

**Submission on Proposed Timaru District Plan - He Po. He Ao. Ka Awatea.**

**Form 5 Submission on publically notified proposal for policy statement or plan, change or variation**

*Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991*

**To:** Timaru District Council - Planning Unit

**Date received:** 15/12/2022

**Submission Reference Number #:**59

This is a submission on the following proposed plan (the **proposal**): Proposed Timaru District Plan - He Po. He Ao. Ka Awatea.

**Submitter:**

Louise Aubrey

**Address for service:**

3636 Rangitata Gorge Road Peel Forest 7990  
New Zealand

**Email:** louisecaubrey@gmail.com

**I wish to be heard:** Yes

**I am willing to present a joint case:** Yes

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?

- **No**

Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

- **N/A**

**Submission points**

---

**Point 59.1**

**Section:** GRUZ – General Rural Zone

**Sub-section: Rules**

**Provision:**

**GRUZ-R14 Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites**

**General Rural Activity status: Permitted Zone**

**Activity status where compliance not achieved: Discretionary**

**Where:**

**PER-1**

The flights are for emergency purposes such as medical evacuations, search and rescue, firefighting or civil defence; or

**PER-2**

The use is for primary production including spraying, stock management, fertiliser application or frost protection for:

1. a maximum of seven days within any three month period where the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback between 500m-1,000m from:
  - a. any Residential zone; and
  - b. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site; or
2. the airstrip or helicopter landing site is setback greater than 1,000m from:
  - a. any Residential zone; and
  - b. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity, not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site; or

**PER-3**

Take offs or landings must not exceed 10 per month; and the airstrip or landing site is setback a minimum of 500m from:

1. any Residential zone; and
2. the notional boundary of a building containing a noise sensitive activity not located on the site of the airstrip or helicopter land site.

**Sentiment: Amend**

**Submission:**

## In Regards to PER-3

Aviation has had a significant presence in the district for over 75 years for private, business, training, and agriculture and forms an essential transportation link for many residents. The limit of 10 take-offs and landings per month is overly restrictive and excessively limits the existing use and rights of aviators operating aircraft on private airstrips. This will make recreation, business, training and social gatherings such as fly-ins virtually unachievable which will have a detrimental impact on businesses, recreation opportunities and mental health of residents.

By implementing movement restrictions could and should only be in response of that activity occurring in our district having ever been identified as causing a significant issue. Aircraft present a minimal overall noise impact given the duration of time to take off and land an aircraft is low in comparison to many other permitted rural and business/recreational activities permitted within the General Rural Zone.

Where one can take-off and land with no adjoining property occupant even knowing that this activity has occurred (as is the case for many rural airstrips) begs to question what issue is resolved restricting movements within PER-3. In other cases, adjoining properties have no issue/concern with the number of movements, so who is this rule designed to protect?

Private airstrips are often used for flight training purposes, through the consent of landowners. These environments offer better instructional value including preparing future recreational and commercial pilots for high risk situations, terrain, weather conditions and geographic impacts on flight versus established airports. PER-3 will limit the ability of pilots to receive adequate training within our district and potentially reduce viability of businesses such as South Canterbury Aeroclub which has operated since 1946.

### **Relief sought**

Amend PER-3.

The proposed District Plan should preserve the existing rights and freedoms of aviators and private land owners, through removal of movement (take off and landing) frequency limitations in PER-3.

The proposed District Plan should preserve the existing right to host a fly-in, as organised by organisations such as the Aircraft Owner's and Pilots Association (AOPA) and Aero clubs.

---

## **Point 59.2**

**Section:** SASM – Sites and Areas of Significance to Maori

**Sentiment:** Oppose

### **Submission:**

I make this submission as the manager of a property that has extensive areas of SASM mapped across the property, this includes developed and undeveloped areas. The proposed rules that lack specificity around what the value is and where but a broad brush sweep of a map which then increases the resource consenting requirements significantly is inappropriate. Managing and protecting cultural matters is virtually impossible with the broad brush approach that has been taking and just adds a layers of bureaucratic process to any landowner requirements especially on previously developed areas.

I also support the submission made by Federated Farmers.

### **Relief sought**

The Council should remove this section of the proposed district plan development until they have further developed information, reports and consultation with land owners and are able to provide landowners and managers with greater information regarding the values present on their properties.