TIMARU DISTRICT COUNCIL

15 Dec 2022

RECORDS

Form 5 of the Resource Management Act

Submission on a Notified Proposed District Plan

To: Timaru District Council

Full name of Submitter;-

MALPATI REGENVANU

This is a submission on the Proposed District Plan of the Timaru District Council.

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

I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that adversely affects the environment and does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are;-

Rural Lifestyle Zone - Standards for built structures - RLZ S1, S3, S4, S5, S6 & S8

My submission is in opposition for the following reasons;-

This submission relates to the Standards for the **Rural Lifestyle Zone**, (RLZ), as they relate to Built Structures and landscaping requirements.

The standards when applied to the small Lots on Hislop Street & Shaw Street Geraldine – in the RLZ are overly restrictive and un-necessary within the urban precinct of the Geraldine Community.

RLZ-S1 building maximum heights.

RLZ-S3 site coverage limitation to 10%, (some of these sites are only 760 sq metres in area so this is an unrealistic and unjust restriction).

RLZ-S4 boundary setbacks from boundaries for buildings and structures, building setbacks of 8 metres on these small Lots are very unrealistic.

RLZ-S5, S6 & S8 These design control standards are opposed as they impinge on property ownership rights within the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township and are therefore un-necessarily restriction without providing a benefit to the natural rural landscape of the Geraldine Downs. Other property owners within the Geraldine Township logically do not suffer from this imposition, (rightly so). Such controls are inconsistent and with the remainder of the urban precinct of Geraldine and suggest that zone boundaries have not been carefully considered or drawn.

The small allotments in the RLZ on Shaw and Hislop Streets are small scale and unable to achieve yard setbacks set out in Schedule 16 and the RLZ of the PDP. They are below the minimum site area of 5000 sq metres for new Lots referred to in RLZ-R2. These Lots have been granted subdivision consent by the Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties, not rural residential properties

I seek the following decision or relief from the Council;-

Re-draw the planning maps to include these Lots in the GRZ, see attached map, Or in the alternative amend the standards of the RLZ to exclude Lots existing at the time of public notification of the Proposed District Plan which are less than 2001 square metres in area. This can be achieved by providing an **exemption** for small Lots from all of those standards of the RLZ that are impractical when applied to small Lots

I wish to be heard in support of my submission and will consider presenting a joint case with other submitters.

MALPATI REGENVANU (FOR 2, 4	SHAW STREET
Signature & date: Megeman 12/12	12022
Email address for service regenvanu. m @ For g	email.com
Postal Address 23 A SOUTH TERRACE ROAL	
GERALDINE 7930	

Attachment, excerpt from Proposed District Plan - Planning Maps with Lots subject to this submission highlighted

Attachment to submission

This submission applies to Street numbers;-

Shaw Street 2, 4, 6, 12 and Hislop Street 6 & 6A highlighted in yellow below.

