

**Clause 6 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991**

**TO:** Timaru District Council  
Submitted by email: [pdp@timdc.govt.nz](mailto:pdp@timdc.govt.nz)

**SUBMISSION BY:** Rooney Group Ltd

**SUBMISSION ON:** The Proposed Timaru District Plan

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

**The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:**

Please see attached Appendix 1 – Submissions on Proposed Timaru District Plan which specifies the provisions of the Plan the submission relations to.

**My submission is:**

The details of the submission is attached and described in Appendix 1.

**I seek the following decision from the local authority:**

The relief sought is described and attached in Appendix 1.

**I wish to be heard in support of my submission.**

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

**Date:** 15 December 2022

**Electronic address for service:** [nathan.hole@rooneygroup.co.nz](mailto:nathan.hole@rooneygroup.co.nz)

**Telephone:** 027 243 2219

**Postal Address:** c/- Rooney Group Ltd  
PO Box 10  
Waimate 7960

**Contact Person:** Nathan Hole  
Senior Advisor – Environmental Policy & Projects  
Rooney Group Ltd

- WAIMATE (Head Office)
- ASHBURTON
- TIMARU
- OAMARU

## General Submission Points

As a general statement the Proposed Timaru District Plan (**PTDP**) has been drafted as a restrictive planning document that seeks to micromanage the effects of many activities that have previously been permitted. It would have been preferable for the PTDP to be more enabling and then restricting where necessary to achieve statutory requirements. The PTDP consistently goes that extra step in terms of restrictiveness and micromanagement compared to other district plans is unnecessary and will result in additional costs and delays without adding any value in terms of environmental outcomes and sustainable management.

A key point to note is for the PTDP to be amended to avoid confusing and unnecessary overlap with consenting for Regional Council activities within the beds of rivers. The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement allows this, and the Draft Waitaki District Plan is an example where this overlap is avoided.

The PTDP has been drafted to require significant areas of private land to be surrendered when subdivision or development occurs. Minor activities such as boundary adjustments between rural properties will trigger esplanade and public access provisions, and the formation of cycle ways where these are identified as being required.

Significant Natural Areas (SNA) should not include section 13 RMA riverbed land and regionally there should be a consistent approach. At the very least where SNAs that are identified in riverbeds there should be no rules applying to these areas as the effects of the activity will be considered by the regional council (as is the approach currently).

The visual amenity landscape layer controls are unnecessarily restrictive and controlling. VAL-4 in particular applies to a large area of land at Taiko that is largely developed while containing many areas identified as SNA. This landscape has survived within the current pattern of development of the operative District Plan and need not be restricted further by introducing a visual amenity landscape as the areas of national importance have been identified separately.

The policy direction in the PTDP provides for Council to take significant areas of land without any provision for compensation. The minimum requirements to comply with performance standards are large, it would appear to be minimum standard plus more. Corner splays, land for legal road, land for public access, land for cycle ways and public access are all taken without any provision for compensation. Such requirements will deter development, rather than encourage it, and lead to more unconnected areas as landowners choose not to develop rather than develop. These requirements do facilitate sustainable development. Council should be providing compensation to landowners where they are required/requested to provide land to provide for Council's future needs over and above the minimum requirements.

It is submitted that the proposed plan should introduce a gravel extraction overlay across land where existing land-based gravel extraction and clean fill deposition occurs. Such a layer should recognise and provide for this activity as well as protecting the sites from encroachment of sensitive activities in a way that the proposed plan has recognised and protected primary production. Land based gravel extraction is extremely important to continuity of supply and consistency of gravel quality.

The provisions for renewable energy in the PTDP should be more enabling in line with the NPS for Renewable Energy Generation 2011. Requiring a discretionary activity resource consent for large scale (non-domestic) renewable generation does not achieve the policy intention of the NPS.

**Appendix 1: Submissions on Proposed Timaru District Plan**

Specific Provision	Submission	Relief Sought
<p><i>Definitions</i></p> <p>Earthworks</p> <p>National Grid Subdivision Corridor</p> <p>National Grid Yard</p> <p>Outdoor Lighting</p>	<p>The submitters <b>support in part</b> the definition of earthworks but <b>submits</b> that the definition be refined to exclude mining and quarrying as these activities have their own separate definitions and rules. Such an amendment avoids potential confusion, misalignment or misinterpretation when applying the relevant planning provisions to the relevant activities.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> the definition as it goes beyond what is required by the relevant Code of Practice and Regulations providing an unfair advantage to the network provider potentially avoiding and/or frustrating the requirement to pay compensation under the Public Works Act 1981.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> the definition as it goes beyond what is required by the relevant Code of Practice and Regulations providing an unfair advantage to the network provider potentially avoiding and/or frustrating the requirement to pay compensation under the Public Works Act 1981.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> the definition including the reference to interior lighting that emits directly into the outdoor environment. The definition</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> the definition of earthworks to exclude mining and quarrying.</p> <p><b>Amend</b> the definition to refer to the clearance distances specified by the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001) and the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.</p> <p><b>Amend</b> the definition to refer to the clearance distances specified by the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances (NZECP 34:2001) and the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.</p> <p><b>Amend</b> the definition to exclude the reference to interior lighting and to exclude light emitted from vehicles.</p>

<p>Permanent Workers Accommodation</p> <p>Quarrying Activities</p> <p>Riparian Margin</p>	<p>should be refined to exclude artificial light from vehicles.</p> <p>The submitters <b><u>oppose</u></b> the definition as it only provides for full-time workers accommodation.</p> <p>The submitters <b><u>support in part.</u></b></p> <p>The submitters <b><u>oppose</u></b> the definition. Defining the riparian margin based on the width of the riverbed is too generic and, in many situations, will be well outside the transitional zone. The riparian margin should be defined by a lesser distance such as 5 metres, or the Riparian Zone, whichever is the greater.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> the definition to provide for the accommodation of part-time workers of a primary production activity, or a rural industrial activity.</p> <p><b>Amend</b> the definition to include the removal of overburden, not just the deposition.</p> <p><b>Amend</b> the definition to give effect to the submission.</p>
<p><i>Energy and Infrastructure</i></p> <p>EI-R26(2) – Construction of Water Infrastructure</p>	<p>The submitters <b><u>oppose</u></b> Rule EI-26(2). The rule requires a RDA land use consent for ALL plumbing and drainage work associated with a water supply, wastewater system, and stormwater infrastructure, whether above or below ground in all zones except Rural.</p> <p>This rule should be deleted as the requirement for resource consent is unnecessary. This rule in itself would make most subdivisions at least a RDA activity, and duplicate Subdivision Consent, Building Consent and Service Consent assessments.</p>	<p><b>Delete</b> this rule in its entirety.</p> <p><b>Delete</b> this rule in its entirety. Rule EI-R32(2) should apply to ALL zones.</p>



<p>SW-R7 (zincalume, copper etc)</p> <p>SW-S1</p>	<p>The submitters have a <b>neutral</b> position SW-R7 as the effects of the rule are still being assessed.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> this standard applying to DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area as the Gleniti bund and swale network has been designed to capture additional post development stormwater flows from this area.</p>	<p><b>Exclude</b> DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area from SW-S1.</p>
<p><i>Transport</i></p> <p>TRAN-P1</p> <p>TRAN-P8</p> <p>TRAN-R11</p> <p>TRAN-S1</p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> TRAN-P1(5) using the word “requiring”. Council should be encouraging and promoting cycle parking not requiring it as it is not appropriate in all circumstances.</p> <p>The submitters oppose TRAN-P8(3) as the policy duplicates the requirements of the Building Act 2004.</p> <p>There is no definition of a Private Road. Any combined private access appears to meet the definition of a Private Way.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> TRAN-S1. Limiting landscaping to indigenous species and requiring a 40mm minimum diameter (indigenous) tree, as well as being required to source the plantings from within the ecological district is unnecessarily onerous and expensive, let alone potentially difficult to source.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> TRAN-S10. TRAN-S10(2)</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> rule TRAN-P1(5) – by deleting “require” and inserting “<u>encourage</u>”</p> <p><b>Delete</b> TRAN-P8(3) in its entirety.</p> <p><b>Add</b> a definition of “Private Way” to the definition section <b>or remove</b> the reference to Private Way.</p> <p>The standard should be <b>amended</b> to encourage but not mandate indigenous planting. The 40mm diameter requirement of TRAN-S1(5)(b) should be reduced for indigenous tree species.</p> <p><b>Amend</b> by reducing the sealing requirement of TRAN-S10(2) to 5 metres from the existing seal</p>

TRAN-S10(2)	requires sealing 20 metres back from the road boundary. Not only is this unnecessarily long, but most roads are not sealed to the road boundary.	formation regardless of the distance to the road boundary, and not require sealing where the road is unsealed.
TRAN-S10(3)	The submitters <b>oppose</b> TRAN-S10(3) should promote rather than require (“must” and “all”) accesses to the secondary road. There are many examples where it is appropriate to have the primary or secondary access to the primary road without any adverse effects resulting.	<b>Amend</b> TRAN-S10(3) to promote the access to the secondary road as the principal consideration but provide for access to the primary road as an alternative where there are no resulting adverse effects.
TRAN-S10(4)	The submitters <b>oppose</b> the passing bay width of 5.5 metres as it seems excessively wide when a vehicle is less than 2.5 metres wide. It appears that 5.5 metres is intended to be the combined width of the carriageway and passing bay, but the drafting does not specify this.	<b>Amend</b> TRAN-S10(3) to specify a combined passing bay and carriage way width of 5.5 metres.
TRAN-S17(1)	The submitter is <b>neutral</b> on this rule as the Plan does not appear to specify Gate Setback Distances referred to in the standard.	<b>Amend</b> to specify Gate Setback Distances.
TRAN-S19	The submitters <b>oppose</b> TRAN-S19 referring to all zones. This standard conflicts with Light restrictions within Light Sensitive Areas as it is not clear what the standard means when it states “...that comply with the rules in the Light Chapter...”	The standard should be <b>amended</b> to provide an exemption within Light Sensitive Areas, and all activities that are not commercial or industrial. Many farms (Primary Production properties) will load and unload stock in darkness at certain times of the year and it is unnecessary to require lighting of these areas for when this activity occurs. Many rural or rural lifestyle residential properties will have more than 10 or more



		(unmarked) parking spaces.
<i>Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori</i>		
SASM-R1(1) PER-1	The submitters <b>oppose</b> SASM-R1(1) PER-1. The maximum area of 750m <sup>2</sup> is too restrictive for earthworks associated with primary production and should be increased to 2000m <sup>2</sup> .	<b>Amend</b> SASM-R1(1) to a maximum area of 2000m <sup>2</sup> .
SASM-R1(1) PER-2	The submitters <b>support</b> accidental discovery protocol provisions but <b>oppose</b> the requirements of SASM-R1 PER-2 and the commitment required by the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form contained in APP4. Providing two weeks' notice in advance of the activity occurring in conjunction with the requirements of APP4 is too onerous and will make it very difficult for minor activities to be undertaken as a permitted activity as intended.	<b>Amend</b> PER-2 to remove the requirement to provide two weeks' notice.
SASM-R1(3) RDIS-1	The submitters <b>oppose</b> earthworks within SASM-8 being a restricted discretionary activity.	<b>Remove</b> SASM-R1(3) and <b>amend</b> permitted activity rule SASM-R1(1) to include wahi tapu and wahi tapu overlays.
SASM-R5(1) PER-1	The submitters <b>oppose</b> SASM-R5(1) PER-1 in relation to the inclusion of SASM-6. The upper Rangitata is back country land and the maximum area of 750m <sup>2</sup> is too restrictive for mining and quarrying in this area.	<b>Amend</b> SASM-R5(1) to exclude SASM-6.
<i>Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity</i>		
Bat Protection Overlay	The submitters <b>oppose</b> the Bat Protection Overlay (BPO). It is submitted that the BPO is a	<b>Amend</b> the Bat Protection Overlay to be named "Bat Habitat Identification Area".

	<p>SNA as it is for the protection of habitation of significant indigenous fauna and should be labelled as such if it is to remain. The submitter <b>supports</b> the identification of bat habitat and landowners being encouraged to protect bat habitat but <b>opposes</b> a regulatory approach that will create the same sentiment that SNAs have created and potentially do more harm than good.</p>	
ECO-P1	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> ECO-P1 to the extent that Council has identified and mapped SNAs within the beds of rivers and lakes (section 13 RMA land). The Canterbury Region Policy Statement does not require district councils to identify SNA on section 13 land, and many Canterbury district councils such as Waitaki District Council do not. The Canterbury Regional Council is the lead authority with regard to managing activities within the beds of rivers and lakes, including assessing any adverse effects associated with activities. Unnecessary duplication, over-regulation, misalignment, and confusion should be avoided.</p>	<p>ECO-P1 should be <b>amended</b> to specially exclude the identification of SNAs on section 13 RMA land.</p>
ECO-R1(1)	<p>The submitters <u>support in part</u> the rule but submits that another provision should be added to provide for the clearance for indigenous vegetation within the SNA overlay where the clearance is supported by QEII National Trust or the Department of Conservation.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> ECO-R1 to add PER-6 to state “<u>or the clearance is supported by the QEII National Trust or the Department of Conservation.</u>”</p>
ECO-R4 Clearance of Vegetation in the Long-	<p>The submitters <u>oppose</u> ECO-R4. The diameter of the trees in PER-2 are 10cm for a native tree, and</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> ECO-R4 to provide for any vegetation clearance to be a permitted activity where</p>



NFL-R8	<p>This VAL layer covers a significant area of land that is already subject to multiple SNAs.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> NFL-R9 applying to the VAL overlay. Including the VAL overlay is unduly restrictive and unnecessary.</p>	<b>Remove</b> the VAL overlay from NFL-R8.
NFL-R9	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> ALL subdivision being discretionary within an ONF, ONL or VAL overlay. This is unnecessarily restrictive. Boundary adjustment subdivisions, or subdivisions facilitating primary production activities should be excluded from the rule, and the VAL overlay removed in its entirety from the rule.</p>	<b>Remove</b> the VAL overlay from NFL-R9. <b>Amend</b> to exclude boundary adjustment subdivisions and subdivision of land used for primary production from the NFL-R9.
NFL-S3(2)	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> NFL-S3(2) as this level of control is unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.</p>	<b>Delete</b> NFL-S3(2).
NFL-S4(2)	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> NFL-S4(2) as this level of control is unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.</p>	<b>Delete</b> NFL-S4(2).
NFL-S5(2)	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> NFL-S5(2) as this level of control is unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.</p>	<b>Delete</b> NFL-S5(2).
NFL-S6(2)	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> NFL-S6(2) as this level of control is unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.</p>	<b>Delete</b> NFL-S6(2).
<i>Public Access</i>		
PA-P1	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> PA-P1 as the policy needs</p>	<b>Amend</b> PA-P1 to recognise the impacts of public

<p>PA-P2</p> <p>PA-P4</p> <p>SCHED11</p>	<p>to recognise the negative impact public access can have on landowners, in particular those involved in primary production. The current drafting only looks at public access through one sphere.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> PA-P2 to “require” public access. The policy should be worded to “facilitate” public access. The policy should also recognise the reverse sensitivity effect that can arise from providing public access. This needs to be able to be balanced as public access may not be appropriate in all circumstances depending on the type of land use.</p> <p>It is submitted that PA-P4 should recognise reverse sensitivity as a reason for limiting public access.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> the inclusion of the “Unnamed tributary of the Pareora River”. This tributary flows from a vegetated gully that has been identified as a SNA. There is no reason for this tributary to be included in SCHED11</p>	<p>access also.</p> <p><b>Replace</b> the word “require” from PA-P2 to “facilitate” or “promote” public access. <b>Insert</b> an additional subclause recognising reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p><b>Amend</b> PA-P4 to include a subclause identifying reverse sensitivity as a reason to limit public access.</p> <p><b>Delete</b> “Unnamed tributary of the Pareora River” from SCHED11.</p>
<p><i>Subdivision</i></p> <p>SUB-P7</p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P2(2). Esplanade provisions should be considered where appropriate, but not required. The policy should also consider that esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> SUB-P7 to remove the requirement for esplanade provisions. <b>Insert</b> a provision into SUB-P2 to recognise that esplanade provisions can have adverse effects through reverse sensitivity. <b>Provide</b> an additional policy to provide for consideration of waivers or a reduction. The draft Waitaki District Plan has</p>

	<p>reverse sensitivity. For example, people and dogs are not compatible with adjoining deer farming or other sensitive stock.</p>	<p>such a consideration.</p>
SUB-P11	<p>The submitters <b>generally support</b> SUB-P11 but submits that SUB-P11(2) should also afford the same flexibility to the General Residential Zone.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> SUB-P11(2) to include General Residential Zone.</p>
SUB-P14	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> the use of the word “avoid” in SUB-P14. The policy should provide flexibility to work with natural boundaries and existing fence lines and occupation, rather than promoting a minimum lot size as a target.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> SUB-P14 by deleting the word “avoid” and replace with “discourage”. <b>Add</b> to the policy to encourage where practicable for new boundaries to align with natural boundaries or existing fence lines.</p>
SUB-R1 – Boundary Adjustments	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> SUB-R1. Boundary adjustments should be a permitted activity. The Westland District Plan has had a permitted activity subdivision rule since 2002 and this is reflected in the proposed Tai Poutini combined West Coast District Plan. A section 223 and 224 RMA certificate is applied for as per a normal subdivision. The council certificate is then provided to LINZ for the issue of the new records of title.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> the activity status of SUB-R1 from “controlled” to “permitted”.</p>
SUB-S1 – Allotment Sizes and Dimensions	<p>The submitter has a <b>neutral</b> position on proposed allotment sizes within ALL zones as the overarching effects of the proposed sizes is still being assessed.</p>	
SUB-S1(6) – General Industrial Zone	<p>It is submitted that SUB-S1(6) should be amended to allow for legal access to road frontage.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> SUB-S1(6) to state “Allotments must have <b>legal access to</b> a minimum road frontage width of 7m.”</p>

<p>SUB-S3(1) – Rural Water Supply</p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> SUB-S3(1) using a consent notice to “alert” future owners that the allotment does not require a water supply. A consent notice is a condition that requires continuing compliance and should not be a notice board to advise future purchasers of information that would be ordinarily available if a LIM was sought.</p>	<p><b>Delete</b> “..., and a consent notice is proposed alerting future purchasers” from SUB-S3(1)(1)(c).</p>
<p>SUB-S4(1) – Wastewater Disposal</p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> the requirement for all General Industrial Zone allotments to be connected to a reticulated wastewater network when there is currently limited ability to provide a reticulated connection in this zone due to location and Council infrastructure capacity. The standard should provide a minimum distance to the allotment boundary before a connection is required.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> SUB-S4(1) to only require a connection where a conveyance structure of the reticulated sewer network passes within 50 metres of the allotment boundary and where Council can provide that service.</p>
<p>SUB-S6 – Vehicular Access</p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> SUB-S6. The standard should refer to no “additional” access with regard to a state highway or railway line. The standard should not alter the activity status of an application where there is an existing lawful access to either a state highway or crossing a railway line.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> SUB-S6(2) to only capture additional accesses or crossings.</p>
<p>SUB-S8 – Esplanade Reserves and Strips</p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> SUB-S8. This standard should not apply to boundary adjustments. The draft Waitaki District Plan has such a provision. The requirement for a minimum width of 10m for a lot of less than 4ha compared to 5m for a</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> SUB-S8 to recognise section 230 RMA. To provide for a minimum width of 5m regardless of lot size, and for compensation to be paid where any esplanade reserve or strip is taken.</p>





	standard as proposed and would not be able to be undertaken as a controlled activity, becoming a fully discretionary activity.	
<i>Drinking Water Protection</i>  DWP-R2	The submitters <b>oppose</b> DWP-R2 applying to all subdivision. It is submitted that DWP-R2 should not apply to boundary adjustment subdivision or subdivision not intended for use where a wastewater disposal is required.	<b>Amend</b> DWP-R2 to exclude boundary adjustment subdivision or subdivision where the resultant use does not require wastewater disposal.
<i>Financial Contributions</i>  FC-P2          APP7 1.0 – Water, Stormwater and Roading	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> FC-P2. It is submitted that the policy is not specific enough in relation to meeting the needs for additional infrastructure that arise from the activity. The wording is open and unclear. It appears a contribution taken should only be taken where there is a demonstrated need arising from the activity.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> the drafting of APP7(1.0) in its current form. It is submitted that the drafting of APP7 should specify more detail especially in relation to financial contributions for retrospective infrastructure upgrades. Works that Council has previously undertaken in preparation of additional growth should be clearly documented to specify the direct and indirect benefit of the works. The direct benefit should only include the cost of the over and above from what would have been routine upgrade and replacement work. Council should</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> FC-P2 to provide clarity.</p> <p><b>Redraft</b> APP7 1.0</p>

<p>APP7 – 1.4 Water, Stormwater, Wastewater and Rooding.</p>	<p>keep a detailed record of the costs incurred for that work should ensure that the contribution ceases to be collected once the cost of the works has been recovered. Council should not apply the producer price index for construction outputs for work that has already been completed as developers should not be levied a contribution in “todays” money for “yesterdays” work. PPI should only be applied to future work where the costing has been set and the contribution levied on that work. In that sense “yesterdays” price is converted to “todays” cost.</p> <p>It is submitted that contributions levied for Rooding should be taken from all the land that benefits that road, not just properties that have frontage to that road. A collector road for example will service and benefit a much wider area than a local road that is not a thoroughfare. Rooding contributions should not include amenity items such as Street Furniture, and items in relation to general compliance matters and fences and charging stations. Council needs to provide a clear link between the direct benefit to the developer and indirect benefit to the community. APP7(1.0) needs to provide sufficient certainty to show compliance with the Resource Management Act 1991 and the Local Government Act 2002.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> 1.4.a specifying the “full actual cost”. It is submitted that an equitable share would be a more appropriate term</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> APP7 1.4 to make clear that any infrastructure contribution will be an equitable share of the full cost of any upgrade required as</p>
--	--	--

<p>APP7 – 2.0 Open Space and Recreation</p>	<p>especially as financial contributions for infrastructure are predominately taken retrospectively. Even if infrastructure upgrades are triggered directly as a result of an activity, that activity should not bear the full cost of the upgrade as other future activities may also benefit. The current wording of APP7 1.4 is open ended and provides for Council to recover 100% of any infrastructure upgrades it considers necessary.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> a 4% contribution. It is submitted that this is a significant increase from \$500 which is payable under the operative District Plan. A 4% contribution on a \$300,000 section is \$12,000 alone before any infrastructure contributions are added. Such a contribution will either increase the cost of sections, adding to the affordability issue, or make many developments uneconomical.</p>	<p>a result of the development.</p> <p>Retain a flat fee contribution that is affordable and facilitates subdivision and development.</p>
<p><i>Future Development Areas</i></p>	<p>The submitters are <b>neutral</b> on the proposed Future Development Areas and submits that Lot 4 DP 301476 and Pt Lot 2 DP 17808 at Redruth behind EcoTech Ltd should be identified as an additional Future Development Area for either a partial extension of the General Industrial Zone and/or General Residential Zone.</p>	<p><b>Add</b> an additional Future Development for General Industrial Zone and/or General Residential Zone over Lot 4 DP 301476 and Pt Lot 2 DP 17808.</p>
<p><i>Light</i></p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> the Light provisions proposed. The provisions are too extensive and restrictive and will make compliance as a permitted activity difficult. Proposed Plan Change 22 to the Mackenzie District Plan provides a more pragmatic framework yet in</p>	<p><b>Replace</b> the Light rules to reflect those proposed by Proposed Plan Change 22 of the Mackenzie District Plan.</p>

<p>LIGHT-R1(1)</p> <p>LIGHT-R2</p> <p>LIGHT-R3</p>	<p>arguably a more sensitive dark sky environment.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> PER-3 of LIGHT-R1(1). This performance standard is essentially extending the Light Sensitive Area. If a site is outside of the Light Sensitive Area, then only PER-1 and PER-2 should apply.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> LIGHT-R2. The rule should be extended to provide for permitted activities, not just a temporary activity. Temporary activities are limited as defined.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> LIGHT-R3. PER-2(3) is too restrictive and not practicable for many activities including primary production activities such as sheep kept in covered yards overnight under light ahead of shearing. The rule should also provide for sensor lighting to be an option. PER-2(3) is also too restrictive. Many primary production and primary production industry commences well before 7am.</p>	<p><b>Delete</b> PER-3 of LIGHT-R1(1).</p> <p><b>Amend</b> LIGHT-R2 PER-2 to provide for any temporary activity.</p> <p><b>Amend</b> LIGHT-R3 to provide for lighting in relation to primary production activities, and to also provide for sensor lighting as a performance standard and reduce the time restriction period to recognise that many activities that require artificial light commence before 7am.</p>
<p><i>Noise</i></p> <p>NOISE-R9</p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> NOISE-R9 to the extent that it applies to alterations to existing buildings. It is submitted that the rule should only apply to new buildings. A minor alteration of an existing building should not trigger an extensive upgrade of an existing building which may not be viable long term. The rule as drafted may have the reverse effect avoiding any alterations to existing buildings. The rule should also recognise that</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> NOISE-R9 to remove alterations to existing buildings.</p>

	some existing residential buildings are occupied by staff of industrial or commercial businesses and such occupants may not be sensitive to those activities.	
<i>Relocated Buildings and Containers</i>		
RELO-P1	It is submitted that RELO-P1 should also enable the use of shipping containers in the General Rural Zone as these are currently widely used within the zone.	<b>Amend</b> RELO-P1 to include the General Rural Zone.
RELO-P2	It is submitted that RELO-P2 be more flexible to provide for shipping containers to be screened and not readily visible but not necessarily unseen.	<b>Amend</b> RELO-P2 to be "...not <u>readily</u> visible..."
RELO-R2(2)	The submitters oppose RELO-R2(2). This should be a permitted activity rule.	<b>Amend</b> RELO-R2(2) to be a permitted activity rule.
<i>Temporary Activities</i>		
TEMP-R3 Temporary Events	The submitters <b>oppose</b> TEMP-R3. It is submitted that it supports temporary events but opposes the provisions proposed as they do not go far enough. It is submitted that the number of events should be extended and should also provide for motorsport events. Limited motorsport events such as car rallies and fundraising trailbike or 4wd events should not require resource consent. The rule also should apply to all zones and should allow for regular temporary events such as markets that add to the vibrance of the community and should not require resource consent to the limitations of the	<b>Amend</b> TEMP-R3 to make the rule to extend the number of events for non-motorsport events and provide for a limited number of motorsport events.

	rule.	
<p><i>General Residential</i></p> <p>GRZ-R10 - Fences</p> <p>GRZ-S9 - Landscaping</p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> PER-1 limiting the height of a road boundary fence or a fence adjoining a walkway or cycleway to 1m or 45% visually permeable. It is submitted that this will result in a loss of privacy and make screening of outdoor storage difficult for landowners. Where a north or west facing site adjoins road or a walk/cycleway then privacy of outdoor living space will be compromised adversely affecting the property owner. It is submitted that such restrictions should be left to developers to impose through covenants if considered necessary, and not apply to the entire zone.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> GRZ-S9. It is submitted that this level of control is not required by the District Plan. Most owners of residential sections provide landscaping on their own accord. The plan should also clarify if grassed landed areas also comply/qualify as outdoor living space. It is submitted that such areas should be able contribute to both requirements.</p>	<p><b>Delete</b> GRZ-R10 PER-1.</p> <p>Delete GRZ-S9</p>
<p><i>Medium Density Residential</i></p> <p>MRZ-P3 – Innovative Approaches</p> <p>MRZ-R10 – Fences</p>	<p>The submitters <b>support</b> MRZ-P3.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> PER-1 limiting the height of a road boundary fence or a fence adjoining a walkway or cycleway to 1m or 45% visually permeable. It is submitted that this will result in</p>	<p><b>Delete</b> MRZ-R10 PER-1</p>

<p>MRZ-S6 Landscaping</p> <p>MRZ-S10 – Hobbs Street Noise Mitigation</p>	<p>a loss of privacy and provide screening of outdoor storage difficult for landowners. Where a north or west facing site adjoins road or a walk/cycleway then privacy of outdoor living space will be compromised adversely affecting the property owner. It is submitted that such restrictions should be left to developers to impose through covenants if considered necessary, and not apply to the entire zone.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> MRZ-S6. It is submitted that this level of control is not required by the District Plan. Most owners of residential sections provide landscaping on their own accord.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> MRZ-S10 as this standard is contrary to the conditions of Subdivision Consent 101.2021.79.1 granted to Timaru Developments Ltd on 14.4.22. The subdivision consent only requires a 2-metre-high acoustic fence, not 4 metres. MRZ-S10(2) and (3) are addressed in the subdivision consent conditions and by the consent itself.</p>	<p>Delete MRZ-R6</p> <p>Delete MRZ-S10</p>
<p><i>General Rural</i></p> <p>GRUZ-R4 – Residential Units</p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> GRUZ-R4 PER-1. A minimum site area of 40ha is unnecessary and overly restrictive. It is submitted that the minimum site area should be 10ha and should also provide for clustering of residential units on a site comparable to the overall property size where a farm comprises multiple records of title. It is submitted that while the hub or base of a</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> GRUZ-R4 PER-1 to reduce the minimum site area to 10ha and provide for clustering of residential units on a site regardless of the site size up to 1 residential unit per 10ha of overall property (combined sites) area.</p>

<p>GRUZ-R11 – Recreation Activities</p>	<p>primary production activity might be spread over several hectares, the actual record of title area may be small depending age on the title history of the area. Changes to PER-1 to reflect this would provide more flexibility to farm owners and avoid unnecessary and costly resource consents.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> GRUZ-R11 PER-1. It is submitted that the rule should provide for commercial activities that are non-motorised, or predominately non-motorised. The rule should provide for commercial activities such as guided hunting and recreational tours to be undertaken as a permitted activity.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> GRUZ-R11 PER-1 to provide for commercial activities that are predominantly non-motorised.</p>
<p>GRUZ-R14 – Airstrips and Landing Sites</p>	<p>The submitters <b>support</b> the provisions of the rule for primary production and submits that the rule should also provide for take-off and landings associated with recreational activities such as hunting and fishing whether commercial or non-commercial. Such activities are often associated with properties undertaking primary production and provide an integrated part of the income stream for that property.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> GRUZ-R14 to provide for take-off and landings associated with commercial and non-commercial recreational activities.</p>
<p>GRUZ-16 – Quarries and Quarrying Activities</p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> GRUZ-16 PER-4 requiring Accidental Discovery Protocol. The SASM areas in the proposed plan are extensive. It is submitted that the Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment should only be required in SASM areas. Council should be promoting the practice of accidental discovery rather than regulating for</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> GRUZ-R16 Per-4 to state “Where located in a SAMS...”</p>





	for an exclusion for rural water tanks as these are a building by definition and are predominately located on boundaries adjoining fence lines.	
<i>General Industrial Zone</i>  GIZ-R2 – Industrial Ancillary Activities	The submitters <b>oppose</b> GIZ-R2 as it does not provide for residential activities that are ancillary to an industrial site. It is submitted that the rule should provide for residential units and residential activities that are ancillary to the primary industrial activity. Having the ability to incorporate ancillary residential activity is important as it aides site security and should not be considered a sensitive activity in such situations. The rule should also apply to separate adjoining sites that are in the same ownership of that as the principal site.	<b>Amend</b> GIZ-R2 PER-1 to add “... <u>unless the ancillary activity is a residential activity on the site, or on an adjoining site in the same ownership as that of the primary industrial activity site; and</u> ”.  Delete GIZ-R2 PER-2  <b>Amend</b> GIZ-R2 Per-3(1) to add “ <u>or on an adjoining site in the same ownership as that of the primary industrial activity site; and</u> ”
<i>DEV1 – Brouchs Gully</i>	The submitters have a <b>neutral</b> position on DEV1.	
<i>DEV2 – Gleniti</i>  DEV2-R1 Land Use, Subdivision and Development	The submitters <b>oppose</b> DEV2-R1. It is submitted that the rule should not apply to land use and development. It is also unclear what difference is intended between land use and development? The standards of DEV2 should only apply to subdivision (apart from DEV2-S1(3)) as all five standards relate to infrastructure that will vest to council through subdivision. It is also unclear how infrastructure will vest to Council outside of subdivision. It is considered unnecessarily onerous and unfair for an owner to trigger the performance standards when constructing a new	<b>Amend</b> DEV2-R1 PER-2 to include a new residential unit. Standards DEV2-S1 to S5 should be excluding from applying to land use activities apart from DEV2-S1(3). The relationship between land use and development should also be defined or the term “development” deleted.

<p>DEV2-S3 Walkway/Cycleways</p>	<p>residential dwelling outside of subdivision.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> DEV2-S3. This standard triggers a developer to design and construct ALL walkways/cycleways indicated on the Gleniti Residential Development Area Plan. It is submitted that this is absurd and not practically possible as the developer will not own all the sites within DEV2. DEV2-S3 should refer to “a site”.</p> <p>It is submitted that DEV2-S3 should only apply to subdivision and should only relate to setting land aside for the walkway/cycleway and should not include the design or formation of the structure. A significant proportion of DEV2 has already been developed to date with no walkways/cycleways required to be formed. Where a walkway/cycleway is to be designed and constructed, this should be funded from Council’s reserve contribution fund. As the walkway/cycleways are for recreation compensation should be provided to the landowner as a land credit against any reserve contribution payable.</p>	<p>Amend DEV2-S3 to only provide for the land required and delete the requirements for the developer to design and form the walkway/cycleways.</p> <p>Amend DEV2-S3 to provide for walkway/cycleway land to be provided as land in lieu of cash to offset any reserve contribution payable.</p> <p><b>Amend</b> DEV2-S3 to only apply to subdivision.</p>
<p><i>DEV3 – Washdyke Industrial</i></p> <p>DEV3-R1 – Land Use, Subdivision and Development</p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> DEV3-R1. It is submitted that the rule should not apply to land use and development. It is unclear what difference is intended between land use and development. The standards of DEV3 should only apply to subdivision (apart from DEV3-S1(3)) as all five</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> DEV3-R1 PER-2 to include a new residential unit. Standards DEV3-S1 to S5 should be <b>excluded</b> from applying to land use activities apart from DEV3-S1(3). The relationship between land use and development should also be <b>defined</b> or the term “development” <b>deleted</b>.</p>

<p>DEV3-S1 – Roading</p>	<p>standards relate to infrastructure that will vest to council through subdivision. It is also unclear how infrastructure will vest to Council outside of subdivision. It is considered unnecessarily onerous and unfair for an owner to trigger the performance standards when constructing a new residential unit outside of subdivision.</p> <p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> DEV3-S1 but do not oppose the location of ROAD 5. It is submitted that there is no benefit to the landowner from ROAD 5 as the road is facilitating Council’s vision for development of the road network through DEV3. Council should be solely responsible for the design and construction of ROAD 5 and compensation should be paid to the landowner for the land taken which is not insignificant at 22 metres wide (if ROAD 5 becomes a Principal Road). It is noted that ROAD 5 is not listed in SCHED1 – Schedule of Roading Hierarchy, however as ROAD 5 is taking on the function of the Seadown Road to Meadows Road connection it is anticipated ROAD 5 will become a Principal Road and Seadown Road between ROAD 5 and Meadows Road will revert to a Local Road.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> DEV3-S1 to only provide for the land to vest with Council at the time of subdivision and to provide for compensation to be paid to the landowner for the land surrendered for ROAD 5. <b>Delete</b> the requirements for the developer to design and construct ROAD 5.</p> <p><b>Amend</b> SCHED1 – Schedule of Roading Hierarchy to include ROAD 5 or note on DEV3 – Washdyke Industrial Development Plan that ROAD 5 is a Local Road.</p>
<p>DEV3-S2 – Stormwater, Water, and Sewerage</p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> DEV3-S2. It is submitted that the standard is unclear using the term “required”. The standard should simply refer to where there is existing reticulated infrastructure within a minimum distance from the site boundary, and that infrastructure can be extended to the boundary.</p>	<p><b>Amend</b> DEV3-S2 to require reticulated water and services to be provided to the boundary when the network is within a specified distance of the site and can be extended to the site boundary.</p>

<p>DEV3-S3 – Walkway/Cycleways</p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> DEV3-S3. This standard triggers a developer to design and construct ALL walkways/cycleways indicated on DEV3 – Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan. It is submitted that this is absurd and not practically possible as the developer will not own all the sites within DEV3. DEV2-S3 should refer to “a site”.</p> <p>It is also submitted that it is not clear from the development plan and the wording of DEV-S3 whether the intention is for the walkway/cycleways to be on legal road or be from land taken from the developer adjacent to the legal road. The submitters <b>oppose</b> any land being taken or required to vest for this purpose. It is submitted that any walkway/cycleways within DEV3 should be designed and constructed by Council and should be funded from Council’s Reserves Contribution Fund. If land for walkway/cycleways is to be taken upon subdivision, then compensation should be paid to the landowner. There is also a natural conflict between promoting walking and cycling within an industrial zone that is dominated by heavy vehicle movements.</p>	<p><b>Delete</b> DEV3-S3</p>
<p><i>Appendix 4 – Accidental Discovery Protocol</i></p>	<p>The submitters <b>oppose</b> APP4 and the need to confirm a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol. While the submitters support the principle of accidental protocol, the specified requirement is a pseudo contract that is unnecessary. Imposing such a</p>	<p><b>Delete</b> the requirement to “commit” to Accidental Discovery Protocol.</p>

	<p>regulatory requirement will have the opposite effect to that desired and will damage relationships when the opposite needs to be promoted. The submitters do not oppose the principle of Accidental Discovery Protocol and supports working with the relevant authorities and local runanga when accidental discovery occurs.</p>	
<p><i>Schedule 7 – Significant Natural Areas</i></p>	<p>It is submitted that SCHED7 should refer to the names of landowners under the column “Survey Reference”. Apart from the issue of protecting privacy, properties may change ownership over time and the name reference will be incorrect.</p>	<p><b>Delete</b> the “Survey Reference” column from SCHED7.</p>