

Hearing E General

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept / Reject
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.4	General	General	General	Note across the whole plan, that references to "height" of buildings or structures do not make reference to where height is measured from (for example Open Space Zones and Rural Lifestyle Zone). Ensure that height for buildings and structures is measured from "ground level", which is a national planning standard term, with consistent expression of height rules across the plan.	Review all references to the height of buildings across the plan to ensure that height is measured from ground level, with consistent expression of height rules.	Reject
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.1	General	General	General	Notes that a large number of rules in the plan use variable terminology to define floor areas of buildings, often with the term undefined, so that it is not clear what is being measured. It is necessary to review all references to size of buildings and consider whether a clear definition is required linking development to either the "building footprint" or "gross floor area", which are defined National Planning Standard terms, and then create exclusions from those terms within the rules if necessary.	Review the entire plan so all references to the size of buildings, link to either building footprint or gross floor area which are defined terms in the National Planning Standards.	Reject
Waipopo Huts Trust	189.3	General	General	General	The Council needs to provide the Waipopo Huts with adequate drinking water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure.	No specific relief sought.	Reject
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.3	General	General	General	Considers the PTDP has been drafted to require significant areas of private land to be surrendered when subdivision or development occurs, even for minor activities such as boundary adjustment.	Not specified.	Reject
GJH Rooney	191.3	General	General	General	Considers the PTDP has been drafted to require significant areas of private land to be surrendered when subdivision or development occurs, even for minor activities such as boundary adjustment.	Not specified.	Reject
Rooney Group Limited	249.3	General	General	General	Considers the PTDP has been drafted to require significant areas of private land to be surrendered when subdivision or development occurs, even for minor activities such as boundary adjustment.	Not specified.	Reject
Rooney Farms Limited	250.3	General	General	General	Considers the PTDP has been drafted to require significant areas of private land to be surrendered when subdivision or development occurs, even for minor activities such as boundary adjustment.	Not specified.	Reject
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.3	General	General	General	Considers the PTDP has been drafted to require significant areas of private land to be surrendered when subdivision or development occurs, even for minor activities such as boundary adjustment.	Not specified.	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.3	General	General	General	Considers the PTDP has been drafted to require significant areas of private land to be surrendered when	Not specified.	Reject

					subdivision or development occurs, even for minor activities such as boundary adjustment.		
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.4	General	General	General	Considers policy direction in the PTDP provides for Council to take significant areas of land without any provision for compensation. Considers the land required by the PTDP is large, which would deter development. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide compensation to landowners where they are required/requested to provide land to provide for Council's future needs over and above the minimum requirements.	Reject
GJH Rooney	191.4	General	General	General	Considers policy direction in the PTDP provides for Council to take significant areas of land without any provision for compensation. Considers the land required by the PTDP is large, which would deter development. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide compensation to landowners where they are required/requested to provide land to provide for Council's future needs over and above the minimum requirements.	Reject
Rooney Group Limited	249.4	General	General	General	Considers policy direction in the PTDP provides for Council to take significant areas of land without any provision for compensation. Considers the land required by the PTDP is large, which would deter development. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide compensation to landowners where they are required/requested to provide land to provide for Council's future needs over and above the minimum requirements.	Reject
Rooney Farms Limited	250.4	General	General	General	Considers policy direction in the PTDP provides for Council to take significant areas of land without any provision for compensation. Considers the land required by the PTDP is large, which would deter development. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide compensation to landowners where they are required/requested to provide land to provide for Council's future needs over and above the minimum requirements.	Reject
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.4	General	General	General	Considers policy direction in the PTDP provides for Council to take significant areas of land without any provision for compensation. Considers the land required by the PTDP is large, which would deter development. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide compensation to landowners where they are required/requested to provide land to provide for Council's future needs over and above the minimum requirements.	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.4	General	General	General	Considers policy direction in the PTDP provides for Council to take significant areas of land without any provision for compensation. Considers the land required by the PTDP is large, which would deter development. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide compensation to landowners where they are required/requested to provide land to provide for Council's future needs over and above the minimum requirements.	Reject
David and Judith Moore	100.2	General	General	General	Supports federated Farmers submission.	Relief sought as seen in Federated Farmers submission.	As per Fed Farmers
Peel Forest Estate	105.1	General	General	General	Support Federated Farmers New Zealand and their submission	As relief sought in Federated Farmers submission.	As per Fed Farmers
Kerry & James McArthur	113.1	General	General	General	Support Federated Farmer submission.	Consider the Federated Farmer recommendations.	As per Fed Farmers

Hearing E - Subdivision

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept / Reject
Bruce Speirs	66.49	ECO - Ecosystems and Indigenous Biodiversity	Rules	ECO-R6 Subdivision of land containing a Significant Natural Area	When we consider that subdivision is given considerable prominence and significance in resource management, it makes sense to have all rules involving subdivision in one place in the plan	1. Delete ECO-R6 Subdivision of land containing a Significant Natural Area. AND 2. If necessary, consider developing appropriate objectives, policies, rules, standards, activity status, matters of control and discretion, for subdivision of land containing a Significant Natural Area, in the Subdivision Chapter of the plan.	Accept
Bruce Speirs	66.50	NATC - Natural Character	Rules	NATC-R6 Subdivision of land containing a riparian margin	When we consider that subdivision is given considerable prominence and significance in resource management, it makes sense to have all rules involving subdivision in one place in the plan.	1. Delete NATC-R6 Subdivision of land containing a riparian margin. AND 2. If necessary, develop appropriate objectives, policies, rules, standards, activity status, matters of control and discretion, for subdivision of land containing a riparian margin, in the Subdivision Chapter of the plan.	Accept
Bruce Speirs	66.51	NFL - Natural Features and Landscapes	Rules	NFL-R9 Subdivision	When we consider that subdivision is given considerable prominence and significance in resource management, it makes sense to have all rules involving subdivision in one place in the plan.	1. Delete NFL-R9 Subdivision. AND 2. If necessary, develop appropriate objectives, policies, rules, standards, activity status, matters of control and discretion, for subdivision in a ONF Overlay Area, in the subdivision section of the plan.	Accept
Bruce Speirs	66.45	NH - Natural Hazards	Rules	NH-R8 Subdivision	When we consider that subdivision is given considerable prominence and significance in resource management, it makes sense to have all rules involving subdivision in one place in the plan.	Amend PDP, by moving NH-R8 Subdivision and associated objectives and policies to the Subdivision section of the plan.	Accept
Bruce Speirs	66.46	HH - Historic Heritage	Rules	HH-R10 Subdivision of land containing a Historic Heritage Item	When we consider that subdivision is given considerable prominence and significance in resource management, it makes sense to have all rules involving subdivision in one place in the plan.	Amend PDP, by moving HH-R10 Subdivision of land containing a Historic Heritage Item and associated objectives and policies to the Subdivision section of the plan.	Accept
Bruce Speirs	66.47	HH - Historic Heritage	Rules	HH-R16 Subdivision of land within a Historic Heritage Area	When we consider that subdivision is given considerable prominence and significance in resource management, it makes sense to have all rules involving subdivision in one place in the plan.	Amend PDP, by moving HH-R16 Subdivision of land within a Historic Heritage Area and associated objectives and policies to the Subdivision section of the plan.	Accept
Bruce Speirs	66.48	SASM - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori	Rules	SASM-R7 Subdivision	When we consider that subdivision is given considerable prominence and significance in resource management, it makes sense to have all rules involving subdivision in one place in the plan.	1. Delete SASM-R7 Subdivision. AND 2. If necessary, consider developing appropriate objectives, policies, rules, standards, activity status, matters of control and discretion, for subdivision of land shown in the Wāhi taoka, wāhi tapu, wai taoka and wai tapu overlay areas, in the Subdivision Chapter of the plan.	Accept

Bruce Speirs	66.52	PA - Public Access	Rules	PA-R1 Any new land use, subdivision or development	When we consider that subdivision is given considerable prominence and significance in resource management, it makes sense to have all rules involving subdivision in one place in the plan.	1. Amend PA-R1 as follows: PA-R1 Any new land use, subdivision or development AND 2. If necessary, develop appropriate objectives, policies, rules, standards, activity status, matters of control and discretion, for subdivision in a public access overlay area, in the subdivision section of the plan.	Reject
Bruce Speirs	66.53	CE - Coastal Environment	Rules	CE-R11 Subdivision	When we consider that subdivision is given considerable prominence and significance in resource management, it makes sense to have all rules involving subdivision in one place in the plan.	1. Delete CE-R11 Subdivision . AND 2. If necessary, develop appropriate objectives, policies, rules, standards, activity status, matters of control and discretion, for subdivision in the Coastal Environment area, Sea Water Inundation, Coastal High Natural Character Area and Coastal Erosion Overlay areas, in the Subdivision chapter of the plan.	Accept
Bruce Speirs	66.54	DWP - Drinking Water Protection	Rules	DWP-R2 Subdivision not connected to a community sewage system	When we consider that subdivision is given considerable prominence and significance in resource management, it makes sense to have all rules involving subdivision in one place in the plan.	Amend the PDP by moving DWP-R2 Subdivision not connected to a community sewage system and associated objectives and policies to the Subdivision Chapter of the plan.	Accept
Bruce Speirs	66.61	FC - Financial Contribution	Rules	FC-R3 Subdivision	Considers that FC-R3 should be moved into the Subdivision Chapter of the PDP.	Amend the PDP by moving FC-R3 Subdivision into the Subdivision Chapter amend the title as follows: FC-R3 Subdivision SUB-RX Financial Contributions	Reject
George Harper, R & G Kellahan, H Kellahan, B & S Robertson, D & S Payne, G & R Harper	108.3	SUB - Subdivision	General	General	Considers PDP and supporting documents are inconsistent and there is confusion regarding on site wastewater systems within the Rural Lifestyle Zone. The S.32 report considers a 5000m2 minimum allotment size, while the PDP sets a 2ha minimum lot size should reticulated wastewater is not provided. The submitter considers, the 2ha minimum requirement is overly restrictive and wasteful of the already limited RLZ resource. Considers that 2ha is too large and most RLZ owners are seeking rural amenity values but without too much work to maintain. The requirements do not align with ECan's requirement, which is 4ha, which adds another layer of complexity. Support SUB-P15 which states that: 'Require connection to the reticulated wastewater networks where available, or if not available, provide a suitable site area for onsite disposal[...]	Amend the SUB-Subdivision chapter to: 1. Remove the 2ha minimum lot size for on-site wastewater management system within the RLZ. Make operative the rule as currently proposed within Part 2, District Wide Matters, SUB-Subdivision SUB-P15 Rural Lifestyle Zone, which requires connection to the reticulated wastewater networks if available, or if not available, provide a suitable site area for on-site disposal	Reject

					<p>Considers the proposed 2h does not meet the above objective and should be amended.</p> <p>[Refer original submission or full reason]</p>		
David & Susanne Payne	160.3	SUB - Subdivision	General	General	<p>Considers PDP and supporting documents are inconsistent and there is confusion regarding on site wastewater systems within the RLZ. The S.32 report considers a 5000m2 minimum allotment size, while the PDP has 2ha if reticulated wastewater is not provided. The submitter considers, the 2ha minimum requirement is overly restrictive and wasteful of the already limited RLZ resource. Considers that 2ha is too large and most RLZ owners are seeking rural amenity values but without too much work to maintain.</p> <p>The requirements do not align with ECan's requirement which is 4ha, which adds another layer of complexity.</p> <p>Support SUB-P15 which states that:</p> <p><i>'Require connection to the reticulated wastewater networks where available, or if not available, provide a suitable site area for onsite disposal[...]</i>' [Refer original submission or full reason]</p>	<p>Amend the SUB-Subdivision chapter to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Remove the 2ha minimum lot size under SUB-S1.4 for on-site wastewater management system within the RLZ. 2. Create rules to align with SUB-P15 to provide a suitable site area for on-site disposal. 	Reject
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.57	SUB - Subdivision	General	General	<p>Considers it is not clear in the SUB - Subdivision chapter that the status and matters of discretion will change in the SASM overlay. A cross reference is sought in the SUB chapter to clearly reference this rule.</p>	<p>Amend SUB - Subdivision Chapter to include a cross reference to SASM-R7 Subdivision, so it is clear how the provisions apply.</p>	Accept in Part
Federated Farmers	182.143	SUB - Subdivision	Introduction	General	<p>Subdivision should provide for managed growth in rural communities and allow that farmers undertake small lot subdivision to provide for farm succession, dispose of surplus dwellings and for providing on-farm accommodation for employees. There should be acknowledgement that well managed growth in rural communities provides for diversity and vibrancy in rural areas, sustains essential community infrastructure, and provides employment flexibility and opportunities.</p> <p>One major concern with subdivision in rural areas is the issue of reverse sensitivity. Rural residential activities are often incompatible with rural production activities. Federated Farmers advocates for reverse sensitivity protection for rural land use so that the introduction of residential activities in rural areas will not negatively impact on the current use of rural land for production purposes. Federated Farmers wants to ensure that any objectives, policies, and relevant rules consider and mitigate the potential for reverse sensitivity issues to arise, where practical.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend the SUB - Subdivision overview to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) acknowledge the need for growth of rural communities; and b) address in detail the issue of reverse sensitivity in the rural environment and clearly sets out why the issue needs to be acknowledged and addressed. <p>AND</p> 2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought. 	Accept in Part

					[Refer to original submission for full reason]		
Federated Farmers	182.144	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	All	Support the recognition of highly productive land and the reverse sensitivity issues that arise from subdivision in rural areas.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept in Part
Bruce Speirs	66.55	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	General	Considers that at present there are Objectives for Rural and Residential subdivision, but none for Rural Lifestyle subdivision.	1. Amend the Objectives of Subdivision Chapter to identify appropriate Objectives for the Rural Lifestyle Zone. AND Amend SUB-P15 as appropriate.	Reject
Connexa Limited	176.78	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	New	Considers that reverse sensitivity should be a consideration for all subdivisions. Considers an objective providing direction on this matter is warranted and supports SUB-5 as notified.	Amend SUB - Subdivision Chapter to add a new objective, as follows: <u>SUB-O[X] Reverse sensitivity.</u> <u>Reverse sensitivity effects of subdivision on existing lawfully established activities (including network utilities) are avoided where practicable or mitigated where avoidance is not practicable.</u>	Reject
Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	208.78	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	New	Considers that reverse sensitivity should be a consideration for all subdivisions. Considers an objective providing direction on this matter is warranted and supports SUB-5 as notified.	Amend SUB - Subdivision Chapter to add a new objective, as follows: <u>SUB-O[X] Reverse sensitivity.</u> <u>Reverse sensitivity effects of subdivision on existing lawfully established activities (including network utilities) are avoided where practicable or mitigated where avoidance is not practicable.</u>	Reject
Chorus New Zealand Limited	209.78	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	New	Considers that reverse sensitivity should be a consideration for all subdivisions. Considers an objective providing direction on this matter is warranted and supports SUB-5 as notified.	Amend SUB - Subdivision Chapter to add a new objective, as follows: <u>SUB-O[X] Reverse sensitivity.</u> <u>Reverse sensitivity effects of subdivision on existing lawfully established activities (including network utilities) are avoided where practicable or mitigated where avoidance is not practicable.</u>	Reject
Vodafone New Zealand Limited	210.78	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	New	Considers that reverse sensitivity should be a consideration for all subdivisions. Considers an objective providing direction on this matter is warranted and supports SUB-5 as notified.	Amend SUB - Subdivision Chapter to add a new objective, as follows: <u>SUB-O[X] Reverse sensitivity.</u> <u>Reverse sensitivity effects of subdivision on existing lawfully established activities (including network utilities) are avoided where practicable or mitigated where avoidance is not practicable.</u>	Reject
Ministry of Education	106.12	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O1 General subdivision design	Support this policy as it ensures that subdivisions are serviced by the required infrastructure, requests that specific provision for educational facilities is provided to ensure that population growth and the impact on schools is considered within developments.	Amend SUB-O1 General subdivision design as follows: <i>New subdivisions will:</i> [...] 6. <i>respond appropriately to hazards, risks and site constraints; and</i> 7. <i>have infrastructure and facilities appropriate for the intended use including educational facilities; and</i> 8. <i>have minimal adverse effects on regional significant infrastructure or intensive primary production; and</i>	Reject

						[...]	
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.8	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O1 General subdivision design	Supports SUB-O1 as it requires new subdivision to have infrastructure and facilities appropriate for the intended use and that subdivision design provides for the health, wellbeing and safety of people.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.93	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O1 General subdivision design	Supports allowing for subdivision where this will have minimal adverse effects on regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Fonterra Limited	165.82	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O1 General subdivision design	Considers that the objective should be more explicit in relation to reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend SUB-O1 General subdivision design as follows: <i>New subdivisions will:</i> [...] <i>10. not intentionally prevent, hinder or limit the use or development of adjoining or adjacent land, <u>including by way of reverse sensitivity effects.</u></i>	Accept
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.80	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O1 General subdivision design	The policy should also set out the maintenance and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity outside of SNAs as required by the RMA (Part 2 (7) & Section 31) and Policy 4, 5, 8 & 13 of the draft NPS-IB which seeks to recognise the importance of maintaining and providing for indigenous biodiversity outside SNAs.	Amend SUB-O1 as follows: SUB-O1 General subdivision design <i>New subdivisions will:</i> 1. accord with the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; and 2. respond positively to the physical characteristics of the site and its context; and 3. maintain and enhances amenity values and the quality of the environment <u>including indigenous biodiversity values;</u> 4. [...]. [...].	Reject
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.58	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O1 General subdivision design	Considers minor changes will clarify the values of Kāti Huirapa should be considered.	Amend SUB-O1 General subdivision design as follows: <i>New subdivisions will:</i> <i>1. accord with the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; and</i> <i>2. respond positively to the physical <u>and associational</u> characteristics of the site and its context; and</i> <i>3. maintain and enhances amenity values and the quality of the environment;</i> <i>4. be accessible, connected and integrated with surrounding neighbourhoods; and</i> <i>5. protect significant natural and cultural values; and [...]</i>	Accept in Part
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	187.61	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O1 General subdivision design	Supports the objective to manage adverse effects on regionally significant infrastructure. Considers strengthening of this objective to avoid adverse effects. The rail network interacts with almost all zones within Timaru. Seeks an objective that identifies that subdivision in any zone could result in the location of a noise sensitive use adjacent to the rail corridor. If not managed	Amend SUB-O1 General subdivision design as follows: <i>New subdivisions will:</i> <i>1. accord with the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; and [...]</i> <i>8. have minimal <u>avoid</u> adverse effects on regional significant infrastructure or intensive primary production; and</i>	Accept

					effectively at the subdivision stage, this can result in reverse sensitivity effects on the operational corridor which threatens the effective function and operation of the existing rail network.	[...]	
Kāinga Ora	229.41	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O1 General subdivision design	Supports the objective generally but seeks that clause (1) refers to 'planned' character. Also seek that Clause (3) is deleted as this should be managed through clause (1).	Amend SUB-O1 General subdivision design as follows: SUB-O1 General subdivision design <i>New subdivisions will:</i> 1. accord with the purpose, <u>planned</u> character and qualities of the zone; and 2. respond positively to the physical characteristics of the site and its context; and 3. maintain and enhances amenity values and the quality of the environment; 4. be accessible, connected and integrated with surrounding neighbourhoods; and [...]	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.64	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O1 General subdivision design	Considers it is important to link to the subdivision outcomes sought for each respective zone and the strategic direction of the Plan. Also considers it important for subdivision at a zone interface to respond appropriately. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-O1 as follows: SUB-O1 General subdivision design <i>New subdivisions will:</i> 1. ... [...] 10. not intentionally prevent, hinder or limit the development of adjoining or adjacent land-; and 11. <u>respond to a zone interface to avoid conflict between incompatible activities and reverse sensitivity.</u>	Reject
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.94	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O2 Infrastructure	Supports allowing subdivision where infrastructure has been provided in an integrated, efficient and co-ordinated manner.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Connexa Limited	176.77	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O2 Infrastructure	Supports the objective that requires the integration of subdivision and infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.145	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O2 Infrastructure	Submission point deleted due to duplication, refer submission point 182.144.	1. Refer submission point 182.144.	
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.98	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O2 Infrastructure	Supports SUB-O2 as it is consistent with the CRPS because it provides for infrastructure in a coordinated and integrated way.	Retain SUB-O2 as notified or preserve original intent.	Accept
Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	208.77	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-O2 Infrastructure	Supports the objective that requires the integration of subdivision and infrastructure.	Retain SUB-O2 Infrastructure as notified.	Accept

Chorus New Zealand Limited	209.77	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-02 Infrastructure	Supports the objective that requires the integration of subdivision and infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Vodafone New Zealand Limited	210.77	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-02 Infrastructure	Supports the objective that requires the integration of subdivision and infrastructure.	Retain SUB-02 Infrastructure as notified.	Accept
Bruce Speirs	66.26	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-03 Rural subdivision	Amend to be consistent with the National Policy Statement for highly productive soils.	Amend SUB-03 Rural subdivision , as follows: Subdivision <i>in the rural zones will:</i> <i>1. minimise the fragmentation of <u>highly</u> productive land in the General Rural Zone; and</i> <i>[...]</i>	Reject
Radio New Zealand Limited	152.47	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-03 Rural subdivision	Supports the maintenance of low-density development.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Fonterra Limited	165.83	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-03 Rural subdivision	Considers that the objective should be more explicit in relation to reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend SUB-03 Rural subdivision as follows: <i>Subdivision in the rural zones will:</i> <i>[...]</i> <i>4. minimise <u>avoid</u> reverse sensitivity effects on intensive primary production and rural industry.</i>	Accept in Part
Road Metals Company Limited	169.30	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-03 Rural subdivision	Supports SUB-03 as it rightly recognises that reverse sensitivity effects can arise from subdivision in rural areas. However, it is unclear why the protection from reverse sensitivity is applied only to intensive primary production.	Amend SUB-03 Rural subdivision as follows: <i>Subdivision in the rural zones will:[...]</i> <i>4.minimise reverse sensitivity effects on intensive primary production.</i>	Accept in Part
Fulton Hogan Limited	170.30	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-03 Rural subdivision	Supports SUB-03 as it rightly recognises that reverse sensitivity effects arise from subdivision in rural areas. However, it is unclear why the protection from reverse sensitivity is applied only to intensive primary production. It should be applied to primary production activities.	Amend SUB-3 Rural subdivision as follows: <i>Subdivision in the rural zones will:</i> <i>[...]</i> <i>4.minimise reverse sensitivity effects on intensive primary production.</i>	Accept in Part
Silver Fern Farms	172.73	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-03 Rural subdivision	The potential for subdivision to cause reverse sensitivity effects on existing industrial activities in rural areas, and major hazard facilities is recognised in this objective.	Amend SUB-03 as follows: SUB-03 Rural Subdivision <i>[...]</i> <i>4. minimise reverse sensitivity effects on intensive primary production <u>and existing industrial activities and major hazard facilities in any zone.</u></i>	Reject

Alliance Group Limited	173.73	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-03 Rural subdivision	The potential for subdivision to cause reverse sensitivity effects on existing industrial activities in rural areas, and major hazard facilities is recognised in this objective.	Amend SUB-03 as follows: SUB-03 Rural subdivision [...] 4. <u>minimise reverse sensitivity effects on intensive primary production and existing industrial activities in any zone.</u>	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.146	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-03 Rural subdivision	Submission point deleted due to duplication, refer submission point 182.144.	1. Refer submission point 182.144.	
Horticulture New Zealand	245.65	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-03 Rural subdivision	Supports the outcome sought to minimise the fragmentation of production land and avoidance as the priority for managing reverse sensitivity effects of subdivision. Considers this outcome should relate to all primary production. [refer to original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-03 Rural subdivision as follows: <i>Subdivision in the rural zones will:</i> 1. <i>minimise the fragmentation of productive land in the General Rural Zone; and</i> 2. <i>maintain the low-density open character of the General Rural Zone; and</i> 3. <i>maintain a contrast between the rural environment and adjoining urban, Rural Lifestyle and Settlement zones; and</i> 4. <u>minimise avoid reverse sensitivity effects on primary production including intensive primary production.</u>	Accept in Part
New Zealand Pork Industry Board	247.15	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-03 Rural subdivision	Supports the intent of the objective but opposes the use of the term “minimise” as this may still allow subdivision to occur in the rural zone where it is not enabling the rural nature of the zone and may impact on the availability of highly productive land for primary production.	Amend SUB-03 as follows: SUB-03 Rural Subdivision <i>Subdivision in the rural zones will:</i> 1. <u>minimise avoid the fragmentation of productive land in the General Rural Zone; and [...]</u> 4. <u>minimise avoid reverse sensitivity effects on intensive primary production.</u>	Accept in Part
Federated Farmers	182.147	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-04 Residential subdivision	Submission point deleted due to duplication, refer submission point 182.144.	1. Refer submission point 182.144.	
Peter Bonifacio	36.6	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-05 Public access and esplanade reserves and Esplanade strips	It is unclear in SUB-05 how and who will determine whether the proposed public recreational uses will be compatible with conservation values.	Provide detail as to how compatibility with conservation values will be assessed under SUB-05 .	Reject
Timaru District Council	42.37	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-05 Public access and esplanade reserves and Esplanade strips	Supports the intent of SUB-05, consideration be given to the wording of sub-clause (2) and (3) to ensure alignment with the Objective PA-O1 and Policy PA-P4 in the Public Access Section of the Natural Environmental Values. Those provisions acknowledge that public access to the identified areas may not always be appropriate, e.g., to protect certain sensitive areas/values or for public health and safety reasons.	Amend SUB-05.2 and SUB-05.3 to ensure alignment with PA-O1.	Accept in Part

Bruce Speirs	66.58	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-05 Public access and esplanade reserves and Esplanade strips	Considers that it is possible to create esplanades outside of the subdivision process, and it is therefore appropriate a separate that a section of the Proposed Plan be developed.	Amend PDP by moving SUB-05 Public access and esplanade reserves into a new Chapter of the PDP relating to esplanades.	Reject
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.81	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-05 Public access and esplanade reserves and Esplanade strips	Considers this Objective gives effect to Objective 4 and Policy 18 & 19 of the NZCPS and Policy 8.1.5 of the CRPS	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Federated Farmers	182.148	SUB - Subdivision	Objectives	SUB-05 Public access and esplanade reserves and Esplanade strips	Submission point deleted due to duplication, refer submission point 182.144.	1. Refer submission point 182.144.	
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.49	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	New	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P7.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. The submitter refers to the draft Waitaki District Plan which provides for a waiver/reduction. [Refer original submission for full reason]	And a new policy to the SUB-Subdivision Chapter to provide for a waiver or a reduction for esplanade requirements; AND Related sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
GJH Rooney	191.49	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	New	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P7.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. The submitter refers to the draft Waitaki District Plan which provides for a waiver/reduction. [Refer original submission for full reason]	And a new policy to the SUB-Subdivision Chapter to provide for a waiver or a reduction for esplanade requirements; AND Related sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
Rooney Group Limited	249.49	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	New	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P7.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. The submitter refers to the draft Waitaki District Plan which provides for a waiver/reduction. [Refer original submission for full reason]	And a new policy to the SUB-Subdivision Chapter to provide for a waiver or a reduction for esplanade requirements; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
Rooney Farms Limited	250.49	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	New	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P7.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. The	And a new policy to the SUB-Subdivision Chapter to provide for a waiver or a reduction for esplanade requirements; AND Related sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject

					submitter refers to the draft Waitaki District Plan which provides for a waiver/reduction. [Refer original submission for full reason]		
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.49	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	New	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P7.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. The submitter refers to the draft Waitaki District Plan which provides for a waiver/reduction. [Refer original submission for full reason]	And a new policy to the SUB-Subdivision Chapter to provide for a waiver or a reduction for esplanade requirements; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.49	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	New	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P7.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. The submitter refers to the draft Waitaki District Plan which provides for a waiver/reduction. [Refer original submission for full reason]	And a new policy to the SUB-Subdivision Chapter to provide for a waiver or a reduction for esplanade requirements; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.149	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P1 Subdivision	Supports this policy.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept
Kāinga Ora	229.42	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P1 Subdivision	Supports the Policy generally, but seeks that clause (1) refers to 'planned' character.	Amend SUB-P1 Subdivision as follows: SUB-P1 Subdivision <i>Require subdivision design to accord with the purpose, <u>planned</u> character and qualities of the applicable zone.</i>	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.66	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P1 Subdivision	Considers it is important to link to the subdivision outcomes sought for each respective zone and the strategic direction of the Plan.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.97	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P10 Safe, connected and accessible neighbourhoods	Supports allowing for subdivision where: a) vehicle crossing proliferation is minimised, b) the resulting road and access environment is safe and accessible, c) this provides for multi-modal travel options.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Kāinga Ora	229.47	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P10 Safe, connected and accessible neighbourhoods	None specified.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Rooney Holdings Limited	174.50	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P11 Residential Intensification	Supports SUB-P11 but consider that SUB-P11.2 should also afford the same flexibility to the General Residential Zone.	Amend SUB-P11 as follows: SUB-P11 Residential Intensification <i>Provide for consolidation of residential zones outside of the Gleniti Low Density Residential Specific Control Areas and PREC1 - Old North General Residential Precinct by:</i> <i>1. enabling a variety of residential units within the constraints of the allotment size anticipated by the zone;</i> <i>2. not specifying a minimum allotment size in <u>the General Residential Zone</u> and the Medium Density Zone for joint subdivision and land use applications to ensure flexibility and comprehensive consideration of applications; and [...]</i>	Reject
GJH Rooney	191.50	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P11 Residential Intensification	Supports SUB-P11 but consider that SUB-P11.2 should also afford the same flexibility to the General Residential Zone.	Amend SUB-P11 as follows: SUB-P11 Residential Intensification <i>Provide for consolidation of residential zones outside of the Gleniti Low Density Residential Specific Control Areas and PREC1 - Old North General Residential Precinct by:</i> <i>1. enabling a variety of residential units within the constraints of the allotment size anticipated by the zone;</i> <i>2. not specifying a minimum allotment size in <u>the General Residential Zone</u> and the Medium Density Zone for joint subdivision and land use applications to ensure flexibility and comprehensive consideration of applications; and [...]</i>	Reject
Kāinga Ora	229.48	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P11 Residential Intensification	Consider that this policy should be deleted from the subdivision chapter, and sit in the residential zone Chapter. Also seeks that this policy in amended in a manner consistent with the relief sought in the Residential Zone Chapter	Delete SUB-P11 ; AND Insert an amended policy in the General Residential Zone chapter.	Reject
Rooney Group Limited	249.50	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P11 Residential Intensification	Supports SUB-P11 but consider that SUB-P11.2 should also afford the same flexibility to the General Residential Zone.	Amend SUB-P11 as follows: SUB-P11 Residential Intensification <i>Provide for consolidation of residential zones outside of the Gleniti Low Density Residential Specific Control Areas and PREC1 - Old North General Residential Precinct by:</i> <i>1. enabling a variety of residential units within the constraints of the allotment size anticipated by the zone;</i> <i>2. not specifying a minimum allotment size in <u>the General Residential Zone</u> and the Medium Density Zone for joint subdivision and land use applications to ensure flexibility and comprehensive consideration of applications; and [...]</i>	Reject
Rooney Farms Limited	250.50	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P11 Residential Intensification	Supports SUB-P11 but consider that SUB-P11.2 should also afford the same flexibility to the General Residential Zone.	Amend SUB-P11 as follows: SUB-P11 Residential Intensification	Reject

						<p>Provide for consolidation of residential zones outside of the Gleniti Low Density Residential Specific Control Areas and PREC1 - Old North General Residential Precinct by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> enabling a variety of residential units within the constraints of the allotment size anticipated by the zone; not specifying a minimum allotment size in <u>the General Residential Zone</u> and the Medium Density Zone for joint subdivision and land use applications to ensure flexibility and comprehensive consideration of applications; and [...] 	
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.50	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P11 Residential Intensification	Supports SUB-P11 but consider that SUB-P11.2 should also afford the same flexibility to the General Residential Zone.	<p>Amend SUB-P11 as follows:</p> <p>SUB-P11 Residential Intensification</p> <p>Provide for consolidation of residential zones outside of the Gleniti Low Density Residential Specific Control Areas and PREC1 - Old North General Residential Precinct by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> enabling a variety of residential units within the constraints of the allotment size anticipated by the zone; not specifying a minimum allotment size in <u>the General Residential Zone</u> and the Medium Density Zone for joint subdivision and land use applications to ensure flexibility and comprehensive consideration of applications; and [...] 	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.50	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P11 Residential Intensification	Supports SUB-P11 but consider that SUB-P11.2 should also afford the same flexibility to the General Residential Zone.	<p>Amend SUB-P11 as follows:</p> <p>SUB-P11 Residential Intensification</p> <p>Provide for consolidation of residential zones outside of the Gleniti Low Density Residential Specific Control Areas and PREC1 - Old North General Residential Precinct by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> enabling a variety of residential units within the constraints of the allotment size anticipated by the zone; not specifying a minimum allotment size in <u>the General Residential Zone</u> and the Medium Density Zone for joint subdivision and land use applications to ensure flexibility and comprehensive consideration of applications; and [...] 	Reject
Kāinga Ora	229.49	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P12 Non-compliant lot size	Considers that the use of the term 'avoid' seems overly restrictive. Amendment also sought to minimum lot sizes which may impact the terminology used in SUB-P12.	<p>Amend SUB-P12 as follows:</p> <p>SUB-P12 Non-compliant lot size</p> <p>Avoid <u>Provide</u> for subdivision in the General Residential Zones that does not comply with the minimum lot design and parameters <u>where unless:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> the subdivision design maintains residential character and amenity of the area; and it can be demonstrated that it is consistent with the character and qualities of development envisaged by General Residential Zone; and it does not individually or cumulatively affect the ability of the properties in the zone, specific control area or precinct to be developed or serviced 	Reject

						<i>now or in the future to the density anticipated in the zone, specific control area or precinct.</i>	
Brouchs Gully Development Limited	167.16	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P13 Development Area Plans	Requests replacing 'complies' in SUB-P3 with 'in general accordance with' given the plan is at such a course level and that compliance may be difficult to determine. A design, that is not in general accordance with a Development Area Plan, shall achieve the outcomes listed in Objectives for that Development Area – it doesn't necessarily need to 'better achieve' these.	Amend SUB-P13 Development Area Plans as follows: SUB-P13 Development Area Plans <i>Require subdivisions to be <u>in general accordance</u> comply with the relevant Development Area Plan, unless it can be demonstrated that an alternative proposal can better achieve the objectives of the Development Area Plan.</i>	Accept
Silver Fern Farms	172.76	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P14 Rural allotments	It is not sufficient to allow a small-lot rural zone subdivision simply to retain the average dwelling density anticipated for the zone. And also to amend that new allotments do not facilitate the development of rural-residential dwellings in the environs of activities like the Pareora processing site.	Amend SUB-P14 as follows: SUB-P14 Rural allotments <i>Avoid subdivision that creates allotments that are less than the required minimum allotment size within the General Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone unless:</i> <i>[...]</i> <i>2. the non-compliance is minor, and the subdivision maintains the dwelling density anticipated for the zone <u>and does not facilitate the establishment of sensitive activities with reverse sensitivity effects on existing rural and industrial activities; or and</u></i>	Reject
Alliance Group Limited	173.76	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P14 Rural allotments	It is not sufficient to allow a small-lot rural zone subdivision simply to retain the average dwelling density anticipated for the zone. And also to amend that new allotments do not facilitate the development of rural-residential dwellings in the environs of activities like the Smithfield processing site.	Amend SUB-P14 as follows: SUB-P14 Rural allotments <i>Avoid subdivision that creates allotments that are less than the required minimum allotment size within the General Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone unless:</i> <i>[...]</i> <i>2. the non-compliance is minor, and the subdivision maintains the dwelling density anticipated for the zone <u>and does not facilitate the establishment of sensitive activities with reverse sensitivity effects on existing rural and industrial activities; or and</u></i> <i>[...]</i>	Reject

Rooney Holdings Limited	174.51	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P14 Rural allotments	Opposes the use of the word “avoid” in SUB-P14. Considers the policy should provide flexibility to work with natural boundaries and existing fence lines and occupation.	Amend SUB-P14 as follows: SUB-P14 Rural allotments Avoid- Discourage subdivision that creates allotments that are less than the required minimum allotment size within the General Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone unless: 1. the subdivided allotments are solely for the purpose of network utilities, esplanade reserves or strips, roads, walkways, cycleways or access; or 2. the non-compliance is minor and the subdivision maintains the dwelling density anticipated for the zone; and 3. the subdivision is necessary for natural hazard mitigation; or 4. the subdivision is necessary to protect the values of sensitive environments. AND Amend the policy to encourage, where practicable, for new boundaries to align with natural boundaries or existing fence lines.	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.156	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P14 Rural allotments	Supports this policy.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept in Part
GJH Rooney	191.51	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P14 Rural allotments	Opposes the use of the word “avoid” in SUB-P14. Considers the policy should provide flexibility to work with natural boundaries and existing fence lines and occupation.	Amend SUB-P14 as follows: SUB-P14 Rural allotments Avoid- Discourage subdivision that creates allotments that are less than the required minimum allotment size within the General Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone unless: 1. the subdivided allotments are solely for the purpose of network utilities, esplanade reserves or strips, roads, walkways, cycleways or access; or 2. the non-compliance is minor and the subdivision maintains the dwelling density anticipated for the zone; and 3. the subdivision is necessary for natural hazard mitigation; or 4. the subdivision is necessary to protect the values of sensitive environments. AND Amend the policy to encourage, where practicable, for new boundaries to align with natural boundaries or existing fence lines.	Reject
Rooney Group Limited	249.51	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P14 Rural allotments	Opposes the use of the word “avoid” in SUB-P14. Considers the policy should provide flexibility to work with natural boundaries and existing fence lines and occupation.	Amend SUB-P14 as follows: SUB-P14 Rural allotments Avoid- Discourage subdivision that creates allotments that are less than the required minimum allotment size within the General Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone unless: 1. the subdivided allotments are solely for the purpose of network utilities, esplanade reserves or strips, roads, walkways, cycleways or access; or	Reject

						<p>2. <i>the non-compliance is minor and the subdivision maintains the dwelling density anticipated for the zone; and</i></p> <p>3. <i>the subdivision is necessary for natural hazard mitigation; or</i></p> <p>4. <i>the subdivision is necessary to protect the values of sensitive environments.</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the policy to encourage, where practicable, for new boundaries to align with natural boundaries or existing fence lines.</p>	
Rooney Farms Limited	250.51	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P14 Rural allotments	<p>Opposes the use of the word “avoid” in SUB-P14.</p> <p>Considers the policy should provide flexibility to work with natural boundaries and existing fence lines and occupation.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-P14 as follows:</p> <p>SUB-P14 Rural allotments</p> <p>Avoid <u>Discourage</u> <i>subdivision that creates allotments that are less than the required minimum allotment size within the General Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone unless:</i></p> <p>1. <i>the subdivided allotments are solely for the purpose of network utilities, esplanade reserves or strips, roads, walkways, cycleways or access; or</i></p> <p>2. <i>the non-compliance is minor and the subdivision maintains the dwelling density anticipated for the zone; and</i></p> <p>3. <i>the subdivision is necessary for natural hazard mitigation; or</i></p> <p>4. <i>the subdivision is necessary to protect the values of sensitive environments.</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the policy to encourage, where practicable, for new boundaries to align with natural boundaries or existing fence lines.</p>	Reject
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.51	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P14 Rural allotments	<p>Opposes the use of the word “avoid” in SUB-P14.</p> <p>Considers the policy should provide flexibility to work with natural boundaries and existing fence lines and occupation.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-P14 as follows:</p> <p>SUB-P14 Rural allotments</p> <p>Avoid <u>Discourage</u> <i>subdivision that creates allotments that are less than the required minimum allotment size within the General Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone unless:</i></p> <p>1. <i>the subdivided allotments are solely for the purpose of network utilities, esplanade reserves or strips, roads, walkways, cycleways or access; or</i></p> <p>2. <i>the non-compliance is minor and the subdivision maintains the dwelling density anticipated for the zone; and</i></p> <p>3. <i>the subdivision is necessary for natural hazard mitigation; or</i></p> <p>4. <i>the subdivision is necessary to protect the values of sensitive environments.</i></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the policy to encourage, where practicable, for new boundaries to align with natural boundaries or existing fence lines.</p>	Reject

Timaru Developments Limited	252.51	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P14 Rural allotments	Opposes the use of the word “avoid” in SUB-P14. Considers the policy should provide flexibility to work with natural boundaries and existing fence lines and occupation.	Amend SUB-P14 as follows: SUB-P14 Rural allotments Avoid <u>Discourage</u> subdivision that creates allotments that are less than the required minimum allotment size within the General Rural Zone and Rural Lifestyle Zone unless: 1. the subdivided allotments are solely for the purpose of network utilities, esplanade reserves or strips, roads, walkways, cycleways or access; or 2. the non-compliance is minor and the subdivision maintains the dwelling density anticipated for the zone; and 3. the subdivision is necessary for natural hazard mitigation; or 4. the subdivision is necessary to protect the values of sensitive environments. AND Amend the policy to encourage, where practicable, for new boundaries to align with natural boundaries or existing fence lines.	Reject
Fonterra Limited	165.86	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P15 Rural Lifestyle Zone	Considers that the objective should be more explicit in relation to reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend SUB-P15 Rural Lifestyle Zone Require as follows: <i>Require subdivision in the Rural Lifestyle Zone to:</i> [...] <u>5. avoid reverse sensitivity effects on existing or permitted primary production and rural industry activities.</u>	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.157	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P15 Rural Lifestyle Zone	Supports this policy.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.103	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P15 Rural Lifestyle Zone	Supports the requirement for new Rural lifestyle allotments to connect to a reticulated system or else have a larger minimum allotment size.	Retain SUB-P15 as notified or preserve original intent.	Accept
Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	114.36	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P2 Subdivision of land within sensitive environments	Supports policy SUB-P2 which seeks to ensure that subdivision in sensitive environments, including heritage items, settings and sites of significance to Māori, does not compromise identified cultural values.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.82	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P2 Subdivision of land within sensitive environments	The submitter considers this policy is consistent with the requirements of the RMA and CRPS.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Rooney Holdings Limited	174.47	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P2 Subdivision of land within sensitive environments	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P2.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-P2 to recognise that esplanade provisions can have an adverse effect through reverse sensitivity; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.150	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P2 Subdivision of land within sensitive environments	Supports this policy.	4. Retain as notified; OR 5. Wording with similar effect; AND 6. Any consequential amendments.	Accept
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.99	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P2 Subdivision of land within sensitive environments	Supports SUB-P2 as it provides for the protection of the quality of the environment.	Retain SUB-P2 as notified or preserve original intent.	Accept
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.59	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P2 Subdivision of land within sensitive environments	Acknowledge this policy seeks to protect Kāti Huirapa values and request this policy be retained.	Retain SUB-P2 Subdivision of land within sensitive environments as notified.	Accept
GJH Rooney	191.47	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P2 Subdivision of land within sensitive environments	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P2.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-P2 to recognise that esplanade provisions can have an adverse effect through reverse sensitivity; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
Rooney Group Limited	249.47	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P2 Subdivision of land within sensitive environments	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P2.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-P2 to recognise that esplanade provisions can have an adverse effect through reverse sensitivity; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
Rooney Farms Limited	250.47	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P2 Subdivision of land within sensitive environments	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P2.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-P2 to recognise that esplanade provisions can have an adverse effect through reverse sensitivity; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.47	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P2 Subdivision of land within sensitive environments	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P2.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity.	Amend SUB-P2 to recognise that esplanade provisions can have an adverse effect through reverse sensitivity; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject

					[Refer original submission for full reason]		
Timaru Development Limited	252.47	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P2 Subdivision of land within sensitive environments	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P2.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-P2 to recognise that esplanade provisions can have an adverse effect through reverse sensitivity; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
Fonterra Limited	165.84	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P3 Disruptive Subdivision	Considers that the policy should be more explicit in relation to reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend SUB-P3 Disruptive Subdivision as follows: <i>Avoid subdivisions that are intended to prevent, hinder or limit the use or development of adjoining or adjacent land, unless it is done to comply with a Council approved Development Area Plan. <u>including by way of reverse sensitivity effects.</u></i>	Accept in Part
Federated Farmers	182.151	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P3 Disruptive Subdivision	Supports this policy.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept in Part
Bruce Speirs	66.27	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P4 Quality of the environment and amenity	Considers that for safety, people who are in control of mobile transport need to concentrate on their immediate surroundings, not looking at views and landmarks.	Amend SUB-P4 Quality of the environment and amenity as follows: <i>Require subdivision to maintain and enhance amenity values and the quality of the environment by ensuring subdivision design:</i> 1. <i>responds positively to natural and physical features such as underlying landscape, topography and established trees and vegetation that provide amenity, contribute to local character and sense of place; and</i> 2. <i>aligns streets to focus on significant views or landmarks; and</i> 3. <i>provide street trees and landscaping; and</i> <i>[...]</i>	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.152	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P4 Quality of the environment and amenity	Supports this policy.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.100	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P4 Quality of the environment and amenity	Supports SUB-P4 as it provides for the protection of the quality of the environment.	Retain SUB-P4 as notified or preserve original intent.	Accept
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.60	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P4 Quality of the environment and amenity	Considers an amendment is necessary to include the associational values as well as the physical values of the landscape and sense of place.	Amend SUB-P4 Quality of the environment and amenity as follows: <i>Require subdivision to maintain and enhance amenity values and the quality of the environment by ensuring subdivision design:</i>	Accept

						1. responds positively to <u>the associational</u> natural and physical features such as underlying landscape, topography and established trees and vegetation that provide amenity, contribute to local character and sense of place; and 2. [...]	
Kāinga Ora	229.43	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P4 Quality of the environment and amenity	None specified.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Horticulture New Zealand	245.67	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P4 Quality of the environment and amenity	Supports the policy outcome that seeks to avoid, remedies or mitigates adverse effects.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.95	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Supports allowing for subdivision where this will not result in reverse sensitivity effects on regionally significant infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Radio New Zealand Limited	152.48	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Supports a policy to explicitly address reverse sensitivity effect that would compromise infrastructure but considers that Lifeline Utilities should also be referred to as they provide critical civil defence functions and therefore it's important they are protected from reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend SUB-P5 as follows: SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity <i>Only allow subdivision that does not result in reverse sensitivity effects that would compromise the operation of regionally significant infrastructure / facilities, <u>Lifeline Utilities</u> and legally established intensive primary production.</i>	Accept
Fonterra Limited	165.85	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Considers that the policy should be more explicit in relation to reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity as follows: <i>Only allow subdivision that does not result in reverse sensitivity effects that would compromise the operation of regionally significant infrastructure/facilities, and legally established intensive primary production and <u>rural industry</u>.</i>	Accept in Part
Road Metals Company Limited	169.31	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse sensitivity	Supports SUB-P5 As it rightly recognises that reverse sensitivity effects can arise from subdivision in rural areas. However, it is unclear why the protection from reverse sensitivity is applied only to intensive primary production. It should be applied to primary production activities.	Amend SUB- P5 Reverse sensitivity as follows: SUB-P5 Reverse sensitivity <i>Only allow subdivision that does not result in reverse sensitivity effects that would compromise the operation of regionally significant infrastructure/facilities and legally-lawfully established intensive primary production.</i>	Accept
Fulton Hogan Limited	170.31	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse sensitivity	Supports SUB-P5 as it rightly recognises that reverse sensitivity effects can arise from subdivision in rural areas. However, it is unclear why the protection from reverse sensitivity is applied only to intensive primary production. It should be applied to primary production activities.	Amend SUB- P5 Reverse sensitivity as follows: <i>Only allow subdivision that does not result in reverse sensitivity effects that would compromise the operation of regionally significant infrastructure/facilities and legally-lawfully established intensive primary production.</i>	Accept

Silver Fern Farms	172.74	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Seeks to ensure subdivision design is cognisant of interfaces with non-residential zones.	Amend SUB-P5 as follows: SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity <i>Only allow subdivision that does not result in reverse sensitivity effects that would compromise the operation of regionally significant infrastructure/facilities and legally established intensive primary production or industrial activities.</i>	Accept
Alliance Group Limited	173.74	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Amend so that subdivision design is also cognisant of interfaces with non-residential zones.	Amend SUB-P5 as follows: SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity <i>Only allow subdivision that does not result in reverse sensitivity effects that would compromise the operation of regionally significant infrastructure/facilities and legally established intensive primary production or industrial activities.</i>	Accept
Connexa Limited	176.79	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Supports the policy which provides direction on reverse sensitivity.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Federated Farmers	182.153	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Supports this policy.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept in Part
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.101	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Supports SUB-P5 as it is consistent with CRPS Chapter 5 including Policy 5.3.12.	Retain SUB-P5 as notified or preserve original intent.	Accept in Part
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	187.62	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Supports the intent of this policy but seeks minor amendment to clarify that it is the safe and efficient operation of regionally significant infrastructure that requires protection.	Amend SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity as follows: <i>Only allow subdivision that does not result in reverse sensitivity effects that would compromise the <u>safe and efficient</u> operation of regionally significant infrastructure/facilities and legally established intensive primary production.</i>	Accept
Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	208.79	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Supports the policy which provides direction on reverse sensitivity.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Chorus New Zealand Limited	209.79	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Supports the policy which provides direction on reverse sensitivity.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Vodafone New Zealand Limited	210.79	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Supports the policy which provides direction on reverse sensitivity.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Kāinga Ora	229.44	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Concerns around how this policy could be applied, where the zone anticipates residential subdivision, however sites are adjacent to, or nearby regionally	Amend SUB-P5 as follows:	Reject

					significant infrastructure. The Submitter is concerned that the policy as drafted could be applied bluntly and result in residential zoned land not being development as intended by the Plan.	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity Only allow Manage subdivision that does not result in to ensure that adverse reverse sensitivity effects that would compromise the operation of on regionally significant infrastructure/facilities and legally established intensive primary production are minimised.	
Horticulture New Zealand	245.68	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Supports the approach to avoidance as the priority for managing reverse sensitivity effects. Considers this outcome should relate to all primary production.	Amend SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity as follows: <i>Only allow subdivision that does not result in reverse sensitivity effects that would compromise the operation of regionally significant infrastructure/facilities and legally established <u>primary production including intensive primary production.</u></i>	Accept in Part
New Zealand Pork Industry Board	247.16	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity	Supports the intent of the policy but opposes the narrowness of the term “legally established”. Intensive Primary Production is permitted in the GRUZ subject to meeting standards. Using only the term “legally established” does not allow for new primary production to be established.	Amend SUB-P5 as follows: SUB-P5 Reverse Sensitivity <i>Only allow subdivision that does not result in reverse sensitivity effects that would compromise the operation of regionally significant infrastructure/facilities and legally established <u>and permitted intensive primary production.</u></i>	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.9	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P6 Infrastructure	Supports SUB-P6 as it ensures that subdivision is serviced with infrastructure with sufficient capacity and requires allotments to have access to a water supply suitable for firefighting.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.96	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P6 Infrastructure	Supports allowing for subdivision where: a) the infrastructure network has capacity to accommodate development or appropriate upgrades are completed to support this, b) new infrastructure is provided in an efficient and integrated way with existing or proposed infrastructure, c) multi-nodal and active transport links are appropriately considered; and d) there is sufficient legal and physical access to each allotment.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Connexa Limited	176.80	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P6 Infrastructure	Supports the policy requiring the integration of subdivision and infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.154	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P6 Infrastructure	Supports this policy.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept
Canterbury Regional Council	183.102	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P6 Infrastructure	Supports SUB-P6 as it provides for the protection of the quality of the environment.	Retain SUB-P6 as notified or preserve original intent.	Accept

(Environment Canterbury)							
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.61	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P6 Infrastructure	Considers untreated storm water and wastewater is culturally inappropriate. This should be a consideration for new infrastructure in relation to subdivisions.	Amend SUB-P6 Infrastructure as follows: <i>Ensure subdivision is serviced sustainably with infrastructure by requiring:</i> 1. [...] <u>10. infrastructure will maintain or enhance Kāti Huirapa values onsite or downstream.</u>	Accept in Part
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	187.63	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P6 Infrastructure	Stormwater discharge onto the rail corridor has the potential to damage the rail network and disrupt the safe and efficient function of the railway. The Submitter supports policy direction to ensure that stormwater does not result in increased flooding and erosion risk.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	208.80	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P6 Infrastructure	Supports the policy requiring the integration of subdivision and infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Chorus New Zealand Limited	209.80	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P6 Infrastructure	Supports the policy requiring the integration of subdivision and infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Vodafone New Zealand Limited	210.80	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P6 Infrastructure	Supports the policy requiring the integration of subdivision and infrastructure.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Kāinga Ora	229.45	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P6 Infrastructure	Considers that the clause (2) in particular is inconsistent with the provisions in the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport Chapter where they relate to Stormwater management. Also considers the s32 reports related to stormwater infrastructure contain limited information and evidence around the current or future capacity of the Council's stormwater infrastructure.	Asks that the Council provide information needed to implement the policy so it is readily available; AND Amend SUB-P6 so clauses (1) and (4) are not in conflict with each other; AND Amend SUB-P6 to ensure consistency with other chapter's provisions.	Reject
Peter Bonifacio	36.7	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips	Oppose SUB-P7 as there are significant health and safety, security, biodiversity and cost implications for the provision of esplanades around farming land. Riparian margins that were fenced off many years ago have almost fully regenerated so disturbing them to create an esplanade would be contrary to the biodiversity values being protected.	Reconsider the practicalities of creating esplanade strips and/or reserves around functioning farming operations and through high biodiversity value areas. Provide more clarity around who will fund and maintain these areas and who is responsible for funding and undertaking cost benefit analysis of these areas.	Reject

Bruce Speirs	66.59	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips	Move SUB-P7 to a new section of the Proposed Plan relating to esplanades. It is possible to create esplanades outside of the subdivision process, and it is appropriate a separate section of the Proposed Plan be developed.	Move SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips to a new section of the Proposed Plan relating to esplanades. (as discussed further in another submission point).	Reject
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.83	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips	SUB-P7 and SCHED 12: This policy is consistent with the requirements of the CRPS and NZCPS Policy 18.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.48	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P2.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips to remove the requirement for esplanade provisions; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
PrimePort Limited	175.41	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips	There will be some sites where esplanade reserve or strip provision is not appropriate (other than where already identified in the Proposed Plan), and it is appropriate that the policy set out circumstances where those requirements can be reduced or waived.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.155	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips	Concerns around the right of public access. The landowner should not be compelled by the District Plan to always provide access across what is essentially their business and home.	1. Amend SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips to: a) address the issue of public access across private property; and b) ensure that this access is provided with the agreement of the landowner; and c) provide access to public land, only if access cannot be gained through public land in a safe manner. AND 2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	Reject
GJH Rooney	191.48	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P2.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips to remove the requirement for esplanade provisions; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
Rooney Group Limited	249.48	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P2.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips and remove the requirement for esplanade provisions; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject

Rooney Farms Limited	250.48	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P2.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips to remove the requirement for esplanade provisions; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.48	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P2.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips to remove the requirement for esplanade provisions; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.48	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips	Opposes the directive to requiring esplanade provisions as described in SUB-P2.2. Considers the esplanade provisions may compromise the ability of the landowner to continue to use their land effectively due to reverse sensitivity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-P7 Esplanade reserves and strips to remove the requirement for esplanade provisions; AND Related relief sought to other submission points on SUB Chapter policies.	Reject
Silver Fern Farms	172.75	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P9 Residential subdivision	A minor amendment is appropriate to align sub-clause SUB- P9(7) with the direction of SUB-P5.	Amend SUB-P9 as follows: SUB-P9 Residential subdivision <i>Require residential subdivision to accord with the purpose, character and qualities of the zone, and maintain and enhance amenity values, by ensuring:</i> [...] <i>7. conflict between residential activities and adjoining land uses are is avoided or minimised including by integrating buffers between new lots and adjoining zones.</i>	Reject
Alliance Group Limited	173.75	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P9 Residential subdivision	A minor amendment is appropriate to align sub-clause SUB- P9(7) with the direction of SUB-P5.	Amend SUB-P9 as follows: SUB-P9 Residential subdivision <i>Require residential subdivision to accord with the purpose, character and qualities of the zone, and maintain and enhance amenity values, by ensuring:</i> [...] <i>conflict between residential activities and adjoining land uses are is avoided or minimised including by integrating buffers between new lots and adjoining zones.</i>	Reject

KiwiRail Holdings Limited	187.64	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P9 Residential subdivision	Seeks the strengthening of clause 7. to avoid conflict and adverse effects on adjoining land uses including the rail corridor.	Amend SUB-P9 Residential subdivision as follows: <i>Require residential subdivision to accord with the purpose, character and qualities of the zone, and maintain and enhance amenity values, by ensuring:</i> [...] <i>7. adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects from conflict between residential activities and on adjoining land uses are avoided <u>minimised</u>.</i>	Reject
Kāinga Ora	229.46	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P9 Residential subdivision	None specified.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Horticulture New Zealand	245.69	SUB - Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P9 Residential subdivision	Considers it is important for subdivision at a zone interface to respond in an appropriate manner. [refer to original submission for full reasons]	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Kāinga Ora	229.50	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2	The drafting of the rule is unclear. As drafted, the rule reads that subdivision in accordance with SUB-S2-SUB-S7 is Restricted Discretionary, however if SUB-S2-SUB-S7 are not complied with, the activity is still Restricted Discretionary. If the intent is that only non-compliance with SUB-S1 is non-complying then RDIS-1 can be deleted. If this is not the case, the rule will need to be redrafted so the Councils intent is clear.	Amend SUB-R3 as follows: <i>SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2 Activity status:</i> <i>Restricted Discretionary</i> <i>Where:</i> <i>RDIS-1</i> <i>SUB-S2 – SUB-S7 are complied with; and</i> <i>RDIS-2</i> <i>SUB-S1 is complied with.</i> <i>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</i> <i>1[...]</i>	Reject
Kāinga Ora	229.52	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	New	Seek a new permitted activity rule for subdivision in accordance with an existing land use consent.	Insert a new rule into SUB-Subdivision chapter as follows: <i>SUB-R(NEW-A)</i> <i>Subdivision in the Residential Zones in Accordance with an Approved Land Use Consent All Zones</i> <i>Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where:</i> <i>RDIS-1</i> <i>Any subdivision relating to an approved land use consent must comply with that resource consent.</i> <i>Matters for discretion:</i> <i>1. the effect of the design and layout of the proposed sites created in relation to the approved land use consent.</i> <i>Notification:</i> <i>Any application arising from SUB-R (NEW-A) shall not be subject to public or limited notification and shall be processed on a non-notified basis.</i>	Reject
Kāinga Ora	229.53	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	New	Seek a new permitted activity rule for vacant lot subdivision where it can be demonstrated that the proposed lots are able to accommodate a residential	Insert a new into SUB-Subdivision chapter as follows: <i>SUB-R(NEW-B)</i> <i>Subdivision around an approved development General Residential Zone Medium Density Residential Zone Activity status: Controlled Where:</i> <i>CON-1</i>	Reject

					unit that is of the size, scale and location that is anticipated for the zone.	<p><u>Vacant lot subdivision where it can be demonstrated that the proposed lots are able to accommodate a residential unit that is of the size, scale and location that is anticipated for the zone.</u></p> <p>Matters of control are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>1. The location, size and design of allotments, building platforms, roads, accessways, right of ways, vehicle crossings, open space, reserves, landscaping and connections to the surrounding area; and</u> <u>2. the ability to accommodate permitted and/or intended land uses; and</u> <u>3. the compatibility with the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; and</u> <u>4. the response to the site's and surrounding areas natural and physical features, character, amenity, constraints and vegetation; and</u> <u>5. the provision, location, design, specification, construction, connection and timing of infrastructure, transport links, water sensitive design measures and firefighting water supply; and</u> <u>6. the extent to which infrastructure has capacity to service the subdivision; and</u> <u>7. legal and physical access arrangements; and</u> <u>8. the requirement for any consent notices, covenants, easements, esplanades or public access; and</u> <u>9. measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <u>a. of any natural hazards or other risks; and</u> <u>b. on any sensitive environments, waterbodies, ecosystems or notable trees; and</u> <u>c. on infrastructure; and</u> <u>d. on existing or permitted adjoining or adjacent land uses; and</u> <u>10. the ability of any existing activity on the site to comply with the District Plan and/or existing resource consent; and</u> <u>11. the suitability of any future development that would be enabled as a result of the subdivision; and</u> <u>12. whether it is appropriate that the subdivision prevents, hinders or limits the development of adjoining or adjacent land,</u> <u>13. measures to manage adverse effects.</u> <p>Notification: <u>Any application arising from SUB-R (NEW-B) shall not be subject to public or limited notification and shall be processed on a non-notified basis.</u></p>	
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.26	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment	Opposes boundary adjustment within the GRUZ that doesn't meet the 40ha minimum allotment size be Non-Complying Activity.	<p>Amend SUB-R1 Boundary Adjustment and SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions so that Boundary adjustment in the General Rural Zone is a Discretionary Activity with no minimum allotment size apply</p> <p>[Refer to submission on SUB-R1 for more detail]</p>	Accept in Part
Bruce Speirs	66.56	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment	Considers the move from a Controlled activity to a Non-Complying activity is too extreme where there is only one standard that is not complied with.	<p>Amend SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment as follows:</p> <p>Boundary adjustment Activity status: Controlled Where:</p> <p>CON-1 SUB-S1 is complied with; and [...]</p>	Accept

						Activity status when compliance not achieved with CON-1: <u>Non-complying Discretionary</u>	
Darren Wayne Rae	95.2	SUB-Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment	The minimum allotment size in the General Rural Zone is 40 hectares for boundary adjustment with consent classified as a non-complying activity. The Submitter would like to separate the house at 59 Milford-Clandeboye Road, Temuka from the remaining land. Agreement has been reached with the current landowner. There are no other lifestyle lots suitable within Temuka. This proposal would not interfere with any productive land.	Amend SUB-R1 so that boundary adjustment is considered a Discretionary Activity without a minimum allotment size rather than a Non-Complying Activity where the minimum allotment size is not met.	Withdrawn as per email on 30 June 2024. See doc:#1681185
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.98	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment	Supports including matters of control relating to: a) roading, accessways and right of ways, vehicle crossings and the associated connectivity, b) the provision, location, design, specification, construction, connection and timing of infrastructure, transport links, c) infrastructure capacity, d) legal and physical access arrangements; and, e) measures to manage effects.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.52	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment	Opposes SUB-R1. Consider that Boundary adjustments should be a permitted activity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment as follows: SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment Activity status : <u>Controlled Permitted CON-1</u> SUB- S1 is complied with; and CON-2 SUB-S2 to SUB- S7 are complied with. Matters of control are restricted to: [...]	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.158	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment	Supports this rule.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept in Part
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	187.65	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment	Seeks amendment to the matters of control to clearly outline what adverse effects are to be managed.	Amend SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment as follows: [...] Matters of control are restricted to: [...] 13. measures to manage adverse effects, <u>including reverse sensitivity effects, on existing land uses.</u>	Reject
GJH Rooney	191.52	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment	Opposes SUB-R1. Consider that Boundary adjustments should be a permitted activity.	Amend SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment as follows: SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment Activity status : <u>Controlled Permitted CON-1</u>	Reject

					[Refer original submission for full reason]	<i>SUB- S1 is complied with; and</i> CON-2 <i>SUB-S2 to SUB- S7 are complied with. Matters of control are restricted to:</i> [...]	
Rooney Group Limited	249.52	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment	Opposes SUB-R1. Consider that Boundary adjustments should be a permitted activity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment as follows: SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment Activity status : Controlled Permitted CON-1 <i>SUB- S1 is complied with; and</i> CON-2 <i>SUB-S2 to SUB- S7 are complied with.</i> Matters of control are restricted to: [...]	Reject
Rooney Farms Limited	250.52	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment	Opposes SUB-R1. Consider that Boundary adjustments should be a permitted activity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment as follows: SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment Activity status : Controlled Permitted CON-1 <i>SUB- S1 is complied with; and</i> CON-2 <i>SUB-S2 to SUB- S7 are complied with.</i> Matters of control are restricted to: [...]	Reject
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.52	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment	Opposes SUB-R1. Consider that Boundary adjustments should be a permitted activity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment as follows: SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment Activity status : Controlled Permitted CON-1 <i>SUB- S1 is complied with; and</i> CON-2 <i>SUB-S2 to SUB- S7 are complied with.</i> Matters of control are restricted to: [...]	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.52	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment	Opposes SUB-R1. Consider that Boundary adjustments should be a permitted activity. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment as follows: SUB-R1 Boundary adjustment Activity status : Controlled Permitted CON-1 <i>SUB- S1 is complied with; and</i> CON-2 <i>SUB-S2 to SUB- S7 are complied with.</i> Matters of control are restricted to: [...]	Reject
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.62	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R1 Boundary Adjustment SUB-R2 Subdivision that creates new allotments solely for the purpose of network utilities, the national grid or roads SUB-R3 Subdivision not	Supports that sensitive environments such as SASM are a matter of control.	Retain SUB - Subdivision rules as notified	Accept in Part

				listed in SUB- R1 and SUB-R2			
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.99	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R2 Subdivision that creates new allotments solely for the purpose of network utilities, the national grid or roads	Supports providing for new allotments to be created as a Controlled Activity for the purpose of roading	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Transpower New Zealand Limited	159.83	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R2 Subdivision that creates new allotments solely for the purpose of network utilities, the national grid or roads	Supports that the rule recognises that subdivision for network utilities differs to subdivision for other purposes and as such the standards that are necessary are limited. But considers that the activity status for such subdivision is more stringent than is necessary. The submitter does not consider it is necessary for Council to retain the ability to decline consent for a subdivision for a network utility.	<p>Amend SUB-R2 Subdivision that creates new allotments solely for the purpose of network utilities, the national grid or roads as follows:</p> <p>All zones</p> <p>Activity status: Controlled <u>Permitted</u> Where:</p> <p><u>CON-PER-1</u></p> <p><i>SUB-S2, SUB-S7 and SUB-S8 are complied with. <u>Matters of control are restricted to:</u></i></p> <p>1. The location, size and design of allotments, building platforms, roads, accessways, right of ways, vehicle crossings, open space, reserves, landscaping and connections to the surrounding area; and</p> <p>2. the ability to accommodate permitted and/or intended land uses; and</p> <p>3. the compatibility with the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; and</p> <p>4. the response to the site's and surrounding areas natural and physical features, character, amenity, constraints and vegetation; and</p> <p>5. the provision, location, design, specification, construction, connection and timing of infrastructure, transport links, water sensitive design measures and firefighting water supply; and</p> <p>6. the extent to which infrastructure has capacity to service the subdivision; and</p> <p>7. legal and physical access arrangements; and</p> <p>8. the requirement for any consent notices, covenants, easements, esplanades or public access; and</p> <p>9. measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects:</p> <p>a. of any natural hazards or other risks; and</p> <p>b. on any sensitive environments, waterbodies, ecosystems or notable trees; and</p> <p>c. on infrastructure; and</p> <p>d. on existing or permitted adjoining or adjacent land uses; and</p> <p>10. the ability of any existing activity on the site to comply with the District Plan and/or existing resource consent; and</p> <p>11. the suitability of any future development that would be enabled as a result of the subdivision; and</p> <p>12. whether it is appropriate that the subdivision prevents, hinders or limits the development of adjoining or adjacent land,</p> <p>13. measures to manage adverse effects.</p>	Reject

						<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: Restricted Discretionary</p> <p><u>Controlled Where:</u></p> <p><u>RDIS-CON-1</u></p> <p>Compliance is not achieved with <u>PER CON-1</u>. Matters of <u>control discretion</u> are restricted to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the matters of control relevant to CON-1 <u>The location, size and design of allotments, building platforms, roads, accessways, right of ways, vehicle crossings, open space, reserves, landscaping and connections to the surrounding area; and</u> 2. <u>the ability to accommodate permitted and/or intended land uses; and</u> 3. <u>the compatibility with the purpose, character and qualities of the zone; and</u> 4. <u>the response to the site's and surrounding areas natural and physical features, character, amenity, constraints and vegetation; and</u> 5. <u>the provision, location, design, specification, construction, connection and timing of infrastructure, transport links, water sensitive design measures and firefighting water supply; and</u> 6. <u>the extent to which infrastructure has capacity to service the subdivision; and</u> 7. <u>legal and physical access arrangements; and</u> 8. <u>the requirement for any consent notices, covenants, easements, esplanades or public access; and</u> 9. <u>measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects:</u> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. <u>of any natural hazards or other risks; and</u> b. <u>on any sensitive environments, waterbodies, ecosystems or notable trees; and</u> c. <u>on infrastructure; and</u> d. <u>on existing or permitted adjoining or adjacent land uses; and</u> 10. <u>the ability of any existing activity on the site to comply with the District Plan and/or existing resource consent; and</u> 11. <u>the suitability of any future development that would be enabled as a result of the subdivision; and</u> 12. <u>whether it is appropriate that the subdivision prevents, hinders or limits the development of adjoining or adjacent land,</u> 13. <u>measures to manage adverse effects; and</u> 14. <u>the matters of discretion of any infringed standard.</u> 	
Connexa Limited	176.81	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R2 Subdivision that creates new allotments solely for the purpose of network utilities, the national grid or roads	Supports the Controlled Activity status for new network utility allotments.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.159	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R2 Subdivision that creates new allotments solely for	Supports this rule.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 	Accept

				the purpose of network utilities, the national grid or roads		3. Any consequential amendments.	
Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	208.81	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R2 Subdivision that creates new allotments solely for the purpose of network utilities, the national grid or roads	Supports the Controlled Activity status for new network utility allotments.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Chorus New Zealand Limited	209.81	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R2 Subdivision that creates new allotments solely for the purpose of network utilities, the national grid or roads	Supports the Controlled Activity status for new network utility allotments.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Vodafone New Zealand Limited	210.81	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R2 Subdivision that creates new allotments solely for the purpose of network utilities, the national grid or roads	Supports the Controlled Activity status for new network utility allotments.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Bruce Speirs	66.57	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2	Considers the move from Restricted Discretionary to Non-Complying is too extreme where there is only one standard is not complied with.	Amend SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2 as follows: Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 SUB-S2 - SUB-S7 are complied with; and RDIS-2 SUB-S1 is complied with. [...] Activity status when compliance not achieved with RDIS-2: Non-complying Discretionary	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.10	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2	The ability to connect to a sufficient water supply and be satisfied that the infrastructure in the subdivision has capacity, is supported.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part

Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.100	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2	Supports including matters of discretion relating to: a) roading, accessways and right of ways, vehicle crossings and the associated connectivity, b) the provision, location, design, specification, construction, connection and timing of infrastructure, transport links, c) infrastructure capacity, d) legal and physical access arrangements; and, e) measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate effects on infrastructure and measures to manage adverse effects.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Chris Hughes	147.1	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2	Opposes the requirement for a non-complying activity status for subdivision which cannot meet the minimum lot size under SUB-R3. The activity status should be changed to discretionary activity, which is appropriate for an activity that is not suitable in all locations. It is also consistent with how non-compliance with the General Residential Zone minimum lot size is addressed. The submitters property is suitable for subdivision. [Refer to original submission for full reason].	1. Amend SUB-R3 so the activity status for a subdivision in the General Rural Zone which does not comply with the minimum net site area is changed from a Non-complying activity to Discretionary. AND 2. Make any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to this relief.	Reject
Radio New Zealand Limited	152.49	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2	Supports the controlled status subject to relief sought on SUB- P3.	Retain as notified subject to relief sought on SUB-P3 .	Accept in Part
Federated Farmers	182.160	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2	Supports this rAccept in Partule.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept in Part
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	183.104	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2	Notes that sometimes land adjacent to flood protection or drainage works is subdivided from rural sized blocks to housing. This limits access or ability to continue to provide public flood protection and drainage works. This should be a matter that the Council is able to consider when evaluating a subdivision application. Canterbury Regional Council's FPD Bylaw provides some protection in this space but this issue should be identified and addressed earlier in the subdividing process. The requirement to comply with the Chapter's standards and in particular SB-R4 will ensure that consideration of wastewater disposal and servicing can be undertaken at the time of resource consent for the	1. Add an additional matter of discretion to SUB-R3 as follows: [...] <u>x. the impact of the subdivision on the on-going delivery of existing public flood or erosion protection or drainage works".</u> AND 2. Retain reference to standards as notified or preserve original intent.	Accept

					subdivision. In particular support SB-4 Standard 2. Rural Zones. [See original submission for full reasons]		
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	187.66	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2	Seeks amendment to the matters of control to clearly outline what adverse effects are to be managed	Amend SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2 as follows: [...] Matters of discretion are restricted to: [...] <u>13. measures to manage adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, on existing land uses.</u>	Reject
Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited	192.13	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2	Agree with the reasons set out in the s32 evaluation.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Horticulture New Zealand	245.70	SUB - Subdivision	Rules	SUB-R3 Subdivision not listed in SUB-R1 and SUB-R2	Supports a Restricted Discretionary Activity status for general subdivision and the matter of discretion that considers effects on existing or permitted adjoining or adjacent land uses.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Horticulture New Zealand	245.71	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	General	Considers that building platform requirements provide a mechanism for achieving setbacks, a method to assist in managing reverse sensitivity effects.	Amend Standards of the Subdivision Chapter to add a new standard to require a 30m setback for a building platform from internal boundary in the GRZ and RLZ zones.	Reject
David George Earl and Maria Lucia Earl	13.2	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	In addition to the request to rezone 42 Burdon Road (3.5ha) to Rural Lifestyle, the minimum allotment size for the site would be 2h under SUB-S1.4.4 (no sewer connection no development area plan). To enable development on the site, it is requested the site be added to SUB-S1.4.1 to enable the land be subdivided to 5000sqm.	Amend SUB-S1 as follows: SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions 4. Rural Lifestyle Zone <i>If no development area plan is required, allotments must have a net site area no less than:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. 5000sqm for Lots 1 and 2 DP 444786, <u>Lot 3 DP 415886</u>;2. 2ha in the 2ha lot size specific control area;3. 10ha in the 10ha lot size specific control area; and4. in any other areas, 5000m² if there is a sewer connection to each residential lot, otherwise 2ha.	Reject
Oliver Amies	22.2	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Considers allowing smaller allotment size in RLZ in FDA10 would enable more cost effective development. Therefore, considers that within SUB-S1.4 the subdivision lot size in the RLZ should be reduced from 5000sqm to 2000sqm in the FDA10 Overlay. [Refer to original submission for full reasons].	Amend SUB-S1.4 to allow for 2000 sqm in the FDA10 Overlay for RLZ.	Reject

Maze Pastures Limited	41.2	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	<p>Concerned the Proposed Plan did not sufficiently consider existing subdivision consent (101.2021.131) issued for the submitter's rural property in 2021.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions as follows:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>3 General Rural Zone</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>Allotments must have a minimum net site area of 40ha in area.; and</u> 2. <u>Allotments in the GRUZ with subdivision consent issued prior to the date the new District Plan became fully operative, is subject to the allotment areas and boundary setbacks applicable at the time of lodgement of that subdivision consent.</u> 	Reject
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.27	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Oppose to SUB-S1.1 GRZ where sites that unable to accommodate a 15m diameter circle be classified as a Non-Complying activity. 2. Oppose to SUB-S1.3 GRUZ on the following matters: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. that the minimum 40ha allotment size apply to boundary adjustment; b. Request a new Rule and associated performance standard to permit subdivision of existing household units in the GRUZ established prior to 22 September 2022. c. Request a new Rule to exempt allotments in the GRUZ being subject to a 40ha allotment size if subdivision consent was obtained prior to the proposed plan being fully Operative. d. Considers the 2ha minimum allotment size for lots in the RLZ that do not have a sewer connect does not align with Settlement Zone provisions where this is no minimum allotment size without sewer connection. Therefore, the 2ha restriction in RLZ should be removed. 	<p>Amend SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions with following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. For General Residential Zone (SUB-S1.1): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Amend the required minimum dimension under subclause 2 from 15m to 13m; and b. Amend the activity status for allotments that is unable to comply with the 13m dimension from Non-Complying to Discretionary. 2. For General Rural Zone (SUB-S1.3): <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Add a new clause to exempt boundary adjustment 2022 from the 40ha minimum allotment size requirement; b. Add a new clause to exempt subdivision with houses established prior to 22 September 2022 from the 40ha minimum allotment size requirement; and c. Add a new clause to enable allotments in the GRUZ with subdivision consent issued prior to the date the new District Plan became fully operative, to be subject to the allotment areas and boundary setbacks applicable at the time of lodgment of that subdivision consent. 3. For Rural Lifestyle (SUB-S1.4) as follows: <p>4 Rural Lifestyle Zone</p> <p><i>If no development area plan is required, allotments must have a net site area no less than:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. 5000sqm for Lots 1 and 2 DP 444786 b. 2ha in the 2ha lot size specific control area; c. 10ha in the 10ha lot size specific control area; and <p><i>In any other areas, 5000m² if there is a sewer connection to each residential lot, otherwise 2ha.</i></p>	Accept in Part
Bruce Speirs	66.28	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Considers the 40 ha site rule for the General Rural Zone is not consistent with the National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land, and a rule which is consistent with the National Policy Statement needs to be developed. 2. As the Rural Lifestyle Zone is inconsistent with the NPS, it is probable such zones will be located away from the residential zones of the district, which are currently surrounded by highly productive soils. In such situations, 2 ha should allow for Environment Canterbury compliant effluent disposal systems to 	<p>Amend SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions as follows:</p> <p>3 General Rural Zone</p> <p>1. Allotments must have a minimum net site area of 40ha in area.</p> <p>1 Highly Production Soils</p> <p>[insert appropriate allotment size]</p> <p>2 Other Soils</p>	Reject

					be installed, while avoiding un-necessary expansion of residential activity onto general agricultural land. [Refer original submission for full reason].	[insert appropriate allotment size] [...] 4 Rural Lifestyle Zone If no development area plan is required, allotments must have a net site area no less than: 1. 5000sqm for Lots 1 and 2 DP 444786 2. 2ha in the 2ha lot size specific control area; 3. 10ha in the 10ha lot size specific control area; and 4. in any other areas, 5000m² if there is a sewer connection to each residential lot, otherwise 2ha. <u>5,000 m² in areas where there is a community sewer connection to an allotment intended for residential use, otherwise 2 ha.</u>	
John Leonard Shirtcliff and Rosemary Jean Shirtcliff	81.2	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Considers SUB-S1.4, which requires subdivision within the RLZ to be to a minimum area of 2 hectares in the absence of connection to a sewer reticulation network, is an unnecessary impost upon the available RLZ lands. Considers there is a contradiction between the PDP and the requirements imposed by the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan. The required minimum separation distances This conflict creates uncertainty for the submitter. The submitters hold 6 existing ECan wastewater consents in anticipation of a subdivision to create allotments that may be less than the 2 hectare size which would be a Non-Complying activity under the PDP.	Amend the SUB-S1.4 Drinking Water for the RLZ with the following changes: 1. Declare 584 Orari Station Road will be provided to the Geraldine water reticulation network; and 2. Make allotment sizes below 2 hectares a restricted discretionary activity (where water network connections are not available or are reliant upon an alternative wastewater disposal site) subject to achievement of satisfactory separation between water abstraction and wastewater disposal sites in compliance with ECan's Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan Rule 5.8 and the Restricted Discretion provisions of Rule 5.9.	Reject
Fonterra Limited	165.87	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Considers that a 40ha minimum lot size in the General Rural Zone is appropriate.	Retain SUB1.3 as notified.	Accept

Broughs Gully Development Limited	167.17	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Considers the minimum lot size exemption provided SUB- S1.2.4 should also be extended to maximum allotment size, to provide, for example, multi-unit developments. Also considers that there may be instances where a proposed dwelling does not require a land use consent, however this scenario is not exempt under exemption b.	Amend SUB-S1 as follows: SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions [...] 2 Medium Density Residential Zone 1. Allotments must have a minimum net site area of 300m ² in area; and 2. no more than one allotment that is more than 500m ² in net site area; and 3. allotments must have a dimensions that can accommodate a circle with a minimum 13m diameter, clear of any vehicle access, surface water body or boundary setback. Except that 4. no minimum <u>or maximum</u> net site area or dimension applies to allotments created: a. around existing residential unit; or b. a proposed residential unit is part of a combined land use and subdivision consent application, <u>or does not require a land use consent.</u> 3. General Rural Zone [...]	Accept in Part
Silver Fern Farms	172.77	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Supports having the 40-hectare minimum lot size specified in the GRUZ and for no minimum lot size to be specified for land in the GIZ. Supports the respective purposes of these zones.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Alliance Group Limited	173.77	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Supports having the 40-hectare minimum lot size specified in the GRUZ and for no minimum lot size to be specified for land in the GIZ. Supports the respective purposes of these zones.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.53	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 allotment sizes and dimensions	The submitter has a neutral position on proposed allotment sizes within all zones as the overarching effects of the proposed sizes is still being assessed.	Not specified.	Accept
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.54	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Considers SUB-S1.6 should be amended to allow for legal access to road frontage.	Amend SUB-S1 as follows: SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions SUB-S1 6. General Industrial Zone Allotments must have <u>legal access to</u> a minimum road frontage width of 7m. [...]	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.161	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Considers the 40ha requirement is overtly limiting and would require farmers to sacrifice more productive land for subdivision. This will leave less productive farmland	1. Amend SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions from a minimum allotment size for rural production land from 40ha to 20ha. AND	Reject

					on the working farm and more productive land on a smaller lifestyle property. [Refer to original submission for full reason]	2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought.	
GJH Rooney	191.53	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 allotment sizes and dimensions	The submitter has a neutral position on proposed allotment sizes within all zones as the overarching effects of the proposed sizes is still being assessed.	Not specified.	Accept
GJH Rooney	191.54	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Considers SUB-S1.6 should be amended to allow for legal access to road frontage.	Amend SUB-S1 as follows: SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions SUB-S1 6. General Industrial Zone Allotments must have <u>legal access</u> to a minimum road frontage width of 7m. [...]	Accept
Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited	192.14	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Agree with the reasons set out in the s32 evaluation.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Kāinga Ora	229.51	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Consider that a minimum shape factor in the Medium Density Residential Zone is more appropriate than a minimum allotment size. A new clause is sought to be added to (1) General Residential Zone.	Amend SUB-S1 as follows: SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions 1. General Residential Zone 1. Allotments must have a minimum net site area of 450m ² in area; and 2. allotments must have a minimum dimension that can accommodate a circle with a 15m diameter, clear of any vehicle access, surface water body or boundary setback; and 3. within the Gleniti Low Density Residential Specific Control Area, allotments must have a minimum net site area of 700m ² in area; and 4. within PREC1 - Old North General Residential Precinct, allotments must have a minimum net site area of 1,500m ² in area. Except that: 5. clauses 1 and 2 above do not apply to a. allotments created around an existing residential unit, in which case there is no minimum net site area or dimensions requirement. b. <u>a proposed residential unit is part of a combined land use and subdivision consent application.</u> 2. Medium Density Residential Zone 1. Allotments must have a minimum net site area of 300m² in area <u>shape factor of 8m x 15m</u> ; and 2. no more than one allotment that is more than 500 m ² in net site area; and	Reject

						[...]	
Horticulture New Zealand	245.72	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Supports a minimum net site area of 40ha in the General Rural Zone where that is required to support primary production.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Rooney Group Limited	249.53	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 allotment sizes and dimensions	The submitter has a neutral position on proposed allotment sizes within all zones as the overarching effects of the proposed sizes is still being assessed.	Not specified.	Accept
Rooney Group Limited	249.54	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Considers SUB-S1.6 should be amended to allow for legal access to road frontage.	Amend SUB-S1 as follows: SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions SUB-S1 6. General Industrial Zone Allotments must have <u>legal access</u> to a minimum road frontage width of 7m. [...]	Accept
Rooney Farms Limited	250.53	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 allotment sizes and dimensions	The submitter has a neutral position on proposed allotment sizes within all zones as the overarching effects of the proposed sizes is still being assessed.	Not specified.	Accept
Rooney Farms Limited	250.54	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Considers SUB-S1.6 should be amended to allow for legal access to road frontage.	Amend SUB-S1 as follows: SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions SUB-S1 6. General Industrial Zone Allotments must have <u>legal access</u> to a minimum road frontage width of 7m. [...]	Accept
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.53	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 allotment sizes and dimensions	The submitter has a neutral position on proposed allotment sizes within all zones as the overarching effects of the proposed sizes is still being assessed.	Not specified.	Accept
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.54	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Considers SUB-S1.6 should be amended to allow for legal access to road frontage.	Amend SUB-S1 as follows: SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions SUB-S1 6. General Industrial Zone Allotments must have <u>legal access</u> to a minimum road frontage width of 7m. [...]	Accept

Timaru Developments Limited	252.53	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 allotment sizes and dimensions	The submitter has a neutral position on proposed allotment sizes within all zones as the overarching effects of the proposed sizes is still being assessed.	Not specified.	Accept
Timaru Developments Limited	252.54	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions	Considers SUB-S1.6 should be amended to allow for legal access to road frontage.	Amend SUB-S1 as follows: SUB-S1 Allotment sizes and dimensions SUB-S1 6. General Industrial Zone <i>Allotments must have <u>legal access to a minimum road frontage width of 7m.</u></i> [...]	Accept
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.63	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S2 Storm water treatment, catchment and disposal SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal	The discharge of untreated storm water or wastewater to water is culturally inappropriate. Consider this needs to be a consideration for new infrastructure in relation to subdivisions.	Amend SUB-S2 Storm water treatment, catchment and disposal and SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal to add the following as a matter of discretion: <u><i>effects of the discharge on the values of Kāti Huirapa.</i></u>	Accept
Timaru District Council	42.39	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S2 Stormwater treatment, catchment and disposal	Supports SUB-S2.	Retain SUB-S2 as notified, subject to requested relief to SUB-S3.1.b.	Accept
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.101	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S2 Stormwater treatment, catchment and disposal	Supports requiring the alignment with the stormwater chapter and requiring written approval in regard to the acceptance of stormwater. Waka Kotahi holds regional consent to manage stormwater in the state highway network and need to ensure that these are not impacted from stormwater discharge from adjacent properties.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.162	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S2 Stormwater treatment, catchment and disposal	Supports this standard.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept
Waipopo Huts Trust	189.46	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S2 Stormwater treatment, catchment and disposal.	Opposes SUB-S2 and seeks the recognition of mana whenua interests in the occupation of ancestral land and formation of a thriving, sustainable and self-sufficient Māori community on Māori Trust land.	Amend SUB-S2 Stormwater treatment, catchment and disposal to recognise the special case of the submitter's 36 properties at Waipopo Huts and allow for subdivision of their lands as a controlled activity.	Reject
Timaru District Council	42.38	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S3 Water supply	Concern that SUB-S3(1)(b) requires evidence of an alternative water supply capable of providing a minimum of 56 litres per hectare per day. However, TDC's rural schemes have moved to an allocation of 65 litres per hectare per day. It considers that SUB-S3(1)(b) should be amended to ensure consistency with that requirement.	Amend SUB-S3 as follows: SUB-S3 Water Supply 1. General Rural Zone	Accept

						<p>1. All allotments within a rural water supply scheme must have either: [...]</p> <p>b. evidence of an alternative water supply capable of providing a minimum of 56 65 litres per hectare per day; or</p> <p>[...]</p>	
John Leonard Shirtcliff and Rosemary Jean Shirtcliff	81.3	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S3 Water supply	<p>Considers there is a contradiction between the proposed Timaru District Plan and the requirements imposed by the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement regarding the required minimum separation distances between water abstraction and wastewater disposal sites may be readily achieved for the land to the north of Raukapuka Stream and may not comply with the more restrictive (as to site size) requirements of the proposed plan. The costs of any potential connection to the Te Moana scheme are excessive in relation to the cost of establishing alternative ground water bore sources of water or connection to the immediately adjacent Geraldine reticulation network.</p> <p>The submitters hold 6 existing ECan wastewater consents in anticipation of a subdivision to create allotments that may be less than the 2 hectare size which would be a Non-Complying activity under the PDP.</p>	<p>Amend the SUB-S3.2 Wastewater for RLZ with the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Declare that the subject lands will be provided with a connection to the Geraldine sewer network. 2. Make allotment sizes below 2 hectares a matter for restricted discretion (where sewer network connections are either not available or prohibitively expensive and/or are relying upon an alternative sewer disposal site) subject to achievement of satisfactory separation between water abstraction and wastewater disposal sites in compliance with ECan's Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan Rule 5.8 and the Restricted Discretion provisions of Rule 5.9. 	Reject
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.11	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S3 Water supply	<p>Supports SUB-S3 as it requires all new lots to connect to a public reticulated water supply, or when a public reticulated water supply is not available, the subdivider must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory water supply can be provided to each lot. However, requests inclusion of explanatory text to encourage engagement with Fire and Emergency to determine how best to achieve the Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. This is important for new lots that are unable to connect to the public reticulated water supply or require additional water supply. Engagement will provide the appropriate flexibility in achieving the servicing of lots.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-S3 Water supply, to include, as follows:</p> <p>SUB-S3 Water supply</p> <p>1. General Rural Zone</p> <p>1. All allotments within a rural water supply scheme must have either:</p> <p>c. evidence the future use of the allotment does not require water supply, and a consent notice is proposed alerting future purposes.;</p> <p>-</p> <p><u>d. If the future use of the allotment requires water supply for firefighting purposes, evidence of how onsite firefighting water supply storage will be achieved in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to each lot can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>2. <u>All allotments outside of rural water supply scheme that are connected to a water supply must demonstrate how a firefighting water supply is provided in accordance New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p>	Accept in Part

						<p>2 Rural Lifestyle Zone</p> <p>Each allotment must:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><u>4. Be provided with firefighting water supply in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>3. All other zones</p> <p>[...]</p> <p><u>3 If the future use of the allotment requires water supply for firefighting purposes, evidence of how onsite firefighting water supply storage will be achieved in accordance with New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p><u>Further advice and information about how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided to each lot can be obtained from Fire and Emergency New Zealand and the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNA PAS 4509:2008.</u></p>	
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.55	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S3 Water supply	<p>Opposes SUB-S3.1 using a consent notice to “alert” future owners that the allotment does not require a water supply.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SUB-S3 follows:</p> <p>SUB-S3 Water supply</p> <p>1. General Rural Zone</p> <p>1. All allotments within a rural water supply scheme must have either:</p> <p>a. Approval for the allotment to connect to a rural water supply scheme....</p> <p>b.[...]</p> <p>c. Evidence the future use of the allotment does not require water supply, and a consent notice is proposed alerting future purchasers.</p> <p>[...]</p>	Accept in Part
Federated Farmers	182.163	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S3 Water supply	<p>Supports this standard.</p>	<p>1. Retain as notified; OR</p> <p>2. Wording with similar effect; AND</p> <p>3. Any consequential amendments.</p>	Accept in Part
GJH Rooney	191.55	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S3 Water supply	<p>Opposes SUB-S3.1 using a consent notice to “alert” future owners that the allotment does not require a water supply.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SUB-S3 follows:</p> <p>SUB-S3 Water supply 1.</p> <p>General Rural Zone</p> <p>1. All allotments within a rural water supply scheme must have either:</p>	Accept in Part

						<p>a. Approval for the allotment to connect to a rural water supply scheme....</p> <p>b.[...]</p> <p>c. Evidence the future use of the allotment does not require water supply, and a consent notice is proposed alerting future purchasers.</p> <p>[...]</p>	
Rooney Group Limited	249.55	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S3 Water supply	<p>Opposes SUB-S3.1 using a consent notice to “alert” future owners that the allotment does not require a water supply.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SUB-S3 follows:</p> <p>SUB-S3 Water supply 1.</p> <p>General Rural Zone</p> <p>1. All allotments within a rural water supply scheme must have either:</p> <p>a. Approval for the allotment to connect to a rural water supply scheme....</p> <p>b.[...]</p>	Accept in Part
Rooney Farms Limited	250.55	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S3 Water supply	<p>Opposes SUB-S3.1 using a consent notice to “alert” future owners that the allotment does not require a water supply.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SUB-S3 follows: SUB-S3 Water supply 1.</p> <p>General Rural Zone</p> <p>1. All allotments within a rural water supply scheme must have either:</p> <p>a. Approval for the allotment to connect to a rural water supply scheme....</p> <p>b.[...]</p> <p>c. Evidence the future use of the allotment does not require water supply, and a consent notice is proposed alerting future purchasers.</p> <p>[...]</p>	Accept in Part
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.55	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S3 Water supply	<p>Opposes SUB-S3.1 using a consent notice to “alert” future owners that the allotment does not require a water supply.</p> <p>[Refer original submission for full reason]</p>	<p>Amend SUB-S3 follows:</p> <p>SUB-S3 Water supply 1.</p> <p>General Rural Zone</p> <p>1. All allotments within a rural water supply scheme must have either:</p> <p>a. Approval for the allotment to connect to a rural water supply scheme....</p> <p>b.[...]</p> <p>c. Evidence the future use of the allotment does not require water supply, and a consent notice is proposed alerting future purchasers.</p> <p>[...]</p>	Accept in Part

Timaru Developments Limited	252.55	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S3 Water supply	Opposes SUB-S3.1 using a consent notice to “alert” future owners that the allotment does not require a water supply. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-S3 follows: SUB-S3 Water supply 1. General Rural Zone <i>1. All allotments within a rural water supply scheme must have either:</i> <i>a. Approval for the allotment to connect to a rural water supply scheme....</i> <i>b.[...]</i> <i>c. Evidence the future use of the allotment does not require water supply, and a consent notice is proposed alerting future purchasers.</i> [...]	Accept in Part
Timaru District Council	42.40	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal	Supports SUB-S4.	Retain SUB-S4 as notified, subject to requested relief to SUB-S3.1.b.	Accept
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.56	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal	Opposes 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.	Amend SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal to only require a connection within the General Industrial Zone where a conveyance structure of the reticulated sewer network passes within 50 metres of the allotment boundary and where Council can provide that service.	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.164	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal	Supports this standard.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept
GJH Rooney	191.56	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal	Opposes 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.	Amend SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal to only require a connection within the General Industrial Zone where a conveyance structure of the reticulated sewer network passes within 50 metres of the allotment boundary and where Council can provide that service.	Reject
Rooney Group Limited	249.56	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal	Opposes 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.	Amend SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal to only require a connection within the General Industrial Zone where a conveyance structure of the reticulated sewer network passes within 50 metres of the allotment boundary and where Council can provide that service.	Reject
Rooney Farms Limited	250.56	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal	Opposes 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	Amend SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal to only require a connection within the General Industrial Zone where a conveyance structure of the	Reject

					location and Council infrastructure capacity. The standard should provide a minimum distance to the allotment boundary before a connection is required.	reticulated sewer network passes within 50 metres of the allotment boundary and where Council can provide that service.	
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.56	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal	Opposes 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.	Amend SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal to only require a connection within the General Industrial Zone where a conveyance structure of the reticulated sewer network passes within 50 metres of the allotment boundary and where Council can provide that service.	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.56	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal	Opposes 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.	Amend SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal to only require a connection within the General Industrial Zone where a conveyance structure of the reticulated sewer network passes within 50 metres of the allotment boundary and where Council can provide that service.	Reject
Waipopo Huts Trust	189.47	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal.	Opposes SUB-S4 and seeks the recognition of mana whenua interests in the occupation of ancestral land and formation of a thriving, sustainable and self-sufficient Māori community on Māori Trust land.	Amend SUB-S4 Wastewater disposal to recognise the special case of the submitter's 36 properties at Waipopo Huts and allow for subdivision of their lands as a controlled activity.	Reject
Connexa Limited	176.82	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S5 Electricity supply and telecommunications	Considers all new subdivisions, regardless of zoning, should be required to provide a telecommunications connection. All new subdivisions within the Rural Lifestyle and urban zones should require a connection to an open access fiber network.	Amend SUB-S5 as follows: <i>SUB-S5 Electricity supply and telecommunications All zones except General Rural Zone</i> <i>All allotments, other than allotments for access, roads, utilities or reserves, must be provided with connections at the boundary of the net area of the allotment to an electricity supply and telecommunication <u>service system networks</u>, unless evidence is provided that a suitable alternative supply can be provided, and a consent notice is proposed alerting future purchasers.</i> <i><u>In all zones except General Rural, the connection to a telecommunication service must be through an open access fibre network. In the general rural zone the applicant shall provide written confirmation from a telecommunication network operator confirming that a telecommunications connection (fibre, mobile or wireless including satellite) can be provided to all new allotments and describing how this can be achieved.</u></i> <i><u>In all zones, at the time of subdivision, sufficient land for telecommunications, and any associated ancillary services must be set aside. For a subdivision that creates more than 15 lots, consultation with telecommunications network utility operators will be required.</u></i> <i><u>All necessary easements for the protection of telecommunications network utility services must be duly granted and reserved.</u></i>	Accept in Part

						<i>This standard does not apply to allotments for a utility, road, reserve or for access purposes.</i>	
Federated Farmers	182.165	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S5 Electricity supply and telecommunication s	Supports this standard.	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments. 	Accept in Part
Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	208.82	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S5 Electricity supply and telecommunication s	Considers all new subdivisions, regardless of zoning, should be required to provide a telecommunications connection. All new subdivisions within the Rural Lifestyle and urban zones should require a connection to an open access fiber network.	<p>Amend SUB-S5 as follows:</p> <p><i>SUB-S5 Electricity supply and telecommunications All zones except General Rural Zone</i></p> <p><i>All allotments, other than allotments for access, roads, utilities or reserves, must be provided with connections at the boundary of the net area of the allotment to an electricity supply and telecommunication service system networks, unless evidence is provided that a suitable alternative supply can be provided, and a consent notice is proposed alerting future purchasers.</i></p> <p><u><i>In all zones except General Rural, the connection to a telecommunication service must be through an open access fibre network. In the general rural zone the applicant shall provide written confirmation from a telecommunication network operator confirming that a telecommunications connection (fibre, mobile or wireless including satellite) can be provided to all new allotments and describing how this can be achieved.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>In all zones, at the time of subdivision, sufficient land for telecommunications, and any associated ancillary services must be set aside. For a subdivision that creates more than 15 lots, consultation with telecommunications network utility operators will be required.</i></u></p> <p><u><i>All necessary easements for the protection of telecommunications network utility services must be duly granted and reserved.</i></u></p> <p><i>This standard does not apply to allotments for a utility, road, reserve or for access purposes.</i></p>	Accept in Part
Chorus New Zealand Limited	209.82	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S5 Electricity supply and telecommunication s	Considers all new subdivisions, regardless of zoning, should be required to provide a telecommunications connection. All new subdivisions within the Rural Lifestyle and urban zones should require a connection to an open access fiber network.	<p>Amend SUB-S5 as follows:</p> <p><i>SUB-S5 Electricity supply and telecommunications All zones except General Rural Zone</i></p> <p><i>All allotments, other than allotments for access, roads, utilities or reserves, must be provided with connections at the boundary of the net area of the allotment to an electricity supply and telecommunication service system networks, unless evidence is provided that a suitable alternative supply can be provided, and a consent notice is proposed alerting future purchasers.</i></p>	Accept in Part


						<p><u>In all zones except General Rural, the connection to a telecommunication service must be through an open access fibre network. In the general rural zone the applicant shall provide written confirmation from a telecommunication network operator confirming that a telecommunications connection (fibre, mobile or wireless including satellite) can be provided to all new allotments and describing how this can be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>In all zones, at the time of subdivision, sufficient land for telecommunications, and any associated ancillary services must be set aside. For a subdivision that creates more than 15 lots, consultation with telecommunications network utility operators will be required.</u></p> <p><u>All necessary easements for the protection of telecommunications network utility services must be duly granted and reserved.</u></p> <p><i>This standard does not apply to allotments for a utility, road, reserve or for access purposes.</i></p>	
Vodafone New Zealand Limited	210.82	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S5 Electricity supply and telecommunications	Considers all new subdivisions, regardless of zoning, should be required to provide a telecommunications connection. All new subdivisions within the Rural Lifestyle and urban zones should require a connection to an open access fiber network.	<p>Amend SUB-S5 as follows:</p> <p><i>SUB-S5 Electricity supply and telecommunications All zones except General Rural Zone</i></p> <p><i>All allotments, other than allotments for access, roads, utilities or reserves, must be provided with connections at the boundary of the net area of the allotment to an electricity supply and telecommunication service system networks, unless evidence is provided that a suitable alternative supply can be provided, and a consent notice is proposed alerting future purchasers.</i></p> <p><u>In all zones except General Rural, the connection to a telecommunication service must be through an open access fibre network. In the general rural zone the applicant shall provide written confirmation from a telecommunication network operator confirming that a telecommunications connection (fibre, mobile or wireless including satellite) can be provided to all new allotments and describing how this can be achieved.</u></p> <p><u>In all zones, at the time of subdivision, sufficient land for telecommunications, and any associated ancillary services must be set aside. For a subdivision that creates more than 15 lots, consultation with telecommunications network utility operators will be required.</u></p> <p><u>All necessary easements for the protection of telecommunications network utility services must be duly granted and reserved.</u></p> <p><i>This standard does not apply to allotments for a utility, road, reserve or for access purposes.</i></p>	Accept in Part
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.12	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S6 Vehicular Access	Supports SUB-S6 as it specifically mentions where fire appliances cannot reach residential unit or a water supply source that access must be provided in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. It is noted that at subdivision stage, location of buildings are not always	Retain as notified.	Accept

					known therefore it is considered appropriate to have sufficient access as set out in point 4.		
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.102	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S6 Vehicular Access	Supports not providing for vehicular access to a state highway without consultation with Waka Kotahi. This will ensure that appropriate consideration is given to achieve safe access to the state highway network	Retain as notified.	Accept
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.57	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S6 Vehicular access	Opposes SUB-S6.2. 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.	Amend SUB-S6 Vehicular Access so that clause 2 does not apply to existing vehicular crossings, and instead only new or additional crossings.	Accept
Federated Farmers	182.166	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S6 Vehicular Access	Supports this standard.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept
KiwiRail Holdings Limited	187.67	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S6 Vehicular Access	Supports the requirement to comply with the Transport Chapter Standards and that vehicular access must not be across a railway line.	Retain as notified.	Accept
GJH Rooney	191.57	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S6 Vehicular access	Opposes SUB-S6.2. 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.	Amend SUB-S6 Vehicular Access so that clause 2 does not apply to existing vehicular crossings, and instead only new or additional crossings.	Accept
Rooney Group Limited	249.57	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S6 Vehicular access	Opposes SUB-S6.2. 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.	Amend SUB-S6 Vehicular Access so that clause 2 does not apply to existing vehicular crossings, and instead only new or additional crossings.	Accept
Rooney Farms Limited	250.57	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S6 Vehicular access	Opposes SUB-S6.2. 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.	Amend SUB-S6 Vehicular Access so that clause 2 does not apply to existing vehicular crossings, and instead only new or additional crossings.	Accept
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.57	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S6 Vehicular access	Opposes SUB-S6.2. 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.	Amend SUB-S6 Vehicular Access so that clause 2 does not apply to existing vehicular crossings, and instead only new or additional crossings.	Accept

Timaru Developments Limited	252.57	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S6 Vehicular access	Opposes SUB-S6.2. 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.	Amend SUB-S6 Vehicular Access so that clause 2 does not apply to existing vehicular crossings, and instead only new or additional crossings.	Accept
H B	74.4	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S7 Roads, cycleways and pedestrian access	While the PDP encourages cycling within settlements, it does not do the same for cycling between settlements. [Please see original submission for full details].	Add to SUB-S7 Roads, cycleways and pedestrian access the following: 1. All Zones [...] 2. Geraldine Downs - Walking and Cycling tracks specific control areas [...] 3. <u>Land adjoining State Highway 1 from the Ashburton District Council boundary to the Waimate District Council boundary</u> <u>A 5m wide access lot is vested to Waka Kotahi or Timaru District Council for the provision of a cyclelane as a result of any subdivision of land adjoining SH1 from the Ashburton District Council boundary in the north to the Waimate District Council boundary in the south.</u>	Reject
Federated Farmers	182.167	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S7 Roads, cycleways and pedestrian access	Supports this standard.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept
Peter Bonifacio	36.8	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips	Oppose SUB-S8 as there are significant health and safety, security, biodiversity and cost implications for the provision of esplanades around farming land. Riparian margins that were fenced off many years ago have almost fully regenerated so disturbing them to create an esplanade would be contrary to the biodiversity values being protected.	Reconsider the practicalities of creating esplanade strips and/or reserves around functioning farming operations and through high biodiversity value areas. If they are to go ahead, provide compensation to the land owners for the provision of land to support these areas.	Reject
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.58	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips	Opposes SUB-S8. This standard should not apply to boundary adjustments . The standard should also recognise that in accordance with section 230 RMA esplanade provisions are only required where the average bed width of a river through or adjoining an allotment is 3m or more. The standard should outline that Council should be paying compensation for all esplanade provisions. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips to recognise Section 230 of the Resource Management Act; to provide for a minimum width of 5 metres regardless of lot size; and that compensation is to be paid where any strip is taken.	Reject
PrimePort Limited	175.42	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips	There are significant health and safety and security issues, as well as operational efficiency issues, with requiring esplanade reserves and strips within the Port area. Exclusion of the Port from Rule SUB-S8 is appropriate.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part

Federated Farmers	182.168	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips	Supports this standard.	1. Retain as notified; OR 2. Wording with similar effect; AND 3. Any consequential amendments.	Accept in Part
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	185.64	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips	Supports access to natural watercourses, except where access will impact the cultural value of an area. Therefore, a matter of discretion for taking the esplanade should be the impact on Kāti Huirapa values as outlined in SCHED12 and SUB-P7.	Amend SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips as follows: <i>Matters of discretion restricted to:</i> <i>[...]</i> <i><u>6. The impact of taking the esplanade provision on Kāti Huirapa values</u></i>	Accept
GJH Rooney	191.58	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips	Opposes SUB-S8. This standard should not apply to boundary adjustments. The standard should also recognise that in accordance with section 230 RMA esplanade provisions are only required where the average bed width of a river through or adjoining an allotment is 3m or more. The standard should outline that Council should be paying compensation for all esplanade provisions. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips to recognise Section 230 of the Resource Management Act; to provide for a minimum width of 5 metres regardless of lot size; and that compensation is to be paid where any strip is taken.	Reject
Harvey Norman Properties (N.Z.) Limited	192.15	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips	Agree with the reasons set out in the s32 evaluation.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Rooney Group Limited	249.58	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips	Opposes SUB-S8. This standard should not apply to boundary adjustments . The standard should also recognise that in accordance with section 230 RMA esplanade provisions are only required where the average bed width of a river through or adjoining an allotment is 3m or more. The standard should outline that Council should be paying compensation for all esplanade provisions. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips to recognise Section 230 of the Resource Management Act; to provide for a minimum width of 5 metres regardless of lot size; and that compensation is to be paid where any strip is taken.	Reject
Rooney Farms Limited	250.58	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips	Opposes SUB-S8. This standard should not apply to boundary adjustments . The standard should also recognise that in accordance with section 230 RMA esplanade provisions are only required where the average bed width of a river through or adjoining an allotment is 3m or more. The standard should outline that Council should be paying compensation for all esplanade provisions. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips to recognise Section 230 of the Resource Management Act; to provide for a minimum width of 5 metres regardless of lot size; and that compensation is to be paid where any strip is taken.	Reject

Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.58	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips	Opposes SUB-S8. This standard should not apply to boundary adjustments . The standard should also recognise that in accordance with section 230 RMA esplanade provisions are only required where the average bed width of a river through or adjoining an allotment is 3m or more. The standard should outline that Council should be paying compensation for all esplanade provisions. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips to recognise Section 230 of the Resource Management Act; to provide for a minimum width of 5 metres regardless of lot size; and that compensation is to be paid where any strip is taken.	Reject
Timaru Development s Limited	252.58	SUB - Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips	Opposes SUB-S8. This standard should not apply to boundary adjustments . The standard should also recognise that in accordance with section 230 RMA esplanade provisions are only required where the average bed width of a river through or adjoining an allotment is 3m or more. The standard should outline that Council should be paying compensation for all esplanade provisions. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Amend SUB-S8 Esplanade reserves and strips to recognise Section 230 of the Resource Management Act; to provide for a minimum width of 5 metres regardless of lot size; and that compensation is to be paid where any strip is taken.	Reject
Waipopo Huts Trust	189.50	SUB – Subdivision	Standards	SUB-S3 Water supply	Provide for the recognition of mana whenua interests in the occupation of ancestral land and formation of a thriving, sustainable and self-sufficient Māori community on Māori Trust land	Amend the standards to recognise the special case of the Waipopo Huts Trust land and allow for subdivision of their lands as a controlled activity.	Reject
Fonterra Limited	165.145	Subdivision	Policies	SUB-P14 Rural allotments	Fonterra supports the policy as proposed.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Bruce Speirs	66.60	General	General	New	While definitions of an Esplanade reserve and an Esplanade strip are included in the Proposed Plan, the lack of context could be misleading to the general public, and further explanation needs to be outlined. [See original submission for full details].	Add a new Chapter specifically relating to Esplanades.	Reject
Clayton Wallwork	2.2	Planning Maps	Esplanade Provisions Overlay	Hae Hae Te Moana River	Consider the planning maps for 1986 Te Moana Road didn't recognise land topography and the mapped area is not accessible from Te Moana Road. The submitter suggest that the map be redrawn to follow the blue line in the attached image, which is within the Four Peaks Esplanade Reserve owned by Timaru District Council. [Refer to original submission for full reasons]	Amend Esplanade Provisions Overlay at Hae Hae Te Moana River at 1986 Te Moana Road so it is located within the Four Peaks Esplanade Reserve as shown by the blue line below.	Reject

							
James Reese Hart	149.4	SCHED12 - Schedule of Esplanade Provisions	SCHED12 - Schedule of Esplanade Provisions	Papaka Stream	<p>Considers the proposed esplanade reserve/strip on Papaka Stream, which would require the provision of esplanade at time of subdivision, will pose difficulties on farm access and results in the south-east corner of 403 Pleasant Point Highway becoming 'land locked'.</p> <p>In addition, considers the Papaka Stream is not suitable for a reserve or walkway as it floods frequently and flood water traverses through intensive farmland.</p>	Delete Papaka Stream from SCHED12 - Schedule of Esplanade Provisions	Reject
Simon Connolly	136.3	SCHED12 - Schedule of Esplanade Provisions	SCHED12 - Schedule of Esplanade Provisions	Orakipaua Creek	Esplanade provision mapping for waterbody for Orakipaua Creek, explanation is required for a line on the map.	Request clarification on the esplanade provision, specifically mapping for waterbody for Orakipaua Creek, explanation is required for a line on the map.	Reject
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.84	SCHED12 - Schedule of Esplanade Provisions	General	General	SUB-P7 and SCHED 12: This policy is consistent with the requirements of the CRPS and NZCPS Policy 18.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
PrimePort Limited	175.4	Planning Maps	Esplanade Provisions Overlay		The area of land north of Talbot Street within the Port Zone, being land contained within Lot 2 DP 326718, forms part of the working Port area and may on occasion require closure for health and safety reasons, or may be developed for Port purposes. Provision for an esplanade reserve is inconsistent with those uses, nor is an esplanade reserve required in that location given public access can be gained to the coast from Talbot Street, the adjoining Open Space Zone and along the coast itself.	Amend the Planning Maps to delete the Esplanade Provision overlay on Lot 2 DP 326718.	Accept


PrimePort Limited	175.96	SCHED12 - Schedule of Esplanade Provisions	SCHED12 - Schedule of Esplanade Provisions	General	<p>The area of land north of Talbot Street within the Port Zone, being land contained within Lot 2 DP 326718, forms part of the working Port area and may on occasion require closure for health and safety reasons, or may be developed for Port purposes. Provision for an esplanade reserve is inconsistent with those uses, nor is an esplanade reserve required in that location given public access can be gained to the coast from Talbot Street, the adjoining Open Space Zone and along the coast itself.</p> <p>Exclusion of esplanade provision requirements from Timaru Port is appropriate, given health, safety and security concerns within the Port area.</p>	<p>1. Amend SCHED12 - Schedule of Esplanade Provisions to delete the Lot 2 DP 326718; AND</p> <p>2. Retain within SCHED12 the exclusion for Timaru Port, including that land between Charman Street and Talbot Street.</p>	Accept
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.2	Definitions	Definitions	Boundary Adjustment	<p>Considers that boundary adjustment may alter the number of allotments.</p>	<p>Amend definition of Boundary Adjustment as follows:</p> <p><i>means a subdivision that alters the existing boundaries between adjoining allotments, without altering the number of allotments <u>of two or more contiguous sites where the site boundaries are amended, altering the size and/or shape of the existing sites.</u></i></p>	Reject

Hearing E - Development Areas

Submitter	Sub No.	Section/ Appendix	Sub-section	Provision	Submission Point Summary	Relief/ Decision Sought Summary	Accept / Reject
Timaru District Council	42.6	Definitions	Definitions	New	The PDP does include a description of Development Areas within 'Relationships between Spatial Layers' in 'How the Plan Works' but it is acknowledged, they aren't clearly described in the Development Area chapter nor the Financial Contribution chapter. Anyone looking at the Plan would be able to use the maps to find out if a Development Area applies or not.	Add a new definition of Development Areas as follows: <u>Development Areas spatially identify and manage an area where Development Area Plans are used to determine future land uses, development, infrastructure provision, and open space. Activities that are in accordance with the Development Area Plan are permitted within the development area, while activities which do not comply with the plan require consent.</u>	Reject
Horticulture New Zealand	245.85	DEV - Development Areas	General	General	The submitter: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes development in the Brough's Gully Development Area (DEV1) due to on land class 1-3; • Notes the Gleniti Residential Development Area (DEV2) is on Class 3 land; • Notes the Washdyke Industrial Development Area (DEV3) is on LUC 2 - 3 and does capture a rural area potentially horticultural land; • Notes the Temuka North West Residential Development Area (DEV4) is on LUC class 2 land and appears to include some rural properties. For all areas the submitter wants to ensure adequate reverse sensitivity management is in place such as 30 m setback and provision to ensure primary production can occur.	Amend the PDP to provide adequate reverse sensitivity management, including the use of setbacks and other measures to preserve primary production. [the submitter has made other related submission points on this matter, particularly related to the use of setbacks]	Reject
Broughs Gully Development Limited	167.5	DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area	General	General	This chapter refers to the 'Broughs Gully Residential Development Area' and the 'Broughs Gully Development Area'. The submitter requests that a single reference should be adopted.	Amend DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area chapter to adopt a single name for the Development Area.	Accept
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.90	DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area	General	General	The submitters have a neutral position on DEV-1.	None specified.	Accept
GJH Rooney	191.90	DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area	General	General	The submitters have a neutral position on DEV-1.	None specified.	Accept

Rooney Group Limited	249.90	DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area	General	General	The submitters have a neutral position on DEV-1.	None specified.	Accept
Rooney Farms Limited	250.90	DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area	General	General	The submitters have a neutral position on DEV-1.	None specified.	Accept
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.90	DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area	General	General	The submitters have a neutral position on DEV-1.	None specified.	Accept
Timaru Developments Limited	252.90	DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area	General	General	The submitters have a neutral position on DEV-1.	None specified.	Accept
Broughs Gully Development Limited	167.6	DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area	Introduction	General	<p>Requests amendments to the introduction to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Refer to the MRZ to reflect the rezoning request. - To refer to 'urban development' rather 'new growth area' to be consistent with the definition of the PDP. - To ensure that development not in accordance with DEV1 doesn't necessarily have to be better to achieve the outcomes of the DEV1. 	<p>Amend DEV1 as follows:</p> <p>DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area</p> <p><i>The Broughs Gully Development Area comprises 27ha of land situated in north Timaru bordered by Jellicoe Street, Old North Road and Mahoneys Hill Road. The land within the Development Area is zoned General Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone. The Broughs Gully Development Area Plan guides the general pattern of urban development for new growth in the area. It provides for the integration of future suburban development with roads, sewer and water infrastructure, stormwater basins and linkages to the surrounding area. It also restricts vehicle access area onto to Old North Road.</i></p> <p><i>It is anticipated that urban development will be in general accordance with the Broughs Gully Development Area Plan. However, it is also recognised that through the detailed preparation of a subdivision consent application(s) or infrastructure asset design, there is the potential for alternative solutions may to be developed that also better achieve the objective of the Broughs Gully Development Area. specific outcomes sought than the land use pattern shown on the Broughs Gully Development Area Plan.</i></p> <p>When assessing a Any resource consent applications for development that is not in general accordance with the Broughs Gully Development Area Plan, it is anticipated that such applications will only be granted where they are able to shall demonstrate that the proposed urban development better achieves the objectives identified in this chapter and specific outcomes</p>	<p>Accept in Part</p> <p>MRZ Deferred by Author</p>

						<p>sought in of the Broughs Gully Development Area Plan. This will be easier to demonstrate if the proposed development encompasses the entire development area so that the implications of the changes can be fully understood. Conversely, Where the proposed <u>urban</u> development is only for a portion of the <u>Broughs Gully</u> Development Area, the <u>application</u> will need to demonstrate that the outcomes sought for the <u>entire Broughs Gully</u> Development Area will not be compromised or constrained.</p> <p><u>Any resource consent application</u> that is not in <u>general</u> accordance with the Broughs Gully Development Area Plan, Any new design will need to <u>shall align with the design qualities principles</u> of the New Zealand Urban Design Protocol, <u>or its successor.</u></p>	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.178	DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area	Objectives	DEV1-O1 Key Outcomes for the Development Area	Supports the objective, which seeks to ensure development is established in a comprehensive manner, particularly as it recognises that residential development is integrated and coordinated with infrastructure and the road and pedestrian network is efficient, connected and safe.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Transpower New Zealand Limited	159.103	DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area	Objectives	DEV1-O1 Key Outcomes for the Development Area	Considers the PDP should provide the same level of protection for the National Grid as Plan Change 21 to the Operative District Plan. Objective DEV1-O1, as notified, does not achieve this (and does not give effect to Policy 10 and Policy 11 of the NPSET).	<p>Amend DEV1-O1 Key Outcomes for the Development Area as follows:</p> <p><i>Development occurs in the Broughs Gully Development Area in a comprehensive manner that ensures:</i></p> <p>[...]</p> <p>10. <i>stormwater has a minimal effect on Waitarakao (Washdyke lagoon); and</i></p> <p>11. there is minimal <u>adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, on the <u>National Grid</u> are avoided.</u></p>	Accept in Part

<p>Broughs Gully Development Limited</p>	<p>167.7</p>	<p>DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area</p>	<p>Objectives</p>	<p>DEV1-O1 Key Outcomes for the Development Area</p>	<p>As a consequential change to the rezone request, request amendments to DEV1-O1 to incorporate the reference to MRZ, and to streamline the wording and ensure the reference to 'urban development' is used to align with the definition in the PDP.</p>	<p>Amend DEV1-O1 as follows: DEV1-O1 Key Outcomes for the Development <u>Urban development occurs in the Broughs Gully Development Area in a comprehensive manner that ensures:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>efficient provision of suburban residential urban development that provides a range of allotment sizes; and</u> 2. <u>residential urban development is integrated and coordinated with infrastructure; and</u> 3. <u>infrastructure is provided in an effective and efficient manner; and</u> 4. <u>road and pedestrian network is efficient, connected and safe; and</u> 5. <u>the character and qualities of the General Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone are met; and</u> 6. <u>the design integrates with the area's topography and natural drainage channels; and</u> 7. <u>adverse effects of natural hazards are avoided or mitigated; and</u> 8. <u>the ability to develop any remaining area is not compromised or constrained by new urban development; and</u> 9. <u>new urban development integrates well with surrounding urban environment adjoining urban land uses; and</u> 10. <u>stormwater has a minimal effect on Waitarakao (Washdyke lagoon); and</u> 11. <u>there is minimal adverse effect on the national grid.</u> 	<p>Accept in Part MRZ Deferred by Author</p>
<p>Broughs Gully Development Limited</p>	<p>167.4</p>	<p>DEV1 - Broughs Gully Residential Development Area</p>	<p>Plans</p>	<p>Figure 21 - Broughs Gully Development Area Plan</p>	<p>Requests the removal of the stormwater management area to the west of Road 1 on DEV-1 as the engineering design and Council has confirmed that it's not necessary.</p>	<p>Remove the Stormwater Management Area to the west of Road 1 on Broughs Gully Development Area Plan as indicated below.</p> <p>DEV1 - BROUGHES GULLY DEVELOPMENT AREA PLAN</p> 	<p>Accept</p>

Brouchs Gully Development Limited	167.8	DEV1 - Brouchs Gully Residential Development Area	Policies	DEV1-P1 Anticipated Activities	Requests replacing 'complies' in DEV-P1 with 'in general accordance with' given the plan is at such a course level and that compliance may be difficult to determine. Amendments are also sought to delete 'associated requirements' as its unclear, and to insert 'urban' before 'development' to align with the definition in the PDP.	Amend DEV1-P1 as follows: DEV1-P1 Anticipated Activities <i>Enable <u>urban development that is in general accordance</u> complies with the Brouchs Gully Development Area Plan and any associated requirements.</i>	Accept in Part
Brouchs Gully Development Limited	167.9	DEV1 - Brouchs Gully Residential Development Area	Policies	DEV1-P2 Unanticipated Activities Only	Requests replacing 'complies' in DEV-P2 with 'in general accordance with' given the plan is at such a course level and that compliance may be difficult to determine. Amendments are also sought to insert 'urban' before 'development' to align with the definition in the PDP.	Amend DEV1-P2 as follows: DEV1-P2 Unanticipated Activities Only <i>Only Allow <u>urban development that is not in general accordance</u> activities that do not comply with Brouchs Gully Development Area Plan and associated requirements if an alternative design provides a better solution to meeting <u>if it achieves the outcomes in Objective DEV1-O1.</u></i>	Accept in Part
Brouchs Gully Development Limited	167.10	DEV1 - Brouchs Gully Residential Development Area	Rules	DEV1-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	Requests replacing 'complies' in DEV-R1.PER1 with 'in general accordance with' given the plan is at such a course level and that compliance may be difficult to determine.	Amend DEV1-R1 as follows: DEV1-R1 Land use, subdivision and development Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 <i>It is <u>in general accordance</u> complies with Brouchs Gully Development Area Plan; and [...]</i>	Accept in Part
Transpower New Zealand Limited	159.104	DEV1 - Brouchs Gully Residential Development Area	Rules	Note:	Supports the clear direction included in the Note that relate to the Development Area that the rules in the district wide chapters apply.	Retain the Rules Note as notified.	Accept
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.49	DEV1 - Brouchs Gully Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV1-S1 Roading	Opposes the note in this standard, as Roading design plans are currently being signed by not only engineers, but also surveyors. The submitter request the status quo remains. [Refer original submission or detail]	Amend DEV1-S1 Roading as follows: [...] Note: <ol style="list-style-type: none"><i>The Council will require specific designs for roads in accordance with Council's infrastructure Standards. This is to be completed by a suitably qualified chartered professional engineer, <u>or suitably qualified licensed Cadastral Surveyor or Registered Professional Surveyor</u> and these engineering plans and specifications will require Timaru District Council approval prior to the commencement of any work.</i>	Accept in Part
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.179	DEV1 - Brouchs Gully Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV1-S1 Roading	The standard is supported, which requires developers to establish new roads to be constructed in general accordance with the Development Area Plan prior to the land use, subdivision or development and prior to any new buildings being occupied.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part

Brouchs Gully Development Limited	167.11	DEV1 - Brouchs Gully Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV1-S1 Roading	Considers that roading design can be undertaken by a suitably qualified professional engineer. This person does not necessarily need to be chartered.	Amend DEV1-S1 as follows: DEV1-S1 Roading [...] Note: 1. The Council will require specific designs for roads in accordance with Council's infrastructure Standards. This is to be completed by a suitably qualified chartered professional engineer and these engineering plans and specifications will require Timaru District Council approval prior to the commencement of any work. 2. Quality control during construction shall also be documented to check compliance with the relevant engineering design.	Accept in Part
Timaru District Council	42.60	DEV1 - Brouchs Gully Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV1-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	Considers the standard could be improved to ensure the intention of these standards is clear and can be understood by plan users.	Amend DEV1 as follows: DEV1-S2 At the time of land use, subdivision or development and prior to any new buildings being occupied, any stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure required to service the land use, subdivision or development shall be designed and <u>constructed by the developer as reticulated systems that are located within their site land owned by the developer.</u> Include and stormwater, water and sewerage systems required to service the lands through reticulation systems.	Accept
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.50	DEV1 - Brouchs Gully Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV1-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	Opposes the note in this standard as Roading design plans are currently being signed by not only engineers, but also surveyors. The submitter requests the status quo remains. [Refer original submission or detail]	Amend DEV1-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure as follows: [...] Note: 1. The Council will require specific designs for roads in accordance with Council's infrastructure Standards. This is to be completed by a suitably qualified chartered professional engineer, <u>or suitably qualified licensed Cadastral Surveyor or Registered Professional Surveyor</u> and these engineering plans and specifications will require Timaru District Council approval prior to the commencement of any work.	Accept in Part
Brouchs Gully Development Limited	167.12	DEV1 - Brouchs Gully Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV1-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	Considers that infrastructure design can be undertaken by a suitably qualified professional engineer. This person does not necessarily need to be chartered.	Amend DEV1-S2 as follows: DEV1-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage Note: 1. The Council will require specific designs for roads in accordance with Council's infrastructure Standards. This is to be completed by a suitably qualified chartered professional engineer and these engineering plans and specifications will require Timaru District Council approval prior to the commencement of any work. 2. Quality control during construction shall also be documented to check compliance with the relevant engineering design.	Accept in Part

Brouchs Gully Development Limited	167.13	DEV1 - Brouchs Gully Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV1-S3 Walkway/cycleways	Considers the development of walk/cycleways in DEV1-S1 should be limited to within 'their land'.	Amend DEV1-S3 as follows: DEV1-S3 Walkway/cycleways <i>At the time of land use, subdivision or development and prior to any new buildings being occupied, the developer shall design and construct all walkway/cycleways <u>on their land</u> indicated on the Brouchs Gully Development Area Plan to include:</i> <i>1. a minimum reserve width of 6 metres;</i> <i>2. a minimum formed width of 2.5 metres;</i> <i>3. planting and mulching of the remaining 3.5 metres;</i> <i>4. for the formed width, 200mm (depth) of compacted AP65 must be provided, after vegetation and topsoil is removed. A 100mm layer of compacted AP20 is then to be applied and topped with 25mm of crusher dust.</i> <i>5. for the unformed width, a planting plan incorporating appropriate native plants and 100mm depth of bark mulch is to be submitted to Council for approval prior to planting.</i>	Accept in Part
Brouchs Gully Development Limited	167.14	DEV1 - Brouchs Gully Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV1-S4 Parks	Supports DEV-S4 but notes that DEV1 does not indicate the location of parks, but it is understood that these may be incorporated in stormwater management areas in the future.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Brouchs Gully Development Limited	167.15	DEV1 - Brouchs Gully Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV1-S5 Vesting of infrastructure and assets	Requests the replacement of 'public utility' with 'network utility' to align with the definition in the PDP.	Amend DEV1-S5 as follows: DEV1-S5 Vesting of infrastructure and assets <i>At the time of land use, subdivision or development and prior to any new buildings being occupied, all required roads, <u>network utility</u> public utility services, parks, walkway/cycleways and stormwater swales indicated on the Brouchs Gully Development Area Plan and within the site shall be vested into Timaru District Council's ownership.</i> <i>Note:</i> <i>1. The actual cost of road, <u>network utility services</u> and walkway/cycleway construction will be apportioned between the developer and Council, with that apportionment to be determined on the basis of the percentage of public versus private benefit.</i>	Accept
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.180	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Objectives	DEV2-O1 Key Outcomes for the Development Area	Supports the objective, which seeks to ensure development is established in a comprehensive manner, particularly as it recognises that residential development is integrated and coordinated with infrastructure and the road and pedestrian network is efficient, connected and safe.	Retain as notified.	Accept

Rooney Holdings Limited	174.91	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Rules	DEV2-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	The submitters oppose DEV2-R1 as the rule should not apply to land use and development. It is unclear to the submitter, what difference is intended between land use and development. The standards of DEV 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 considered unnecessarily onerous and unfair for an owner to trigger the performance standards when constructing a new residential dwelling outside of subdivision.	Amend the Rules and Standards of the chapter to achieve the follows: -amend DEV2-R1,PER-2 to include a new residential unit; -standards DEV2-S1 to DEV2-S5 should not apply to land use activities apart from DEV2-S1.3 ; -define the relationship between land use and development OR delete the term 'development'.	Accept in Part
GJH Rooney	191.91	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Rules	DEV2-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	The submitters oppose DEV2-R1 as the rule should not apply to land use and development. It is unclear to the submitter, what difference is intended between land use and development. The standards of DEV 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 considered unnecessarily onerous and unfair for an owner to trigger the performance standards when constructing a new residential dwelling outside of subdivision.	Amend the Rules and Standards of the chapter to achieve the follows: -amend DEV2-R1,PER-2 to include a new residential unit; -standards DEV2-S1 to DEV2-S5 should not apply to land use activities apart from DEV2-S1.3 ; -define the relationship between land use and development OR delete the term 'development'.	Accept in Part
Rooney Group Limited	249.91	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Rules	DEV2-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	The submitters oppose DEV2-R1 as the rule should not apply to land use and development. It is unclear to the submitter, what difference is intended between land use and development. The standards of DEV 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 considered unnecessarily onerous and unfair for an owner to trigger the performance standards when constructing a new residential dwelling outside of subdivision.	Amend the Rules and Standards of the chapter to achieve the follows: -amend DEV2-R1,PER-2 to include a new residential unit; -standards DEV2-S1 to DEV2-S5 should not apply to land use activities apart from DEV2-S1.3 ; -define the relationship between land use and development OR delete the term 'development'.	Accept in Part
Rooney Farms Limited	250.91	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Rules	DEV2-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	The submitters oppose DEV2-R1 as the rule should not apply to land use and development. It is unclear to the submitter, what difference is intended between land use and development. The standards of DEV 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 considered unnecessarily onerous and unfair for an owner to trigger the performance standards when constructing a new residential dwelling outside of subdivision.	Amend the Rules and Standards of the chapter to achieve the follows: -amend DEV2-R1,PER-2 to include a new residential unit; -standards DEV2-S1 to DEV2-S5 should not apply to land use activities apart from DEV2-S1.3 ; -define the relationship between land use and development OR delete the term 'development'.	Accept in Part
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.91	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Rules	DEV2-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	The submitters oppose DEV2-R1 as the rule should not apply to land use and development. It is unclear to the submitter, what difference is intended between land use and development. The standards of DEV should only apply to subdivision (apart from DEV2-S1.3) as all five standards relate to infrastructure that will vest to	Amend the Rules and Standards of the chapter to achieve the follows: -amend DEV2-R1,PER-2 to include a new residential unit; -standards DEV2-S1 to DEV2-S5 should not apply to land use activities apart from DEV2-S1.3 ;	Accept in Part

					Council through subdivision. It is considered unnecessarily onerous and unfair for an owner to trigger the performance standards when constructing a new residential dwelling outside of subdivision.	-define the relationship between land use and development OR delete the term 'development'.	
Timaru Developments Limited	252.91	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Rules	DEV2-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	The submitters oppose DEV2-R1 as the rule should not apply to land use and development. It is unclear to the submitter, what difference is intended between land use and development. The standards of DEV 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 considered unnecessarily onerous and unfair for an owner to trigger the performance standards when constructing a new residential dwelling outside of subdivision.	Amend the Rules and Standards of the chapter to achieve the follows: -amend DEV2-R1,PER-2 to include a new residential unit; -standards DEV2-S1 to DEV2-S5 should not apply to land use activities apart from DEV2-S1.3 ; -define the relationship between land use and development OR delete the term 'development'.	Accept in Part
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.51	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV2-S1 Rooding	Opposes the note in this standard as Rooding design plans are currently being signed by not only engineers, but also surveyors. The submitter requests the status quo remains. [Refer original submission or detail]	Amend DEV2-S1 Rooding as follows: [...] Note: <i>1. The Council will require specific designs for roads in accordance with Council's infrastructure Standards. This is to be completed by a suitably qualified chartered professional engineer, or suitably qualified licensed Cadastral Surveyor or Registered Professional Surveyor and these engineering plans and specifications will require Timaru District Council approval prior to the commencement of any work.</i>	Accept in Part
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.181	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV2-S1 Rooding	The standard is supported, which requires developers to establish new roads to be constructed in general accordance with the Development Area Plan prior to the land use, subdivision or development and prior to any new buildings being occupied.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Timaru District Council	42.61	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV2-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	Considers the standard could be improved to ensure the intention of these standards is clear and can be understood by plan users.	Amend DEV2 as follows: DEV2-S2 <i>At the time of land use, subdivision or development and prior to any new buildings being occupied, any stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure required to service the land use, subdivision or development shall be designed and constructed by the developer as reticulated systems that are located within their site land owned by the developer.</i> Include and stormwater, water and sewerage systems required to service the lands through reticulation systems.	Accept
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.52	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV2-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	Opposes the note in this standard as Rooding design plans are currently being signed by not only engineers, but also surveyors. The submitter requests the status quo remains.	Amend DEV2-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure as follows: [...]	Accept in Part

					[Refer original submission or detail]	<p>Note:</p> <p>1. The Council will require specific designs for roads in accordance with Council's infrastructure Standards. This is to be completed by a suitably qualified chartered professional engineer, <u>or suitably qualified licensed Cadastral Surveyor or Registered Professional Surveyor</u> and these engineering plans and specifications will require Timaru District Council approval prior to the commencement of any work.</p>	
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.92	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV2-S3 Walkway/cycleway s	The submitters oppose this standard as it triggers a developer to design and construct ALL cycleways/walkways indicated on the Gleniti Residential Development Area Plan. The submitter considers this absurd and not practically possible as the developer will not own all the sites within DEV2.	<p>Amend DEV2-S3 to achieve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -to only provide for the land required and delete requirements for the developer to design and form the walkways/cycleways; -to provide for walkway/cycleway land to be provided as land in lieu of cash to offset any reserve contribution payable; -to only apply to subdivision. 	Accept in Part
GJH Rooney	191.92	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV2-S3 Walkway/cycleway s	The submitters oppose this standard as it triggers a developer to design and construct ALL cycleways/walkways indicated on the Gleniti Residential Development Area Plan. The submitter considers this absurd and not practically possible as the developer will not own all the sites within DEV2.	<p>Amend DEV2-S3 to achieve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -to only provide for the land required and delete requirements for the developer to design and form the walkways/cycleways; -to provide for walkway/cycleway land to be provided as land in lieu of cash to offset any reserve contribution payable; -to only apply to subdivision. 	Accept in Part
Timaru Developments Limited	252.92	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV2-S3 Walkway/cycleway s	The submitters oppose this standard as it triggers a developer to design and construct ALL cycleways/walkways indicated on the Gleniti Residential Development Area Plan. The submitter considers this absurd and not practically possible as the developer will not own all the sites within DEV2.	<p>Amend DEV2-S3 to achieve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -to only provide for the land required and delete requirements for the developer to design and form the walkways/cycleways; -to provide for walkway/cycleway land to be provided as land in lieu of cash to offset any reserve contribution payable; -to only apply to subdivision. 	Accept in Part
Rooney Group Limited	249.92	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV2-S3 Walkway/cycleway s	The submitters oppose this standard as it triggers a developer to design and construct ALL cycleways/walkways indicated on the Gleniti Residential Development Area Plan. The submitter considers this absurd and not practically possible as the developer will not own all the sites within DEV2.	<p>Amend DEV2-S3 to achieve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -to only provide for the land required and delete requirements for the developer to design and form the walkways/cycleways; -to provide for walkway/cycleway land to be provided as land in lieu of cash to offset any reserve contribution payable; -to only apply to subdivision. 	Accept in Part
Rooney Farms Limited	250.92	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV2-S3 Walkway/cycleway s	The submitters oppose this standard as it triggers a developer to design and construct ALL cycleways/walkways indicated on the Gleniti Residential Development Area Plan. The submitter considers this	<p>Amend DEV2-S3 to achieve the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -to only provide for the land required and delete requirements for the developer to design and form the walkways/cycleways; 	Accept in Part

					absurd and not practically possible as the developer will not own all the sites within DEV2.	-to provide for walkway/cycleway land to be provided as land in lieu of cash to offset any reserve contribution payable; -to only apply to subdivision.	
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.92	DEV2 - Gleniti Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV2-S3 Walkway/cycleway s	The submitters oppose this standard as it triggers a developer to design and construct ALL cycleways/walkways indicated on the Gleniti Residential Development Area Plan. The submitter considers this absurd and not practically possible as the developer will not own all the sites within DEV2.	Amend DEV2-S3 to achieve the following: -to only provide for the land required and delete requirements for the developer to design and form the walkways/cycleways; -to provide for walkway/cycleway land to be provided as land in lieu of cash to offset any reserve contribution payable; -to only apply to subdivision.	Accept in Part
Hilton Haulage Limited Partnership	168.27	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	General	General	Considers the inconsistent references to the name of the Washdyke Industrial Development Area are addressed by referring only to the "Washdyke Industrial Development Area".	Amend the DEV3 chapter to ensure all references to the chapter name are correct.	Accept
North Meadows 2021 Limited and Thompson Engineering (2002) Limited	190.26	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	General	General	Opposes the use of multiple references to the same area of land. The PTDP uses the following references which are understood to relate to the same area of land: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Washdyke Development Area- Washdyke Industrial Development Area- Washdyke Expansion Development Area (planning map reference). The PTDP should rely on the reference to "Washdyke Industrial Development Area" and delete or amend any other reference.	Amend the Washdyke Industrial Development Area Chapter to ensure all references to the chapter name area correct.	Accept
Venture Timaru	212.4	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	General	General	Considers it important to have 'shovel ready industrial land' and encourages the Council to enable the proactive development of a Washdyke Industrial Park within the area identified as DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Plan. This area is a 'sweet spot' for growth/consolidation of existing and new food processors and manufacturers, given its access to key infrastructure. A large portion of this land is owned by Council, whom are not the right entity to proactively develop the landholding. Such land should be sold to a developer with a proven track record of delivering an industrial park. [Refer original submission for full reason]	Urges Council to facilitate the development of an industrial park in Washdyke by selling its land holding.	Accept in Part

Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.182	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Objectives	DEV3-O1 Key Outcomes for the Development Area	Supports of the objective, which seeks to ensure development is established in a comprehensive manner, particularly as it recognises that residential development is integrated and coordinated with infrastructure and the road and pedestrian network is efficient, connected and safe.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Transpower New Zealand Limited	159.105	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Objectives	DEV3-O1 Key Outcomes for the Development Area	National Grid transmission lines traverse the Development Area and therefore the Submitter seeks that the outcomes for the Development Area reflect the outcomes set out in the Objective of the NPSET. The Submitter considers that DEV3- O1, as notified, does not achieve the objective of the NPSET.	Amend DEV3-O1 Key Outcomes for Development Area as follows: <i>Development occurs in the Washdyke Industrial Development Area in a comprehensive manner that ensures:</i> [...] <i>10. there is minimal adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, on the National Grid are avoided.</i>	Accept in Part
Hilton Haulage Limited Partnership	168.29	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Objectives	DEV3-O1 Key Outcomes for the Development Area	Considers DEV3-O1 is appropriate.	Retain as notified.	Accept in part
Southern Proteins Limited	140.29	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Plans	Figure 23 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan	A walkway/cycleway is shown along the southern boundary of 6 Milward Street and through 6 Milward Street site. There are public health and safety concerns associated with a walkway/cycleway in this location. The walkway/cycleway should instead extend along Milward Street and Road 4 and on to the lagoon.	Amend Figure 23 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan as follows: 1. delete the section of walkway/cycle along the southern boundary of 6 Milward Street; and 2. extend the section of walkway/cycle along Milward Street and Road 4 to Washdyke Lagoon.	Reject
Hilton Haulage Limited Partnership	168.28	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Plans	Figure 23 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan	Considers there are public health and safety concerns, as well as security concerns about the export food safety, associated with the use of a walkway and cycleway along and through 6 Milward Street. Hence requests to amend the walk/cycleway so that it extends within the current and future road corridor along Milward Street and Road 4 to Washdyke Lagoon, rather than along and through 6 Milward Street.	Amend Figure 23 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan walkway/cycleway as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none">- delete the section running west/east from Meadows Road to the Washdyke Lagoon along the southern boundary of 6 Milward Street (Seaward Drain);- delete the section running south from Road 4 through the 6 Milward Street site; and- extend the section running west/east from Meadows Road to Washdyke Lagoon along Milward Street and Road 4.	Reject
North Meadows 2021 Limited and Thompson Engineering (2002) Limited	190.28	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Plans	Figure 23 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan	Opposes a Walkway/ cycle way as shown on Figure 23. This runs along the southern boundary of 2 and 4 Milward Street. There are public health and safety concerns associated with a walkway/cycleway in this location. It should instead extend along Milward Street and Road 4 and on to the lagoon.	Amend Figure 23, to delete the Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan walkway/cycleway from the southern boundary of 2 and 4 Milward Street; and instead relocate it to Milward Street and Road 4 to Washdyke Lagoon.	Reject

Southern Proteins Limited	140.28	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Policies	DEV3-P1 Anticipated Activities	Policy DEV3-P1 is generally considered appropriate, however the reference to “development” should include a reference to “land use and subdivision”. Further, it is not clear what the “associated requirements” are. This term is considered unnecessary.	Amend DEV3-P1 as follows: DEV3-P1 Anticipated Activities <i>Enable <u>land use, subdivision and</u> development that complies with the Washdyke Industrial Development Area and any associated requirements.</i>	Accept in Part
Hilton Haulage Limited Partnership	168.30	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Policies	DEV3-P1 Anticipated Activities	Considers DEV3-P1 is appropriate, however the reference to “development” should include a reference to “land use and subdivision”. Further, it is not clear what the “associated requirements” are.	Amend DEV3-P1 as follows: DEV3-P1 Anticipated Activities <i>Enable <u>land use, subdivision and</u> development that complies with the Washdyke Industrial Development Area and any associated requirements.</i>	Accept in Part
North Meadows 2021 Limited and Thompson Engineering (2002) Limited	190.27	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Policies	DEV3-P1 Anticipated Activities	Considers DEV3-P1 is generally appropriate, however the reference to “development” should include a reference to “land use and subdivision”. Further, it is not clear what the “associated requirements” are. This term is considered unnecessary.	Amend DEV3- P1 Anticipated Activities as follows: <i>Enable <u>land use, subdivision and</u> development that complies with the Washdyke Industrial Development Area and any associated requirements.</i>	Accept in Part
Hilton Haulage Limited Partnership	168.31	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Rules	DEV3-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	Considers DEV-R1 is appropriate.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.93	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Rules	DEV3-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	Considers the rule should not apply to land use and development. The standards should only apply to subdivision (apart from DEV3-S1(3)) as all five standards relate to infrastructure that will vest to council through subdivision. Amendment also sought to clarify how infrastructure will vest to Council outside of subdivision.	Amend the Rules and Standards of the chapter to achieve the following: 1. Amend DEV3-R1.PER-2 to include a new residential unit; 2. standards DEV3- S1 - S5 should not apply to land use activities apart from DEV3-S1.3 ; 3. define the relationship between land use and development OR delete the term ‘development’.	Accept in Part
GJH Rooney	191.93	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Rules	DEV3-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	Considers the rule should not apply to land use and development. The standards should only apply to subdivision (apart from DEV3-S1(3)) as all five standards relate to infrastructure that will vest to council through subdivision. Amendment also sought to clarify how infrastructure will vest to Council outside of subdivision.	Amend the Rules and Standards of the chapter to achieve the following: 1. Amend DEV3-R1.PER-2 to include a new residential unit; 2. standards DEV3- S1 - S5 should not apply to land use activities apart from DEV3-S1.3 ; 3. define the relationship between land use and development OR delete the term ‘development’.	Accept in Part
Rooney Group Limited	249.93	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Rules	DEV3-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	Considers the rule should not apply to land use and development. The standards should only apply to subdivision (apart from DEV3-S1(3)) as all five standards relate to infrastructure that will vest to council through subdivision.	Amend the Rules and Standards of the chapter to achieve the following: 1. Amend DEV3-R1.PER-2 to include a new residential unit; 2. standards DEV3- S1 - S5 should not apply to land use activities apart from DEV3-S1.3 ;	Accept in Part

					Amendment also sought to clarify how infrastructure will vest to Council outside of subdivision.	3. define the relationship between land use and development OR delete the term 'development'.	
Rooney Farms Limited	250.93	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Rules	DEV3-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	<p>Considers the rule should not apply to land use and development. The standards should only apply to subdivision (apart from DEV3-S1(3)) as all five standards relate to infrastructure that will vest to council through subdivision.</p> <p>Amendment also sought to clarify how infrastructure will vest to Council outside of subdivision.</p>	<p>Amend the Rules and Standards of the chapter to achieve the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend DEV3-R1.PER-2 to include a new residential unit; 2. standards DEV3- S1 - S5 should not apply to land use activities apart from DEV3-S1.3; 3. define the relationship between land use and development OR delete the term 'development'. 	Accept in Part
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.93	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Rules	DEV3-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	<p>Considers the rule should not apply to land use and development. The standards should only apply to subdivision (apart from DEV3-S1(3)) as all five standards relate to infrastructure that will vest to council through subdivision.</p> <p>Amendment also sought to clarify how infrastructure will vest to Council outside of subdivision.</p>	<p>Amend the Rules and Standards of the chapter to achieve the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend DEV3-R1.PER-2 to include a new residential unit; 2. standards DEV3- S1 - S5 should not apply to land use activities apart from DEV3-S1.3; 3. define the relationship between land use and development OR delete the term 'development'. 	Accept in Part
Timaru Developments Limited	252.93	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Rules	DEV3-R1 Land use, subdivision and development	<p>Considers the rule should not apply to land use and development. The standards should only apply to subdivision (apart from DEV3-S1(3)) as all five standards relate to infrastructure that will vest to council through subdivision.</p> <p>Amendment also sought to clarify how infrastructure will vest to Council outside of subdivision.</p>	<p>Amend the Rules and Standards of the chapter to achieve the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend DEV3-R1.PER-2 to include a new residential unit; 2. standards DEV3- S1 - S5 should not apply to land use activities apart from DEV3-S1.3; 3. define the relationship between land use and development OR delete the term 'development'. 	Accept in Part
Transpower New Zealand Limited	159.106	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Rules	Note	<p>Considers the note does not direct that the rules in the district wide chapters apply. This would mean that the provisions that protect the National Grid do not apply and therefore the provisions that apply to the Development Area do not give effect to the National Grid.</p>	<p>Amend the Note that accompanies the Rules as follows:</p> <p><i>Note: The rules of this chapter apply in addition of the underlying zone provisions <u>and district wide chapters</u>. For certain activities, consent may be required by rules in other chapters in the Plan.</i></p> <p><i>Unless expressly stated otherwise by a rule, consent is required under each of those rules. The steps plan users should take to determine what rules apply to any activity, and the status of that activity, are provided in Part 1, HPW - How the Plan Works - General Approach.</i></p>	Accept
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.53	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S1 Roading	<p>Opposes the note in this standard as Roading design plans are currently being signed by not only engineers, but also surveyors. The submitter requests the status quo remains.</p> <p>[Refer original submission or detail]</p>	<p>Amend DEV3-S1 Roading as follows:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>Note:</p> <p><i>1. The Council will require specific designs for roads in accordance with Council's infrastructure Standards. This is to be completed by a suitably qualified chartered professional engineer, <u>or suitably qualified licensed Cadastral Surveyor or Registered Professional Surveyor</u> and these</i></p>	Accept in Part

						<i>engineering plans and specifications will require Timaru District Council approval prior to the commencement of any work.</i>	
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.183	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S1 Roading	The standard is supported, which requires developers to establish new roads to be constructed in general accordance with the Development Area Plan prior to the land use, subdivision or development and prior to any new buildings being occupied.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Hilton Haulage Limited Partnership	168.32	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S1 Roading	Considers DEV3-S1 is appropriate.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.94	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S1 Roading	<p>Opposes DEV3-S1 but do not oppose the location of ROAD 5. The submitter considers 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. 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 (if ROAD 5 becomes a Principal Road).</p> <p>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>Amend DEV3-S1 Roading with the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to only provide for the land to vest with Council at the time of subdivision; 2. to provide for compensation to be paid to the landowner for the land surrendered for ROAD 5; 3. delete the requirements for the developer to design and construct ROAD 5: [...] 	Reject
GJH Rooney	191.94	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S1 Roading	<p>Opposes DEV3-S1 but do not oppose the location of ROAD 5. The submitter considers 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. 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 (if ROAD 5 becomes a Principal Road).</p> <p>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>Amend DEV3-S1 Roading with the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to only provide for the land to vest with Council at the time of subdivision; 2. to provide for compensation to be paid to the landowner for the land surrendered for ROAD 5; 3. delete the requirements for the developer to design and construct ROAD 5: [...] 	Reject
Rooney Group Limited	249.94	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial	Standards	DEV3-S1 Roading	Opposes DEV3-S1 but do not oppose the location of ROAD 5. The submitter considers 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.	<p>Amend DEV3-S1 Roading with the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to only provide for the land to vest with Council at the time of subdivision; 2. to provide for compensation to be paid to the landowner for the land surrendered for ROAD 5; 	Reject

		Development Area			<p>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 (if ROAD 5 becomes a Principal Road).</p> <p>It is noted that ROAD 5 is not listed in SCHED1 - Schedule of Roding 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>3. delete the requirements for the developer to design and construct ROAD 5: [...]</p>	
Rooney Farms Limited	250.94	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S1 Roding	<p>Opposes DEV3-S1 but do not oppose the location of ROAD 5. The submitter considers 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. 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 (if ROAD 5 becomes a Principal Road).</p> <p>It is noted that ROAD 5 is not listed in SCHED1 - Schedule of Roding 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>Amend DEV3-S1 Roding with the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to only provide for the land to vest with Council at the time of subdivision; 2. to provide for compensation to be paid to the landowner for the land surrendered for ROAD 5; 3. delete the requirements for the developer to design and construct ROAD 5: [...] 	Reject
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.94	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S1 Roding	<p>Opposes DEV3-S1 but do not oppose the location of ROAD 5. The submitter considers 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. 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 (if ROAD 5 becomes a Principal Road).</p> <p>It is noted that ROAD 5 is not listed in SCHED1 - Schedule of Roding 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>Amend DEV3-S1 Roding with the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to only provide for the land to vest with Council at the time of subdivision; 2. to provide for compensation to be paid to the landowner for the land surrendered for ROAD 5; 3. delete the requirements for the developer to design and construct ROAD 5. 	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.94	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S1 Roding	<p>Opposes DEV3-S1 but do not oppose the location of ROAD 5. The submitter considers 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. Council should be solely responsible for the design and construction of ROAD 5 and compensation should be</p>	<p>Amend DEV3-S1 Roding with the following changes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to only provide for the land to vest with Council at the time of subdivision; 2. to provide for compensation to be paid to the landowner for the land surrendered for ROAD 5; 3. delete the requirements for the developer to design and construct ROAD 5. 	Reject

					<p>paid to the landowner for the land taken (if ROAD 5 becomes a Principal Road).</p> <p>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>		
Timaru District Council	42.62	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	<p>Considers the standard could be improved to ensure the intention of these standards is clear and can be understood by plan users.</p>	<p>Amend DEV3 as follows:</p> <p>DEV3-S2</p> <p><i>At the time of land use, subdivision or development and prior to any new buildings being occupied, any stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure required to service the land use, subdivision or development shall be designed and constructed by the developer <u>as reticulated systems that are</u></i></p> <p><i><u>located within their site land owned by the developer. Include and stormwater, water and sewerage systems required to service the lands through reticulation systems.</u></i></p>	Accept
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.54	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	<p>Opposes the note in this standard as Roading design plans are currently being signed by not only engineers, but also surveyors. The submitter requests the status quo remains.</p> <p>[Refer original submission or detail]</p>	<p>Amend DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure as follows:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>Note:</p> <p><i>1. The Council will require specific designs for roads in accordance with Council's infrastructure Standards. This is to be completed by a suitably qualified chartered professional engineer, <u>or suitably qualified licensed Cadastral Surveyor or Registered Professional Surveyor</u> and these engineering plans and specifications will require Timaru District Council approval prior to the commencement of any work.</i></p>	Accept in Part
Hilton Haulage Limited Partnership	168.33	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	<p>Considers DEV3-S2 is appropriate.</p>	<p>Retain as notified.</p>	Accept in Part
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.96	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	<p>Opposes DEV3-S2. It is submitted that the standard is unclear using the term "required". Considers 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>Amend DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure 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 boundary.</p>	Reject

GJH Rooney	191.96	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	Opposes DEV3-S2. It is submitted that the standard is unclear using the term “required”. Considers 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.	Amend DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure 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 boundary.	Reject
Rooney Group Limited	249.96	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	Opposes DEV3-S2. It is submitted that the standard is unclear using the term “required”. Considers 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.	Amend DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure 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 boundary.	Reject
Rooney Farms Limited	250.96	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	Opposes DEV3-S2. It is submitted that the standard is unclear using the term “required”. Considers 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.	Amend DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure 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 boundary.	Reject
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.96	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	Opposes DEV3-S2. It is submitted that the standard is unclear using the term “required”. Considers 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.	Amend DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure 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 boundary.	Reject
Timaru Developments Limited	252.96	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	Opposes DEV3-S2. It is submitted that the standard is unclear using the term “required”. Considers 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.	Amend DEV3-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure 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 boundary.	Reject
Hilton Haulage Limited Partnership	168.34	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S3 Walkway/cycleways	Requests to amend DEV3-S3 to refer to the design and construction of walkways / cycleways on “their land”, rather than the whole area.	Amend DEV3-S3 as follows: DEV3-S3 Walkway/cycleways DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area <i>At the time of land use, subdivision or development and prior to any new buildings being occupied, the developer shall design and construct at walkway/cycleways <u>on their land</u> indicated on the Washdyke Industrial Development Area to include:</i> <i>1. a minimum reserve width of 6 metres;</i> <i>2. a minimum formed width of 2.5 metres;</i> <i>3. planting and mulching of the remaining 3.5 metres;</i> <i>4. for the formed width, 200mm (depth) of compacted AP65 must be provided, after vegetation and topsoil is removed. A 100mm layer of</i>	Accept

						<p>compacted AP20 is then to be applied and topped with 25mm of crusher dust.</p> <p>5. for the unformed width, a planting plan incorporating appropriate native plants and 100mm depth of bark mulch is to be submitted to Council for approval prior to planting.</p>	
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.97	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S3 Walkway/cycleway s	<p>Opposes the standard which triggers a developer to design and construct ALL walkways/cycleways indicated on DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan. Also considers an amendment to provide clarity on 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. Considers 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.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete DEV3-S3.	Accept in Part
GJH Rooney	191.97	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S3 Walkway/cycleway s	<p>Opposes the standard which triggers a developer to design and construct ALL walkways/cycleways indicated on DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan. Also considers an amendment to provide clarity on 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. Considers 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.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete DEV3-S3.	Accept in Part
Rooney Group Limited	249.97	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S3 Walkway/cycleway s	<p>Opposes the standard which triggers a developer to design and construct ALL walkways/cycleways indicated on DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan. Also considers an amendment to provide clarity on 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. Considers 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.</p> <p>[see original submission for full reason]</p>	Delete DEV3-S3.	Accept in Part

Rooney Farms Limited	250.97	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S3 Walkway/cycleways	Opposes the standard which triggers a developer to design and construct ALL walkways/cycleways indicated on DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan. Also considers an amendment to provide clarity on 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. Considers 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. [see original submission for full reason]	Delete DEV3-S3.	Accept in Part
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.97	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S3 Walkway/cycleways	Opposes the standard which triggers a developer to design and construct ALL walkways/cycleways indicated on DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan. Also considers an amendment to provide clarity on 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. Considers 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. [see original submission for full reason]	Delete DEV3-S3.	Accept in Part
Timaru Developments Limited	252.97	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S3 Walkway/cycleways	Opposes the standard which triggers a developer to design and construct ALL walkways/cycleways indicated on DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan. Also considers an amendment to provide clarity on 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. Considers 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. [see original submission for full reason]	Delete DEV3-S3.	Accept in Part
Hilton Haulage Limited Partnership	168.35	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial	Standards	DEV3-S4 Parks	Supports DEV3-S4 on the basis that while it does not indicate the location of parks, it is understood that these may be incorporated in future.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part

		Development Area					
Hilton Haulage Limited Partnership	168.36	DEV3 - Washdyke Industrial Development Area	Standards	DEV3-S5 Vesting of roads services and infrastructure	Considers DEV3-S5 is appropriate.	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.184	DEV4 - Temuka North West Residential Development Area	Objectives	DEV4-O1 Key Outcomes for the Development Area	Supports the objective, which seeks to ensure development is established in a comprehensive manner, particularly as it recognises that residential development is integrated and coordinated with infrastructure and the road and pedestrian network is efficient, connected and safe.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Milward Finlay Lobb	60.55	DEV4 - Temuka North West Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV4-S1 Rooding	Opposes the note in this standard as Rooding design plans are currently being signed by not only engineers, but also surveyors. The submitter requests the status quo remains. [Refer original submission or detail]	Amend DEV4-S1 Rooding as follows: [...] Note: <i>1. The Council will require specific designs for roads in accordance with Council's infrastructure Standards. This is to be completed by a suitably qualified chartered professional engineer, <u>or suitably qualified licensed Cadastral Surveyor or Registered Professional Surveyor</u> and these engineering plans and specifications will require Timaru District Council approval prior to the commencement of any work.</i>	Accept in Part
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	143.185	DEV4 - Temuka North West Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV4-S1 Rooding	The standard is supported, which requires developers to establish new roads to be constructed in general accordance with the Development Area Plan prior to the land use, subdivision or development and prior to any new buildings being occupied.	Retain as notified.	Accept
Timaru District Council	42.63	DEV4 - Temuka North West Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV4-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	Considers the standard could be improved to ensure the intention of these standards is clear and can be understood by plan users.	Amend DEV4 as follows: DEV4-S2 <i>At the time of land use, subdivision or development and prior to any new buildings being occupied, any stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure required to service the land use, subdivision or development shall be designed and constructed by the developer <u>as reticulated systems that are located within their site land owned by the developer.</u></i> Include and stormwater, water and sewerage systems required to service the lands through reticulation systems.	Accept

Milward Finlay Lobb	60.56	DEV4 - Temuka North West Residential Development Area	Standards	DEV4-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure	<p>Opposes the note in this standard as Roading design plans are currently being signed by not only engineers, but also surveyors. The submitter requests the status quo remains.</p> <p>[Refer original submission or detail]</p>	<p>Amend DEV4-S2 Stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure as follows:</p> <p>[...]</p> <p>Note:</p> <p><i>1. The Council will require specific designs for roads in accordance with Council's infrastructure Standards. This is to be completed by a suitably qualified chartered professional engineer, <u>or suitably qualified licensed Cadastral Surveyor or Registered Professional Surveyor</u> and these engineering plans and specifications will require Timaru District Council approval prior to the commencement of any work.</i></p>	Accept in Part
------------------------	-------	---	-----------	---	--	--	-------------------