



Timaru District Council
2 King George Place
Timaru 7910
Phone: 03 687 7200

Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, submission on the Proposed Timaru District Plan

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Further submissions close on Friday 4 August 2023 at 5pm

To: Timaru District Council

This is a further submission in support of, or in opposition to, a submission on the **Proposed Timaru District Plan**.

Full name of person making further submission:

Hermann Frank

Organisation name and contact (if representing a group or organisation):

Only certain persons can make a further submission. Please select the option that applies.

I am:

a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has;

Please explain why you come within the category selected above:

I have undertaken extensive research and surveys in regard to biodiversity in the District (e.g. lizards, threatened plants) and so I consider myself able to make greater contributions than the general public. I restrict my submissions to points where I have considerable experience.

Hearing options

I wish to be heard in support of my further submission? No

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

No

Signature: Hermann Frank

Date: 11 August 2023

(of person making submission or person authorised to make decision on behalf)

PLEASE NOTE - A signature is not required if you submit this form electronically. By entering your name in the box above you are giving your authority for this application to proceed.

Electronic address for service of person making further submission: hermann@newfrankland.org

Telephone: 03 6845399 or 027 650 7356

Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the Act): 27 Archer Street, Timaru 7910

Contact person: *[name and designation, if applicable]:* Click to enter text.

You have served a copy of the further submission on the original submitter (this is required under the Resource Management Act 1991 Schedule 1, s8A(2) to be completed within 5 working days after it is served on the Timaru District Council)

Will do

Further submissions close on Friday 4 August 2023 at 5pm.

Additional template for multiple further submission points

Name of person making further submission:						
This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: <i>Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council</i>	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number: <i>enter the unique submission number as per the SoDR. E.g. 42.45</i>	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is: <i>Support or oppose</i>	The reasons for my/our support/ opposition to the original submission are:	Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part)	Give precise details (which can include tracked changes) of the decision you want the Council to make in relation to the original submission point
Penny Nelson	166.29	Points 1 and 2 especially	Support	These points have been raised by various submitters and need to be addressed in the Plan		
Roselyne Yeandle	253.20	Considers lack of consultation	Reject	Council has statutory responsibility and there has been extensive consultation and engagement with landowners	Disallow	
Penny Nelson	166.30	Fully	Support	This is related to point 166.29	Allow fully	Amend as suggested
Penny Nelson	166.31	The CRPS notes that there is a need for action to restore fragmented, degraded or scarce natural habitat, to restore	Support	As stated in the submission	Allow fully	Include sentence: Overall, there is an increase in indigenous biodiversity throughout the District, comprising:
Silver Fern Farms	172.47	Restrict protection to mapped areas	Oppose	There are areas not yet mapped	Disallow	
Penny Nelson	166.33	there is a process provided in the Plan for identifying new areas of significant vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna	Support	see 166.29	Allow fully	Amend as suggested
Rooney Holdings Ltd	174.30	Oppose ECO-P1 to the extent that Council has identified	Reject	see submission from ECan for example	Disallow	
GJH Rooney	191.30	Oppose ECO-P1 to the extent that Council has identified	Reject	see submission from ECan for example	Disallow	
Rooney Group Ltd	249.30	Oppose ECO-P1 to the extent that Council has identified	Reject	see submission from ECan for example	Disallow	
Rooney Farms Ltd	250.30	Oppose ECO-P1 to the extent that Council has identified	Reject	see submission from ECan for example	Disallow	
Rooney Earthmoving Ltd	251.30	Oppose ECO-P1 to the extent that Council has identified	Reject	see submission from ECan for example	Disallow	
Timaru Developments Ltd	252.30	Oppose ECO-P1 to the extent that Council has identified	Reject	see submission from ECan for example	Disallow	
Forest&Bird	156.10	show that Council may consider allowing clearance in certain circumstances.	Support	seems clearer wording	Allow	Amend as suggested in addition to the wording suggest by myself in 90.4
Road Metals Ltd	169.19	It does not provide for quarrying activities in SNAs	Reject	Quarrying in SNAs (if at all) should have a very high threshold	Disallow	
NZ Agricultural Aviation	132.17	Assumes that clearance of native vegetation is a permitted activity below 900 m and slope is less than 30 degrees.	Reject	If this would be correct, it would need urgent change and amendment	Disallow	
Penny Nelson	166.40	In line with the draft NPS-IB, the permitted activities within an SNA should occur within a much tighter threshold	Support	As stated in the submission	Allow	Amend as suggested
Ecan	183.77	there are SNAs that meet the criteria of Appendix 5 but that have not been identified or mapped,	Support	As stated in the submission, also applies to other rules	Allow	Amend
Penny Nelson	166.45	that the rule does not apply to any new extension of the existing structures listed	Support	As stated in the submission	Allow	Amend
Rooney Holdings Ltd	174.32	to provide for the clearance for indigenous vegetation within the SNA overlay where the clearance is supported by QEII National Trust or the Department of Conservation	Reject	Should not override the SNA policies	Disallow	
GJH Rooney	191.32	to provide for the clearance for indigenous vegetation within the SNA overlay where the clearance is supported by QEII National Trust or the Department of Conservation	Reject	Should not override the SNA policies	Disallow	
Rooney Group Ltd	249.32	to provide for the clearance for indigenous vegetation within the SNA overlay where the clearance is supported by QEII National Trust or the Department of Conservation	Reject	Should not override the SNA policies	Disallow	
Rooney Farms Ltd	250.32	to provide for the clearance for indigenous vegetation within the SNA overlay where the clearance is supported by QEII National Trust or the Department of Conservation	Reject	Should not override the SNA policies	Disallow	
Rooney Earthmoving Ltd	251.32	to provide for the clearance for indigenous vegetation within the SNA overlay where the clearance is supported by QEII National Trust or the Department of Conservation	Reject	Should not override the SNA policies	Disallow	
Timaru Developments Ltd	252.32	to provide for the clearance for indigenous vegetation within the SNA overlay where the clearance is supported by QEII National Trust or the Department of Conservation	Reject	Should not override the SNA policies	Disallow	
Federated Farmers	182.11	Opposes the permitted clearance within 50m of any wetland	Reject	10m as suggested does not provide a sufficient buffer for wetlands	Disallow	Retain original wording
Forest&Bird	156.12	Add a new objective seeking restoration of natural character where it has been degraded.	Support	Needs to add aspirational goal as many ecosystems are degraded, but still retain values	Allow	Amend as suggested
Rangitata Dairies	44.70	Opposes the extent of the riparian margins as being 100m from the bank edges of the Rangitata River, as this will include farmed land.	Reject	Does not prevent appropriate farming activities. Also, farms have claimed public land which they do not own	Disallow	
Penny Nelson	166.53	highlights to the user that there are indigenous vegetation clearance rules that also apply within riparian margins	Support	Helps to clarify	Allow	Amend
Rooney Holdings Ltd	174.36	Opposes NFL-R7 requiring a resource consent for afforestation within VAL-4.	Reject	This is needed to protect values of VAL and needs consistency across all VAL	Disallow	Retain original wording

GJH Rooney	191.36	Opposes NFL-R7 requiring a resource consent for afforestation within VAL-4.	Reject	This is needed to protect values of VAL and needs consistency across all VAL	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Group Ltd	249.36	Opposes NFL-R7 requiring a resource consent for afforestation within VAL-4.	Reject	This is needed to protect values of VAL and needs consistency across all VAL	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Farms Ltd	250.36	Opposes NFL-R7 requiring a resource consent for afforestation within VAL-4.	Reject	This is needed to protect values of VAL and needs consistency across all VAL	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Earthmoving Ltd	251.36	Opposes NFL-R7 requiring a resource consent for afforestation within VAL-4.	Reject	This is needed to protect values of VAL and needs consistency across all VAL	Disallow	Retain original wording
Timaru Developments Ltd	252.36	Opposes NFL-R7 requiring a resource consent for afforestation within VAL-4.	Reject	This is needed to protect values of VAL and needs consistency across all VAL	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Holdings Ltd	174.37	Opposes NFL-R7 requiring a resource consent for afforestation within VAL-4	Reject	This is needed to protect values of VAL and needs consistency across all VAL	Disallow	Retain original wording
GJH Rooney	191.37	Opposes NFL-R7 requiring a resource consent for afforestation within VAL-4	Reject	This is needed to protect values of VAL and needs consistency across all VAL	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Group Ltd	249.37	Opposes NFL-R7 requiring a resource consent for afforestation within VAL-4	Reject	This is needed to protect values of VAL and needs consistency across all VAL	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Farms Ltd	250.37	Opposes NFL-R7 requiring a resource consent for afforestation within VAL-4	Reject	This is needed to protect values of VAL and needs consistency across all VAL	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Earthmoving Ltd	251.37	Opposes NFL-R7 requiring a resource consent for afforestation within VAL-4	Reject	This is needed to protect values of VAL and needs consistency across all VAL	Disallow	Retain original wording
Timaru Developments Ltd	252.37	Opposes NFL-R7 requiring a resource consent for afforestation within VAL-4	Reject	This is needed to protect values of VAL and needs consistency across all VAL	Disallow	Retain original wording
ECan	183.93	Supports the assessment of impacts on Landscape Values when considering afforestation.	Support	As stated in the submission	Allow	Retain original wording
Rooney Holdings Ltd	174.38	Oppose NFL-R8 applying to the VAL overlay.	Reject	New farm tracks can impact visual landscape aspects considerably	Disallow	Retain original wording
GJH Rooney	191.38	Oppose NFL-R8 applying to the VAL overlay.	Reject	New farm tracks can impact visual landscape aspects considerably		Retain original wording
Rooney Group Ltd	249.38	Oppose NFL-R8 applying to the VAL overlay.	Reject	New farm tracks can impact visual landscape aspects considerably		Retain original wording
Rooney Farms Ltd	250.38	Oppose NFL-R8 applying to the VAL overlay.	Reject	New farm tracks can impact visual landscape aspects considerably		Retain original wording
Rooney Earthmoving Ltd	251.38	Oppose NFL-R8 applying to the VAL overlay.	Reject	New farm tracks can impact visual landscape aspects considerably		Retain original wording
Timaru Developments Ltd	252.38	Oppose NFL-R8 applying to the VAL overlay.	Reject	New farm tracks can impact visual landscape aspects considerably		Retain original wording
Federated Farmers	182.13	Farm tracks in VAL's should be permitted, at the most, controlled.	Reject	New farm tracks can impact visual landscape aspects considerably		Retain original wording
Rooney Holdings Ltd	174.39	Oppose all subdivision being discretionary within an ONF, ONL or VAL overlay	Reject	See 183.93 by ECan	Disallow	Retain original wording
GJH Rooney	191.39	Oppose all subdivision being discretionary within an ONF, ONL or VAL overlay	Reject	See 183.93 by ECan	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Group Ltd	249.39	Oppose all subdivision being discretionary within an ONF, ONL or VAL overlay	Reject	See 183.93 by ECan	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Farms Ltd	250.39	Oppose all subdivision being discretionary within an ONF, ONL or VAL overlay	Reject	See 183.93 by ECan	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Earthmoving Ltd	251.39	Oppose all subdivision being discretionary within an ONF, ONL or VAL overlay	Reject	See 183.93 by ECan	Disallow	Retain original wording
Timaru Developments Ltd	252.39	Oppose all subdivision being discretionary within an ONF, ONL or VAL overlay	Reject	See 183.93 by ECan	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Holdings Ltd	174.40	Oppose NFL-S3.2 as this level of control is unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	There should be a very strict approach for new buildings and structures. Considerable part of the values are the lack of built structures	Disallow	Retain original wording
GJH Rooney	191.40	Oppose NFL-S3.2 as this level of control is unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	There should be a very strict approach for new buildings and structures. Considerable part of the values are the lack of built structures	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Group Ltd	249.40	Oppose NFL-S3.2 as this level of control is unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	There should be a very strict approach for new buildings and structures. Considerable part of the values are the lack of built structures	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Farms Ltd	250.40	Oppose NFL-S3.2 as this level of control is unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	There should be a very strict approach for new buildings and structures. Considerable part of the values are the lack of built structures	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Earthmoving Ltd	251.40	Oppose NFL-S3.2 as this level of control is unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	There should be a very strict approach for new buildings and structures. Considerable part of the values are the lack of built structures	Disallow	Retain original wording
Timaru Developments Ltd	252.40	Oppose NFL-S3.2 as this level of control is unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	There should be a very strict approach for new buildings and structures. Considerable part of the values are the lack of built structures	Disallow	Retain original wording

Rooney Holdings Ltd	174.41	Oppose NFL-S4.2 as this level of control in unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	see similar topics	Disallow	Retain original wording
GJH Rooney	191.41	Oppose NFL-S4.2 as this level of control in unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	see similar topics	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Group Ltd	249.41	Oppose NFL-S4.2 as this level of control in unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	see similar topics	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Farms Ltd	250.41	Oppose NFL-S4.2 as this level of control in unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	see similar topics	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Earthmoving Ltd	251.41	Oppose NFL-S4.2 as this level of control in unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	see similar topics	Disallow	Retain original wording
Timaru Developments Ltd	252.41	Oppose NFL-S4.2 as this level of control in unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	see similar topics	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Holdings Ltd	174.43	Oppose NFL-S6.2 as this level of control in unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	see similar topics	Disallow	Retain original wording
GJH Rooney	191.43	Oppose NFL-S6.2 as this level of control in unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	see similar topics	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Group Ltd	249.43	Oppose NFL-S6.2 as this level of control in unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	see similar topics	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Farms Ltd	250.43	Oppose NFL-S6.2 as this level of control in unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	see similar topics	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Earthmoving Ltd	251.43	Oppose NFL-S6.2 as this level of control in unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	see similar topics	Disallow	Retain original wording
Timaru Developments Ltd	252.43	Oppose NFL-S6.2 as this level of control in unnecessary for a visual amenity landscape.	Reject	see similar topics	Disallow	Retain original wording
Penny Nelson	166.74	proposed introduction is consistent with the RMA requirements (Part 2, Section 6(d)) and New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZPS).	Support	As stated in the submission	Allow	Retain original wording
Federated Farmers, also similar submissi	182.135	that landowners should not be compelled to always provide access a	Reject	public access is restricted to defined areas i.e. coastal marine areas and identified wetlands and rivers	Disallow	Retain original wording
Federated Farmers	182.137	Private property rights as well as the additional impacts public access may also have on the amenity value of selected landscapes and areas	Reject	as above	Disallow	Retain original wording
Penny Nelson	166.75	This objective gives effect to Objective 4 and Policy 18 & 19 of the NZCPS and Policy 8.1.5 of the CRPS.	Support	As stated in the submission	Allow	Retain original wording
Penny Nelson	166.76	This policy gives effect to Objective 4 and Policy 18 & 19 of the NZCPS and Policy 8.1.5 of the CRPS. Also other policies.	Support	As stated in the submission	Allow	Retain original wording
Federated Farmers	182.141	Provide information and education to the public regarding where public access is available	Support in parts	Support this part of submission as the public need to know	Partly allow	Add this part of wording for policy
Forest&Bird	156.181	Support the inclusion of all the SNAs and add more SNAs as they become known to the schedule	Support	Need to have a provision to add new SNAs	Allow	Amend as suggested
Rooney Holdings Ltd	174.101	Considers that SCHED7 should not (does not make sense otherwise) refer to the names of landowners under the column "Survey Reference".	Reject	While landowner might change, this is a helpful reference and can be adjusted in documents	Disallow	Retain original wording
GJH Rooney	191.101	Considers that SCHED7 should not (does not make sense otherwise) refer to the names of landowners under the column "Survey Reference".	Reject	While landowner might change, this is a helpful reference and can be adjusted in documents	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Group Ltd	249.101	Considers that SCHED7 should not (does not make sense otherwise) refer to the names of landowners under the column "Survey Reference".	Reject	While landowner might change, this is a helpful reference and can be adjusted in documents	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Farms Ltd	250.101	Considers that SCHED7 should not (does not make sense otherwise) refer to the names of landowners under the column "Survey Reference".	Reject	While landowner might change, this is a helpful reference and can be adjusted in documents	Disallow	Retain original wording
Rooney Earthmoving Ltd	251.101	Considers that SCHED7 should not (does not make sense otherwise) refer to the names of landowners under the column "Survey Reference".	Reject	While landowner might change, this is a helpful reference and can be adjusted in documents	Disallow	Retain original wording
Timaru Developments Ltd	252.101	Considers that SCHED7 should not (does not make sense otherwise) refer to the names of landowners under the column "Survey Reference".	Reject	While landowner might change, this is a helpful reference and can be adjusted in documents	Disallow	Retain original wording
ECan	183.169	There should be some recognition that the listed sites will be added to over time	Support	Need to have a provision to add new SNAs	Allow	Amend
Pye Group	35.3	Considers the area identified on the map contains lizard habitat and kanuka and should be identified as a SNA to ensure biodiversity values are protected long-term.	Support	The submitter is correct	Allow	Add to Schedule
ECan	183.70	Inclusion of this Schedule is consistent with CRPS Objective 12.2.1 and Policy 12.3.1	Support	As stated in the submission	Allow	Retain original wording; consider adding as in next point
Forest&Bird	156.184	P should include the Two Thumb, Hall, and Gammack Range ONL to give better give effect to the CRPS.	Support	As stated in the submission	Allow	Consider adding suggested areas
Rooney Holdings Ltd	174.99	Oppose the inclusion of the "Unnamed tributary of the Pareora River" due to the tributary flowing from a vegetated gully that has been identified	Reject	As stated, this is a SNA in a vegetated gully and there would be no interference with farm operations. There are not many opportunities like this for the public.	Disallow	Retain

GJH Rooney	191.99	Oppose the inclusion of the "Unnamed tributary of the Pareora River" due to the tributary flowing from a vegetated gully that has been identified	Reject	As stated, this is a SNA in a vegetated gully and there would be no interference with farm operations. There are not many opportunities like this for the public.	Disallow	Retain
Rooney Group Ltd	249.99	Oppose the inclusion of the "Unnamed tributary of the Pareora River" due to the tributary flowing from a vegetated gully that has been identified	Reject	As stated, this is a SNA in a vegetated gully and there would be no interference with farm operations. There are not many opportunities like this for the public.	Disallow	Retain
Rooney Farms Ltd	250.99	Oppose the inclusion of the "Unnamed tributary of the Pareora River" due to the tributary flowing from a vegetated gully that has been identified	Reject	As stated, this is a SNA in a vegetated gully and there would be no interference with farm operations. There are not many opportunities like this for the public.	Disallow	Retain
Rooney Earthmoving Ltd	251.99	Oppose the inclusion of the "Unnamed tributary of the Pareora River" due to the tributary flowing from a vegetated gully that has been identified	Reject	As stated, this is a SNA in a vegetated gully and there would be no interference with farm operations. There are not many opportunities like this for the public.	Disallow	Retain
Timaru Developments Ltd	252.99	Oppose the inclusion of the "Unnamed tributary of the Pareora River" due to the tributary flowing from a vegetated gully that has been identified	Reject	As stated, this is a SNA in a vegetated gully and there would be no interference with farm operations. There are not many opportunities like this for the public.	Disallow	Retain