

BEFORE A HEARING PANEL IN QUEENSTOWN

IN THE MATTER: of the Resource Management Act
1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Proposed Queenstown Lakes
District Plan (Chapter 21 – Rural;
Chapter 23 – Gibbston Character
Zone; and Chapter 33 – Indigenous
Vegetation and Biodiversity)

SUBMISSION/S Transpower New Zealand Limited
(Submitter 805 and Further
Submission 1301)

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF AILEEN MARY CRAW FOR
TRANSPOWER NEW ZEALAND LIMITED**

21 April 2016

Introduction

1. My full name is Aileen Mary Crow. I hold the position of Senior Planner at Beca Limited, based in Dunedin. I am engaged by Transpower New Zealand Limited (**'Transpower'**) to provide expert planning evidence in relation to Transpower's submission, and further submissions, on the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan (**'Proposed Plan'**).
2. This is the second statement of evidence prepared by me, and filed by Transpower, in relation to the Proposed Plan. My evidence builds on the evidence I have previously given and specifically addresses planning matters on behalf of Transpower in respect of Chapter 21 (Rural), Chapter 23 (Gibbston Character Zone) and Chapter 33 (Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity) of the Proposed Plan.
3. My qualifications and relevant experience, including my experience providing planning advice in relation to Transpower's National Grid, are set out in my first statement of evidence¹.

Code of Conduct

4. In accordance with the 'Minute and Directions of Hearings Commissioners on Procedures for Hearing of Submissions' dated 26 January 2016, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court's 2014 Practice Note. I have complied with the Practice Note when preparing my written statement of evidence and will do so when I give oral evidence before the hearings panel.
5. My qualifications are referenced above and set out in my first statement of evidence. I confirm that the issues addressed in this brief of evidence are within my area of expertise.
6. The data, information, facts and assumptions I have considered in forming my opinions are set out in my evidence to follow. The reasons for the opinions expressed are also set out in the evidence. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

Scope of Evidence

7. My evidence specifically addresses the following:

¹ A Crow, Statement of Evidence, Chapters 3, 4 and 6 of the Proposed Plan, Paragraphs 6 – 10, pages 2 and 3, dated 29 February 2016

- a) Transpower's submission and further submissions on Chapter 21 (Rural), Chapter 23 (Gibbston Character Zone) and Chapter 33 (Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity) of the Proposed Plan; and
 - b) the 'Section 42A Hearings Reports' for Chapters 21, 23 and 33, dated 6 and 7 April 2016, to the extent that they are relevant to Transpower's submission.
8. For the purposes of my evidence, I rely upon the evidence of **Mr Andrew Renton**, filed by Transpower in respect of Chapters 21, 23 and 33 of the Proposed Plan. Mr Renton's evidence details the requirement for Transpower to clear indigenous vegetation in order to avoid fire hazards to the National Grid, as per the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.
 9. I also rely on the earlier evidence of Mr Renton, filed by Transpower in respect of Chapters 3, 4 and 6 of the Proposed Plan.² Mr Renton's earlier evidence details Transpower's role and responsibilities as the owner and operator of the National Grid, including the nature and operation of Transpower's assets in the Queenstown Lakes District. Mr Renton's evidence also provides some useful examples of reverse sensitivity effects, and direct effects, on the National Grid.
 10. My evidence should also be read in conjunction with my earlier evidence. I rely on that evidence particularly in terms of the planning background for Transpower's submission, being the national importance of the National Grid, established by the national planning instruments, being the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission 2008 ('**NPSET**') and the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009 ('**NESETA**').
 11. My earlier evidence supports Transpower's submission to include specific provisions within Chapter 3 – Strategic Direction for the on-going operation, maintenance, development and upgrading of infrastructure within the District, as well as protecting this infrastructure from adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects. I note that the Council's right of reply, dated 7 April 2016, has accepted Transpower's submission in this regard and subsequently included an additional goal, objective and policy.

² Mr Renton's statement of evidence is available on the Queenstown Lakes District Plan website at: <http://www.qldc.govt.nz/planning/district-plan/proposed-district-plan/proposed-district-plan-hearings/strategic-direction-urban-development-and-landscape-chapters-3-4-and-6/pre-lodged-evidence-and-legal-submissions/>.

12. Council's right of reply in relation to Chapter 6 – Landscapes, dated 7 April 2016, has also accepted part of Transpower's submission and my earlier evidence in relation to recognising the locational, operational and technical requirements of regionally significant infrastructure.
13. In preparing this evidence I have reviewed the following documents:
 - the RMA;
 - the NPSET;
 - the NESETA;
 - the Section 42A Hearings Reports and Section 32 Reports;
 - the redrafted Chapters accompanying the Memorandum of Counsel on behalf of Queenstown Lakes District Council ('**the Council**', dated 13 April 2016);
 - the operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 1998 ('**operative RPS**');
 - the proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2015 ('**proposed RPS**') including the associated Section 42A Report on Decisions Requested and the summary of submissions received; and
 - submissions of a number of parties, particularly those related to infrastructure matters or land holdings that are traversed by Transpower's assets.

Overview of the Key Changes Sought

14. Transpower's submission is generally concerned with ensuring that the Proposed Plan appropriately gives effect to the NPSET.
15. In the context of Chapters 21 – Rural and 23 – Gibbston Character Zone, Transpower's submission seeks amendments to recognise that infrastructure activities are also located in the Rural and Gibbston Character Zones, and have a locational, functional and/or operational requirement to do so. This would give effect to the NPSET, and specifically Policy 3.
16. Transpower's submission on Chapter 33 – Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity seeks:

- a) Amendment of Policy 33.2.1.8 to ensure that offsetting the impacts of development is not a requirement of the Proposed Plan but rather an option for applicants to consider;
 - b) Limited amendments to Policy 33.2.2.1 to allow applicants to avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects associated with the clearance of indigenous vegetation; and
 - c) Amendments to Section 3.3.2 – Rules to ensure that Transpower is not unduly constrained in relation to the trimming and pruning of trees within Significant Natural Areas and in the vicinity of the National Grid.
17. The remainder of my evidence specifically addresses the relief sought in Transpower's submissions. I note that no further submissions were received on Transpower's submission in relation to Chapters 21, 23 and 33 of the Proposed Plan.
 18. The amendments suggested in, or supported by, my evidence are appended as **Attachment A**.

Chapter 21 – Rural

Section 21.1 – Zone Purpose

19. Transpower's submission seeks amendments to Section 21.1 'Zone Purpose' to include recognition that infrastructure activities are also located in the Rural Zone, and have a locational, functional and / or operational requirement to do so.
20. The Section 42A Report does not recommend making the amendment sought by Transpower. Neither the Section 42A Report nor Appendix 2 to the Report provides any rationale for the recommendation.
21. I agree with the recommendation in the Section 42A Report that infrastructure does not need to be explicitly provided for within the Zone Purpose. The Section 42A Report recommends amendments to Objectives 21.2.1 and 21.2.4 to recognise and provide for regionally significant infrastructure, such as the National Grid, within the Rural Zone. The Council's right of reply in relation to Chapter 3 – Strategic Directions also recommends additional provisions to recognise the locational, technical and operational constraints of infrastructure.
22. Provided these amendments are adopted by the Panel, I consider that adequate recognition of regionally significant infrastructure and its locational, operational

and technical requirements is provided for within higher order chapters of the Proposed Plan, as well as other provisions contained in Chapter 21.

Objectives 21.2.1 and 21.2.13

23. Transpower's submission seeks amendments to Objectives 21.2.1 and 21.2.13 to include recognition that regionally significant infrastructure, such as the National Grid, is also established in the Rural Zone, and has a locational, functional and / or operational requirement to do so.
24. The Section 42A Report recommends that Transpower's submission on Objective 21.2.1 is rejected with no specific reasons. However, the Section 42A Report recommends amending Objective 21.2.1 as follows:

~~“Enable~~ Undertake a range of land uses including farming, permitted and established activities while protecting, maintaining and enhancing-landscape, ecosystem services, nature conservation and rural amenity values.”
25. In my opinion, the amendments recommended in the Section 42A Report better acknowledge that the Rural Zone accommodates activities other than farming, such as regionally significant infrastructure. I accept that a more detailed suite of provisions, enabling the on-going operation, maintenance, development and upgrading of the National Grid, is included in Chapter 30 as well as Chapter 3 (Council's right of reply). I am therefore supportive of the amended Objective 21.2.1.
26. In terms of Objective 21.2.13, Transpower's submission seeks to include recognition of infrastructure activities within the Rural Industrial Sub Zone. The Section 42A Report recommends that Transpower's submission be rejected and states that the Rural Industrial Sub Zone is distinct from the remainder of the Rural Zone. I agree with the Section 42A Report and note that Transpower's National Grid assets are not currently located within the Rural Industrial Sub Zone.

Objective 21.2.4

27. Transpower's submission seeks amendments to Objective 21.2.4 to give effect to Policies 2, 10 and 11 of the NPSET, specifically to protect regionally significant infrastructure from adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects.

28. The Section 42A Report recommends that Transpower's submission be rejected as the protection of legally established infrastructure will be appropriately managed under Objective 21.2.4 without making Transpower's amendments.

29. The Section 42A Report has recommended the following amendments to the objective:

~~"Manage s-Situations where sensitive activities conflict with existing and anticipated activities are managed the Rural Zone."~~

30. In my opinion, the amendments proposed in the Section 42A Report will appropriately manage adverse effects on existing activities, including reverse sensitivity effects. Although Policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET are more stringent in that they direct Council to **manage** activities to **avoid** reverse sensitivity effects on the National Grid, I consider that Policy 3.2.8.1.1 proposed in the Council's right of reply for Chapter 3 will enable infrastructure, such as the National Grid, to be safeguarded and not compromised by incompatible development. Policy 3.2.8.1.1 is specific to infrastructure whereas Objective 21.2.4 is a broad objective to cover all activities.

31. I agree with the Section 42A Report that infrastructure does not need to be specifically stated, particularly because no other types of activities have been referred to within the objective.

32. It is my opinion that the word "avoided" would provide stronger protection of existing activities from adverse effects than the proposed word "managed", particularly because the Court stated in the recent *King Salmon* case that the word "avoid" means "not allowing" or "preventing the occurrence of".

33. Provided the Panel adopt proposed Policy 3.2.8.1.1, I support the amendments in the planner's report in relation to Objective 21.2.4.

Sections 21.3.1 and 23.3.1 – District Wide Rules (Chapter 21 – Rural and Chapter 23 Gibbston Character Zone)

34. Transpower's submission seeks an additional clause under Sections 21.3.1 and 23.3.1 which directs plan users to consider the rules contained within Chapter 30 – Energy and Utilities, particularly the rules relating to subdivision and development in close proximity to the National Grid.

35. The Section 42A Report recommends rejecting both these submission points. In my opinion, the identification of the National Grid on the planning maps along with

the extensive list of District Wide Chapters that plan users must consider, which includes Chapter 30: Energy and Utilities, is appropriate. I consider that the maps along with the current list provide enough direction to plan users to consider the National Grid rules contained in Chapter 30.

36. I therefore agree with the Section 42A Report's recommendation in relation to both submission points.

Chapter 23 – Gibbston Character Zone

Section 23.1 – Zone Purpose

37. Transpower's submission seeks to include an additional paragraph to recognise that infrastructure activities are also established in the Gibbston Character Zone and have a functional, locational and operational need to do so.
38. The Section 42A Report acknowledges Transpower's submission point and reasoning, but does not support the inclusion of infrastructure as the Report considers that the purpose statement does not need to identify every resource or issue that could occur within the zone. The Section 42A Report also states that infrastructure is acknowledged and managed by Chapter 30: Energy and Utilities, as well as the designation process.
39. I agree with the Section 42A Report that the Zone Purpose statement does not need to specify all activities located within the zone. In addition, the Section 42A Report recommends amendments to Policy 23.2.1.7 to recognise that regionally significant infrastructure may have locational, technical or operational requirements to be located within the Gibbston Character Zone.
40. Provided the amendments to Policy 23.2.1.7 are adopted by the Panel, I agree with the recommendation in the Section 42A Report to not include Transpower's relief in Section 23.1. I consider that amended Policy 23.2.1.7 appropriately recognises infrastructure and its constraints, thereby giving effect to Policies 2 and 8 of the NPSET.

Objective 23.2.1

41. Transpower's submission seeks to recognise and enable regionally significant infrastructure within the Gibbston Character Zone by including the words "regionally significant infrastructure" within the Objective.

42. The Section 42A Report recommends rejecting Transpower's submission point as the objective sets out that viticulture is the key land use of this particular zone. The Section 42A Report considers that elevating regionally significant infrastructure is out of context with the intent of the objective.
43. I agree with the recommendation in the Section 42A Report to not specifically reference regionally significant infrastructure within the objective as infrastructure is provided for both within Chapter 3 – Strategic Directions (by way of Objective 3.2.8.1 contained in Council's right of reply), as well as provisions in Chapter 30 – Energy and Utilities.
44. However, the Section 42A Report recommends the following amendments to Objective 23.2.1:
- ~~“Protect~~ The economic viability, character and landscape values of the Gibbston Character Zone are protected by enabling viticulture activities and controlling the adverse effects resulting from inappropriate other activities locating in the Zone.”*
45. The Report recommends replacing the word 'inappropriate' with 'other' activities as the Report considers that this will directly acknowledge that other activities are contemplated in this zone, on the basis that their adverse effects are controlled.
46. I agree with the Section 42A Report's intention in amending the objective to allow other activities, such as the National Grid, to be established and developed within the Gibbston Character Zone. However, in my opinion, the proposed wording does not achieve this intent as the reworded objective seems to imply that other activities will only be contemplated within this zone if their adverse effects are controlled.
47. In light of this, I consider that the word 'inappropriate' should be reinstated and the word 'other' deleted. This would allow appropriate activities to be located within this zone, such as regionally significant infrastructure, whilst discouraging land uses considered to be 'inappropriate' in the Gibbston Character Zone.

Policy 23.2.1.7

48. Transpower's submission supports Policy 23.2.1.7 but seeks amendments to reflect that some structures, such as a new electricity substation or line, may have a functional, operational and / or locational need to be located on skylines, ridges, hills or prominent slopes.

49. The Section 42A Report accepts that the policy, as notified, is phrased so that it is absolute in that structures are avoided, likely resulting in development with locational constraints being inconsistent with the policy. The Section 42A Report recommends that the policy should be more accommodating of infrastructure that is important to the District and passes through the Gibbston Valley (as well as serving it), such as the National Grid.
50. I agree with the amendments proposed in the Section 42A Report as the amendments recognise the locational, technical and operational constraints of regionally significant infrastructure. The amendments also give effect to Policy 3 of the NPSET.

Chapter 33 – Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Policy 33.2.1.5

51. Transpower's submission seeks that Policy 33.2.1.5 be amended to recognise regionally significant infrastructure activities within rural areas.
52. The Section 42A Report recommends that Transpower's submission be rejected and states that the identification of farming is not absolute and it would not prejudice other activities that could be reasonably contemplated.
53. I agree with the Section 42A Report's recommendation and explanation insofar that the policy does not prevent other activities being established. I therefore do not consider that 'infrastructure' needs to be referred to within the policy.
54. However, I note that the rationale in the Section 42A Report is contrary to the recommendation in the Section 42A Report to include "Ski Area Activities" within the policy. This appears to conflict with the rationale for recommending rejection of Transpower's submission, which was that the identification of farming is not absolute and other activities could be reasonably contemplated.
55. The Section 42A Report does not provide any justification as to why the policy has been amended to include this particular activity, but not amended to include nationally important activities, such as the National Grid.

Policy 33.2.1.8

56. Transpower's submission seeks the deletion of Policy 33.2.1.8 as offsets are not a requirement of the RMA.

57. The Section 42A Report recommends that Transpower's submission point be rejected as the policy does not compel proponents to undertake biodiversity offsets but considers that it could be in the interests of the proponent to consider biodiversity offsets, depending on the scale of the impacts of a proposal on indigenous biodiversity. The Section 42A Report states that the policy is broad enough that it will not be usurped by advances in practice.
58. I agree with the reasoning in the Section 42A Report that the intention of the policy should be to encourage proponents to consider offsets, rather than making it a requirement of the Proposed Plan. I agree with Transpower's submission that offsetting is not a requirement of the RMA and thus should not be a requirement of the Proposed Plan.
59. I have considered Transpower's submission against the policy framework. The operative Otago RPS does not contain provisions relating to offsetting or compensation of biodiversity values, and the Proposed Plan must give effect to the operative RPS.
60. Although less weight is given to the proposed RPS, the proposed RPS does contain policies relating to offsetting and compensation. Policies 4.5.7 and 4.5.8 of the proposed RPS aim to provide and enable the offsetting of adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity, ensuring that the offset achieves no net loss and preferably a net gain in indigenous biodiversity values. However, I consider that the most specific and relevant policy in relation to the National Grid is Policy 3.5.2. Policy 3.5.2 relates to managing adverse effects of infrastructure that has national or regional significance and clause e) specifically encourages infrastructure providers to consider the use of offsetting, or other compensatory measures, for residual adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity. I agree with the intent of this policy as it does not compel nationally and regionally significant infrastructure providers to offset or compensate adverse effects, but rather encourages the consideration of offsetting and compensation.
61. I therefore suggest the following amendments to the Policy:

"Where the adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity values cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated, consideration ~~will~~ should be given to ~~whether there has been any environmental compensation or~~ biodiversity offsetting, ensuring that proposed and the extent to which any offset ~~achieves will result in no net loss and preferably, a net~~ gain in indigenous biodiversity values gain."

62. In my opinion, the amendments I have proposed are more consistent with Policy 3.5.2 of the proposed RPS as well as clause a) of Policy 4.5.8 in terms of ensuring that any offset achieves no net loss, rather than favouring no net loss or a net gain when offsetting may not be warranted by a particular consent application. I also recommend inserting 'environmental compensation' to address the concerns in the Section 42A Report that 'compensation' could be misconstrued as other forms of compensation, such as financial compensation.
63. I do however note that all the associated rules are discretionary activities and thus Council will have the discretion to assess any biodiversity offsets and compensation offered by an applicant during the assessment of a resource consent application.
64. Overall, I generally support the intention of Policy 33.2.1.8 but consider that it needs to be explicitly clear that offsetting residual adverse effects on indigenous biodiversity is not a requirement, but rather an option available to applicants.

Policy 33.2.2.1

65. Transpower's submission seeks to amend the policy to include the words "remedy or mitigate" along with avoid. Transpower considers that the phrase "avoid, remedy or mitigate" is consistent with the RMA. In addition, effects must be balanced against other nationally important matters such as the operation, maintenance, upgrade or development of the National Grid.
66. The Section 42A Report rejects Transpower's submission point with no identified reasons.
67. I disagree with the recommendation in the Section 42A Report and support Transpower's proposed amendments. The proposed terminology is more consistent with the RMA and responds to the position in the recent *King Salmon* case where the Court stated that the word "avoid" means "not allowing" or "preventing the occurrence of".
68. In addition, Policy 3 of the NPSET directs decision-makers to consider the technical and operational constraints imposed on Transpower when considering the measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse environmental effects. Overall, the NPSET directs Council to consider the extent to which effects have been avoided, remedied or mitigated, as well as the constraints imposed on Transpower to do so.

69. As currently drafted, Policy 33.2.2.1 would “not allow” the clearance of indigenous vegetation within a Significant Natural Area, thereby not offering the options to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects. I consider this approach to be inconsistent with the RMA and could preclude the effective operation, maintenance, upgrade and development of Transpower’s National Grid as it passes through SNAs (such as when the National Grid passes through SNA F40A in the Gibbston Character Zone).
70. Policy 3.5.2 of the proposed RPS relates to managing adverse effects of infrastructure that has national and regional importance. Policy 3.5.2 gives preference to firstly avoiding the location of infrastructure in areas of significant indigenous vegetation, but if this is not possible, such as when the National Grid is currently located within these areas or SNAs, then the policy directs infrastructure to avoid significant adverse effects, and then to avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects on those values that contribute to the significance of the biodiversity. In my opinion, the same approach should be followed in Policy 33.2.2.1 whereby significant adverse effects should be avoided, and if other adverse effects cannot be avoided, they are remedied or mitigated.
71. In order to be consistent with the RMA, NPSET and the proposed RPS, I support Transpower’s submission to alter Policy 33.2.2.1.

Section 33.3.2

72. Transpower’s submission seeks an additional point to clarify that Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Significant Natural Areas are not considered ‘natural areas’ for the purposes of the NESETA.
73. The Section 42A Report recommends that Transpower’s submission point be rejected as the meaning of ‘natural area’ has the same intent of a SNA in the Proposed Plan. The Section 42A Report considers that SNAs in the Proposed Plan qualify as a natural area under the NESETA.
74. Although I agree with the rationale contained in the Section 42A Report, I understand that the intent of Transpower’s submission was to address the anomaly created between the NESETA and the rules in Chapter 33.
75. The NESETA defers to the relevant District Plan to identify natural areas. Because the Proposed Plan identifies SNAs, the rules within Chapter 33 would result in Transpower being required to obtain a resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity under Regulation 32 of the NESETA. However, the exemption in Section 33.3.4.2 of the Proposed Plan provides an exemption from

the rules for all operational utilities. This therefore means that network utility operators do not require resource consent for vegetation clearance, but Transpower does under the NESETA.

76. Transpower's submission therefore seeks to address this anomaly which is created because the rules within the Proposed Plan are more stringent than the NESETA, even though these rules are not intended to apply to network utilities.
77. I consider that another option to address this issue, aside from including Transpower's requested clarification paragraph, is to provide a permitted activity rule which states that any trimming, felling, or removing of any tree or indigenous vegetation, for the operation, upgrade and maintenance of the National Grid, is a permitted activity. A permitted activity rule such as this would ensure that the Proposed Plan applies to vegetation clearance for National Grid purposes, rather than the NESETA. In my opinion, the proposed rule would also ensure that Transpower is not unduly constrained in relation to the trimming and pruning of trees within Significant Natural Areas and in the vicinity of the National Grid.
78. Transpower needs to be easily able to trim and prune trees as they can cause fire hazards to the National Grid if not adequately maintained. Transpower may also be required to undertake the trimming and pruning under the Electricity Act. The anomaly between the NESETA and the rules in Chapter 33 therefore needs to be addressed. In my opinion, providing the exemption by way of a permitted activity rule is the best option to ensure that the Proposed Plan rather than the NESETA applies to indigenous vegetation clearance.

Section 33.3.4.2

79. Transpower's submission supports Section 33.3.4.2 as it recognises that operational utilities are exempt from the indigenous vegetation clearance rules. Transpower did not propose any amendments and the Section 42A Report accepts Transpower's submission point.
80. I agree with the recommendation contained in the Section 42A Report, however I do note that this exemption does not apply to Transpower due to the rules being more stringent than the NESETA, as discussed above.

Definitions

81. Transpower's submission supports the definitions for 'Factory Farming', 'Farming Activity' and 'Farm Building' with no amendments. The Section 42A Report

accepts Transpower's submission points on these definitions and recommends no amendments.

82. I agree with the Section 42A Report in regards to these three definitions.

Further Submissions

83. Transpower did not make any further submissions to other parties' submissions in relation to Chapters 21, 23 and 33 of the Proposed Plan.

Conclusion

84. The Queenstown Lakes District Plan must give effect to the NPSET, have regard to the proposed RPS, and achieve the purpose of the RMA. Transpower's submission seeks minor amendments to achieve this.
85. In my view, the amendments as set out in Attachment A of this evidence, enable the Proposed Plan to appropriately give effect to the NPSET (and reflect the current direction of the proposed RPS) and as such achieve the purpose of the RMA by:
- a) Providing for the use, development and protection of the National Grid;
 - b) Protecting the National Grid from the adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects; and
 - c) Appropriately managing the adverse effects of the National Grid.

Aileen Mary Crow

21 April 2016

ATTACHMENT A: FURTHER REVISIONS TO THE PROPOSED QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT PLAN SUPPORTED IN EVIDENCE

The following amendments (shown in [blue](#)) are proposed to the Revised Version of the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan that incorporates the amendments recommended in the various Section 42A Reports.

Chapter 21 – Rural

Amend Objective 21.2.4 as follows:

~~“Manage Situations where sensitive activities conflict with existing and anticipated activities are avoided managed the Rural Zone.”~~

Chapter 23 – Gibbston Character Zone

Amend Objective 23.2.1 as follows:

~~“Protect The economic viability, character and landscape values of the Gibbston Character Zone are protected by enabling viticulture activities and controlling the adverse effects resulting from inappropriate ~~other~~ activities locating in the Zone.”~~

Chapter 33 – Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Amend Policy 33.2.1.8 as follows:

~~“Where the adverse effects of an activity on indigenous biodiversity values cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated, consideration will should be given to whether there has been any environmental compensation or biodiversity offsetting, ensuring that proposed and the extent to which any offset achieves will result in no net loss and preferably, a net gain in indigenous biodiversity values gain.”~~

Amend Policy 33.2.2.1 as follows:

~~“Avoid, or where this is not practicable, remedy or mitigate the effects associated with the clearance of indigenous vegetation with Significant Natural Areas that would reduce indigenous biodiversity values.”~~

Amend Section 33.3.2 as follows:

~~“Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Significant Natural Areas are not considered to be ‘natural areas’ for the purposes of the Resource Management”~~

(National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities) Regulations 2009 (NESETA)."

OR

Include a permitted activity rule instead of an exemption.