 2006

wide need is required before a new issue and policy framework should added to the Proposed One Plan.

In my view, the loss of Class I and II land due to urban encroachment is not currently a significant issue the Manawatu-Wanganui Region. I also consider that the matter is being appropriately addressed by Territorial Authorities in the Region and inclusion of a policy framework in the Proposed One Plan would not add any significant value to that. On this basis I recommend that submissions seeking addition of a policy framework for management of urban encroachment be rejected.

The submission of Gordon McKellar (354/1) seeks inclusion of a rule relating to subdivision of rural land. I note that subdivision is a Territorial Authority function and it is not appropriate that this be dealt with in the Proposed One Plan.

In my view the submission points seeking specific policy provision for hydro-electricity generation are more appropriately dealt with in Chapter 6 of the Proposed One Plan because that is where the primary relief is sought by the submitters. Evaluation in Chapter 6 will avoid the complication of cross-referencing should the submission points be accepted. The submissions are therefore accepted in part to the extent they will be evaluated in the Planning Officers' Report on Chapter 6.

The submission points supporting contaminated land policy can be accepted as this is consistent with Recommendation IEW 20 in the Horizons Regional Council Planning Officers' Report on Chapter 3.

#### **2.1.4 Recommendation IEW\_ADD 1**

- (a) Reject submission points that seek inclusion of a policy framework for protection of Class I and II soils.
- (b) Accept in part submissions seeking specific policy provision for hydro-electricity generation to the extent that these points will be considered in Chapter 6.
- (c) Accept submission points supporting contaminated land Policy 3-12.

##### **2.1.4.1 Recommended changes to provisions**

- (a) No changes to provisions are recommended.

## **2.2 Submissions relating to Chapter 3 – Glossary General, and omitted from Officers' Report – IEW\_ADD 2**

### **2.2.1 Submissions summary**

There are 15 submission points to consider in this recommendation. These submissions would have been considered in the Horizons Regional Council's Planning Officers' Report for Chapter 3 of the Proposed One Plan had they not been omitted.

Ten submission points seek the addition of the RMA definition of "renewable energy" to the Glossary (see for example Grant John Stephens 369/51).

The other submission points are requests for additional definitions (“large users of energy,” “energy efficiency,” “renewable energy generation facilities” and “renewable energy development plan”) and in the case of Powerco Limited (272/26) a request for “a review of the range of definitions and terms referring to infrastructure and essential services and work.”

### **2.2.2 Legislative overview**

Renewable energy is defined under Section 2 of the RMA as: “energy produced from solar wind, hydro, geothermal, biomass, tidal, wave, and ocean current sources.”

### **2.2.3 Evaluation**

In considering the requests for inclusion of the RMA definition of renewable energy in the Glossary, I note that the introduction to the Glossary in the Proposed One Plan states that “a term or expression that is defined in the RMA and used in the Plan, but which is not included in the Glossary, has the same meaning as in the Act.” The benefit of this approach is that there is no need to consider amendment of the Plan should the RMA definition change.

I note that it was suggested at the hearing for the Overall Plan that RMA terms be identified in some way, even if the RMA definition is not included in the Glossary. It would be appropriate to identify “renewable energy” in that way in the body of the Plan if the Hearing Panel decides to proceed with that suggestion.

The terms “renewable energy generation facilities” and “renewable energy development plan” are not used in the Proposed One Plan. These are terms used in submission points made by Meridian Energy Limited to several Proposed One Plan chapters. A glossary definition as a consequential amendment may be appropriate should any of these submission points be accepted. As at 1 March 2009, I note that use of the terms has not been accepted in Horizons’ planning evidence, so glossary definitions are not currently needed. However, if either term is used in the One Plan as an outcome of the hearing process, the need for glossary definition may require re-evaluation.

Policy 3-5(a) makes reference to efficient use of energy as being a matter to take into account in consent decisions for “large users of energy”. Powerco Ltd (272/10) suggests consideration be given to defining this term and that it “will give further thought to this”. Discussions with Powerco Ltd since submissions closed indicates that they now consider the term could be deleted from Policy 3-5(a) as there is benefit in considering energy efficiency during processing of all consent decisions. The current position in the Horizons Regional Council Planning Officers’ recommendation on Policy 3-5 is that it be retained as written and that review of that recommendation is outside the scope of this recommendation. It is therefore recommended that no addition to the Glossary be made at this time; however, the submitter (Powerco Ltd 272/10) is expected to provide further evidence on this submission point at the hearing and I have an open mind on the outcome.

The term “energy efficiency” is introduced in Chapter 3. Policy 3-5 deals specifically with energy efficiency. Powerco Ltd (272/11) requests that the

term “energy efficiency” be defined in the Glossary and suggests a definition consistent with that in the Energy Efficiency and Conservation Act 2000. The addition of this definition may be helpful for interpretation of Policy 3-5 and is supported.

Powerco Ltd (272/26) also requests that the range of definitions and terms referring to infrastructure and essential services and works be reviewed. I understand the terms in question to be:

- *Infrastructure* (used 99 times throughout the document and defined in the Glossary)
- *Infrastructure of regional and national importance* (one reference: **Policy 3-1**)
- *Critical infrastructure* (eleven references: **Policy 10.4**, 10.7 Explanations and Principal Reasons, Glossary and Anticipated Environmental Results for Chapters 3, 5, 9 and 10)
- *Essential works and services* (one reference: **Policy 6-27**)
- *Essential and beneficial activities* (one reference: **Policy 6-31**)

A complete review of these terms is outside the scope of this addendum and the most appropriate action is to review the terms as they appear in the Proposed One Plan. I note that *infrastructure* and *infrastructure of regional and national importance* have already been reviewed as part of the Officers’ Report for Chapter 3 and that *critical infrastructure* is under review as the Officers’ Report for Chapter 10 is being prepared

## 2.2.4 Recommendation IEW\_ADD 2

- (a) Reject submission points seeking to include the RMA definition of “renewable energy” in the Glossary.
- (b) Reject submission point seeking to include “renewable energy generation facilities” and “renewable energy development plan” in the Glossary.
- (c) Reject submission point seeking a definition of “large users of energy”
- (d) Accept submission point seeking a definition of “energy efficiency.”
- (e) Accept submission point requesting a review of terms used for infrastructure and services to the extent that these will be reviewed as they are first used in the Proposed One Plan.

### 2.2.4.1 Recommended changes to provisions

[Words to add are shown in underline, words to delete are shown in ~~strike through~~.]

Amend the Glossary by adding the following definition:

**Energy efficiency** means a change to energy use that results in an increase in the net benefits per unit of energy.



# APPENDIX A

## A.1 Submission points considered in Recommendation IEW\_ADD 1

Table of Submitters, Submission Points and Recommendations

Submitter	Number	Point	Decision Sought	Recommendation
MARGARET & ALAN COOPER	107	1	That our hort/ag land will be protected for future generations of farmers by allowing realistic size blocks of land for such activities and restricting urban spread to insignificant ag/hort land and encourage intensification of urban areas.	Reject
LIONEL WEST IN ASSOCIATION WITH PROPERTY RIGHTS IN NZ	220	3	No decision is requested however it appears the submitter wants Council to consider the loss of productive land due to urban and life style block developments	Reject
ANNE JUDITH MILNE	318	1	That the draft One Plan be amended to include the following from the current RPS:  "adverse effects from urban growth" as an issue (L6, p78)	Reject
	X 527	112	TARARUA - AOKAUTERE GUARDIANS INC ( T A G ) - Support	Reject
ANNE JUDITH MILNE	318	2	That the draft One Plan be amended to include the following from the current RPS:  "To avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of urban development" as an objective (21.4 Objective 6, p85)	Reject
	X 527	113	TARARUA - AOKAUTERE GUARDIANS INC ( T A G ) - Support	Reject

Submitter	Number	Point	Decision Sought	Recommendation
ANNE JUDITH MILNE	318	3	That the draft One Plan be amended to include the following from the current RPS:  "The retention of options for the future use of Class 1 and 2 land" as a policy (policy 6.1 b, p85).	Reject
	X 527	114	TARARUA - AOKAUTERE GUARDIANS INC ( T A G ) - Support	Reject
	X 531	38	HORTICULTURE NEW ZEALAND - Oppose	Support
ANNE JUDITH MILNE	318	4	That the draft One Plan be amended to include the following from the current RPS:  "Method to implement policy 21.4.2 District Councils should:  - Consider placing a priority on the consolidation of existing or partly developed areas before opening up new areas to urban development (Method 6.2)  - Provide measures within District Plans to retain options for the future use of Class 1 and 2 land (Method 6.5)"	Reject
	X 527	115	TARARUA - AOKAUTERE GUARDIANS INC ( T A G ) - Support	Reject
	X 531	39	HORTICULTURE NEW ZEALAND - Oppose	Support
TRUST POWER LIMITED	358	32	Insert a new section to Part 6 of the Proposed Plan that provides a policy framework (objectives and policies) for hydroelectricity generation.  Any similar amendments to like effect.  Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Section 6 as proposed in this	Accept in part

Submitter	Number	Point	Decision Sought submission	Recommendation
	X 519	31	MIGHTY RIVER POWER - Support	Accept in part
	X 525	240	GENESIS POWER LTD - Support	Accept in part
<b>MERIDIAN ENERGY LIMITED</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>61</b>	<p><b>Meridian requests that Chapter 6 is amended as follows or similar:</b></p> <p><b>In the alternative, but without prejudice to the relief sought above [363/58] to 363/60] , if it is the Councils deliberate intent to not make specific policy provision for hydro electricity generation in Chapter 6 because of the provisions in Chapter 3, then it is Meridians opinion that the majority of changes recommended in this submission will need to be made to Chapter 3 with cross references being added to relevant chapters.</b></p> <p><b>Any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to this submission</b></p>	<b>Accept in part</b>
	X 511	149	TRUST POWER LIMITED - Support	Accept in part
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL WORKING PARTY</b>	<b>386</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>We support Councils plans to identify and monitor these sites [old dumpsites and contaminated land], and to work with territorial local authorities to manage them.</b>	<b>Accept</b>
<b>NGA PAE O RANGITIKEI</b>	<b>427</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>As for 386/62.</b>	<b>Accept</b>
<b>GORDON MCKELLAR</b>	<b>354</b>	<b>1</b>	<p><b>To protect the sustainable future of our very limited amount of high quality class I and II soils the following rule is sought:</b></p> <p><b>The subdivision of class I and class II soils is permitted in areas outside of urban and industrial zoned land is under the</b></p>	<b>Reject</b>

Submitter	Number	Point	Decision Sought	Recommendation
			<p>following conditions/standards/terms:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. for title size 0.1 ha or less.</li><li>2. for title size 20 ha or more</li><li>3. for a title that has had an occupied residence on the title for ten years or more</li><li>4. where the amount of class I and II soils on a title represent less than 10 percent of the total area of the title.</li></ol> <p>Subdivision of class I and class II soils outside of urban and industrial zoned land and not complying with the above rule is a non-complying activity.</p> <p>OR WORDS TO THAT EFFECT</p>	

## A.2 Submission Points considered in Recommendation IEW\_ADD 2

### Table of Submitters, Submission Points and Recommendations

Submitter	Number	Point	Decision Sought	Recommendation
POWERCO LIMITED	272	10	G2 - Consideration of a definition for "Large users of energy" should be developed. We will give some thought to this.	Reject
POWERCO LIMITED	272	11	G3 - "Energy efficiency" to be defined as a "change to energy use that results in an increase in net benefits per unit of energy".	Accept
POWERCO LIMITED	272	26	P2 - A review of the range of definitions and terms referring to infrastructure and essential services and works. We note that the Proposed Plan does not contain the logic that sits behind the different classifications and resulting hierarchy of protection provided for infrastructure and we submit that it would be useful to understand the basis for the distinctions and the intended use of each term.	Accept in part
	X 511	529	TRUST POWER LIMITED - Support	Accept in part
MERIDIAN ENERGY LIMITED	363	203	Add new definition  In line with the amendments suggested by Meridian to the One Plan, Meridian requests that a new definition of renewable energy is included in the Glossary.	Reject
	X 511	530	TRUST POWER LIMITED - Support	Reject
MERIDIAN ENERGY LIMITED	363	204	Meridian requests a definition of renewable energy generation facilities is included as follows:  Renewable energy generation facilities means land, dams, weirs, tunnels, penstocks, generation units / turbines, underground cabling,	Reject

Submitter	Number	Point	Decision Sought	Recommendation
			<p>substations, earthworks, access tracks, roads and associated buildings and structures associated with the generation of electricity by renewable energy and the operation of those energy facilities. It does not include:</p> <p>Any cabling required to link the renewable energy generation facility to the point of entry into the electricity network, whether transmission or distribution in nature</p> <p>Any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to this submission</p>	
	X 511	531	TRUST POWER LIMITED - Support	Reject
	X 519	29	MIGHTY RIVER POWER - Oppose	Accept
<b>MERIDIAN ENERGY LIMITED</b>	<b>363</b>	<b>205</b>	<p>Meridian requests a definition of renewable energy development plan is included as follows:</p> <p>Renewable energy development plan refers to a work plan or supplementary environmental management plan that has been lodged with Horizons Regional Council and which contains information on:</p> <p>(a) A description of the proposed earthworks and vegetation clearance</p> <p>(b) An assessment of the actual and potential effects on the environment from the proposed activity</p> <p>(c) Any proposed related tracking and/or vegetation clearance</p> <p>(d) A description of any mitigation measures to help prevent or reduce the actual or potential effects</p>	Reject

Submitter	Number	Point	Decision Sought	Recommendation
			<b>(e) Monitoring and reporting requirements</b>	
			<b>Any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to this submission</b>	
	X 519	30	MIGHTY RIVER POWER - Support	Reject
	X 525	72	GENESIS POWER LTD - Support	Reject
<b>GRANT JOHN STEPHENS</b>	<b>369</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>Add the following RMA definition to the glossary:</b>	<b>Reject</b>
			<b>Renewable energy</b>	
			<b>Energy produced from solar, wind, geothermal, hydro, biomass, tidal, wave and ocean current sources</b>	
<b>MASON STEWART</b>	<b>394</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>As for 369/51</b>	<b>Reject</b>
	X 527	243	TARARUA - AOKAUTERE GUARDIANS INC ( T A G ) - Support	Reject
<b>TARARUA - AOKAUTERE GUARDIANS INC ( T A G )</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>As for 369/51</b>	<b>Reject</b>
<b>SUE STEWART</b>	<b>396</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>As for 369/51</b>	<b>Reject</b>
	X 527	302	TARARUA - AOKAUTERE GUARDIANS INC ( T A G ) - Support	Reject
<b>ALISON MARGARET MILDON</b>	<b>401</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>As for 369/51</b>	<b>Reject</b>
	X 527	368	TARARUA - AOKAUTERE GUARDIANS INC ( T A G ) - Support	Reject
<b>ROBERT LEENDERT SCHRADERS</b>	<b>442</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>As for 369/51</b>	<b>Reject</b>
	X 527	475	TARARUA - AOKAUTERE GUARDIANS INC ( T A G ) - Support	Reject
<b>PAUL &amp; MONICA STICHBURY</b>	<b>452</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>As for 369/51</b>	<b>Reject</b>
	X 527	535	TARARUA - AOKAUTERE GUARDIANS INC ( T A G ) -	Reject

<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Number</b>	<b>Point</b>	<b>Decision Sought</b>	<b>Recommendation</b>
<b>SHONA PAEWAI</b>	<b>467</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>As for 369/51</b>	<b>Reject</b>
	X 527	598	TARARUA - AOKAUTERE GUARDIANS INC ( T A G ) - Support	Reject
<b>TONY PAEWAI</b>	<b>468</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>As for 369/51</b>	<b>Reject</b>
	X 527	660	TARARUA - AOKAUTERE GUARDIANS INC ( T A G ) - Support	Reject