



Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Further Submission on Proposed Plan Change 3 to the Kaikōura District Plan

3 June 2021



FURTHER SUBMISSION TO KAIKOURA DISTRICT COUNCIL ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 3 TO THE KAIKOURA DISTRICT PLAN

Form 6

Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission on publicly notified proposed policy statement or plan

Clause 8 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

To: *Kaikōura District Council
PO Box 6
Kaikōura 7340*

Name of further submitter: Federated Farmers of New Zealand – North Canterbury Province

Contact person: Elisha Young-Ebert
Senior Policy Advisor / Resource Management Solicitor

Address for service: PO Box 20448, Bishopdale, Christchurch 8543 or
eyoungbert@fedfarm.org.nz

This is a further submission in response to submission/s made on the following: Proposed Plan Change 3 to the Kaikōura District Plan.

I am

- *a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; and*
- *a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has.*

Grounds for further submission:

Federated Farmers of New Zealand is a representative body for farmers, so it jointly represents a relevant aspect of the public interest and has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest that the general public has.

The particular parts of the submissions I support and oppose are: Variously stated with respect to respective submitters in the schedule attached to this further submission.

The reasons for my support and opposition are: Variously stated with respect to respective submitters in the schedule attached to this further submission.

I seek that the whole or part of the submission be accepted or rejected: As variously stated with respect to respective submitters in the schedule attached to this further submission.

I wish to be heard in support of my further submission. If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

I acknowledge that by taking part in this public submission process the submission (including names and addresses) will be made public.

Where Federated Farmers submitted on the same variation point as any other submitter it stands by its original submission.

This Further Submission provides Federated Farmers views on points raised by other submitters.

Submitter ID.	Submitter Name	Submission point	Our position on this submission point is:	Reason for position	The decision we want Council to make:
5	Kaikōura District Council	5.4	Support	<p>We agree to the changes to the maps of the Landslide Debris Inundation Overlay and Debris Flow Fan Overlay.</p> <p>We understand the changes will reduce the notified areas to better reflect Phase 2 studies of debris inundation.</p>	Allow the submission point.
14	Environment Canterbury	14.2	Support	We agree that cross-referencing Chapter 3 to other applicable and relevant chapters of the plan would be a useful aid to plan users.	Allow the submission point.
14	Environment Canterbury	14.10	Support	The reference to coastal inundation in the first paragraph should be removed if it is not an issue specifically addressed in this chapter.	Allow the submission point.
14	Environment Canterbury	14.15	Support	<p>Agree to the reinstatement of this section.</p> <p>The Council may also wish to consider adding in a note that coastal inundation is not addressed in this chapter and why. It is a natural hazard that imposes risk to those who live along the Kaikōura coastline.</p>	<p>Allow the submission point.</p> <p>Council may also wish to consider adding in a note that coastal inundation is not addressed in this chapter and why.</p>

Submitter ID.	Submitter Name	Submission point	Our position on this submission point is:	Reason for position	The decision we want Council to make:
14	Environment Canterbury	14.16	Partially support	<p>Agree that there could be an overarching objective but disagree this objective should cover all natural hazard risks, even those that have not been identified.</p> <p>The chapter identifies and addresses natural hazards in the district through maps and consequential rules. The proposal is too broad and creates ambiguity for plan users.</p>	Disallow the submission point in part.
14	Environment Canterbury	14.17	Oppose	<p>Mitigation works is a means to end, it is inappropriate to have it as an objective.</p> <p>Like the RPS Policies, the council has elected to have mitigation works provided for in the policies section of Chapter 8.</p> <p>We agree with their approach.</p>	Disallow the submission point.
14	Environment Canterbury	14.27	Support	<p>Agree the suggested two matters of discretion should be included in Rule 8.5.1.</p> <p>We note the draft version in January 2021 did include the two suggested factors but also had "proposals to mitigate risk".</p> <p>We suggest that subclause (1) should say "adjoining" instead</p>	<p>Allow submission point.</p> <p>Recommend subclause (1) should say "adjoining" instead of "adjacent", for consistency of language within that Rule.</p> <p>The Council may reconsider its earlier identified point for consideration: proposals to mitigate risk.</p>

Submitter ID.	Submitter Name	Submission point	Our position on this submission point is:	Reason for position	The decision we want Council to make:
				<p>of “adjacent”, for consistency of language within that Rule.</p> <p>We also suggest the Council may reconsider its earlier identified point for consideration: proposals to mitigate risk.</p>	
14	Environment Canterbury	14.30	Support	<p>We support the use of clear and active language for an objective.</p> <p>However, we think Policy 7 could be used as a standalone objective if it is reworded a little differently.</p> <p>We can agree to the suggested subclause (1) as a standalone objective.</p> <p>We do not agree to suggested subclause (2). The outcome is not about whether there has been appropriate mitigation. The aim is that the risk is <i>acceptable</i>.</p>	<p>Allow the submission point in part:</p> <p>Council may consider adopting suggested subclause (1) as a standalone Objective.</p> <p>The suggested subclause (2) could read, instead: <u>Subdivision is managed appropriately within all natural hazard overlays to ensure risk to life and property is acceptable.</u></p>
14	Environment Canterbury	14.31	Partially Oppose	<p>The suggested subclause (1) conflates Urban and Non-urban. Non-complying status only applies to High Flood Hazard Area within the Non-urban Flood Assessment Overlay.</p>	<p>Allow the submission in part. Disallow the submission in part.</p>

Submitter ID.	Submitter Name	Submission point	Our position on this submission point is:	Reason for position	The decision we want Council to make:
				<p>It would be more useful to plan users if subclause (1) aligns properly with 13.11.4</p> <p>We can agree to subclause (2) and (3).</p> <p>We do not agree with subclause (4). As we said regarding submission 14.16, this chapter addresses natural hazard areas within mapped overlays. Having mechanisms for any other possible natural hazard is too broad.</p>	