

STRATEGIC DIRECTIONS

CONTENTS

1	Scope of Report	2
2	Hearing and Submitters Heard	2
3	Sub-topic Recommendations.....	4
3.1	SD Overview	4
3.2	SD-DI-O1 Sensational Selwyn	5
3.2.1	Community character	5
3.3	SD-DI-O2 District Well-being and Prosperity.....	5
3.3.1	Community well-being.....	6
3.4	SD-DI-O3 Integration and Land Use, Ecosystems, and Water – Ki Uta Ki Tai.....	6
3.5	SD-DI-O4 Our Environment	7
3.5.1	Significance versus importance	7
3.6	SD-DI-O5 Vibrant and Viable Centres	8
3.7	SD-IR-O1 Community Needs.....	8
3.7.1	Incompatible activities.....	9
3.8	SD-IR-O2 Effects of Important Infrastructure.....	9
3.9	SD-IR-O3 Natural Hazards.....	10
3.9.1	Acceptable risk.....	10
3.10	SD-MWV-O1 Partnership with Ngāi Tahu	11
3.11	SD-UFD-O1 Compact and Sustainable Township Network	12
3.11.1	Greater Christchurch differentiation	12
3.12	SD-UFD-O2 Urban Growth and Development.....	13
3.13	SD-UFD-O3 Integration of Land Use and Infrastructure.....	14
3.14	Proposed new Rurally Based Strategic Objective.....	15
3.15	Kāinga Ora’s Proposed Move of the Urban Growth Objectives into the Strategic Directions Chapter	16
3.16	General Submissions	17
3.17	Balance of the Provisions between Development, Use and Protection	17
3.18	Giving Effect to the Resource Management Act, New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement	17
3.19	Non-DPR, Withdrawn and Invalid Submissions.....	17
4	Other Matters	18
	Appendix 1: Recommended Amendments	20
	Amendments to the PDP Maps	20
	Amendments to the PDP Text	20
	Appendix 2: List of Appearances and Tabled Evidence	23

1 Scope of Report

- [1] This Recommendation Report relates to the Strategic Directions Chapter of the Proposed Selwyn District Plan (PDP or Plan) and contains the Hearing Panel's recommendations to Council on the submissions and further submissions received on that chapter.
- [2] The hearing Panel members for Strategic Directions Chapter were:
- Andrew Willis
 - Debra Hasson
 - Gary Rae
 - Lindsay Daysh
 - Malcom Lyall
 - Mark Alexander
 - Nicole Reid
 - Raewyn Solomon
 - Rob van Voorthuysen (Chair)
 - Yvette Couch-Lewis
- [3] The initial Section 42A Report on submissions and further submissions and the end of hearing Section 42A Report (Reply Report) for this topic were:
- Strategic Directions, Robert Love, 9 July 2021
 - Right of Reply Report, Strategic Directions, Robert Love, 27 August 2021
- [4] The Hearing Panel's recommended amendments to the notified provisions of the Strategic Directions Chapter are set out in Appendix 1. Amendments recommended by the Section 42A Report author that have been adopted by the Hearing Panel are shown in strike out and underlining. Further or different amendments recommended by the Hearing Panel are shown in strike out, underlining and red font.
- [5] There are no amendments recommended to the notified planning maps.
- [6] Readers should also note that we have, at their request, amended all references to 'Trustpower' to 'Manawa Energy'.
- [7] Further submitters are not listed in the tables in this Recommendation Report because further submissions are either accepted or rejected in conformance with our recommendations on the original submissions to which they relate.

2 Hearing and Submitters Heard

- [8] The hearing for the Strategic Directions Chapter was held on 9th August 2021 to 13th August 2021.¹ The submitters who appeared at the hearing are listed below, together with an identification of whether they were an original submitter, a further submitter, or both.

Sub #	Submitter	Original	Further
DPR-0032	Christchurch City Council	✓	✓

¹ Excluding Wednesday 11 August.

Sub #	Submitter	Original	Further
DPR-0126	Foster Commercial	✓	
DPR-0136	L&M Stewart, L&C Townsend & R Fraser		
DPR-0157	Kevin & Bonnie Williams		
DPR-0180	Peter & Christine Bond		
DPR-0209	Manmeet Singh		
DPR-0302	A Smith, D Boyd & J Blanchard		
DPR-0344	Four Stars Development Ltd	✓	✓
DPR-0456	Gould Developments Ltd		
DPR-0461	Dunweavin 2020 Ltd		
DPR-0488	Dally Family Trust & J McIlraith		
DPR-0491	Paul and Sue Robinson		
DPR-0492	Kevler Development Ltd		
DPR-0493	Gallina Nominees Ltd & Heinz-Wattie Ltd Pension Plan		
DPR-0212	Ellesmere Sustainable Agriculture Incorporated	✓	✓
DPR-0260	Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	✓	✓
DPR-0298	Trices Road Re-zoning Group	✓	✓
DPR-0353	Horticulture New Zealand	✓	✓
DPR-0358	Rolleston West Residential Limited (RWRL)		
DPR-0363	Iport Rolleston Holdings Limited (IRHL)	✓	✓
DPR-0374	Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (RIHL)		
DPR-0384	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited (RIDL)		
DPR-0367	Orion New Zealand Limited ²	✓	✓
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	✓	
DPR-0371	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	✓	✓
DPR-0372	Dairy Holdings Limited (DHL)		
DPR-0390	Rakaia Irrigation Limited (RIL)	✓	
DPR-0368	Craigmore Farming Services Limited		
DPR-0373	Foodstuffs South Island Limited & Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited	✓	
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	✓	✓
DPR-0379	Jill Thomson	✓	
DPR-0396	Woolworths New Zealand Limited	✓	
DPR-0407	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	✓	✓
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	✓	✓
DPR-0415	Fulton Hogan Limited	✓	✓
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers of New Zealand - North Canterbury	✓	✓
DPR-0427	Director-General of Conservation	✓	
DPR-0446	Transpower New Zealand Limited	✓	✓
DPR-0453	Midland Port, Lyttelton Port Company Limited (LPC)	✓	✓
DPR-0569	W (Fred) van Slooten		✓
DPR-0587	Lloyd Bathurst		✓

- [9] Some of the submitters were represented by counsel or had expert witnesses appear on their behalf. The counsel and expert witnesses we heard from are listed in Appendix 2. Copies of all the legal submissions and evidence (expert and non-expert) received are held by the Council. We do not separately summarise that material here, but we refer to or quote from some of it in the remainder of this Recommendation Report.

² The councillor commissioners recused themselves from consideration of the Orion submission due to the SDC's part ownership of Orion causing a conflict of interest.

- [10] We record that we considered all submissions and further submissions, regardless of whether the submitter or further submitter appeared at the hearing and whether or not they were represented by counsel or expert witnesses.

3 Sub-topic Recommendations

- [11] In this part of the Recommendation Report we assess the submissions by sub-topic, using the same headings as the initial Section 42A Report. We also use the same abbreviations for submitters names.

3.1 SD Overview

- [12] A key matter for the PDP is the role of the Strategic Objectives. This was initially addressed in Section 21 of the Section 42A Report under the heading of 'General Submissions'. We address it here given its pivotal importance.
- [13] The Section 42A Report noted that the Strategic Objectives are deliberately crafted to provide high level direction, with the underlying provisions of the Plan that give effect to the Strategic Objectives providing the necessary detail as to how these strategic outcomes are to be achieved in the context of the relevant proposal.³
- [14] Some submitters supported that approach, and suggested that those objectives should have primacy over other provisions in the Plan. In that regard they would provide 'over-arching' guidance to decision-makers and other Plan provisions would need to be interpreted in a manner that was consistent with the Strategic Objectives. Other submitters suggested that the Strategic Objectives should be read alongside the other provisions in the Plan, but that they would not have primacy over them.
- [15] Having carefully considered this matter we find the approach recommended by the SDC officers whereby the Strategic Objectives have primacy over other provisions in the Plan is appropriate. In that regard the Strategic Objectives can be likened to a 'superior instrument' within the Plan and other provisions must be interpreted so as to give effect to them.
- [16] In response to the submission of Rolleston West Residential Ltd the Section 42A Report author recommended adding text to the fourth paragraph of the SD Overview to clarify the role of the Strategic Directions for decision-makers on consent and designation applications. Given our finding outlined above, we consider that the recommended wording can be improved and that the fourth paragraph should read:⁴

For the purposes of preparing, changing, interpreting, and implementing the District Plan, all other objectives and policies in all other chapters of this District Plan are to be read and ~~achieved~~ implemented in a manner that gives effect to and is consistent with these Strategic Directions. This includes decisions on resource consent applications and notices of requirement for designations.

- [17] In terms of Section 32AA (s32AA) of the RMA, we are satisfied that the recommended amendments to SD-Overview to provide clarity regarding the relationship between Strategic Directions and other parts of the PDP are the most appropriate option for achieving the

³ Paragraph 2.35.

⁴ Note that recommended amendments from the notified text are shown in underlining and strikeout.

purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of the PDP and other relevant statutory documents.

3.2 SD-DI-O1 Sensational Selwyn

- [18] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. In terms of s32AA of the RMA, for these submissions and submission points we are satisfied that the Section 42A Report author's recommended amendment to refer to 'health' is the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0101	Chorus, Spark, Vodafone	001
DPR-0318	Susan Chaney	003
DPR-0343	CDHB	001
DPR-0358	RWRL	060
DPR-0359	FENZ	013
DPR-0363	IRHL	059
DPR-0371	CIAL	015
DPR-0374	RIHL	065
DPR-0384	RIDL	067
DPR-0482	Jayne Grace Philip	003

- [19] On the following matter we differ from either the recommendations or reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

3.2.1 Community character

- [20] Kāinga Ora sought that the Objective be amended to ensure the PDP was more forward thinking by having the defined character of a community linked to what is enabled by the Plan rather than being constrained by the existing character of a community. Having considered the evidence of Kāinga Ora we find that it would be appropriate to recognise both the existing and the anticipated character of communities.
- [21] Consequently, for the following submitter and submission point our recommendations are set out below. The reasons for our recommendations are outlined above. We are satisfied that in terms of s32AA of the RMA our recommendations reflect the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points	Accept in part
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	002	✓

3.3 SD-DI-O2 District Well-being and Prosperity

- [22] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. In terms of s32AA of the RMA, for these submissions and submission points we largely adopt the Section 42A Report author's assessment of effectiveness and efficiency, costs and benefits, the risk of acting or not acting, and conclusions as to the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0101	Chorus, Spark, Vodafone	003
DPR-0142	NZ Pork	018
DPR-0260	CRC	001
DPR-0353	HortNZ	085
DPR-0358	RWRL	061
DPR-0363	IRHL	060
DPR-0365	Stuart PC limited	001
DPR-0367	Orion New Zealand Limited	001
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	016
DPR-0371	CIAL	016
DPR-0372	Dairy Holdings Limited	018
DPR-0374	RIHL	066
DPR-0375	NZTA	012
DPR-0384	RIDL	068
DPR-0388	Craigmore Farming Services Limited	007
DPR-0396	Woolworths New Zealand Limited	003
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	003
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers	098
DPR-0427	DOC	022
DPR-0453	Midland Port, Lyttleton Port Company Limited	014
DPR-0482	Jayne Grace Philip	003

- [23] On the following matter we differ from the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. We note that we have also recommended adding the word ‘effects’ to the term ‘reverse sensitivity’ to better reflect the intent of the provision.

3.3.1 *Community well-being*

- [24] Federated Farmers and DOC both sought to replace SD-DI-O2 with wording that was more closely aligned with Part 2 of the RMA and ‘social, cultural and economic well-being’ in particular. While we agree with the Section 42A Report author that it would not be appropriate to do that, we consider that it would be appropriate to include a reference to ‘community well-being’ in the Objective as this more closely aligns with the title of SD-DI-O2 and recognises that well-being and the economy are related.
- [25] Consequently, for the following submitters and submission points our recommendations are set out below. The reasons for our recommendations are outlined above. We are satisfied that in terms of s32AA of the RMA our recommendations reflect the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points	Accept in part
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers	098	✓
DPR-0427	DOC	022	✓

3.4 **SD-DI-O3 Integration and Land Use, Ecosystems, and Water – Ki Uta Ki Tai**

- [26] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. In terms of s32AA of the RMA, for these submissions and submission points we are satisfied that the Section 42A Report author’s recommended amendment to refer to ‘communities’ is the most appropriate option for

achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0142	NZ Pork	019
DPR-0212	ESAI	009
DPR-0260	CRC	002
DPR-0279	Rex Verity	006
DPR-0358	RWRL	062
DPR-0363	IRHL	061
DPR-0374	RIHL	067
DPR-0384	RIDL	069
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	004
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers	099
DPR-0482	Jayne Grace Philip	005

3.5 SD-DI-O4 Our Environment

- [27] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. In terms of s32AA of the RMA, for these submissions and submission points we are satisfied that the Section 42A Report author's recommended amendment to refer to 'indigenous biodiversity' and to replace the reference to 'Selwyn's character' with a reference to 'Selwyn's environment' is the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0260	CRC	003
DPR-0269	HNZ	002
DPR-0358	RWRL	063
DPR-0363	IRHL	062
DPR-0374	RIHL	067
DPR-0384	RIDL	070
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	005
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers	100
DPR-0427	DOC	023, 144
DPR-0482	Jayne Grace Philip	005

- [28] On the following matter we differ from the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

3.5.1 Significance versus importance

- [29] As outlined in the primary evidence of Amelia Ching, DOC was concerned that the proposed wording of SI-DI-O4 would only capture values which are 'significant' to Selwyn's character, cultural heritage, or were of spiritual importance to Ngāi Tahu, thereby substantially restricting the scope of the provision.⁵ In her Supplementary Evidence Ms Ching recommended the phrase 'which make an important contribution to' and she was of the

⁵ Evidence of Amelia Grace Ching on behalf of the Director-General of Conservation / *Tumuaki Ahurei*, Submitter Number: DPR-0427, Hearing 1: Strategic Directions, Dated: 26 July 2021, paragraph 58.

opinion that would provide the strategic aspect of the Objective whilst not limiting the application of it to only 'significant' values.⁶ We agree and recommend accordingly.

- [30] Consequently, for the following submitter and submission points our recommendations are set out below. The reasons for our recommendations are outlined above. We are satisfied that in terms of s32AA of the RMA our recommendations reflect the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points	Accept in part
DPR-0427	DOC	023, 144	✓

3.6 SD-DI-O5 Vibrant and Viable Centres

- [31] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. We note that this results in no change to the notified provision.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0032	CCC	007
DPR-0126	Foster Commercial	001
DPR-0269	CRC	004
DPR-0358	RWRL	064
DPR-0363	IRHL	063
DPR-0374	RIHL	069
DPR-0384	RIDL	071
DPR-0396	Woolworths New Zealand Limited	002
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	006

3.7 SD-IR-O1 Community Needs

- [32] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.
- [33] We note that we have however recommended an amendment to clarify that the Objective refers to protecting the operation of important infrastructure. As noted by Ainsley McLeod for Transpower, the use of the term 'their' in Objective SD-IR-O1 was ambiguous and could refer to either the 'community needs' or 'important infrastructure'.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0068	MetroPort	005
DPR-0101	Chorus, Spark and Vodafone	002
DPR-0353	HortNZ	086
DPR-0358	RWRL	065
DPR-0359	FENZ	014
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	017
DPR-0374	RIHL	070
DPR-0375	NZTA	013
DPR-0384	RIDL	072
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	006
DPR-0420	Synlait Milk Limited	002

⁶ Supplementary Evidence of Amelia Grace Ching on behalf of the Director-General of Conservation / *Tumuaki Ahurei*, Submitter Number: DPR-0427, Hearing 1: Strategic Directions, Dated: 16 August 2021, paragraph 16.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers	103
DPR-0446	Transpower New Zealand Limited	019
DPR-0448	NZDF	012
DPR-0453	Midland Port, Lyttleton Port Company Limited	014
DPR-0458	KiwiRail	014

- [34] On the following matter we differ from the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

3.7.1 *Incompatible activities*

- [35] An issue arose during the hearing as to what the operation of important infrastructure was being protected from. The evidence of Ainsley McLeod noted that both the NPSET Policy 10 and CRPS referred to avoiding reverse sensitivity effects on electricity networks. The submission of Orion sought that the Objective refers to ensuring that the operation and security of important infrastructure is not compromised by other activities. That of course raises the issue of what 'other activities' means. In that regard we note that SD-DI-O2 (as it is now recommended to be amended) refers to protection 'from incompatible activities and reverse sensitivity effects'. Reflecting on that wording, for Federated Farmers Elisha Young-Ebert suggested that SD-IR-O1 should focus on activities that are incompatible with the operation of important infrastructure.⁷
- [36] Having considered these matters, we agree with Ms Young-Ebert and recommend that SD-IR-O1 is amended to refer to '... the operation of important infrastructure is protected from incompatible activities'. In saying that, we note that reverse sensitivity issues generally arise where incompatible activities occur in close proximity to each other.
- [37] Consequently, for the following submitters and submission points our recommendations are set out below. The reasons for our recommendations are outlined above. We are satisfied that in terms of s32AA of the RMA our recommendations reflect the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points	Accept in part
DPR-0367	Orion New Zealand Limited	002	✓
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers	103	✓
DPR-0446	Transpower New Zealand Limited	019	✓

3.8 SD-IR-O2 Effects of Important Infrastructure

- [38] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. We note that this results in no change to the notified provision.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0068	MetroPort	006
DPR-0101	Chorus, Spark and Vodafone	034
DPR-0260	CRC	005
DPR-0358	RWRL	066

⁷ Elisha Young-Ebert, Federated Farmers of New Zealand, 27 July 2021, paragraphs 41 to 43.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0359	FENZ	015
DPR-0363	IRHL	065
DPR-0367	Orion New Zealand Limited	003
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	018
DPR-0371	CIAL	017
DPR-0374	RIHL	071
DPR-0375	NZTA	014
DPR-0384	RIDL	073
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	008
DPR-0420	Synlait Milk Limited	003
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers	104
DPR-0446	Transpower New Zealand Limited	020
DPR-0448	NZDF	013
DPR-0453	Midland Port, Lyttleton Port Company Limited	016
DPR-0458	KiwiRail	014

3.9 SD-IR-O3 Natural Hazards

- [39] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. In terms of s32AA of the RMA, for these submissions and submission points we generally adopt the Section 42A Report author's assessment of effectiveness and efficiency, costs and benefits, the risk of acting or not acting, and conclusions as to the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0101	Chorus, Spark and Vodafone	035
DPR-0212	ESAI	011
DPR-0260	CRC	006
DPR-0283	David Evans	001
DPR-0305	April Fitzjohn	002
DPR-0367	Orion New Zealand Limited	004
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	019
DPR-0375	NZTA	015
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	009
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers	101
DPR-0446	Transpower New Zealand Limited	021
DPR-0458	KiwiRail	016
DPR-0482	Jayne Grace Philip	012

- [40] On the following matter we differ from the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

3.9.1 Acceptable risk

- [41] Rolleston West Residential Ltd, Iport Rolleston Holdings Ltd, Rolleston Industrial Holdings Ltd, and Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd requested amendments that would provide an 'or' option whereby the natural hazard risks were able to be managed to an acceptable level.
- [42] In his evidence for these submitters, planner Jeremy Phillips suggested that not increasing the risk from natural hazards is unattainable when people, activities or buildings are introduced to a location subject to any natural hazard risk. Mr Phillips considered that, as worded,

SD-IR-O3 would mean that establishing any new activity (other than important infrastructure) in a location that is subject to any risk of natural hazard (which is arguably anywhere in the District, or New Zealand generally) would contradict this Objective. Accordingly, he suggested that the Objective should be amended to include a provision where ‘the risk is able to be managed to an acceptable level’. He considered that would not detract from the intent of the Objective as notified.

- [43] We accept the evidence of Mr Phillips and recommend an amendment to SD-IR-O3 accordingly.
- [44] In that regard we note that CRPS Policy 11.3.5 deals with ‘unacceptable risk’ which is to be determined with regard to the likelihood of the natural hazard event; and the potential consequence of the natural hazard event for: people and communities, property and infrastructure and the environment, and the emergency response organisations. CRPS Policy 11.3.1 provides useful guidance on what might constitute an ‘acceptable risk’. Clauses 1 and 2 of that policy refers to subdivision, use and development that:
- *is not likely to result in loss of life or serious injuries in the event of a natural hazard occurrence; and*
 - *is not likely to suffer significant damage or loss in the event of a natural hazard occurrence.*
- [45] Accordingly, we are satisfied that the amendment we recommend will be able to be implemented by subsequent decision-makers who are properly informed by robust technical advice. We also note that the PDP’s Natural Hazards chapter provides more detailed direction on risk management.
- [46] Consequently, for the following submitters and submission points our recommendations are set out below. The reasons for our recommendations are outlined above. We are satisfied that in terms of s32AA of the RMA our recommendations reflect the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points	Accept in part
DPR-0358	RWRL	067	✓
DPR-0363	IRHL	066	✓
DPR-0374	RIHL	072	✓
DPR-0384	RIDL	074	✓

3.10 SD-MWV-O1 Partnership with Ngāi Tahu

- [47] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. We note that this results in no change to the notified provision.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0260	CRC	007
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	009

3.11 SD-UFD-O1 Compact and Sustainable Township Network

- [48] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. In terms of s32AA of the RMA, for these submissions and submission points we generally adopt the Section 42A Report author's assessment of effectiveness and efficiency, costs and benefits, the risk of acting or not acting, and conclusions as to the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0032	CCC	005, 006
DPR-0142	NZ Pork	020
DPR-0260	CRC	008
DPR-0343	CDHB	012
DPR-0353	HortNZ	088
DPR-0358	RWRL	068
DPR-0363	IRHL	067
DPR-0367	Orion New Zealand Limited	005
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	020
DPR-0371	CIAL	018
DPR-0374	RIHL	073
DPR-0375	NZTA	016
DPR-0384	RIDL	075
DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	001
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	011
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers	105

- [49] On the following matter we differ from the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

3.11.1 Greater Christchurch differentiation

- [50] The submission of Christchurch City Council supported SD-UFD-O1 because in its view it ensured urban growth areas would develop in an efficient manner that supported the provision of infrastructure and services, including public transport, and the achievement of consolidation. This led us to consider whether or not the Objective should be amended to differentiate between inside and outside Greater Christchurch, because under the CRPS different directions apply to urban growth within those respective areas.

- [51] In that regard we note and accept the following legal submissions of Christchurch City Council:⁸

The CRPS framework therefore limits urban growth within the Greater Christchurch area to within the identified infrastructure boundary, i.e. within the GPAs and FDAs. Within the Selwyn District, these areas adjoin Rolleston (GPA and FDAs), Lincoln and Prebbleton only (the latter two having GPAs only).

It is submitted that because the CRPS regime is of strategic significance to Greater Christchurch, and of importance to all Greater Christchurch Partnership members, specific reference to this avoidance regime should be included in the Strategic Directions of the PDP.

⁸ Legal Submissions For Christchurch City Council, Hearing Topic 1 – Strategic Directions Section of the Proposed District Plan, 30 July 2021, paragraphs 4.19, 4.22, 5.4 And 5.7.

In relation to the matter of urban growth, there is a degree of misalignment between the Strategic Directions and the lower order provisions, with UG-P3 (and UG-P13, but not as clearly) providing direction that is aligned with the CRPS avoidance regime, and SD-UFD-O1 approaching urban growth in a broader manner.

CCC considers that the Strategic Directions should provide clarity and direction in a way that is consistent with the CRPS, rather than provide that direction through a lower order policy which leaves a potential lack of clarity between two chapters in the PDP.

- [52] We discuss the matter of urban growth in more detail in our Recommendation Report on the Urban Growth chapter, but suffice to say here that we have concluded that in order to give effect to the CRPS, particularly Change 1 to the CRPS and its accompanying Map A, SD-UFD-O1 should differentiate between inside and outside Greater Christchurch.
- [53] However, we are also aware that one of the features of the new NPSUD that warrants discussion is the 'responsive planning framework' provided by Objective 6(c), Policy 8 and clause 3.8. We agree with counsel for Christchurch City Council that the responsive planning framework requires SDC to consider the merits of unplanned growth or out-of-sequence plan changes, even if they do not accord or align with existing strategic growth plans. While it provides a way to release land for development capacity in a manner that is not entirely aligned with existing growth strategies, this is only where it is warranted (on the merits) and where it still accords with the hierarchy of planning documents under the RMA.⁹
- [54] On that basis of those legal submissions we find that our recommended second limb to SD-UFD-O1 should include the words 'unless adding significantly to development capacity and contributing to well-functioning urban environments' which in our view captures the main elements of the 'responsive planning framework' contained within the NPSUD. The detailed application of that Objective is discussed in our Recommendation Report on the Urban Growth Chapter and its associated Urban Growth Overlay.
- [55] Consequently, for the following submitter and submissions points our recommendations are set out below. The reasons for our recommendations are outlined above. We are satisfied that in terms of s32AA of the RMA our recommendations reflect the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points	Accept in part
DPR-0032	CCC	005, 006	✓

3.12 SD-UFD-O2 Urban Growth and Development

- [56] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. In terms of s32AA of the RMA, for these submissions and submission points we are satisfied that the Section 42A Report author's recommended amendment to refer to 'expected' demands and '...at least sufficient feasible development capacity...' is the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents. In that regard,

⁹ Ibid, paragraph 4.1.

we note that this term is also used in the NPSUD in relation to providing for development capacity.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0136	L & M Stewart, L & C Townsend & R Fraser	002
DPR-0137	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	002
DPR-0157	K and B Williams`	002
DPR-0176	B Macaulay & B Reid	002
DPR-0178	Carey Mason	002
DPR-0180	P & C Bond	003
DPR-0298	Trices Road Rezoning Group	006
DPR-0302	A Smith, D Boyd & J Blanchard	002
DPR-0344	Four Stars Development Ltd & Gould Developments Ltd	006
DPR-0358	RWRL	069
DPR-0363	IRHL	068
DPR-0371	CIAL	019
DPR-0374	RIHL	074
DPR-0376	Fox & Associates	002
DPR-0384	RIDL	076
DPR-0397	Survus Consultants Ltd	002
DPR-0399	Gulf Central properties Ltd & Apton Developments Ltd	003
DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	002
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	012
DPR-0453	Midland Port, Lyttelton Port Company Limited	017
DPR-0460	Marama Te Wai Ltd	008
DPR-0461	Dunweavin 2020 Ltd	003
DPR-0488	Dally Family Trust & Julia McIlraith	005
DPR-0491	Paul & Sue Robinson	003
DPR-0492	Kevler Development Ltd	002
DPR-0493	Gallina Nominees Ltd & Heinz-Wattie Ltd Pension Plan	002

3.13 SD-UFD-03 Integration of Land Use and Infrastructure

[57] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. We note that this results in no change to the notified provision.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0032	CCC	001
DPR-0260	CRC	009
DPR-0343	CDHB	013
DPR-0358	RWRL	070
DPR-0363	IRHL	069
DPR-0367	Orion New Zealand Limited	006
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	021
DPR-0371	CIAL	020
DPR-0374	RIHL	075
DPR-0375	NZTA	017
DPR-0384	RIDL	075
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	013
DPR-0441	Manawa Energy	027
DPR-0453	Midland Port, Lyttelton Port Company Limited	018

3.14 Proposed new Rurally Based Strategic Objective

[58] The following submitters sought a rurally based Strategic Objective.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0142	NZ Pork	017, 076
DPR-0212	ESAI	010, 012, 013
DPR-0353	HortNZ	084, 087
DPR-0372	Dairy Holdings Limited	019
DPR-0388	Craigmore Farming Services Limited	008
DPR-0390	RIL	010
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers	097, 102, 296

[59] The Section 42A Report author recommended rejecting these submissions on the basis that the elements contained in the suggested provisions are already captured either specifically in the General Rural Zone provisions, or in the existing proposed Strategic Objectives largely through SD-DI-O1 – SD-DI-O4, and SD-UFD-O1. We note that the author helpfully recommended potential wording for a rural based objective in the Reply Report should we find in favour of the submissions requesting a rurally based objective.

[60] However, on this matter we prefer the evidence of the submitters. In particular, from the evidence of Elisha Young-Ebert for Federated Farmers¹⁰ that:

- Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) Objective 5.2.1 (e) explicitly provides for rural production;
- CRPS Policy 5.3.12 directs that natural and physical resources which contribute to Canterbury's overall rural productive economy, in areas which are valued for existing or foreseeable future primary production, should be maintained and enhanced; and
- Selwyn District's own Development Strategy (Selwyn 2031) includes a rural direction which is to 'Strive to maintain Selwyn District's identity and character that stems from its productive rural economy, landscapes and iconic rural outlooks'.

[61] We agree that those CRPS provisions indicate that a rural objective is warranted, particularly in light of the fact that the majority of the district is actually rural. In that regard we also note and agree with the points succinctly made by Lynette Wharfe for Horticulture NZ¹¹ that a rural based objective is appropriate because:

- The rural area comprises a large area of the district;
- Farming is the dominant land use in the district and is a large source of employment in the district;
- Rural character is important to the district identity;
- The rural area is significant because 21% of the land in the district is highly productive land which is important for food production and food security, particularly in response to the effects of climate change; and

¹⁰ Elisha Young-Ebert, Federated Farmers of New Zealand, 27 July 2021, paragraphs 10 to 18.

¹¹ Evidence in Chief of Lynette Pearl Wharfe for Horticulture New Zealand PDP Hearing 1 Strategic Directions, paragraph 1.3.

- The rural area is under considerable pressure due to urban growth within the district, so ensuring there is clear direction for the rural area is an important part of maintaining the district's identity.

[62] Ms Young-Ebert noted that Federated Farmers, alongside Horticulture NZ, New Zealand Pork and Ellesmere Sustainable Agriculture Inc, had jointly developed wording for a new rural objective. We have reflected on the wording when developing what we consider to be an appropriate objective that would apply outside of defined urban growth areas as follows:

SD-DI-06 Thriving Rural Communities

Outside of defined urban growth areas Selwyn's highly productive land is retained for rural production activities and rural communities maintain their rural character.

[63] Consequently, for the following submitters and submission points our recommendations are set out below. The reasons for our recommendations are outlined above. We are satisfied that in terms of s32AA of the RMA our recommendations reflect the most appropriate option for achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of this Plan and other relevant statutory documents.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points	Accept in part
DPR-0142	NZ Pork	017, 076	✓
DPR-0212	ESAI	010, 012, 013	✓
DPR-0353	HortNZ	084, 087	✓
DPR-0372	Dairy Holdings Limited	019	✓
DPR-0388	Craigmore Farming Services Limited	008	✓
DPR-0390	RIL	010	✓
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers	097, 102, 296	✓

3.15 Kāinga Ora's Proposed Move of the Urban Growth Objectives into the Strategic Directions Chapter

[64] Kāinga Ora requested that all of the Urban Growth objectives and policies be moved from the Urban Growth chapter and be placed in the Strategic Directions chapter. As noted in the evidence of Nick Roberts for Kāinga Ora, by the time of the hearing Kāinga Ora had amended their relief to request that only the Urban Growth objectives be relocated, and not the policies.

[65] We agree with the Section 42A Report author that, while the Strategic Directions Chapter contains (by way of mandatory direction under the National Planning Standards) a sub-chapter dealing with urban form and development, it only does so at a high level and then relies on the Urban Growth Chapter that has the specific purpose of dealing with urban growth management in the district. We are not persuaded that it is either appropriate or necessary to relocate the Urban Growth objectives as suggested by Kāinga Ora.

[66] For the following submitter and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	014, 439, 440, 441, 442, 443, 444, 445, 446, 447, 448, 449, 450, 451, 452, 453, 454, 455, 456, 457, 458 and 459.

3.16 General Submissions

- [67] For the following submitters and their submission points we generally adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author. See also Section 3.1 of this Recommendation Report where we discuss the SD Overview.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0279	Rex Verity	001
DPR-0357	Siana Fitzjohn	002
DPR-0358	RWRL	059
DPR-0363	IRHL	058
DPR-0374	RIHL	064
DPR-0384	RIDL	066
DPR-0388	Craigmore Farming Services Limited	008
DPR-0390	RIL	010
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	001
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers	097, 102, 296
DPR-0446	Transpower New Zealand Limited	018

3.17 Balance of the Provisions between Development, Use and Protection

- [68] For the following submitter and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0379	Jill Thomson	033, 034, 035 and 036.

3.18 Giving Effect to the Resource Management Act, New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

- [69] For the following submitter and their submission points we generally adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0427	DOC	021, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137 and 138.

- [70] However, as discussed in Section 3.5 of this Recommendation Report, in response to the primary and supplementary evidence of DOC planner Amelia Ching, we have recommended amendments to SD-DI-O2 and SD-DI-O4. Accordingly, we recommend that the Director General's submission points 021, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137 and 138 are accepted in part.

3.19 Non-DPR, Withdrawn and Invalid Submissions

- [71] For the following submitters and their submission points we adopt the recommendations and reasons of the Section 42A Report author.

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0012	Claire and Michael Elford	001
DPR-0024	Heather Jonson	003, 004, 005 and 006
DPR-0035	Andrew Palliser	001
DPR-0048	Brian Thompson & Helen Davey	002 and 003
DPR-0055	Kathryn Taylor	001
DPR-0061	Ian Forsyth	001

Sub #	Submitter	Submission Points
DPR-0078	Ian Laurenson	005 and 006
DPR-0106	Josephine Moffat	001
DPR-0150	Barry Moir	004
DPR-0168	Paula Godfrey	010, 011 and 021
DPR-0179	Philip Baldwin	002
DPR-0202	T & K Hopper et al.	002
DPR-0233	Canterbury Botanical Society	001, 002 and 008
DPR-0267	Jill & Hugh Stevenson	001
DPR-0268	E J Smith	001
DPR-0281	J, V and M Qudley	001
DPR-0287	Maria Carter	001
DPR-0291	Karen St Guillaume	001
DPR-0305	April Fitzjohn	005
DPR-0357	Siana Fitzjohn	005
DPR-0455	Paul & Fay Mc Oscar	018, 019, 020, 021, 028, 029, 030 and 031
DPR-0475	Rolleston Residents Association	001, 004 and 007

[72] At paragraph 24.5 of the Section 42A Report the author listed a number of submission points that were withdrawn. We note their withdrawal and agree with the author that for the sake of completeness and for the record, we recommend that the further submissions relating to those withdrawn submission points are rejected.

[73] At paragraph 24.7 of the Section 42A Report the author listed a number of further submission points that did not appear to be linked to an original submission. For the sake of completeness and for the record, we recommend that those further submission points are rejected.

4 Other Matters

[74] The recommended amendments to the PDP provisions contained in Appendix 1 are those that result from this Hearing Panel's assessment of submissions and further submissions. However, readers should note that further or different amendments to these provisions may have been recommended by:

- Hearing Panels considering submissions and further submissions on other chapters of the PDP;
- the Hearing Panels considering rezoning requests, and
- the Independent Hearing Panel (IHP) considering submissions and further submissions on Variation 1 to the PDP

[75] Any such further or different amendments are not shown in Appendix 1 of this Recommendation Report. However, the Chair¹² and Deputy Chair¹³ of the PDP Hearing Panels have considered the various recommended amendments and have ensured that the overall final wording of the consolidated version of the amended PDP is internally consistent.

[76] In undertaking that 'consistency' exercise, care was taken to ensure that the final wording of the consolidated version of the amended PDP did not alter the intent of the recommended amendments contained in Appendix 1 of this Recommendation Report.

¹² Who is also the Chair of the IHP.

¹³ Who chaired one stream of hearings.

- [77] No other matters arose from our consideration of the submissions and further submissions or that arose during the hearing.

Appendix 1: Recommended Amendments

Note to readers: Only provisions that have recommended amendments are included below. All other provisions remain as notified. Amendments recommended by the Section 42A Report author that have been adopted by the Hearing Panel are shown in strike out and underlining. Further or different amendments recommended by the Hearing Panel are shown in strike out, underlining and red font.

Amendments to the PDP Maps

There are no amendments recommended to PDP Planning Maps arising from our recommendations on the submissions and further submissions covered by this Recommendation Report.

Amendments to the PDP Text

Part 2 – District Wide Matters

Strategic Directions

SD-Overview
... For the purposes of preparing, changing, interpreting, and implementing the District Plan, all other objectives and policies in all other chapters of this District Plan are to be read and achieved implemented in a manner <u>that gives effect to and</u> is consistent with these Strategic Directions. <u>This includes decisions on resource consent applications and notices of requirement for designations.</u> ¹⁴

SD-DI – District Identity

SD-DI-Objectives

Sensational Selwyn	
SD-DI-01	Selwyn is an attractive and pleasant place to live, work, and visit, where development: 1. takes into account the existing and anticipated ¹⁵ character of individual communities; 2. is well-connected, safe, accessible, and resilient; and

¹⁴ DPR-0358.059 Rolleston West Residential Ltd, DPR-0363.058 Iport Rolleston Holdings Limited, DPR-0374.064 Rolleston Industrial Holdings Ltd, DPR-0384.066 Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd
¹⁵ DPR-0414.002 Kāinga Ora

	3. enhances environmental, economic, cultural, and social , <u>and health</u> ¹⁶ outcomes for the benefit of the entire District.
District Well-being and Prosperity	
SD-DI-02	Selwyn's prosperous economy <u>and community well-being are</u> ¹⁷ is supported through the efficient use of land, resources and infrastructure, while ensuring existing activities are protected from incompatible activities <u>and reverse sensitivity effects</u> . ¹⁸
Integration and Land Use, Ecosystems, and Water – Ki Uta Ki Tai	
SD-DI-03	Land and water resources are managed through an integrated approach, which recognises both the importance of ki uta ki tai to Ngāi Tahu and <u>communities</u> , <u>and</u> ¹⁹ the inter-relationship between ecosystems and natural processes.
Our Environment	
SD-DI-04	Places, landscapes, and features, <u>and indigenous biodiversity</u> which are significant <u>which make an important contribution</u> to Selwyn's character <u>environment</u> , cultural heritage, or are of spiritual importance to Ngāi Tahu, are identified, recognised for their values, and protected for future generations. ²⁰
Thriving Rural Communities	
<u>SD-DI-06</u>	<u>Outside of defined urban growth areas Selwyn's highly productive land is retained for rural production activities and rural communities maintain their rural character.</u> ²¹

¹⁶ DPR-0343.011 CDHB

¹⁷ DPR-0422.098 Federated Farmers, DPR-0427.022 DOC

¹⁸ DPR-0367.001 Orion

¹⁹ DPR-0212.009 ESAI

²⁰ DPR-0427.023, 130 and 144 DOC

²¹ DPR-0142.4-017 and 076 NZ Pork, DPR-0212.010, 012, 013 ESAI, DPR-0353.084 HortNZ, DPR-0372.018 Dairy Holdings Ltd, DPR-0388.008 Craigmore Farming Services Ltd, DPR-0390.010 Rakaia Irrigation Ltd, and DPR-0422.097, 102 and 296 Federated Farmers

SD-IR-Infrastructure, Risk and Resilience

SD-IR-Objectives

Community Needs	
SD-IR-01	The important infrastructure needs of the community are fulfilled, and their <u>the</u> operation <u>of important infrastructure</u> ²² is protected <u>from incompatible activities</u> . ²³
Infrastructure, Risk, and Resilience	
SD-IR-03	The risk from natural hazards, including the effects of climate change, to people, property, and important infrastructure is <u>either</u> : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. not increased, other than where necessary to provide for important infrastructure that has no reasonable alternative, <u>or</u></u> <u>2. is managed to an acceptable level</u>.²⁴

SD-UFD-Urban Form and Development

SD-UFD-Objectives

Compact and Sustainable Township Network	
SD-UFD-01	Urban growth is located <u>only</u> : <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. Outside Greater Christchurch</u>²⁵ <u>only within</u> in or around <u>adjoining</u>²⁶ existing townships and in a compact and sustainable form that aligns with its anticipated role in the Township Network, while responding <u>considering</u>²⁷ to the community's needs, natural landforms, cultural values, <u>highly productive land</u>,²⁸ and physical features; <u>or</u> <u>2. Inside Greater Christchurch only within existing urban areas, Greenfield Priority Areas or Future Development Areas identified in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement; unless adding significantly to development capacity and contributing to well-functioning urban environments.</u>²⁹
Urban Growth and Development	
SD-UFD-02	There is <u>at least</u> ³⁰ sufficient feasible development capacity to meet anticipated <u>expected</u> ³¹ demands for housing and business activities.

²² DPR-0353.086 HortNZ, DPR-0367.002 Orion, DPR-0422.103 Federated Farmers, DPR-0446.019 Transpower, DPR-0453.15 Midland Port, Lyttelton Port Company

²³ DPR-0422.103 Federated Farmers, DPR-0446.019 Transpower

²⁴ DPR-0358.067 Rolleston West Residential Limited, DPR-0363.066 Iport Rolleston Holdings Limited, DPR-0374.072 Rolleston Industrial Holdings Ltd, DPR-0384.074 Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd

²⁵ DPR-0375.016 NZTA and DPR-0260 CRC and DPR-0032 CCC in relation to the reasons for the relief they sought to SD-UFD-01

²⁶ DPR-0032.005 CCC

²⁷ DPR-0422.105 Federated Farmers

²⁸ DPR-0535.088 HortNZ, DPR-0422.105 Federated Farmers

²⁹ DPR-0032.005, 006 CCC

³⁰ DPR-0414.012 Kāinga Ora

³¹ DPR-0414.012 Kāinga Ora

Appendix 2: List of Appearances and Tabled Evidence

Hearing Appearances

Sub #	Submitter	Person Appearing	Role
DPR-0032	Christchurch City Council	Mike Wakefield David Falconer Chantal Lauzon	Counsel Planner CDHB
DPR-0126	Foster Commercial	Patricia Harte	Planner
DPR-0136	L&M Stewart, L&C Townsend & R Fraser	Ivan Thompson	Planner
DPR-0157	Kevin & Bonnie Williams		
DPR-0180	Peter & Christine Bond		
DPR-0209	Manmeet Singh		
DPR-0302	A Smith, D Boyd & J Blanchard		
DPR-0344	Four Stars Development Ltd		
DPR-0456	Gould Developments Ltd		
DPR-0461	Dunweavin 2020 Ltd		
DPR-0488	Dally Family Trust & J McIlraith		
DPR-0491	Paul and Sue Robinson		
DPR-0492	Kevler Development Ltd		
DPR-0493	Gallina Nominees Ltd & Heinz-Wattie Ltd Pension Plan		
DPR-0212	Ellesmere Sustainable Agriculture Incorporated	Carey Barnett	Representative
DPR-0260	Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	Michelle Mehlhopt	Counsel
DPR-0298	Trices Road Re-zoning Group	Ivan Thompson	Planner
DPR-0353	Horticulture New Zealand	Rachel McClung Lynette Wharfe	Representative Planner
DPR-0358	Rolleston West Residential Limited (RWRL)	Jo Appleyard	Counsel
DPR-0363	Iport Rolleston Holdings Limited (IRHL)	Tim Carter	Representative
DPR-0374	Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (RIHL)	Mike Copeland	Economics
DPR-0384	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited (RIDL)	Jeremy Phillips	Planner
DPR-0367	Orion New Zealand Limited	Jo Appleyard Garry Hayes Melanie Foote	Counsel Representative Planner
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	Ben Williams Harriet van Genne- Knape Dean Chrystal	Counsel Representative Planner
DPR-0371	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	Jo Appleyard Felicity Blackmore Phil Osborne Sebastian Hawken Matt Bonis	Counsel Representative Economics Aviation Planner Planner
DPR-0372	Dairy Holdings Limited (DHL)	Ben Williams	Counsel
DPR-0390	Rakaia Irrigation Limited (RIL)	Colin Glass	Representative
DPR-0368	Craigmore Farming Services Limited		
DPR-0373	Foodstuffs South Island Limited & Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited	Alex Booker Rebecca Parish	Counsel Representative
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Stewart Fletcher	Planner
DPR-0396	Woolworths New Zealand Limited	Joshua Leckie	Counsel
DPR-0407	Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	Will Jennings	Counsel
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	Lauren Semple Brendon Liggett	Counsel Representative

Sub #	Submitter	Person Appearing	Role
		Nick Roberts	Planner
DPR-0415	Fulton Hogan Limited	Tim Ensor	Planner
DPR-0422	Federated Farmers of New Zealand - North Canterbury	Elisha Young-Ebert	Representative
DPR-0427	Director-General of Conservation	Pene Williams Amelia Ching	Counsel Planner
DPR-0446	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Rebecca Eng Ainsley McLeod	Representative Planner
DPR-0453	Midland Port, Lyttelton Port Company Limited (LPC)	Jo Appleyard Mike Simmers Mike Copeland Matt Bonis	Counsel Representative Economics Planner

Mike Copeland was excused from attendance as the Panel had no questions for him.

Tabled Evidence

Sub #	Submitter	Author	Role
DPR-0101	Chorus NZ Ltd Spark NZ Ltd Vodafone NZ Ltd	Chris Horne	Planner
DPR-0343	Canterbury District Health Board	Dr Anna Stevenson	Medical Officer of Health
DPR-0359	Fire and Emergency NZ	Nicolle Vincent	Planner
DPR-0420	Synlait Milk Ltd	Nicola Rykers	Planner