

Submission on Notified Proposal for Plan, Change or Variation

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Timaru District Council

Name of submitter:

Margaret Elizabeth Digby

[State full name]

This is a submission on the following proposed plan or on a change proposed to the following plan or on the following proposed variation to a proposed plan or on the following proposed variation to a change to an existing plan) (the 'proposal'):

The Proposed Timaru District Plan

[State the name of proposed or existing plan and (where applicable) change or variation].

I ~~could~~/could not* gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

[*Select one.]

~~* I am/am not 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.~~

[*Delete or strike through entire paragraph if you could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.]

[†Select one.]

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are: [Give details]

SASM-O2 Access and Use

My submission is: [Include whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have them amended; and reasons for your views]

[If your submission relates to a proposed plan prepared or changed using the collaborative planning process, you must indicate the following:

- Where you consider that the proposed plan or change fails to give effect to a consensus position and therefore how it should be modified; or
- In the case that your submission addresses a point on which the collaborative group did not reach a consensus position, how that provision in the plan should be modified.]

I was not consulted about the Wahi Tupuna overlay SASM (Sites and areas of significance to Māori) and its relevance to my property 220 Blandswood Rd, and feel that I should have been before now.

When I first purchased my property 23 years ago, it was just bare land, gorse and broom. Since this time I have planted the native trees that you see today in the gully.

I have no direct access to the mountain and I have nothing on my land that could be identified of cultural significance (TDC November 10 2022). No cultural artefacts have been found on my property. Blandswood is a popular holiday place. However, the southside of Blandswood Road above the Ford can be exposed to flash floods from the Kowhai stream. It is a high rainfall area, and the Kowhai stream runs beneath the mountain. This area has always been protected and has been respected for many years, with being identified as having outstanding landscape with cultural value. The guardians of Blandswood, Peel Forest, are the local Blandswood residents. Many families, often six to seventh generation have succeeded in keeping the mountain green for the benefit of all New Zealanders.

The public have access to the majority of the Mountain Peel Forest Park Scenic Reserve. This is a wonderful place to come and enjoy the bushwalks, climb a mountain, enjoy the streams and waterfalls, tall trees, the bird life and the plants. It is a magical place for everyone and free for everyone to enjoy the spiritual attachment of the mountain and land at Blandswood. All people have access to this mountain and the surrounding areas of cultural value are already protected. We all celebrate the mountain as New Zealanders.

I am particularly concerned with SASM O2 Access and Use. Why does SASM allow for access to all private property in this area when the public already have access to the majority of the mountain? I do not have the right to have access to my neighbours property without their

permission and I do not believe that anyone should have access to private land without permission.
 I am unnerved by the concept of people having access to my land, without requiring my permission, even if only to determine whether any specific sites of interest exist. This undermines my rights as a land owner and as a rate payer of the Timaru District Council and I would like to be respected over this decision.
 SASM map is very broad and far reaching. It would be better to identify specific sites that need to be protected.

I seek the following decision from the local authority: *[Give precise details as this is the only part of your submission that will be summarised in the summary of decisions requested]*

- Protect my property rights.
- Ensure that the fundamental concept of Ownership is not in anyway undermined.
- SASM-O2 Access and Use - should be limited to public land or accessways.

I wish (or do not wish) † to be heard in support of my submission.

*[*In the case of a submission made on a proposed planning instrument that is subject to a streamlined planning process, you need only indicate whether you wish to be heard if the direction specifies that a hearing will be held.]*
[†Select one.]

~~***If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.**~~
~~*[*Delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case.]*~~

Signature of submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

[A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means]

Date ... 5 December 2022

Electronic address for service of submitter: margaret.e.digby@gmail.com

Telephone: 027 5222 455

Postal address (or alternative method of service under s352 of the Act):

Unit 43, 1226 River Road, RD7, Ashburton 7777

Contact person: *[name and designation, if applicable]* Margaret Digby

Note to person making submission

1. If you are making a submission to the Environmental Protection Authority, you should use form 16B. 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.
2. 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 specialist knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.