



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

Further Submission in Support of, or in Opposition to 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:

Port Blakely Limited

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

Shona Walter, Saunders & Co

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

I am:

- a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest;
- a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has;
- the local authority for the relevant area.

Please explain why you come within the category selected above:

Port Blakely filed a submission on the Proposed District Plan regarding the matters addressed in this further submission.

Hearing options

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

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

Yes No

Signature: Shona Walter

Date: 4 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: shona.walter@saunders.co.nz

Telephone: (03) 288 0095

Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the Act): 131 Victoria Street, CBD, P O Box 18, Christchurch 8140

Contact person: *[name and designation, if applicable]:* Shona Walter, Saunders & Co Lawyers

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)

Yes No

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

Name of person making further submission: Port Blakely Limited						
This further submission is in relation to the original submission of:	This further submission is in relation to the original submission Number:	The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are:	My/our position on the original submission is:	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
Timaru District Council	42.41	Drinking Water Protection Overlay: Amend the rules or provide additional rules that create a non-complying activity status, within Drinking Water Protection Areas, for the following: exotic tree planting/plantation forestry	Oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 42.41 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	156.6	The amendments set out in their original submission.	support & oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.	Disallow in part	Disallow the submission point 156.6 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.

Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	156.11	Amendments to the definition of clearance of indigenous vegetation to refer to just clearance of vegetation	Oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 156.11 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	156.2	Amendments to the definition of improved pasture	Oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 156.2 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	156.22	Amendments to the definition of indigenous vegetation	Oppose	The definition of indigenous vegetation should not refer to exotic species, or contain more specific criteria.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 156.22 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	156.31	Amendment to definition of sensitive environments	Oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 156.31 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is

				PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.		jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	156.45	Amend SD-09 Rural Areas	support & oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.	Allow in part	Allow submission point 156.45 insofar as the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	156.106	Adding a new policy which seeks to protect indigenous biodiversity values outside or SNAs & sensitive areas, including improved pasture & calling for the mapping of improved pasture.	Oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.	disallow	Disallow the submission point 156.106 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	156.107	Inserting a new policy into the chapter as outlined in their submission	Oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 156.107 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.

				justification for doing so.		
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	156.122	Amendments to NATC-P4 which includes references to plantation forestry	oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 156.122 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	156.109	Amend ECO-R1 (2) so non-compliance is discretionary	Oppose	ECO-R1 imposes stricter standards than the NES-PF in relation to the clearance of indigenous vegetation in areas considered sensitive, such as water bodies, areas above 900m asl and steep slopes. The district authorities lack justification to impose stricter standards in this situation and the NES-PF provisions regarding this matter should prevail over	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 156.109 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.

				the proposed district plan rules.		
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	156.124	Amendments to NATC-R1	Oppose	The matters of control are sufficient to protect and preserve indigenous biodiversity values within these areas.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 156.124 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	156.125	Amend NATC-R3 to add spatial limits to NATC-R3.1. PER-1 and PER-2 and NATC-R3.3	Oppose	The matters of control are sufficient to protect and preserve indigenous biodiversity values within these areas. The Plan should recognise and protect existing use rights in relation to existing fences, tracks, roads or natural hazard mitigation works. Existing use rights already impose spatial limits on earthwork activities.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 156.125 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.

Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society	156.163	Amendments to CE-R2 to require a discretionary consent for afforestation, to require a consent for replanting and requiring larger setbacks than those contained in the NES-PF	Oppose	The District Plan should respect existing use rights as codified by s.10 & s.20 of the RMA and should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 156.163 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.35	Amendments to ECO-P3 to include reference to indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna that do not meet the significance criteria in SCHED-7	Oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 166.35 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.47	Amendments to include different species of conifer pine as a pest species under ECO-R7.	Oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 166.47 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.

				justification for doing so.		
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.34	Amend to include "restore" SNAs and other areas of significant indigenous biodiversity in line with the RMA and CRPS.	Oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 166.34 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.45	Amendments to ECO-R5 as set out in their submission.	oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 166.45 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Penny Nelson, Director-General of Conservation Tumuaki Ahurei	166.40	Amendments to ECO-R1.1 to include within the permitted activity conditions a list of further matters (1) (a)(b) & (c)	oppose	The District Plan should not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 166.40 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.

Hermann Frank	90.7	Amend to strengthen provisions around clearance of indigenous vegetation and earthworks. Considers the word "avoid" should be replaced with "prohibit".	Oppose	The word "avoid" is a well defined term in Resource Management Law and is sufficiently strong to achieve the objectives and policies of the ECO Chapter.	Disallow	Disallow the submission point 183.92 and ensure the District Plan does not impose standards upon plantation forestry activities which are stricter than the NES-PF unless there is jurisdiction and justification for doing so.
Environment Canterbury	183.92	Seeks to ensure plantation forestry provisions within the Proposed Plan are consistent with the NES-PF	support	Port Blakely's submission also seeks to ensure that Plantation Forestry Provisions within the Plan are consistent with the NESPF	Allow	Allow the submission point.