

## List of further submitters on PC7 – Rosewood Terrace

| Further submitter no. | Original submitter no. | Further submitter name                                   |
|-----------------------|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------|
| 1                     | n/a                    | Jim                                                      |
| 2                     | 18                     | George Forbes & Laura Palomino Forbes                    |
| 3                     | 31                     | Wayne and Jenny Chisnall                                 |
| 4                     | n/a                    | Amber Ward                                               |
| 5                     | n/a                    | Connal Bell                                              |
| 6                     | 36                     | Roseanne Hinton & Michael Tayles                         |
| 7                     | 61                     | Andy & Angie Mason on behalf of Amberley Trust           |
| 8                     | 60                     | Timothy Goulding                                         |
| 9                     | 26                     | Vicki & Dave Sanford                                     |
| 10                    | 98                     | Adele Brown                                              |
| 11                    | n/a                    | Amberley Beach Guardians Inc                             |
| 12                    | 54                     | North Canterbury Province, Federated Farmers New Zealand |
| 13                    | 93                     | Paula Le Compte                                          |

## Form 6 - Further submission on a proposed plan change to the District Plan



Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

*Please do not hesitate to contact the planning team at the Hurunui District Council (ph 03 314 0048 or email [planning@hurunui.govt.nz](mailto:planning@hurunui.govt.nz)) if you require any assistance.*

**To:** Hurunui District Council

**Name of submitter: \***

Jim

This is a further submission in support (or opposition to) a submission on the following change proposed to the Hurunui District Plan:

### **Plan Change 7 – Rosewood Terrace**

The Council has initiated a plan change to the Hurunui District Plan to rezone part of the property 185 Ashworths Road, Amberley from Rural Zone to Residential 1 Zone, and apply an Outline Development Zone overlay along with associated changes to the policies and rules applying to the plan change site. The rezoning would enable development of approximately 230 lots.

The purpose of the plan change is to allow for the proactive relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement, which is subject to multiple hazards (including coastal erosion and inundation, fluvial and pluvial flooding and rising groundwater) in a manner that is cost neutral to the wider community and which is sensitively located within, and integrated with, the surrounding environment.

**I am: \***

the local authority for the relevant area.

**Please explain why you come within the category chosen above: \***

Because I live here and thus I should have some authority.

**I support all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

I'm open to more yarns.

The subdivision should go ahead. People need a house, equally, leave the village alone as this is where we call home.

Subdivision yes.

Amberley beach stays residence

**I oppose all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

**The particular parts of the submission/s I support or oppose are:**

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission/s you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal. Continue on a separate document if necessary and upload as a supporting document. Please ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to.

**The reasons for my support or opposition are:**

Give details, continue on a separate sheet if necessary and upload as a supporting document.

**I seek the whole or part of the submission/s be allowed or disallowed:**

Please give precise details of what you seek to be allowed or disallowed. If it is only part of the submission/s please be precise about which part of the submission/s. Ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to each time.

Upload any supporting documents here:

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? \*

Yes

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing:

## Contact details for submitter

---

**Address: \***

Street Address

25 Holton Road

Address Line 2

Amberley

City

Amberley

Postal / Zip Code

7481

State / Province / Region

Amberley

Country

New Zealand

**Phone number:**

**Email: \***

jimmy@insituscaffolding.co.nz

**Contact person:**

Name and designation if applicable

**Note to submitter:**

The closing date for serving further submissions on the consent authority is 5pm Thursday 22 October 2026.

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter/s within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the Council is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- it contains offensive language:
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

**Privacy information:**

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you. The RMA requires your submission, including your name and contact details, to be made available to the Council (including the Council decision-maker) and the applicant.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, may also be made available to other submitters and to the public on the Council's website, or on request. If requested, the Council may legally be required to make all submissions available to the public (which can include the media), including the name and contact details of the submitter, subject to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA).

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential from other submitters or the public under LGOIMA, please contact the processing Planner for this application prior to making your submission.

## HURUNUI DISTRICT COUNCIL

## FORM 6

Further submission on a proposed change to the District Plan

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991



*Please do not hesitate to phone or email the planning team at the Hurunui District Council (ph 03 314 8816; email [planning@hurunui.govt.nz](mailto:planning@hurunui.govt.nz)) if you require any assistance.*

**To:** Hurunui District Council

**Date:** 17 October 2026

**This is a further submission in support of (or in opposition to) a submission on the following proposed plan change to the Hurunui District Plan:**

**Plan Change 7 – Rosewood Terrace**

The Council has initiated a plan change to the Hurunui District Plan to rezone part of the property 185 Ashworths Road, Amberley from Rural Zone to Residential 1 Zone, and apply an Outline Development Zone overlay along with associated changes to the policies and rules applying to the plan change site. The rezoning would enable development of approximately 230 lots.

The purpose of the plan change is to allow for the proactive relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement, which is subject to multiple hazards (including coastal erosion and inundation, fluvial and pluvial flooding and rising groundwater) in a manner that is cost neutral to the wider community and which is sensitively located within, and integrated with, the surrounding environment.

**Submitter details:**

Name/s: (Full name) **George Forbes and Laura Palomino Forbes**

Contact person: **George Forbes**

Designation: **Trustees. Owners of proximate land on Hursley Terrace.**

Address for service:

**205 Hursley Terrace Road**

**RD 1**

**Amberley 7481**

Email address: [georgeforbes.email@gmail.com](mailto:georgeforbes.email@gmail.com)

Telephone:

**I am: (tick the applicable box)**

☐

A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or

☒

**X A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has; or**

☐

The local authority for the relevant area

Please explain why you come within the category you ticked above:

**Our property is proximate to the development site on Hursley Terrace. We have made earlier written submission 18.**

**I support all or part of the submission/s of:**

*Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number*

**Wayne Gregory Sargent Chisnall & Jennifer Linley Chisnall – submission 31**

165 Hursley Terrace Road, Amberley

thedownsangus@amuri.net

**Pounamu Higgs – submission 45**

1 South Crescent, Amberley

Pounamu27@gmail.com

**Arthur Light – submission 52**

arthurlight@gmail.com

## I oppose all or part of the submission/s of:

*Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number*

N/A

## The particular parts of the submission/s I support or oppose are:

*Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission/s you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal, continue on a separate sheet if necessary. Please ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to.*

### SUBMISSIONS BELOW MARKED BY RESPECTIVE SURNAMES:

- A. **Chisnall:** All parts and, particularly, the submission statements that. "...achieving cost-neutral is subject to a wide set of assumptions and risks that make this financial outcome uncertain.", together with those additional parts of their submission that relate to future development related infrastructure and amenities associated with Plan Change 7, including 3-waters and roading, where related responsibility will be for the Hurunui District Council or other Council owned or directed entities.
- B. **Higgs:** All parts and, particularly, the submission statements that Council's obtaining of a green social and sustainability loan should not determine the planning outcome.
- C. **Light:** All parts and, particularly, the submission statements relating to the sale of all of Rosewood farm.

## The reasons for my support or opposition are:

*Give details, continue on a separate sheet if necessary.*

### Support reasons for submitters as identified by surname below:

1. **Chisnall:** There is a complex and potentially unresolvable conflict between:
  - a. the Hurunui District Council's legally significant requirement that, *"The premise of PC7, [is] to provide for this proactive relocation in a manner that is cost neutral to the wider community,"* [s32 report, page 17 and elsewhere];  
  
and
  - b. Council's responsibilities to design, build, deliver and maintain adequate infrastructure and amenities associated with the Plan Change 7 residential development including, without limitation, 3-waters (via a separate Hurunui District Council controlled (50.50% ownership) KHWS water organisation company), roading and landscaping.

In creating the requirement for cost neutral, Council has imposed an additional test connected to various legal requirements associated with Plan Change 7. Council's continuing statutory obligations in relation to infrastructure and amenities associated with the plan change are at material risk of being restricted or otherwise inhibited at each of these stages by the cost neutral test created by Council for Plan Change 7.
2. **Chisnall:** Council should confirm whether it may move certain future costs for the development associated with Plan Change 7 off its balance sheet and into the likes of the KHWS water organisation (3-waters). If that sort of financial structuring may eventuate, Council should explain how the full package of costs will continue to be accounted for in the overall cost neutral calculations associated with Plan Change 7; and, additionally, how this package will be published to ratepayers and to any lenders or others with continuing reporting requirements.
3. **Higgs:** The green loan obtained by the Hurunui District Council from the LGFA contains a term outlining the Council's estimated Amberley Beach proactive relocation timeframe of ten (10) years from the loan commencement date – i.e. the Amberley Beach proactive relocation completed by June 2035. While Council has separately stated that this agreed term and timeframe is an estimate, and it is not required that proactive relocation be completed by June 2035, nevertheless, this estimated relocation timeframe as stated and agreed within the Council's loan facility may add to the Council pressure and momentum, undermining (amongst other matters) the adaptative coastal and trigger-based plan, as well as the voluntary nature of relocation.
4. **Light:** I support the marketing for sale of the whole of Rosewood farm (without any plan change or residential development) at the earliest suitable opportunity, so that Hurunui District Council may avoid or mitigate financial loss resulting from its 2025 acquisition of this land. Given the financial results and position of the Hurunui District Council as published for 2024/25, a sale would appear prudent.

## I seek that the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed.

*Please give precise details of what you seek to be allowed or disallowed. If it is in part please be precise about which part of the submission/s. Ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to each time.*

**In each case, the whole of the submission be allowed.**

## Hearing:

I wish to be heard in support of my further submission: YES ☒ NO ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing: YES ☒ NO ☐

## Notes:

- The closing date for serving further submissions on the consent authority is **5pm Thursday 22 October 2026**.
- **A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter/s within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.**
- If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):
  - it is frivolous or vexatious:
  - it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
  - it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
  - it contains offensive language:
  - it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

## Privacy information:

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to

check and correct any personal information that we hold about you. The RMA requires your submission, including your name and contact details, to be made available to the Council (including the Council decision-maker) and the applicant.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, may also be made available to other submitters and to the public on the Council's website, or on request. If requested, the Council may legally be required to make all submissions available to the public (which can include the media), including the name and contact details of the submitter, subject to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA). If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential from other submitters or the public under LGOIMA, please contact the processing Planner for this application prior to making your submission.

## Form 6 - Further submission on a proposed plan change to the District Plan



Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

*Please do not hesitate to contact the planning team at the Hurunui District Council (ph 03 314 0048 or email [planning@hurunui.govt.nz](mailto:planning@hurunui.govt.nz)) if you require any assistance.*

**To:** Hurunui District Council

**Name of submitter: \***

Wayne Chisnall & Jenny Chisnall

This is a further submission in support (or opposition to) a submission on the following change proposed to the Hurunui District Plan:

### **Plan Change 7 – Rosewood Terrace**

The Council has initiated a plan change to the Hurunui District Plan to rezone part of the property 185 Ashworths Road, Amberley from Rural Zone to Residential 1 Zone, and apply an Outline Development Zone overlay along with associated changes to the policies and rules applying to the plan change site. The rezoning would enable development of approximately 230 lots.

The purpose of the plan change is to allow for the proactive relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement, which is subject to multiple hazards (including coastal erosion and inundation, fluvial and pluvial flooding and rising groundwater) in a manner that is cost neutral to the wider community and which is sensitively located within, and integrated with, the surrounding environment.

**I am: \***

a person who has an interest in the proposal greater than the interest the general public has.

**Please explain why you come within the category chosen above: \***

I am a previous submitter number 31 and a direct neighbour/landowner

**I support all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

Jessica Caddy  
Submission 16  
2 South Crescent, Amberley Beach

Stewart & Kate Henry  
Submission 57  
3 Mill Road, Leithfield

**I oppose all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

N/A

**The particular parts of the submission/s I support or oppose are:**

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission/s you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal. Continue on a separate document if necessary and upload as a supporting document. Please ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to.

Jessica Caddy Submission- 16.5

*"Concerned about the costs of consenting and building on the new land and the removal and clearance of dwellings at the Beach, and it being unattainable for most of the community, meaning relocation is technically available but financially inaccessible."*

Stewart & Kate Henry - Submission 57

All parts and particularly, the decision sought to *"Sell Rosewood as is.."*

**The reasons for my support or opposition are:**

Give details, continue on a separate sheet if necessary and upload as a supporting document.

**1. Jessica Caddy Submission- 16.5**

Previous submissions clearly demonstrate that funding Plan Change 7 is financially unattainable for the majority of Amberley Beach residents, raising serious concerns given that resident funding is a key component of the plan.

It is deeply concerning that, during the planning process, HDC appears to have overlooked the financial realities facing these residents by assuming they would be able to afford relocation. How can this be considered a proactive relocation plan when the financial ability of residents to relocate has not been adequately addressed?

**2. Stewart & Kate Henry - Submission 57**

We support the sale of Rosewood Farm as it stands rather than proceeding with the proposed rezoning and residential development under Plan Change 7.

Given the overwhelming opposition through the original submissions from the Amberley Beach community, the wider Hurunui community, and rural organizations, common sense dictates that the farm should be sold as is, reducing the financial burden on ratepayers and avoiding further debt.

**I seek the whole or part of the submission/s be allowed or disallowed:**

Please give precise details of what you seek to be allowed or disallowed. If it is only part of the submission/s please be precise about which part of the submission/s. Ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to each time.

I seek the whole of the submission be allowed

**Upload any supporting documents here:****Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? \***

Yes

**If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing:**

Yes

**Contact details for submitter**

---

**Address: \***

Street Address

165

Address Line 2

Hursley Terrace Road

City

Amberley

State / Province / Region

Canterbury

Postal / Zip Code

7410

Country

New Zealand

**Phone number:**

64,274,712,078

**Email: \***

thedownsangus@amuri.net

**Contact person:**

Name and designation if applicable

Wayne Chisnall - Please email the above address upon receipt of this submission.

**Note to submitter:**

The closing date for serving further submissions on the consent authority is 5pm Thursday 22 October 2026.

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter/s within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the Council is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- it contains offensive language:
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

**Privacy information:**

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you. The RMA requires your submission, including your name and contact details, to be made available to the Council (including the Council decision-maker) and the applicant.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, may also be made available to other submitters and to the public on the Council's website, or on request. If requested, the Council may legally be required to make all submissions available to the public (which can include the media), including the name and contact details of the submitter, subject to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA).

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential from other submitters or the public under LGOIMA, please contact the processing Planner for this application prior to making your submission.

## Form 6 - Further submission on a proposed plan change to the District Plan



Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

*Please do not hesitate to contact the planning team at the Hurunui District Council (ph 03 314 0048 or email [planning@hurunui.govt.nz](mailto:planning@hurunui.govt.nz)) if you require any assistance.*

**To:** Hurunui District Council

**Name of submitter: \***

Amber ward

This is a further submission in support (or opposition to) a submission on the following change proposed to the Hurunui District Plan:

### **Plan Change 7 – Rosewood Terrace**

The Council has initiated a plan change to the Hurunui District Plan to rezone part of the property 185 Ashworths Road, Amberley from Rural Zone to Residential 1 Zone, and apply an Outline Development Zone overlay along with associated changes to the policies and rules applying to the plan change site. The rezoning would enable development of approximately 230 lots.

The purpose of the plan change is to allow for the proactive relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement, which is subject to multiple hazards (including coastal erosion and inundation, fluvial and pluvial flooding and rising groundwater) in a manner that is cost neutral to the wider community and which is sensitively located within, and integrated with, the surrounding environment.

**I am: \***

a person who has an interest in the proposal greater than the interest the general public has.

**Please explain why you come within the category chosen above: \***

I own property at Amberley beach.

**I support all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

NO

**I oppose all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

Yes to all

**The particular parts of the submission/s I support or oppose are:**

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission/s you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal. Continue on a separate document if necessary and upload as a supporting document. Please ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to.

I oppose all of it.

The plan change 7 to rosewood. Should be left as rural and left alone completely. It all seems too rushed and for what purpose????

**The reasons for my support or opposition are:**

Give details, continue on a separate sheet if necessary and upload as a supporting document.

I oppose the Rosewood plan change 7 due to lack of consultation, no real communication and no real care or empathy for the people of the community, their homes or livelihoods. No real thought process from the council regarding the WHOLE concept, no real care about the actual people and their homes. I feel bullied into the whole concept of this RELOCATION.

I bought my house with the idea of it being my forever house and to be able to retire there and live out my days as I really like where I live. Love the peace, quiet.

**I seek the whole or part of the submission/s be allowed or disallowed:**

Please give precise details of what you seek to be allowed or disallowed. If it is only part of the submission/s please be precise about which part of the submission/s. Ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to each time.

I would love to know more about relocation.

How it is proposed we relocate with no money to do so. I understand a kind of land swap. How do we then get the money for the house? Where does that go/come?

And the ballot for sections - you would think the residents would have 1st dibs on sections considering the land purchase is supposed to be about them, isn't it????

**Upload any supporting documents here:****Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? \***

No

**If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing:**

Yes

**Contact details for submitter**

---

**Address: \***

Street Address

49 Chamberlain Ave

Address Line 2

City

Amberley Beach

Postal / Zip Code

7481

State / Province / Region

Canterbury

Country

New Zealand

**Phone number:****Email: \***

asward@ymail.com

**Contact person:**

Name and designation if applicable

**Note to submitter:**

The closing date for serving further submissions on the consent authority is 5pm Thursday 22 October 2026.

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter/s within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the Council is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:

- it contains offensive language:
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

**Privacy information:**

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you. The RMA requires your submission, including your name and contact details, to be made available to the Council (including the Council decision-maker) and the applicant.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, may also be made available to other submitters and to the public on the Council's website, or on request. If requested, the Council may legally be required to make all submissions available to the public (which can include the media), including the name and contact details of the submitter, subject to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA).

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential from other submitters or the public under LGOIMA, please contact the processing Planner for this application prior to making your submission.

## Form 6 - Further submission on a proposed plan change to the District Plan



Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

*Please do not hesitate to contact the planning team at the Hurunui District Council (ph 03 314 0048 or email [planning@hurunui.govt.nz](mailto:planning@hurunui.govt.nz)) if you require any assistance.*

**To:** Hurunui District Council

**Name of submitter: \***

Connal Bell

This is a further submission in support (or opposition to) a submission on the following change proposed to the Hurunui District Plan:

### **Plan Change 7 – Rosewood Terrace**

The Council has initiated a plan change to the Hurunui District Plan to rezone part of the property 185 Ashworths Road, Amberley from Rural Zone to Residential 1 Zone, and apply an Outline Development Zone overlay along with associated changes to the policies and rules applying to the plan change site. The rezoning would enable development of approximately 230 lots.

The purpose of the plan change is to allow for the proactive relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement, which is subject to multiple hazards (including coastal erosion and inundation, fluvial and pluvial flooding and rising groundwater) in a manner that is cost neutral to the wider community and which is sensitively located within, and integrated with, the surrounding environment.

**I am: \***

a person who has an interest in the proposal greater than the interest the general public has.

**Please explain why you come within the category chosen above: \***

I am a resident of the Amberley Beach community and the decision regarding this proposal directly affects me and my property. We bought this property at the end of 2025 under the assumption that if the community had to retreat then there would be a plan in place. I wanted to make a submission because I do not want a risk of that plan not going ahead.

I was unable to submit an original submission before the closing date (apologies) that is why I am filling out the 'Further Submission' form instead.

**I support all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

I support the submission as long as a few things are clarified first

Connal Bell

15 South Crescent

No original submitter number

**I oppose all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

**The particular parts of the submission/s I support or oppose are:**

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission/s you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal. Continue on a separate document if necessary and upload as a supporting document. Please ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to.

Overall its a great retreat plan for the worst-case scenario

**The reasons for my support or opposition are:**

Give details, continue on a separate sheet if necessary and upload as a supporting document.

As mention, its a great plan for the worst scenario that global warming will eventually make our homes uninhabitable. Its fair to say noone at the beach wants to leave their home voluntarily and the thought of having to abandon their home is quite scary.

From an outsiders view the council seems to be doing everything they can to have this retreat plan underway before a few inevitable changes in the council structure happen and could potentially stop this plan from ever going ahead. So thank you to everyone involved.

All of that being said, I fully support the plan going ahead as long as its kept as a retreat plan for when we have to move and not a "hurry up and move" situation were we have to leave a perfectly good home just to pay for the development. If the infrastructure is there and the plot of land is left there waiting for us to move at our own pace then I see no reason why this isn't a great plan for all.

**I seek the whole or part of the submission/s be allowed or disallowed:**

Please give precise details of what you seek to be allowed or disallowed. If it is only part of the submission/s please be precise about which part of the submission/s. Ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to each time.

As mentioned above, as long as there are no time limit tags in conditions then I'm happy with the submission.

**Upload any supporting documents here:****Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? \***

No

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing:

**Contact details for submitter**

---

**Address: \***

Street Address

15 South Crescent

Address Line 2

City

Amberley

Postal / Zip Code

7481

State / Province / Region

CANTERBURY

Country

New Zealand

**Phone number:**

210,516,644

**Email: \***

connal.bell@gmail.com

**Contact person:**

Name and designation if applicable

Connal

**Note to submitter:**

The closing date for serving further submissions on the consent authority is 5pm Thursday 22 October 2026.

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter/s within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the Council is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:

- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- it contains offensive language:
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

**Privacy information:**

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you. The RMA requires your submission, including your name and contact details, to be made available to the Council (including the Council decision-maker) and the applicant.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, may also be made available to other submitters and to the public on the Council's website, or on request. If requested, the Council may legally be required to make all submissions available to the public (which can include the media), including the name and contact details of the submitter, subject to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA).

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential from other submitters or the public under LGOIMA, please contact the processing Planner for this application prior to making your submission.

## HURUNUI DISTRICT COUNCIL

## FORM 6

Further submission on a proposed change to the District Plan

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991



*Please do not hesitate to phone or email the planning team at the Hurunui District Council (ph 03 314 8816; email [planning@hurunui.govt.nz](mailto:planning@hurunui.govt.nz)) if you require any assistance.*

To: Hurunui District Council

19 October 2026

**This is a further submission in support of (or in opposition to) a submission on the following proposed plan change to the Hurunui District Plan:**

**Plan Change 7 – Rosewood Terrace**

The Council has initiated a plan change to the Hurunui District Plan to rezone part of the property 185 Ashworths Road, Amberley from Rural Zone to Residential 1 Zone, and apply an Outline Development Zone overlay along with associated changes to the policies and rules applying to the plan change site. The rezoning would enable development of approximately 230 lots.

The purpose of the plan change is to allow for the proactive relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement, which is subject to multiple hazards (including coastal erosion and inundation, fluvial and pluvial flooding and rising groundwater) in a manner that is cost neutral to the wider community and which is sensitively located within, and integrated with, the surrounding environment.

**Submitter details:**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Roseanne Hinton and Michael Tayles \_\_\_\_\_

Contact person: Roseanne Hinton

Designation: Affected land owner

Address for service:

70 Newcombes Road, Amberley

Email: [rose\\_hinton@hotmail.com](mailto:rose_hinton@hotmail.com)

Telephone: 02108528434

**I am: (tick the applicable box)**

☐

A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or

☒

A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has; or

☐

The local authority for the relevant area

Please explain why you come within the category you ticked above:

I am a neighbouring rural landowner with an interest in the proposal that is greater than that of the general public due to the potential effects on highly productive land, rural character, local infrastructure and surrounding rural activities.

### **I support all or part of the submission/s of:**

*Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number*

Submission 54 – Federated Farmers – in part

Submission 63 – Celine Goulding – in part

Submission 98 – Adele Brown – in part

### **I oppose all or part of the submission/s of:**

*Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number*

N/A

### **The particular parts of the submission/s I support or oppose are:**

1. Protection of highly productive land and avoidance of unnecessary loss of productive rural land.
2. Concerns that the scale of rezoning exceeds what has been demonstrated as necessary and that approximately 34ha of productive rural land will be permanently removed from production.
3. The principle that Council ownership of the land should not predetermine the rezoning outcome and that the proposal should be assessed solely on its planning merits.

### **The reasons for my support or opposition are:**

I support these submissions points because they focus on fundamental rural planning issues. The permanent loss of highly productive rural land should only occur where it is clearly demonstrated that the extent of rezoning is the minimum necessary.

The proposal appears to enable a scale of residential development that has not been fully justified when weighed against the long-term loss of productive soils and the effects on the surrounding rural environment. Once productive land is rezoned and fragmented for residential development, those productive values cannot be recovered.

I also support the principle that Council ownership of the site should not influence the planning outcome. The proposal should succeed or fail on its planning merits, its consistency with the protection of productive rural land, and its ability to appropriately manage effects on neighbouring rural properties.

**I seek that the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed.**

*Please give precise details of what you seek to be allowed or disallowed. If it is in part please be precise about which part of the submission/s. Ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to each time.*

### Hearing:

Allow the relevant parts of Submissions 54, 63 and 98, and give particular weight to the protection of highly productive land, the need to minimise the extent of rural land loss, and the requirement that the rezoning be assessed independently of Council ownership interests.

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing: YES ☒ NO ☐

### Notes:

- The closing date for serving further submissions on the consent authority is **5pm Thursday 22 October 2026**.

- **A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter/s within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.**
- If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):
  - it is frivolous or vexatious:
  - it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
  - it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
  - it contains offensive language:
  - it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

### **Privacy information:**

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you. The RMA requires your submission, including your name and contact details, to be made available to the Council (including the Council decision-maker) and the applicant.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, may also be made available to other submitters and to the public on the Council's website, or on request. If requested, the Council may legally be required to make all submissions available to the public (which can include the media), including the name and contact details of the submitter, subject to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA). If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential from other submitters or the public under LGOIMA, please contact the processing Planner for this application prior to making your submission.

# HURUNUI DISTRICT COUNCIL FORM 6 Further submission

Clause 8 of Schedule 1  
Resource Management Act 1991

**To: Hurunui District Council**

Further submission period closes: 5pm Thursday 22  
October 2026

**Plan Change 7 - Rosewood Terrace**

## This is a further submission on Plan Change 7 - Rosewood Terrace

This further submission is made in support of or opposition to specified parts of original submissions on Proposed Plan Change 7. It should be finalised against the Council's notified Summary of Submissions and the relevant summary point numbers inserted before filing.

### 1. Further submitter details

|                                                                                             |                            |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Name/s: Andy Mason and Angie Mason, on behalf of the Amberley Trust                         | Contact person: Andy Mason |
| Designation: Trustees/occupiers/operators of Amberley House and adjoining farming operation | Telephone: 021 346 990     |
| Address for service: 127 Ashworths Road, Amberley 7441                                      |                            |
| Email address: andrew@parkhillproperties.co.nz                                              |                            |

### 2. Eligibility and interest

[X] We are not trade competitors.

We have an interest in PC7 greater than the interest of the general public. Amberley House and the adjoining farming operation are immediately adjacent to the proposed State Highway 1 access area and the Rosewood Terrace development. The proposal may directly affect the established Amberley House access, traffic safety, farming and equestrian operations, livestock, rural interface, open-space boundaries, construction effects and the future connectivity of adjoining land.

This further submission is confined to parts of other submissions that materially affect Amberley House or reinforce the protections and amendments sought in our original Submission 61.

#### Form 6 filing note

Under the Council's notified Form 6, a copy of this further submission must also be served on each original submitter to whom it relates within 5 working days after it is served on the Council. The final lodged version should use the Council's Summary of Submissions point numbers and the original submitters' service details as recorded by Council.

### 3. Original submissions supported or opposed

"Support in part" means support only for the identified matter or relief. "Support in part / qualify" means we support the identified matter or relief subject to the qualification stated.

| Sub. | Submitter                                                    | Position                         | Matter relevant to Amberley House                                                                                           | Further-submission relief                                                                                                                                                                                                   |
|------|--------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 18   | George Forbes & Laura Palomino Forbes                        | Support in part                  | Construction effects; mitigation planting/fencing; traffic sensitivity; later participation.                                | Support effective construction management, durable rural-interface mitigation, traffic sensitivity testing and targeted participation by directly affected adjoining owners.                                                |
| 36   | Roseanne Hinton & Michael Tayles                             | Support in part                  | Reverse sensitivity; rural activities; traffic safety; construction effects; participation.                                 | Support protection of lawful rural activities and management of construction/traffic effects. Support later participation where approvals materially affect adjoining owners.                                               |
| 44   | Mitchell Cochrane                                            | Support in part                  | Construction and infrastructure traffic; noise, dust, vibration, access disruption; cumulative effects; later notification. | Support construction and cumulative-effects controls. Support notification/participation only where a later proposal directly and materially affects Amberley House, its access, rural interface or established operations. |
| 46   | Elizabeth Ann Goodwin                                        | Support in part / oppose in part | Formal relocation framework; staged implementation; relocation not automatic on rezoning.                                   | Support a clear staged framework, but oppose reliance on "relocation" traffic assumptions unless corresponding existing beach properties cease residential use or the cumulative two-settlement scenario is reassessed.     |
| 49   | Michael Goodwin                                              | Support in part / oppose in part | Formal relocation framework; staged implementation; relocation not automatic on rezoning.                                   | Same position as Submission 46.                                                                                                                                                                                             |
| 54   | Federated Farmers of New Zealand - North Canterbury Province | Support in part                  | Reverse sensitivity; protection of surrounding rural land users; additional road traffic.                                   | Support avoidance/mitigation of reverse sensitivity, no new constraints on existing rural operations, and traffic management that does not disrupt normal farming activities.                                               |

| Sub. | Submitter                          | Position                  | Matter relevant to Amberley House                                                                                                                                | Further-submission relief                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|------|------------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 65   | Simon & Jaimee Thorne              | Support in part           | Future strategic road connection from the Rosewood Terrace area toward Amberley through adjoining land.                                                          | Support the principle of safeguarding a future road connection from Rosewood Terrace toward Amberley and adjoining land, including a future connection to Amberley House land. The exact alignment should remain subject to structure planning, technical assessment and agreement with affected landowners rather than being fixed prematurely.                                                     |
| 92   | NZ Transport Agency<br>Waka Kotahi | Support in part / qualify | Restricted discretionary status; SH1 intersection design and timing; staging; NZTA approval role.                                                                | Support at least restricted discretionary status and specific control/discretion over SH1 intersection design and delivery. Qualify any stated comfort with the ITA so it is not treated as approval of the materially relocated ODP access unless the actual ODP location, Amberley House driveway, Gracebrook access, SISD, land envelope and final geometry are re-assessed and accepted by NZTA. |
| 99   | Groundswell NZ                     | Support in part           | Reverse sensitivity from residential development adjoining active rural land; protection of established rural production from complaints and later restrictions. | Support the reverse-sensitivity relief insofar as it protects existing lawful rural production and avoids new constraints on Amberley House and adjoining farming operations.                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
| 101  | Christopher John Herbert           | Support in part           | Reverse sensitivity from residential development adjoining active rural land, including noise, dust, odour, machinery and pressure for restrictions on farming.  | Support the reverse-sensitivity relief insofar as it protects existing lawful rural production and avoids new constraints on Amberley House and adjoining farming operations.                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |

| Sub. | Submitter                      | Position                  | Matter relevant to Amberley House                                                                                                                               | Further-submission relief                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|------|--------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 102  | Fire and Emergency New Zealand | Support in part           | Express delivery of both ODP access connections; emergency access and network resilience.                                                                       | Support an express requirement that both external access connections shown on the ODP are formed and constructed as integral components of the development, rather than relying only on subdivision being generally in accordance with the ODP. The SH1/Ashworths Road connection remains subject to the updated location/design assessment and NZTA approval sought in this further submission. |
| 107  | Rosalie Rogers                 | Support in part / qualify | Supports planning ahead but seeks clearer, flexible implementation and genuinely voluntary participation; asks what happens where residents do not participate. | Support the need for a clear and flexible implementation framework and recognition that relocation is voluntary. Qualify this by requiring the ITA and plan provisions to assess the cumulative two-settlement scenario unless one-for-one cessation of residential use at Amberley Beach is legally secured.                                                                                    |

## 4. Narrative in support of this further submission

### 4.1 Scope and approach

This further submission is confined to discrete matters that reinforce the protections and amendments sought in Submission 61. In particular, we support or qualify parts of other submissions where they seek better transport planning, protection of existing rural operations, construction management, enforceable relocation staging, future connectivity and meaningful participation by directly affected adjoining landowners.

### 4.2 NZTA submission and the State Highway 1 intersection

We support NZTA's request that future subdivision have at least Restricted Discretionary Activity status and that the matters of control or discretion expressly address the SH1 intersection, its design and the timing of delivery. We also support NZTA's concern that a Controlled Activity framework could constrain its ability to seek changes at subdivision stage and that staged subdivision could otherwise shift traffic effects onto the existing Hursley Terrace Road and Crosses Road intersections.

We also support Submission 102 by Fire and Emergency New Zealand insofar as it seeks an express re-

quirement for the formation and construction of both access connections shown on the ODP. Fire and Emergency identifies that requiring subdivision to be only “in general accordance” with the ODP does not ensure that both accesses will actually be delivered. We agree that the two external connections - to SH1/Ashworths Road and Hursley Terrace Road - should be required as integral components of the ODP and secured through enforceable plan provisions. The timing and staging of those connections should provide network resilience and reliable emergency access. Our support for the SH1 connection remains subject to the updated location and design assessment, integration with the Amberley House and Gracebrook accesses, and NZTA acceptance sought in this further submission.

Our support is subject to an important qualification. NZTA’s submission records comfort with the intersection design described in the ITA, but the ODP access has been materially relocated from the position assessed during the earlier transport work. The plan change should therefore not treat that statement as final approval of the actual ODP location. The precise location must be reassessed together with the existing Amberley House driveway, the Gracebrook access directly opposite, operating speeds, Safe Intersection Sight Distance, turning lanes, stacking, tapers, visibility splays, drainage, earthworks and the full land envelope required for a workable intersection.

### **4.3 Relocation assumptions and staging**

We support the parts of Submissions 46 and 49 seeking a clear, staged and transparent relocation framework and recognising that rezoning does not itself force existing Amberley Beach residents to move. That proposition makes the transport issue raised in our original submission more important, not less.

Submissions 93 and 107 reinforce that issue from different perspectives. Submission 93 identifies the mismatch between the 109 Amberley Beach properties and the substantially larger Rosewood Terrace development, and the uncertainty created by voluntary uptake. Submission 107 supports planning ahead while seeking a clearer and more flexible implementation framework in which participation remains genuinely voluntary. Those points reinforce the need for the transport assessment and plan provisions to be based on the development outcome that can actually be secured, rather than an assumed full relocation.

If relocation remains voluntary, the plan provisions cannot simultaneously rely on an assumption that 109 Rosewood Terrace households merely replace 109 existing Amberley Beach households unless that result is actually secured. Any lot counted as a relocated household for transport purposes should be linked by enforceable staging and certification to a corresponding existing Amberley Beach property permanently ceasing residential use. If that cannot be achieved, the ITA should be updated to assess the cumulative operation of the existing settlement and the full Rosewood Terrace development.

### **4.4 Future strategic road connection - Submission 65**

We specifically support the future-connectivity relief sought by Simon and Jaimee Thorne in Submission 65. Their submission asks Council to provide for a future road link from the Rosewood Terrace growth area toward Amberley, illustrated on their attached plan as a connection through adjoining land. The stated purpose is to future-proof the southern part of Amberley and provide a direct alternative route rather than forcing future movement onto an increasingly congested State Highway 1.

That relief is strongly consistent with our original Submission 61, which seeks a locality-wide structure planning and connectivity appraisal and the safeguarding of future road, public transport, walking, cycling, open-space and infrastructure corridors to surrounding land. We support the principle that the Rosewood Terrace ODP should expressly safeguard a future road connection to adjoining land, including a future connection to Amberley House land, so that the opportunity for an integrated east-west or north-south network is not sterilised by subdivision, landscaping, open-space boundaries or private lot creation.

We do not seek through this further submission to fix the final alignment of that future road or to impose a corridor across private land without proper assessment and landowner agreement. The appropriate relief is to identify and protect a logical connection point or corridor at the Rosewood Terrace boundary and require locality-wide structure planning to determine the eventual route, geometry, land requirements and integration with

the wider Amberley network. This preserves the strategic opportunity while avoiding premature determination of an exact route.

#### **4.5 Reverse sensitivity and farming operations**

We support the reverse-sensitivity relief sought in Submissions 36, 54, 99 and 101 insofar as it protects existing lawful rural activities. Submissions 99 and 101 specifically identify the potential for residential development adjoining active rural land to create complaints or pressure concerning normal farming effects such as noise, dust, odour, machinery and early-morning activity. Amberley House is an active farming and equestrian property. Public open space, dogs, unfamiliar activity along boundaries and complaints about normal farming noise, machinery, dust, odour, spraying or stock movements can directly affect animal welfare and the practical operation of the farm.

The plan provisions should therefore require appropriate buffers, stock-proof and dog-proof fencing, management of public access and dogs, clear maintenance responsibility, and express recognition that existing rural production activities are anticipated and are not to be constrained by later residential expectations.

#### **4.6 Construction-phase effects**

We support the construction-effect concerns raised in Submissions 18, 36, 44 and 93 to the extent they relate to Amberley House. Submission 93 also identifies the prospect of years of development noise, dust and disruption affecting surrounding rural owners. Development of approximately 238 residential properties, roads, earthworks, services, open space and landscaping is likely to occur progressively over a substantial period. Heavy vehicles, construction traffic, noise, vibration, dust, lighting, temporary traffic management and changing access arrangements may directly affect the adjoining farming and equestrian operation.

The plan change should require an approved Construction Environmental Management Plan, or equivalent enforceable mechanism, before enabling works begin. It should address construction access and haul routes, hours of work, dust, noise, vibration, lighting, traffic management, drainage, complaints procedures, livestock and equestrian safety, and coordination with notified major events at Amberley House. Construction vehicles associated with Rosewood Terrace should not use or obstruct the Amberley House driveway and temporary traffic management on SH1 should maintain safe and practical access at all times.

#### **4.7 Planting, fencing and enduring performance**

Where mitigation planting and boundary fencing are relied upon at the Amberley House interface, they should be completed before adjoining titles are issued or public access is enabled. Provisions should address establishment and maintenance periods, survival standards, replacement of failed plants, weed and pest control, irrigation where necessary, ongoing maintenance responsibility and an enforceable bond or other financial security where appropriate. Interim screening, separation or access controls should be required where planting will take time to become effective.

#### **4.8 Traffic-distribution sensitivity testing**

The ITA's route-distribution assumptions should be sensitivity tested. The final ITA assumes 75 percent of traffic will use the SH1 access, approximately 10 percent will be short internal trips and approximately 15 percent will use Hursley Terrace Road. If the internal-trip assumption is overstated, more traffic will reach either the proposed SH1 intersection beside Amberley House or Hursley Terrace and its SH1 intersection.

The updated ITA should therefore test credible alternative distributions, including a scenario with no allowance for internal vehicle trips and higher proportions using each external access. Intersection design, turning lanes, stacking requirements and the protected ODP land envelope should be based on an appropriately conservative scenario.

#### **4.9 Continued participation in later material decisions**

We support a targeted form of the later-participation relief raised by other submitters, rather than a blanket requirement that every subsequent consent be publicly notified. Any updated ITA, concept intersection design,

SISD assessment or proposal materially affecting the Amberley House driveway or Gracebrook access should be provided to directly affected landowners for review and comment before Council accepts or certifies it.

Plan provisions should also not preclude limited notification to directly affected adjoining owners where a later consent materially departs from the ODP or approved intersection concept, alters the protected intersection land envelope or treatment of the Amberley House access, or materially reduces the rural-interface mitigation relied upon at plan-change stage.

## 5. Decisions sought

We seek that the Hearings Panel accept the identified parts of the original submissions to the extent necessary to achieve the following outcomes:

- At least Restricted Discretionary Activity status for subdivision of the Rosewood Terrace ODP area, with specific matters of discretion/control for the SH1 intersection location, design, timing, staging and delivery.
- Express plan provisions requiring both external access connections shown conceptually on the ODP - the SH1/Ashworths Road connection and the Hursley Terrace Road connection - to be formed and constructed as integral components of the development, rather than relying only on a requirement for subdivision to be generally in accordance with the ODP. The SH1 connection is to remain subject to the updated location/design assessment, integration with the Amberley House and Gracebrook accesses, and NZTA approval sought below.
- An updated ITA and concept intersection design for the precise ODP access location, incorporating the Amberley House driveway and Gracebrook access and assessing operating speeds, SISD, turning lanes, stacking, tapers, visibility, drainage, earthworks, access rights and the complete land envelope required.
- NZTA acceptance in principle of the actual intersection location and concept before subdivision or occupation relies on it, together with the separate Corridor Access Request and detailed approval process required by NZTA.
- Enforceable relocation/staging controls linking any Rosewood Terrace lot treated as a relocated household for transport purposes to the permanent cessation of residential use at a corresponding existing Amberley Beach property; or, if that cannot be secured, an updated ITA assessing the cumulative two-settlement scenario.
- A locality-wide structure planning and connectivity appraisal that safeguards future road and active-transport connections to adjoining land and the wider Amberley network.
- A specifically safeguarded future road connection point/corridor from Rosewood Terrace to adjoining land, including a future connection to Amberley House land, without fixing the ultimate alignment until structure planning, technical assessment and landowner consultation have occurred.
- Sensitivity testing of ITA route-distribution assumptions, including scenarios with no internal-trip allowance and higher use of each external access.
- Express reverse-sensitivity protections for adjoining rural production, including buffers, public-access controls, dog management, stock-proof and dog-proof fencing, maintenance obligations and recognition of normal lawful farming effects.
- A Construction Environmental Management Plan or equivalent enforceable mechanism protecting the Amberley House driveway, livestock and equestrian operations from construction traffic, dust, noise, vibration, lighting, drainage and temporary traffic-management effects.
- Performance, replacement, maintenance and financial-security provisions for mitigation planting and boundary fencing adjoining Amberley House, with interim mitigation where planting will take time to become effective.
- Targeted ongoing participation for directly affected landowners in later material transport or access design

decisions, with no plan provision precluding limited notification where later proposals materially affect Amberley House, Gracebrook or the rural-interface protections relied upon in approving PC7.

- Any consequential amendments to Policy 4.32, Rule 5.6.11, Rule 5.4.4, the ODP, Mitigation Planting Guidelines and associated implementation provisions necessary to give effect to the above relief.

## 6. Hearing

[X] We wish to be heard in support of this further submission.

If appropriate, we will consider coordinating evidence on discrete common issues with other submitters while maintaining our separate position and relief.

## 7. Service on original submitters

A copy of this further submission must be served on each original submitter to whom it relates within 5 working days after lodgement with Council. The following service details are taken from the original submissions presently available. Where an email address was not stated in the published submission, service should be made to the stated physical address. These details should be checked against Council's final service records before service.

| Sub. | Original submitter                                                                     | Email for service                                                      | Address for service                                                                                                     |
|------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 18   | George Forbes & Laura Palomino Forbes                                                  | georgeforbes.email@gmail.com                                           | 38 Garden Road, Merivale, Christchurch 8014                                                                             |
| 36   | Roseanne Hinton & Michael Tayles                                                       | rose_hinton@hotmail.com                                                | 70 Newcombes Road, Amberley                                                                                             |
| 44   | Mitchell Cochrane                                                                      | mitch@cladd.co.nz                                                      | 60 Newcombes Road, RD1, Amberley 7481                                                                                   |
| 46   | Elizabeth Ann Goodwin                                                                  | Goodwin.ann@gmail.com                                                  | 40 Chamberlain Avenue, RD1, Amberley Beach 7481                                                                         |
| 49   | Michael Goodwin                                                                        | goodwin.mj@gmail.com                                                   | 40 Chamberlain Ave, Amberley Beach, Amberley 7481                                                                       |
| 54   | Federated Farmers of New Zealand - North Canterbury Province (contact: Dr Lionel Hume) | lhume@fedfarm.org.nz                                                   | Federated Farmers of New Zealand, c/- Farmlands Cooperative, 535 Wairakei Road, Christchurch                            |
| 65   | Simon & Jaimee Thorne                                                                  | simonthorne.fgs@gmail.com                                              | Owners of properties: 113 Ashworths Road and 413 Ashworths Road (Titles 1 & 2), as stated in Submission 65              |
| 92   | NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi (contact: Charlotte Niederer)                          | EnvironmentalPlanning@nzta.govt.nz;<br>Charlotte.Niederer@nzta.govt.nz | NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi, Christchurch, Level 1, BNZ Centre, 120 Hereford Street, PO Box 1479, Christchurch 8022 |
| 99   | Groundswell NZ (contact: Jamie McFadden)                                               | hurunuinatives@xtra.co.nz                                              | 24 Mina Road, RD2, Cheviot 7382                                                                                         |
| 101  | Christopher John Herbert                                                               | chrisjherbert@xtra.co.nz                                               | 224 Reeces Road, RD3, Amberley                                                                                          |
| 102  | Fire and Emergency New Zealand (contact: Millie Kennedy)                               | millie.kennedy@beca.com                                                | Beca Limited, ANZ Centre Level 2, 267 High Street, Christchurch 8011                                                    |

| Sub. | Original submitter | Email for service                                   | Address for service                          |
|------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|
| 107  | Rosalie Rogers     | No email address stated in the published submission | 12 Holton Road (as stated in Submission 107) |

For Submission 107, the published submission states a physical address but does not state an email address so we will drop a copy in the mailbox. All others will be served via email.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Andy Mason and Angie Mason, on behalf of the Amberley Trust

## Form 6 - Further submission on a proposed plan change to the District Plan



Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

*Please do not hesitate to contact the planning team at the Hurunui District Council (ph 03 314 0048 or email [planning@hurunui.govt.nz](mailto:planning@hurunui.govt.nz)) if you require any assistance.*

**To:** Hurunui District Council

**Name of submitter: \***

timothy john goulding

This is a further submission in support (or opposition to) a submission on the following change proposed to the Hurunui District Plan:

### **Plan Change 7 – Rosewood Terrace**

The Council has initiated a plan change to the Hurunui District Plan to rezone part of the property 185 Ashworths Road, Amberley from Rural Zone to Residential 1 Zone, and apply an Outline Development Zone overlay along with associated changes to the policies and rules applying to the plan change site. The rezoning would enable development of approximately 230 lots.

The purpose of the plan change is to allow for the proactive relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement, which is subject to multiple hazards (including coastal erosion and inundation, fluvial and pluvial flooding and rising groundwater) in a manner that is cost neutral to the wider community and which is sensitively located within, and integrated with, the surrounding environment.

**I am: \***

a person who has an interest in the proposal greater than the interest the general public has.

**Please explain why you come within the category chosen above: \***

I am a beneficial owner of 4 South Crescent Amberley Beach, a property subject to the proposed relocation underpinning PC7

**I support all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

refer schedule annexed hereto

HDC [refer Graeme Abbott] has agreed to carry out all required service under section 8A, Schedule 1, Resource Management Act, and therefore I have not include address details of submitters I support or oppose. I have identified such submitters and their submissions by name and submitter number in accordance with the names of submitters and submitter numbers as set out in "List of Submitters on PC7- Rosewood Terrace -updated 30 September 2026 on the HDC website regarding PC7.

**I oppose all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

refer schedule annexed hereto

**The particular parts of the submission/s I support or oppose are:**

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission/s you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal. Continue on a separate document if necessary and upload as a supporting document. Please ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to.

refer schedule annexed hereto

**The reasons for my support or opposition are:**

Give details, continue on a separate sheet if necessary and upload as a supporting document.

The reasons for my support are set out in the schedule annexed hereto and in the submissions which I have supported

**I seek the whole or part of the submission/s be allowed or disallowed:**

Please give precise details of what you seek to be allowed or disallowed. If it is only part of the submission/s please be precise about which part of the submission/s. Ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to each time.

refer schedule annexed hereto

**Upload any supporting documents here:**

PC7 round 2 TJG.docx

22.26KB

**Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? \***

Yes

**If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing:**

Yes

**Contact details for submitter**

---

**Address: \***

Street Address

4 South Crescent

Address Line 2

City

RD 1

Postal / Zip Code

7481

State / Province / Region

Amberley

Country

New Zealand

**Phone number:**

274,722,555

**Email: \***

tgoulding@xtra.co.nz

**Contact person:**

Name and designation if applicable

tim goulding

**Note to submitter:**

The closing date for serving further submissions on the consent authority is 5pm Thursday 22 October 2026.

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter/s within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the Council is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- it contains offensive language:
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

**Privacy information:**

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you. The RMA requires your submission, including your name and contact details, to be made available to the Council (including the Council decision-maker) and the applicant.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, may also be made available to other submitters and to the public on the Council's website, or on request. If requested, the Council may legally be required to make all submissions available to the public (which can include the media), including the name and contact details of the submitter, subject to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA).

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential from other submitters or the public under LGOIMA, please contact the processing Planner for this application prior to making your submission.

Hurunui District Council PC7

Round 2 Submissions of Timothy John Goulding

[Schedule referred to in Form 6 submission of Timothy John Goulding

**1. I support the following submissions in full for the reasons set out in those submissions:**

*ABRRAC [#53], Vanessa McPherson [#38] and Celine Goulding [#63]*

*Without discounting in any way the other points of these 3 submissions, I particularly support and endorse their contentions below:*

- (a) that HDC in its supporting documents [s32 report and ELA} is arguing fundamentally the wrong issue, viz that the additional market lots are necessary to make the relocation scheme financially neutral to HDC rather than the question under the NHS-HPL whether these lots are required to provide sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand and that the spatial extent of the zoned land is the minimum necessary to provide the required development capacity [ss3.6(4)(a) and 3.6(5) of the NPS-HPL]*
  - (b) that the PC7 proposal involves a significant present land-use decision in response to a future event whose timing and ultimate occurrence are uncertain [HDC's own evidence establishes uncertainty about whether and when relocation will occur].*
  - (c) The financial evidence does not establish that the proposed development is financially necessary [the ELA states that its financial assessment is not intended to be a financial viability assessment]*
  - (d) The CAP does not establish that this particular relocation proposal is necessary*
  - (e) The s32 assessment fails to confront uncertainty in an acceptable manner - see s32(2)(c) of the RMA*
- 2. I support the submission of Anthony Charles Trewinnard [#103] in full except that I do not agree that HDC should have proceeded to purchase Rosewood Farm for managed relocation or land banking without full engagement with the Amberley Beach community.*
  - 3. I support the submission of Carl Krijt [#83] that the main hazard risk to Amberley Beach has been fluvial threat [freshwater flooding] rather than sea inundation and that fluvial risk has now greatly diminished because of various mitigation. Mitigation of hazard risk over the past ten years has been ignored or understated in HDC material.*
  - 4. I support the submission of Scott Orpwood [#95] that the scale of subdivision significantly exceeds any relocation which will be opted for by Beach owners.*
  - 5. I support the submissions of Paula Le Compte [#93], D Ross and K McCarthey [#85] and S and K Henry [#57], and also submissions 21,34,48,60,70,83,108 that HDC is acting outside its core role by engaging in property development and speculation. This could be considered ultra vires its mandate.*
  - 6. I support the submission of Nicola Reed [#104] that hazard triggers under the CAP [which was not mandated by residents] have not occurred, so PC7 is unnecessary and premature, and relocation is a last not a first option as remedy against hazards. Also that PC7 may be cost neutral for HDC but is not cost neutral for residents.*

7. *I support the submissions of Adele Brown [#98] and Vanessa McPerson [#38] that, given the limited and dated evidence relied on by HDC, an independent review of hazard modelling, climate assumptions and projections should have been undertaken as a prerequisite before PC7 was promulgated. Similarly, I support the Forbes submission [#18] that the notified Section 32 evaluation has been insufficient and does not meet the heightened analytical rigour and multi-scenario analysis required for this 'novel' and complex plan change proposal and does not explore and assess other practicable alternatives and downgrades significant localised effects.*  
*Because the managed relocation scheme proposal and consequent plan change proposal are so novel and significant both for directly affected parties [Amberley Beach owners and residents, landowners and residents of land in the proximity of Rosewood] and for HDC ratepayers across the region, HDC has a heightened onus. Instead, HDC's documented proposal and evidence and consultation are woefully inadequate, and HDC has refused to engage in more consultation and seek more comprehensive evidence.*
8. *I support the submission of Adele Brown [#98] that there is financial risk involved in HDC's proposed development and this has been inadequately addressed.*
9. *[while supporting the whole of submission #38], I specifically endorse Vanessa McPherson's particular submission [in #38] that HDC may not have maintained an open and evidence-based process but appears to have predetermined retreat as the desired outcome against which successive decisions have been made.*
10. *I support the many submissions [including 14, 16, 18, 20, 38, 45, 51, 53, 59, 63, 69, 7, 78, 83, 93, 96, 97, 103] that HDC, by this Rosewood purchase, PC7 and relocation scheme, has breached and distorted the DAPP [dynamic pathways] scheme of the CAP and thereby predetermined the pathways of hazard mitigation, that the Rosewood purchase and plan change are premature and a breach of the CAP process in that no triggers have been met, and that managed relocation was intended to be a last resort rather than first resort pathway*
11. *I support the submissions of Forbes [#18], Paula Le Compte [#93] and Chisnall [#31] regarding a confusing financial rationale set out in the s32 Report and ELA - the wrong emphasis on cost neutrality and the cost of debt funding to finance the Rosewood development. The 'cost neutral' mantra of HDC leads to another conundrum. There is a concern that a major motivation of HDC is that this whole exercise of Rosewood land purchase and proposed plan change should not incur HDC cost or loss, and at this stage the only way to achieve this goal is for PC7 to be approved and either:*
  - (a) *the ensuing subdivision development to proceed, and to proceed with haste, so that sections can be sold to the general public and sufficient funds obtained from section sales to repay the loan HDC has taken out, or*
  - (b) *The approval of PC7 will increase the value of the Rosewood land [both the land to be developed and the residual land] so that HDC can recoup its costs by sale of land*

*This motivation should not be considered in the assessment of PC7.. HDC has incurred these costs off its own bat by pursuing a novel scheme which has not proved popular with the Amberley Beach owners nor HDC ratepayers in general. PC7 must be considered and pursued on its own merits ie it is desirable per se, and not just for financial cost recovery. I support Sean Doak's submission #97 in this regard.*
12. *I support the submissions of Jennifer Campbell [#88] and Leslie Smart [#48] that money spent on the HDC managed relocation proposal and PC7 would be far more practicably spent on direct hazard mitigation measures at Amberley Beach*

There are a large number of submissions for a Plan Change of this type – 108.

I calculate that 88% of the submissions are opposed to HDC's proposed Plan Change PC7. A significant proportion of these submitters are Amberley Beach land owners, the supposed beneficiaries of the proposal.

It must also be noted that submission after submission highlights common themes:-

- HDC did not follow the CAP processes (in particular adhering to trigger points) and has compromised the prescribed Dynamic Pathways planning approach
- HDC's managed relocation initiatives are premature
- HDC's lack of consultation and engagement with the Beach community
- HDC has not satisfied the requirements of s3.6(4)(a) and s3.6(5) of the NPS-HPL
- Owners want the priority to be protection and mitigation rather than relocation
- HDC has not considered current scientific evidence, nor taken any steps itself to directly obtain current evidence, suggesting an ideological rather than evidence-driven approach..
- Significant financial adverse consequences for beach owners
- HDC failure to act on a Ministerial caution regarding reliance on extreme climate change data
- concerns about the base document ,the non peer reviewed Jacobs Report, and its reliance on extreme modelling
- Concerns about the financial prudence of the proposed subdivision
- anguish and uncertainty to Beach owners and residents caused by HDC's obsessive relocation programme
- the scale of the subdivision [230 lots] to achieve a likely small uptake of sections by Beach owners
- lack of detail of section uptake and abandonment process, when this should have been negotiated at the outset
- concern that this novel scheme requires greater scrutiny and analytical rigour than it has received
  
- a disconnect between timing and likelihood of section uptake versus immediate removal of productive land
- Lack of robust financial viability analysis
- not assessing the requirements of the NPS-HPL but focussing on financial neutrality to ratepayers.

**So, looking at the preponderance of submissions as well as the overwhelming opposition to its land relocation scheme before PC7 was instigated, why is HDC pushing a proposal that is strongly , vehemently, rationally opposed, particularly by the very beneficiaries it is supposed to assist**

Given that the submissions overall demonstrated decisive opposition and identified many substantive problems [including those listed above] which remain unresolved *what evidence or analysis has HDC undertaken to justify proceeding with PC7?*

*Thank you*

*Tim Goulding*

*4 South Crescent, Amberley Beach*

*0274722555*

## FORM 6

Further submission on a proposed change

*Please do not hesitate to phone or email the planning team at the Hurunui District Council (ph 03 314 8816; email [planning@hurunui.govt.nz](mailto:planning@hurunui.govt.nz)) if you require any assistance.*

**To:** Hurunui District Council

**Date:** 21/10/2026

**This is a further submission in support of (or in opposition to) a submission on the following proposed plan change to the Hurunui District Plan:**

**Plan Change 7 – Rosewood Terrace**

The Council has initiated a plan change to the Hurunui District Plan to rezone part of the property 185 Ashworths Road, Amberley from Rural Zone to Residential 1 Zone, and apply an Outline Development Zone overlay along with associated changes to the policies and rules applying to the plan change site. The rezoning would enable development of approximately 230 lots.

The purpose of the plan change is to allow for the proactive relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement, which is subject to multiple hazards (including coastal erosion and inundation, fluvial and pluvial flooding and rising groundwater) in a manner that is cost neutral to the wider community and which is sensitively located within, and integrated with, the surrounding environment.

**Submitter details:**

Name/s: (Full name)

Vicki and Dave Sanford

Contact person: Vicki Sanford

Designation: Landowner

Address for service: 203 Hursley Tce Road, Amberley

Email address: [dvsanford@xtra.co.nz](mailto:dvsanford@xtra.co.nz)

Telephone: 0212651843

### I am: (tick the applicable box)

☐

A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or

☒

A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has; or

☐

The local authority for the relevant area

Please explain why you come within the category you ticked above:

I am a previous submitter

### I support all or part of the submission/s of:

*Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number*

Stewart & Kate Henry – 57

### I oppose all or part of the submission/s of:

*Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number*

## The particular parts of the submission/s I support or oppose are:

*Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission/s you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal, continue on a separate sheet if necessary. Please ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to.*

*The summary where they request Rosewood to be sold (see snapshot below)  
We recommend for HDC to either sell Rosewood Farm as is, or divide it into four hectare lots for individual sale. The latter course of action would have the benefit of recouping what HDC borrowed, and thus reduce HDC liabilities, at a time of property downturn and imminent recession.*

## The reasons for my support or opposition are:

*Give details, continue on a separate sheet if necessary.*

*I support the sale of Rosewood Farm as it stands rather than proceeding with the proposed rezoning and residential development under Plan Change 7.*

*Selling the property as a whole would provide an opportunity for Council to reconsider its financial exposure and the future use of the land without committing to the proposed residential development*

*My support is specifically for the sale of Rosewood Farm as a whole, and not for its subdivision into smaller lots.*

**I seek that the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed.**

*Please give precise details of what you seek to be allowed or disallowed. If it is in part please be precise about which part of the submission/s. Ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to each time.*

I seek the whole of the submission be allowed

### Hearing:

I wish to be heard in support of my further submission: NO

☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing: YES NO

☒☐

### Notes:

- The closing date for serving further submissions on the consent authority is **5pm Thursday 22 October 2026**.
- **A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter/s within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.**
- If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission,

your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

- Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):
  - it is frivolous or vexatious:
  - it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
  - it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
  - it contains offensive language:
  - it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

### **Privacy information:**

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you. The RMA requires your submission, including your name and contact details, to be made available to the Council (including the Council decision-maker) and the applicant.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, may also be made available to other submitters and to the public on the Council's website, or on request. If requested, the Council may legally be required to make all submissions available to the public (which can include the media), including the name and contact details of the submitter, subject to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA). If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential from other submitters or the public under LGOIMA, please contact the processing Planner for this application prior to making your submission.

## Form 6 - Further submission on a proposed plan change to the District Plan



Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

*Please do not hesitate to contact the planning team at the Hurunui District Council (ph 03 314 0048 or email [planning@hurunui.govt.nz](mailto:planning@hurunui.govt.nz)) if you require any assistance.*

**To:** Hurunui District Council

**Name of submitter: \***

Adele Brown

This is a further submission in support (or opposition to) a submission on the following change proposed to the Hurunui District Plan:

### **Plan Change 7 – Rosewood Terrace**

The Council has initiated a plan change to the Hurunui District Plan to rezone part of the property 185 Ashworths Road, Amberley from Rural Zone to Residential 1 Zone, and apply an Outline Development Zone overlay along with associated changes to the policies and rules applying to the plan change site. The rezoning would enable development of approximately 230 lots.

The purpose of the plan change is to allow for the proactive relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement, which is subject to multiple hazards (including coastal erosion and inundation, fluvial and pluvial flooding and rising groundwater) in a manner that is cost neutral to the wider community and which is sensitively located within, and integrated with, the surrounding environment.

**I am: \***

a person who has an interest in the proposal greater than the interest the general public has.

**Please explain why you come within the category chosen above: \***

I am a Resident and Homeowner at Amberley Beach.

**I support all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

I support the following submissions in full:

- 97. Sean Doak of 43 Chamberlain Avenue, Amberley Beach
- 96. Marc & Tracey Coultard of 26 Holton Road, Amberley Beach
- 102. FENZ of 267 High Street Christchurch
- 60. Timothy Goulding of 4 South Crescent, Amberley Beach
- 53. ABBRaC of Amberley Beach
- 51. Elizabeth Kelsy of 163 MacKenzies Road, Waipara
- 54. NC province of Federated Farmers of NZ 535 Wairakei Road Christchurch
- 45. Pounamu Higgs of 1 South Crescent Amberley Beach
- 38. Vanessa MacPherson of 26 Holton Road Amberley Beach
- 31. Wayne & Jenny Chisnall of 165 Hursley Terrace RD1 Amberley
- 85. Dylan Ross & Kate McCarthy of 122 Ashworths Road Amberley

**I oppose all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

I oppose the following submissions based on conflict of interest, unsubstantiated supporting evidence and lack of knowledge of the proposed plan change and the reasons for it.

- 7. Canterbury Regional Council (ECAN)
- 91. Natural Hazards Commission

**The particular parts of the submission/s I support or oppose are:**

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission/s you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal. Continue on a separate document if necessary and upload as a supporting document. Please ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to.

I fully support the submissions listed above, as they reinforce the concerns raised in my original submission regarding the proposed plan change, its underlying justification, and the adverse effects it has had, and may continue to have, on those directly affected.

I maintain that the land in question is valuable agricultural land and that any proposed change to its current status should be supported by clear, compelling, and evidence-based justification. Such a significant change should not be undertaken without a thorough assessment of its necessity, implications, and long-term consequences.

To date, I have not seen sufficient supporting evidence to demonstrate why this particular parcel of land needs to be subject to a plan change at this time. In the absence of such evidence, I believe the proposed change is premature and inadequately justified. I therefore reiterate my opposition to the plan change and fully endorse the concerns and arguments presented in the submissions I have identified as supporting my position.

**The reasons for my support or opposition are:**

Give details, continue on a separate sheet if necessary and upload as a supporting document.

I oppose in full submissions 7 and 91 for the following reasons.

7. The Hurunui District Council (HDC) is utilising a \$23.5 million loan from the Local Government Funding Agency (LGFA), specifically designated as a Green Fund Loan, to support a plan change based on a Climate Action Plan (CAP) that the Amberley Beach community has repeatedly requested be paused. The Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury / ECan), as a guarantor of the LGFA's institutional obligations and a member of the agency, has a financial interest in the potential consequences of this arrangement. By supporting the proposed plan change, ECan may be exposing the wider ratepayer base to financial risk should HDC be unable to meet its repayment obligations. In such circumstances, there is a potential for the financial burden to extend beyond HDC to other parties associated with the LGFA.

Furthermore, if the proposed plan change proceeds and ECan is subsequently required to issue the necessary consents, this could create a situation in which ECan derives financial benefit from the development it has supported. This raises legitimate questions regarding potential conflicts of interest and the alignment of ECan's responsibilities with the broader interests of the community and ratepayers.

These concerns would not arise in the same way if the land retained its existing agricultural zoning and use. Accordingly, the financial implications, potential conflicts of interest, and wider public interest considerations should be carefully examined before the proposed plan change is progressed.

91. I have concerns that the Natural Hazards Commission has not undertaken sufficient independent due diligence in relation to the proposed plan change. It appears that its assessment may rely primarily on information provided by the Hurunui District Council, including the Jacobs Report, which has been challenged on the grounds of its accuracy, feasibility, and underlying assumptions.

Furthermore, the proposed approach does not appear to have the support of the majority of the community it is intended to protect. Given the potential long-term consequences for the affected residents, it is essential that the Natural Hazards Commission independently scrutinise the information and evidence upon which the proposed plan change is based, rather than relying solely on material supplied by the Council.

I therefore believe that further independent investigation and a more comprehensive assessment of the available evidence are necessary to ensure that any decisions are robust, transparent, and genuinely reflect the needs and concerns of the affected community.

**I seek the whole or part of the submission/s be allowed or disallowed:**

Please give precise details of what you seek to be allowed or disallowed. If it is only part of the submission/s please be precise about which part of the submission/s. Ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to each time.

In relation to the following submissions:

- **7. Environment Canterbury (ECAN) – Canterbury Regional Council**
- **91. Natural Hazards Commission**

I respectfully request that both submissions be disallowed or given no further consideration on the grounds outlined in my preceding arguments. These concerns relate to the potential financial implications for the wider ratepayer community, questions regarding possible conflicts of interest, and the adequacy and independence of the evidence relied upon to support the proposed plan change.

I believe these matters warrant careful consideration to ensure that the submissions are assessed objectively, transparently, and in the best interests of the affected community. Accordingly, I request that the relevant decision-makers consider whether the submissions should be accepted in light of the concerns raised and the supporting evidence provided.

**Upload any supporting documents here:**

**Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? \***

Yes

**If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing:**

Yes

## Contact details for submitter

---

**Address: \***

Street Address

43 Chamberlain Avenue, Amberley Beach

Address Line 2

RD 1

City

Amberley

Postal / Zip Code

7481

State / Province / Region

Hurunui

Country

New Zealand

**Phone number:**

275,054,444

**Email: \***

adele.brown56@gmail.com

**Contact person:**

Name and designation if applicable

Adele Brown

**Note to submitter:**

The closing date for serving further submissions on the consent authority is 5pm Thursday 22 October 2026.

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter/s within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the Council is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- it contains offensive language:

- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

**Privacy information:**

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you. The RMA requires your submission, including your name and contact details, to be made available to the Council (including the Council decision-maker) and the applicant.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, may also be made available to other submitters and to the public on the Council's website, or on request. If requested, the Council may legally be required to make all submissions available to the public (which can include the media), including the name and contact details of the submitter, subject to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA).

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential from other submitters or the public under LGOIMA, please contact the processing Planner for this application prior to making your submission.

## Form 6 - Further submission on a proposed plan change to the District Plan



Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

*Please do not hesitate to contact the planning team at the Hurunui District Council (ph 03 314 0048 or email [planning@hurunui.govt.nz](mailto:planning@hurunui.govt.nz)) if you require any assistance.*

**To:** Hurunui District Council

**Name of submitter: \***

Amberley Beach Guardians Inc

This is a further submission in support (or opposition to) a submission on the following change proposed to the Hurunui District Plan:

### **Plan Change 7 – Rosewood Terrace**

The Council has initiated a plan change to the Hurunui District Plan to rezone part of the property 185 Ashworths Road, Amberley from Rural Zone to Residential 1 Zone, and apply an Outline Development Zone overlay along with associated changes to the policies and rules applying to the plan change site. The rezoning would enable development of approximately 230 lots.

The purpose of the plan change is to allow for the proactive relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement, which is subject to multiple hazards (including coastal erosion and inundation, fluvial and pluvial flooding and rising groundwater) in a manner that is cost neutral to the wider community and which is sensitively located within, and integrated with, the surrounding environment.

**I am: \***

a person who has an interest in the proposal greater than the interest the general public has.

**Please explain why you come within the category chosen above: \***

Amberley Beach Guardians Inc ("ABGI") , an incorporated society with currently 64 members, represents a significant group of Amberley Beach property owners and residents and others involved in the Amberley Beach community.

Its purposes include:

*to protect and represent the interests of Amberley Beach property owners and ratepayers in all matters including those related to local government planning and management of coastal and other hazards and protections and local government provision of services*

PC7 is underpinned by the managed relocation of Amberley Beach properties and so ABGI has an obvious interest in the proposal greater than that of the general public.

**I support all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

ABBRAC [53]

Vanessa McPherson [38]

George Forbes and Laura Palomino Forbes [18]

Timothy John Goulding [60]

Celine Goulding [63]

Tiffany Kate Neylon [79]

Paula Le Compte[93]

Adele Brown [98]

Sean Doak [97]

Anthony Charles Trewinnard[104]

Carl Krijt [83]

Jessica Caddy [16]

Scott Caddy [17]

Scott Orpwood [95]

Graeme and Sally Sutherland [55]

L&D Proctor [14] Jackson Aitken[19] Louise Webb [20] Julie Nunn[28] P Higgs [45] E Kelsy [51] M&D Latham [59] Gary Quinn[69] Robert MAnson [78] M&T Coulthard[96] L Fairbrass [29] B Nunn [13] T Erceg[2] G Legge [21] Miriam Bartlett [35] A Wilkinson [30] Sian Carson [71] W&J Chisnall[31]

refer more particularly to the attached annexed submission

**I oppose all or part of the submission/s of:**

Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number.

Canterbury Regional Council [7]

Natural HAZards Commission [91]

Josi Hamill [22]

refer more particularly to the attached annexed submission

**The particular parts of the submission/s I support or oppose are:**

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission/s you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal.

Continue on a separate document if necessary and upload as a supporting document. Please ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to.

refer more particularly to the attached annexed submission

**The reasons for my support or opposition are:**

Give details, continue on a separate sheet if necessary and upload as a supporting document.

refer more particularly to the attached annexed submission and unless otherwise stated the reasons for my support of the specified submissions are the reasons set out in those submissions

**I seek the whole or part of the submission/s be allowed or disallowed:**

Please give precise details of what you seek to be allowed or disallowed. If it is only part of the submission/s please be precise about which part of the submission/s. Ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to each time.

refer more particularly to the attached annexed submission

**Upload any supporting documents here:**

PC7 round 2 ABGI.docx

21.06KB

**Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? \***

Yes

**If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing:**

Yes

## Contact details for submitter

---

**Address: \***

Street Address

26 Holton Rd

Address Line 2

Amberley Beach

City

RD1 Amberley

Postal / Zip Code

7481

State / Province / Region

Canterbury

Country

New Zealand

**Phone number:**

274,589,742

**Email: \***

marc@mcd-architecture.co.nz

**Contact person:**

Name and designation if applicable

Marc Coulthard

**Note to submitter:**

The closing date for serving further submissions on the consent authority is 5pm Thursday 22 October 2026.

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter/s within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the Council is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious:
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
- it contains offensive language:
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

**Privacy information:**

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you. The RMA requires your submission, including your name and contact details, to be made available to the Council (including the Council decision-maker) and the applicant.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, may also be made available to other submitters and to the public on the Council's website, or on request. If requested, the Council may legally be required to make all submissions available to the public (which can include the media), including the name and contact details of the submitter, subject to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA).

If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential from other submitters or the public under LGOIMA, please contact the processing Planner for this application prior to making your submission.

## **Second Round submission by Amberley Beach Guardians Inc**

To Hurunui District Council

Regarding Plan Change PC7 at Rosewood Farm

This is the (second round) submission of Amberley Beach Guardians Incorporated [“ABGI”]. Amberley Beach Guardians Limited is an incorporated society registered under the Incorporated Societies Act 2022 [ incorporated 19 August 2026 under number 50267890 ; NZBN:9429053900692].

ABGI, with over 60 members, is representative of a substantial body of property owners and residents and interested parties at Amberley Beach, and has taken over the role of the unincorporated group Amberley Beach Ratepayers & Residents Community known as ABBRAC. As representative of owners and residents at Amberley Beach, ABGI has “an interest in the proposed plan change greater than the interest that the general public has”. Accordingly ABGI has the standing to make this submission under the second round of submissions due by 22 October 2026, even though ABGI did not make a submission under Round 1,[ although ABBRAC made a Round 1 submission] .It is important to ABGI, as a key stakeholder and the only body representing a group of Amberley Beach owners and residents, to be actively involved in the PC7 process.

ABGI wishes to be heard at any hearing on PC7 and does not have trade interests or conflicts.

1. ABGI supports in full the submissions of :
  - ABBRAC [53]
  - Vanessa McPherson [38]
  - George Forbes and Laura Palomino Forbes [18]
  - Timothy John Goulding [60]
  - Celine Goulding [63]
  - Tiffany Kate Neylon [79]
  - Paula Le Compte[93]
  - Adele Brown [98]
  - Sean Doak [97]
  - Anthony Charles Trewinnard[104]
  - Carl Krijt [83]
  - Jessica Caddy [16]
  - Scott Caddy [17]
  - Scott Orpwood [95]
  - Graeme and Sally Sutherland [55]

For the reasons set out in those submissions

2. ABGI supports the submissions of AC Trewinnard[104] and Timothy John Goulding [60] that by proceeding with proposed PC7 and subdivision for managed relocation before trigger point based thresholds under the CAP are reached, PC7 surreptitiously predetermines pathways under the CAP, thereby undermining the dynamic pathways approach of the CAP.
3. ABGI supports the submissions of, L and D Proctor [14 ],Jackson Aitken [19] Jessica Caddy [16],Louise Webb [20] Julie Nunn [28], Pounamu Higgs [45],Elizabeth Kelsey [51] M and D Latham [59] Gary Quinn[69]John Robert Manson [78], Marc and Tracey Coulthard [96] and others that PC7 does not follow the trigger-based procedure set out in the CAP thereby distorting the sequential methodology laid down in both the CAP and the PMRLB and so compromises the outcomes to the Amberley Beach community.
4. ABGI supports the submission of G and L Forbes [18] that this plan change is a 'novel' approach to dealing with climate change, encouraging relocation of a settlement, and accordingly requires enhanced scrutiny. Given that AB settlement is established, houses a community of people, was authorised by the Council originally, and titles and dwellings were established with Council consent, to encourage abandonment is a monumental Council initiative with huge consequences and precedent significance {refer submission L Fairbrass 29 and B Nunn[13] regarding undesirable precedent}. It has been driven by HDC ,who has argued that it is desired by the community [the first round of submissions has put paid to that contention].ABGI supports the submissions of T Erceg[#2] and G Legge[21] that there has been no democratic mandate for relocation. ABGI supports the Forbes' submission [#18] that the institutional momentum that PC7 creates will erode freedom of choice for owners and residents at Amberley Beach and in the Hursley Terrace area. ABGI supports the Miriam Bartlett [35] submission that this compensatory managed relocation scheme is better left to be determined on a national level, particularly given proposed restructuring of local authorities.
5. HDC has set out the purpose of the plan change:  
"The purpose of the plan change is to allow for the proactive relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement..." ie PC7 is underpinned by the relocation scheme for the Amberley Beach settlement. ABGI supports the submission of A Wilkinson [30] that the need for relocation must be very robust] to justify the consequences[loss of HPL, creation of urban enclave and all its adverse effects, eventual abandonment of private property]. In assessing PC7, it is fundamental that HDC must provide a watertight case for the need for and mechanics of proactive relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement and in particular that the 'multiple hazards' affecting the settlement are 'terminal' and not able to be mitigated by other more acceptable means. On top of that, the onus is on HDC to provide evidence that the proposal to hand [ie the Rosewood location, plan change and subdivision] is an optimal solution for relocation and justifies the conversion of HPL and establishing an urban

enclave in the designated location. ie approval of PC7 cannot be assessed merely on a cost/benefit analysis of converting a particular piece of farmland to residential land, but on the merits or justification of relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement. This is particularly so given that the proposed proactive relocation is not embraced by many of the Amberley Beach property owners. ABGI considers that the evidence of need for relocation is severely lacking and HDC has refused to seek contemporary evidence. ABGI supports the submission of Sian Carson [71] that there is insufficient evidence that hazards facing Amberley Beach are justification for PC7 and the HDC's 230 lot development.

It is not sufficient for Planning Commissioners to rely on HDC assurances that proper governance has been followed in the steps leading up to acquisition of Rosewood Farm and preparation of the PC7 proposal. The Commissioners have to explore and audit the underlying purpose of and need for the relocation giving rise to the plan change and the adherence to the CAP processes. In this regard ABGI supports the submission of S Doak[97]

6. ABGI supports the submission of W and J Chisnall #31] that full public participation should be essential in all aspects of this novel scheme and, if PC7 is to proceed, HDC should mandate that all RCs should be fully publicly notified under s77D of the RMA
7. ABGI supports the submissions of M and T Coulthard[96] and Anthony Trewinnard [103] that land banking to protect a future option as opposed to an active subdivision for managed relocation are totally different and the latter has never been mandated by the community.
8. ABGI opposes the submissions of Canterbury Regional Council[7], the Natural Hazards Commission [91] and Josi Hamill [22]] as being in general ideologically in support of relocation of communities subject to coastal hazards as opposed to critically assessing this particular PC7. In addition Canterbury Regional Council has a conflict of interest in making its submission given that it will be involved in assessing Resource Consents in relation to the subdivision if PC7 is approved.

Sincerely,

Amberley Beach Guardians Inc

•



# Federated Farmers of New Zealand

## Further Submission on Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Hurunui District Plan

22 October 2026

# **FURTHER SUBMISSION TO HURUNUI DISTRICT COUNCIL ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 7 TO THE HURUNUI 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: *Hurunui District Council  
66 Carters Road  
Amberley 7410*

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

Contact person: Dr Lionel Hume  
Senior Policy Advisor

Address for service: Federated Farmers of New Zealand  
c/- Farmlands Cooperative  
535 Wairakei Road  
Burnside  
Christchurch 8053

Phone: 027 470 9008  
Email: lhume@fedfarm.org.nz

This is a further submission in response to submission/s made on the following:  
Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Hurunui District Plan (PC7)

The following pages detail the specifics in relation to our support or opposition to various submissions lodged. Our further submissions include the particular parts of each submission supported or opposed alongside our reasons for that position and what decision we seek from the local authority.

Federated Farmers wishes to be heard in support of its further submission.

### **Note to person making further submission**

A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days after making the further submission to the local authority.

Where Federated Farmers submitted on the same proposed plan 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 Name                 | Sub No. | Section of Plan    | Support/<br>Oppose | Reason for submission                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                            |
|--------------------------------|---------|--------------------|--------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Canterbury<br>Regional Council | 7.2     | All of Plan Change | Oppose in<br>part  | <p>Objective 5.2.1 covers the location, design and function of development.</p> <p>Part 1 of the objective requires that the development achieves consolidated, well designed and sustainable growth around existing urban areas.</p> <p>Federated Farmers maintains that the proposed Rosewood subdivision does not meet this objective because of its location, isolated from the existing, nearby urban area of Amberley. Because of its isolation, the provision of essential infrastructure will be more difficult and more costly, thus reducing sustainability.</p> <p>Part 2 requires the development to enable <i>people and communities, including future generations, to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and health and safety, and which:</i></p> <p><i>a. Maintains, and where appropriate, enhances the overall quality of the natural environment..</i></p> <p>Comment: As highlighted by a number of other submitters, who live and work in the area, the Rosewood subdivision will likely significantly detract from rural amenity and the natural environment.</p> <p><i>c. Encourages sustainable economic development by enabling business activities in appropriate locations.</i></p> <p>Comment: The proposed subdivision is in conflict with Objective 5.2.1 2 c, because it will prevent a business activity, namely land-based primary production, from occurring on an</p> |

| Submitter Name | Sub No. | Section of Plan | Support/<br>Oppose | Reason for submission                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
|----------------|---------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                |         |                 |                    | <p>appropriate location (LUC class 2 soils) in its immediate vicinity.</p> <p><i>e. Enables rural activities that support the rural environment including primary production.</i><br/> Comment: The proposed Rosewood subdivision clearly conflicts with Objective 5.2.1 2 e, because it would prevent primary production in the vicinity of the subdivision.</p> <p><i>i. Avoids conflicts between incompatible activities.</i><br/> Comment: In conflict with the objective, the Rosewood subdivision would create potential conflict with incompatible activities, namely land-based primary production (with associated noise, odour, dust, light etc.).</p> <p>In summary, Federated Farmers contends that Proposed PC7 and the Rosewood subdivision conflict with Objectives 5.2.1 (1.) and 5.2.1 (2. a, c, e and i) of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS).</p> <p>Policy 5.3.1 of the CRPS, with a focus on sustainable development patterns, seeks to:</p> <p><i>1. ensure that any</i><br/> <i>a. urban growth; and</i><br/> <i>b. limited rural residential development</i><br/> <i>occurs in a form that concentrates, or is attached to, existing urban areas and promotes a coordinated pattern of development;</i></p> <p>Federated Farmers contends that Proposed PC7 and the Rosewood subdivision conflict with Policy 5.3.1, especially part 1 of that policy (quoted above).</p> |

| Submitter Name                                         | Sub No.      | Section of Plan    | Support/<br>Oppose | Reason for submission                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
|--------------------------------------------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                                                        |              |                    |                    | Federated Farmers maintains that the objectives and policy quoted above are of fundamental importance in the context of Proposed PC7                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Wayne Gregory<br>Sargent & Jennifer<br>Linley Chisnall | 31.1 – 31.15 | All of Plan Change | Support            | The submitters live and farm adjacent to the proposed Rosewood subdivision.<br>Their submission points reflect real impacts of Proposed Plan Change 7 and the associated subdivision (and its development) on their farming business and day-to-day lives.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| George & Laura<br>Palomino Forbes                      | 18.1 – 18.26 | All of Plan Change | Support in<br>part | These submitters own a small rural property approximately 400m from the proposed Rosewood subdivision. They greatly value the rural attributes of the area, partly because of deep familial connections with agriculture in the wider area.<br>They make many valid submission points, which Federated Farmers supports, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of rural amenity;</li> <li>• PC7 is premature with respect to anticipated CAP processes;</li> <li>• Institutional momentum of PC7 will erode freedom of choice for residents and property owners at Amberley Beach and adjacent to the proposed Rosewood subdivision;</li> <li>• Likelihood of reverse sensitivity effects on adjacent farming activities;</li> <li>• Conflicts with key parts of the NPS-HPL and the CRPS.</li> </ul> |
| Miriam Lucy<br>Bartlett                                | 35.1 – 35.7  | All of Plan Change | Support in<br>part | This submitter makes several very relevant points from the perspective of an Amberley Beach resident. In particular, she highlights the potentially unmanageable cost to Amberley Beach residents of relocating to Rosewood. She states that the proposal “will not be cost neutral to residents of Amberley beach due to costs of clearing sections, building at Rosewood, connecting to services and moving costs”.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    |
| Grant & Sharon<br>Benns                                | 32.1 – 32.3  | All of Plan Change | Support in<br>part | These submitters make relevant points from the perspective of Amberley Beach residents, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A plea to consider practical ways to protect and improve Amberley Beach, including measures to make the beach</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |

| Submitter Name             | Sub No.       | Section of Plan    | Support/<br>Oppose | Reason for submission                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                        |
|----------------------------|---------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
|                            |               |                    |                    | <p>(and its community) more attractive and financially sustainable.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed Rosewood site is unsuitable because it is considerably removed from the beach and surrounded by farmland.</li> <li>• Relocation would place a major financial burden on Amberley Beach households (which some may be unable to bear).</li> </ul>                                                                                                                                                                                                                               |
| Paula Le Compte            | 93.1 – 93.25  | All of Plan Change | Support in part    | <p>This submitter (owner of a family bach at Amberley Beach) makes many valid points about the potential effects of PC7 on Amberley beach residents.</p> <p>Among the points relating to financial impacts, the submitter highlights the effects of PC7 on the value and insurability of properties at Amberley Beach (points 93.12, 93.23 and 93.25). If protection from the sea is neglected and relocation is assumed, this will inevitably affect insurability and depress property values, with a likely adverse impact on the wellbeing of Amberley Beach residents.</p>                               |
| Anthony Charles Trewinnard | 103.1 – 103.5 | All of Plan Change | Support in part    | <p>The submitter supports the validity of land banking in principle, in the context of the Coastal Adaptation Plan (CAP), but points out that there is currently no urgency to proceed with PC7.</p> <p>He rightly points out that the CAP warns that “care needs to be taken when implementing options now that might prevent an alternative option being taken in future and that land banking does not lock in retreat as the future option”.</p> <p>Federated Farmers believes it is crucial not to close off future options, especially when there is such strong and widespread opposition to PC7.</p> |

## Conclusion

Federated Farmers thanks Hurunui District Council for considering this further-submission on Proposed Plan Change 7 to the Hurunui District Plan. We look forward to ongoing dialogue about the proposed plan change and continuing to work constructively with Council.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Bex Green', with a stylized, cursive script.

Bex Green  
President, North Canterbury Province  
and  
Chair, Canterbury Regional Policy Committee  
Federated Farmers of New Zealand

## HURUNUI DISTRICT COUNCIL

## FORM 6

Further submission on a proposed change to the District Plan

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991



Please do not hesitate to phone or email the planning team at the Hurunui District Council (ph 03 314 8816; email [planning@hurunui.govt.nz](mailto:planning@hurunui.govt.nz)) if you require any assistance.

**To:** Hurunui District Council (HDC)

**Date:** October 22 2026

**This is a further submission in support of (or in opposition to) a submission on the following proposed plan change to the Hurunui District Plan:**

**Plan Change 7 – Rosewood Terrace**

The Council has initiated a plan change to the Hurunui District Plan to rezone part of the property 185 Ashworths Road, Amberley from Rural Zone to Residential 1 Zone, and apply an Outline Development Zone overlay along with associated changes to the policies and rules applying to the plan change site. The rezoning would enable development of approximately 230 lots.

The purpose of the plan change is to allow for the proactive relocation of the Amberley Beach settlement, which is subject to multiple hazards (including coastal erosion and inundation, fluvial and pluvial flooding and rising groundwater) in a manner that is cost neutral to the wider community and which is sensitively located within, and integrated with, the surrounding environment.

**Submitter details:**

Name/s: (Full name)

Paula Marie Le Compte

Contact person: self

Designation:

Address for service:

33 Chamberlain Avenue, Amberley Beach  
or 5 Quail Way, Amberley

Email address: [le.compte@xtra.co.nz](mailto:le.compte@xtra.co.nz)

Telephone: 021 850 594

### I am: (tick the applicable box)

☐

A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest; or

☒

A person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has; or

☐

The local authority for the relevant area

Please explain why you come within the category you ticked above:

Part of Bach Trust of 4 family generations, who own 33 Chamberlain Avenue, Amberley Beach.

### I support all or part of the submission/s of:

*Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number*

1 Jill Waterman of 16 Elizabeth Square Leithfield Beach

2 Teresa Erceg of 10 Chamberlain Avenue Amberley Beach

5 Colin Black of 163 Racecourse Road RD 2 Amberley

8 William & Hillary Turnbull of 48 Newcombes Road RD 1 Amberley

9 Carol Carvell of 13 South Crescent Amberley Beach

10 Linda Constable of 37A Douglas Road Amberley

12 Margaret Hedge of 31 Courage Road Amberley

13 Barrie Nunn of 323 Georges Road Amberley

14 Laura & David Proctor of 22 Grierson Avenue Amberley Beach

16 Jessica Caddy of 2 South Crescent Amberley Beach

17 Scott Caddy of 2 South Crescent Amberley Beach

18 George Forbes & Laura Forbes of 38 Garden Road, Merivale, Christchurch

20 Lulu Webb of 321 Georges Road Amberley

21 Gordon Legge of 321 Georges Road Amberley

23 David & Jenny Uren of 18 Teviotview Place, Amberley

24 Trevor Brown of 213 Hursely Terrace Rd RD1 Amberley

25 Bruce Johns of 20 Ropley Street Amberley

26 David & Vicki Sanford of 203 Hursley Teerace Rd RD 1 Amberley

27 Lorraine Dunning of 217 Hursley Terrace Rd RD1 Amberely

28 Julie Nunn of 323 Georges Rd RD2 Glasnevin

29 Laura Fairbass of 60 Newcombes Rd RD1 Amberley

30 Alan Wilkinson of 29 Newcombes Rd Amberely

31 Wayne & Jenny Chisnall of 165 Hursley Terrace RD1 Amberley  
32 Grant & Sharon Benns of 20 Grierson Road, Amberley Beach  
34 Giles Cormack of 10 Crosses Rd RD 1 Amberley  
35 Miriam Bartlett of 16 Holton Road Amberley Beach  
36 Hinton & Michale Tayles of 70 Newcombes Rd RD 1 Amberley  
37 Linda & Ian Tayles of 14 Bloomfield St Leithfield  
38 Vanessa MacPherson of 26 Holton Road Amberley Beach  
39 Debra Ducker of 329 Hursley Terrace Rd RD1 Amberley  
40 Matthew Dixon of 215 Hursley Terrace Rd RD 1 Amberley  
41 Shau Ducker of 229 Hursley Terrace Rd RD1 Amberley  
42 Alan Hood of 45 Courage Road Amberely  
44 Mitchell Cochrane of 60 Newcombes Road RD 1 Amberley  
45 Pounamu Higgs of 1 South Cresent Amberley Beach  
46 Elizabeth Goodwin of 40 Chamberlain Avenue Amberley Beach  
47 Tony Lowsley of 13 South Crescent Amberley Beach  
48 Leslie Smart of 71 Kings Rd Leithfield  
49 Michael Goodwin of 40 Chamberlain Ave Amberley Beach  
50 Brittany Aitken of 30 Grierson Avenue Amberley Beach  
51 Elizabeth Kelsy of 163 Mackenzies Rd Waipara  
52 Arthur Light email [arthurlight@gmail.com](mailto:arthurlight@gmail.com)  
53 ABRRaC of Amberley Beach – c/- 36 Holton Road Amberley Beach  
54 NC province of Federated Farmers of NZ 535 Wairakei Road Christchurch  
55 Graeme & Sally Sutherland of 22 Grierson Avenue Amberley Beach  
56 James Silcock of 30 Holton Road Amberley Beach  
57 Stewart & Kate Henry of 3 Mill Road Leithfield  
58 Lois Newick of 14 Holton Road Amberley Beach  
59 Megan & Davis Latham of 18 Grierson Avenue of Amberley Beach  
60 Timothy Goulding of 4 South Crescent Amberley Beach  
61 Andy & Angie Mason of Amberley Trust 127 Ashworths Road Amberley  
62 Christine Clyne of email [Christine.clyne1@icloud.com](mailto:Christine.clyne1@icloud.com)  
63 Celine Goulding of 4 South Crescent Amberley Beach  
66 Bernadette Hall of 22 Holton Rd Amberley Beach  
68 Robert Lovell & Josephine Lees of 230 Ashworths Road RD 1 Amberley  
69 Gary Quinn of 18 Holton Road Amberley Beach  
70 Lynn Cropper of 2 Rosewood Drive Amberley

71 John Hall of 22 Holton Road Amberley Beach  
73 Sian Carson of 5 South Cres Amberley Beach  
74 Grant Chapman of 30 Hursley Terrace Road RD 1 Amberley  
75 Tracey Chapman of 30 Hursley Terrace Road RD 1 Amberley  
78 John Manson of 48 Chamberlain Ave Amberley Beach  
80 Nigel Gabrielson of 42 Chamberlain Ave. Amberley Beach  
82 Bev Watson of 17 Holton Road Amberley Beach  
83 Carl Krijt of 5 Quail Way Amberley  
84 David Melvill & Gail Carr email glen.allen@xtra.co.nz  
85 Dylan Ross & Kate McCarthy of 122 Ashworths Road Amberley  
87 Jacquie Georgeson & David Cosby of 28 Grierson Avenue Amberley Beach  
88 Jennifer Campbell of 4 South Crescent Amberley Beach  
89 Margaret Forbes of 28 Holton Rod Amberley Beach  
90 Nikki & Johnathan Nevin of 24 Newcombes Road RD 1 Amberely  
91 Natural Hazards Commission of P O Box 790 Wellington  
94 Sue & George Kemp of 1856 Ashworth Road Amberley  
95 Scott Orpwood of 8 South Crescent Amberley Beach  
96 Marc & Tracey Coulthard of 26 Holton Road Amberley Beach  
97 Sean Doak of Amberley Beach  
98 Adele Brown of Amberley Beach  
101 Christopher Herbert of Omihi  
102 FENZ 267 High St Christchurch  
103 Anthony Trewinnard of 16 Teviotview Place Amberley  
104 Nicola Reed of 60 Grierson Avenue Amberley Beach  
105 Jicinta McBain of 491 Christys Road RD 7 Ashburton  
107 Rosalie Rogers of 12 Holton Road Amberley Beach  
108 Glenys Metcalfe of email glenny.metcalfe@gmail.com

**I oppose all or part of the submission/s of:**

*Include name and address of submitter/s and where known their original submitter number*

## The particular parts of the submission/s I support or oppose are:

*Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission/s you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal, continue on a separate sheet if necessary. Please ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to.*

1. I confirm my original submission. I believe it sets out very clearly on many issues why Plan Change 7 cannot be approved in terms of the statutory planning framework. It is very much on the lived experiences and impacts, on reading other submissions these were reflected and expanded on. There were also many procedural and process issues raised by submitters which I acknowledge and support. I am listing those and referencing them by submission number.
2. For clarity I have used the list as per the attached link:  
[https://www.hurunui.govt.nz/repository/libraries/id:23wyoavbi17q9ssstcjd/hierarchy/Regulatory\\_Services/Resource%20Consents/District%20Plan/Plan%20Changes/PC7-Rosewood-Terrace/Submissions/PC7-Rosewood-Terrace-list-of-submitters.pdf](https://www.hurunui.govt.nz/repository/libraries/id:23wyoavbi17q9ssstcjd/hierarchy/Regulatory_Services/Resource%20Consents/District%20Plan/Plan%20Changes/PC7-Rosewood-Terrace/Submissions/PC7-Rosewood-Terrace-list-of-submitters.pdf)
3. I specifically support the submissions of the Amberley Beach Ratepayers & Residents Community (53) and of Vanessa McPherson (38) which make procedural and process points additional to those of my submission.
4. The Round 1 submissions significantly oppose Plan Change 7 and these are clearly from many Beach residents who are either owning or renting.
5. There is also overwhelming opposition by the nearby landholders around Rosewood Farm, along with other Hurunui residents who are ratepayers. As disclosed by many of the submissions there are a range of matters that remain unresolved. Predominantly noted is the lack of full engagement.
6. I support the submission (103) of Anthony Charles Trewinnard in its entirety and its reasoning, but I do not agree as he has said, that the purchase of Rosewood Farm was necessary. Even if just as land banking, as it could have occurred elsewhere and probably less expensively.
7. I support the submissions that Plan Change 7 is premature, in that it has been proposed contrary to the sequencing set out in the Coastal Adaptation Plan [and the accompanying but separate and in my opinion not adopted Proposal Managed Retreat and Land Banking] and before any triggers have been met – this has been endorsed in many submissions including the following:  
2,10,13,16,18,28,32,35,46,49,50,55,56,59,60,66,71,73,85,87,88,95,96,97,98,103
8. I endorse the submissions that HDC, before proceeding with the Rosewood purchase and proposed Plan Change 7, did not adequately consult with and fully engage with the key stakeholders. That is including both Amberley Beach owners and residents, plus the

properties proximate to Rosewood Farm and HDC ratepayers in general. This is supported by submissions inter alia 9,18,21,31,38,45,47,58,60,63,66,70,71,74,78,80,82,87,88,94,104

9. I endorse that HDC has fundamentally breached the dynamic pathways planning approach that they discussed and used as set out in the Coastal Adaptation Plan, thereby distorting the underlying principles and intent. Supported by submissions inter alia: 14,16,18,20,38,45,51,53,59,63,69,78,83,96,97,103
10. I support the submissions that Plan Change 7 will have an adverse economic impact on Amberley Beach owners who opt in to the subdivision, the very ones Plan Change 7 is intended to benefit.  
Supported by submissions inter alia:  
16,17,39,41,45,47,51,59,60,62,66,69,73,74,78,80,82,,87,89,104,105
11. I support the submissions that HDC has relied for its hazard risk relocation proposal underpinning Plan Change 7 on a single document [being the Jacobs Report 2020] which is now dated, non-peer reviewed, utilising extreme discredited predicted climate scenarios and additionally now is contrary to a Ministerial caution. HDC **has not** sought contemporary scientific evidence - essential for hazard mitigation planning. Nor have they been prepared to review the Coastal Adaptation Plan, despite the provisions contained in it to do so. Nor has HDC had the Jacobs report peer reviewed despite a formal request by Amberley Beach Ratepayers Residents Community (ABRRaC) to do so. Supported by submissions inter alia  
18,23,24,29,30,35,38,41,44,52,57,60,62,83,84,85,87,88,95,98,101,107,108
12. I support the submissions that financial analysis in the s32 report and Economic Impact Assessment is flawed. In particular the cost-neutrality principle has become the sole measure [but even this cost neutrality is strongly queried]. Whereas the key measure for changing Highly Productive Land to residential is not cost neutrality at all. Additionally it must be asked why financial viability was not assessed – the consultant’s brief was limited to cost neutrality. Supported by submissions inter alia 18,31,35,53,70,83,87,98,101,103
13. I support submissions that HDC has not established a sufficient case for Plan Change 7 justifying the conversion of Highly Productive Land to residential, with a large gap in the deduction process that Plan Change 7 is needed to provide sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand with no indication how many Beach owners, if any, will take up a section; lack of detail on section uptake option process. The benefit to cost test has not been met. Supported by submissions inter alia 18,38,53,57,60,61,63,78
14. I support Arthur Light’s submission (52) that Rosewood is an inappropriate location for a further urban cluster between Amberley and Leithfield akin to unsightly and much criticised ribbon development. A satellite sub division devoid of reason and remote from the larger Amberley community without the purpose of location beside an amenity like the beach. I therefore endorse the many other submissions (including those below insofar as they criticise the site of the proposed new subdivision by criticising the location of Rosewood, of amenities, of it being isolated from Amberley town facilities, with unsatisfactory access, a scar on rural landscape, the loss of productive farmland, the lack of beach access, adjoining farming hazards.etc etc) Supported by submissions  
1,8,16,17,18,,23,31,36,37,39,40,41,42,44,45,57,68,74,85,89,91,108

15. I support those submissions below insofar as they confirm that the case for Plan Change 7 does not justify the removal of highly productive farmland.,  
2,5,12,13,14,20,23,24,25,26,27,28,29,30,31,34,36,37,44,45,48,52,53,54,57,73,75,78,84,  
90, 94,98,101,108

16. The submissions overall make it clear that there is very little support from Amberley Beach owners for Plan Change 7- even those who declare support generally insist on substantial conditions as their prerequisites. There appears to be almost no support from landowners proximate to Rosewood Farm , who are another directly impacted group.

Note that the submission numbers [numbered 1 to 108] I have referred to are those listed by HDC in its "List of Submitters on PC7-Rosewood Terrace" as updated 30 September 2026 and so the submitters and their submissions referenced - I have given the same numbering.

I also note that HDC has confirmed via the Graeme Abbott email dated 7 October 2026 cc Nicola Kirby of HDC Planning, that HDC will attend to all service under Section 8A, Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act. Please confirm if I am expected to attend to any service other than what HDC has committed to undertake as stated "**Council officers will manage this process for you**".

### The reasons for my support or opposition are:

*Give details, continue on a separate sheet if necessary.*

As above

### I seek that the whole or part of the submission be allowed or disallowed.

*Please give precise details of what you seek to be allowed or disallowed. If it is in part please be precise about which part of the submission/s. Ensure it is clear which submission/s you are referring to each time.*

As above.

I request that HDC reconsiders Plan Change 7. It is misconceived and should be withdrawn.

In any event, I also consider that in addition to the grounds set out in my submission (#93) and my further submission, that Plan Change 7 should not be approved because it does not satisfy the statutory planning framework of the Resource Management Act and National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land.

**Please note I was unable to configure a tick for the boxes as appeared to be required, I have however used a inserted dasrk circle.**

## Hearing:

I wish to be heard in support of my further submission: YES ☒ NO ☐

If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing: YES ☐ NO ☒

## Notes:

- The closing date for serving further submissions on the consent authority is **5pm Thursday 22 October 2026**.
- **A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter/s within 5 working days after it is served on the local authority.**
- If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):
  - it is frivolous or vexatious:
  - it discloses no reasonable or relevant case:
  - it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:
  - it contains offensive language:
  - it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

## Privacy information:

The information requested on this form, including your contact details, is required by the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The information will be held by the Council, and you may ask to check and correct any personal information that we hold about you. The RMA requires your submission, including your name and contact details, to be made available to the Council (including the Council decision-maker) and the applicant.

Your submission, including your name and contact details, may also be made available to other submitters and to the public on the Council's website, or on request. If requested, the Council may legally be required to make all submissions available to the public (which can include the media), including the name and contact details of the submitter, subject to the provisions of the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (LGOIMA). If you believe there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential from other submitters or the public under LGOIMA, please contact the processing Planner for this application prior to making your submission.