

## Chapter: SCHED7 – Schedule of Sites and Areas of Significance to Kati Huirapa

Feed-back No.	Section	Sub-section	Plan Provision	Feedback	Relief sought
<a href="#">43.134</a>	SCHED7 – Schedule of sites and areas of significance to Kati Huirapa	SCHED7 – Schedule of Sites and areas of significance to Kati Huirapa	SCHED7A – Wahi tupuna areas	<i>Note that the planning maps online refer to ‘wai tupuna’ etc rather than ‘wahi tupuna’, and similar for other terms. This may be an error in transcribing the data to maps that should be addressed.</i>	
<a href="#">66.11</a>	SCHED7 – Schedule of sites and areas of significance to Kati Huirapa	SCHED7 – Schedule of Sites and areas of significance to Kati Huirapa	General	<i>The schedules of sites and areas of significance within Schedule 7 are often quite broad, and some encompass a large area, in particular SASM23. The rules linked to these schedules would apply over these areas. It is not clear on what basis the sites and areas of significance were determined, or other than rivers, streams, and the like, what in particular within these areas is of significance. If there are specific areas or sites of significance (and recognising some may be interconnected) the plan could be more specific to these areas and sites. This may better enable the outcomes sought.</i>	
<a href="#">143.42</a>	SCHED7 – Schedule of sites and areas of significance to Kati Huirapa	SCHED7A – Wahi tupuna areas	Unique identifier Site identifier Site Ty	<p>SASM3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• [REDACTED] would oppose the spatial extents of the overlays that limit development potential, particularly where they overlap urbanised land that already has a built form exceeding the permitted development (e.g. around [REDACTED] and would question why they cover a significant area of privately owned properties that may have reasonable redevelopment potential.</li> </ul>	[REDACTED] would seek amendment of the Overlays SASM-3 and SASM-3a in [REDACTED] where the Overlays cross the MDRZ and Local Centre Zones, unless there is a sound evidence base for these overlays to be situated across these private properties and consequently imposing further restrictions on potential development.



				<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	
<a href="#">131.6</a>	SCHED7 – Schedule of sites and areas of significance to Kati Huirapa	SCHED7D – Wai taoka areas	Kati Huirapa consider the whole of these water bod	<p><i>SITES AND AREAS OF SIGNIFICANCE TO MAORI</i></p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p><i>As previously stated, our entire farming operation is located [REDACTED] which is captured under this provision, and could potentially jeopardize not only our total livelihood, but also those of our employees and families we support.</i></p> <p><i>We seek firstly to understand the process that was used to map this particular area. It seems to encompass a much wider area than other SASM’s on the current TDC map. Also, the area mapped here is vastly different to the Runanga sensitive sites as mapped by Ecan. Again, there seems to be unnecessary differences to provisions under the district and regional council rules. For example, every consent we have conducted as part of normal farming operations (eg; wetland construction, irrigation, effluent discharge, buildings, bridge construction) has resulted in no objections by our local runanga, nor have they flagged any sites or areas of significance or relevance to them during any of their cultural assessments of our property. We would like you to clarify the consultation and decision-making process that was undertaken in coming to this specific SASM, and ask to have the extent of this area reviewed, especially where it relates to entire landownings.</i></p>	<p>We seek firstly to understand the process that was used to map this particular area.</p> <p>We would like you to clarify the consultation and decision-making process that was undertaken in coming to this specific SASM, and ask to have the extent of this area reviewed, especially where it relates to entire landownings.</p>
<a href="#">38.6</a>	SCHED7 – Schedule of sites	SCHED7D – Wai taoka areas	Unique identifier Site	<p><i>Our following points relate specifically to [REDACTED] being the area [REDACTED]</i></p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	

	<p>and areas of significance to Kati Huirapa</p>		<p>identifier Site Ty [REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p><i>We note the objectives of the plan are to enable access and use of resources in areas of cultural value (SASM Objective 2) and protect areas and sites of significance from inappropriate subdivision, use and development (SASM Objective 3). The challenge here is determining what is inappropriate use and development. We would suggest that what is considered normal farming practice should not be considered inappropriate and any effects on the cultural values and the environment are managed through regional council policy as they currently are.</i></p> <p><i>We would like to understand the consultation and decision-making process used to map the various SASMs but in particular [REDACTED] We do not understand how [REDACTED] includes such a large area when the Rūnanga Sensitive Sites mapped by Ecan are vastly different. Our understanding is that Rūnanga Sensitive Sites are sensitive areas of importance to each Ngāi Tahu Rūnanga in Canterbury. The map below shows these sites as identified on the Canterbury Maps website and used by Ecan. As you will see these areas are vastly different to the areas identified by Timaru District Council as being of significance to Maori.</i></p>	
--	--	--	--	--



				<p>We then have some specific concerns about the rules relating to this area which we have detailed below. In the first instance the outcome we seek for all of these issues is to have the extent of the SASMs reviewed and specifically [REDACTED]. The outcomes we have detailed below are what we consider to be the best outcome should any SASMs include large areas of private landholdings.</p>	
<a href="#">48.2</a>	SCHED7 – Schedule of sites and areas of significance to Kati Huirapa	SCHED7D – Wai taoka areas	Unique identifier Site identifier Site Ty	<p>[REDACTED] are uncomfortable with the Draft District Plan especially - Flood overlay NH- Ri. Then SASM/5 and SASM/23 re significance to Maori. EW-R1, the SNA's and GRUZ-1 all make our operation to restrictive and lack commonsense.</p>	
<a href="#">91.5</a>	SCHED7 – Schedule of sites and areas of significance to Kati Huirapa	SCHED7D – Wai taoka areas	Unique identifier Site identifier Site Ty	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. [REDACTED] [REDACTED] property is within the [REDACTED]</li> <li>2. At the outset it is emphasised that [REDACTED] is supportive of Kati Huirapa and their involvement in preparing the Draft Plan. It is accepted that further recognition of cultural values in the District Plan is appropriate. At the same time, [REDACTED] is concerned to ensure it can continue to operate and maintain its land in the Timaru District.</li> <li>3. The [REDACTED] overlay extends significantly into existing intensive farmland, including the whole of [REDACTED] [REDACTED] property. [REDACTED] primary concern is that the boundary of the overlay should only apply until the edge of existing farmland. Additionally, it should only include clearly delineated land that exhibits cultural values worthy of recognition by the District Plan.</li> <li>4. The overlay proposes significant restrictions on land use, which are intended to preserve and protect cultural values. [REDACTED] supports the protection of cultural values, but considers that this significant restriction is not appropriate and would have limited utility in what is a highly modified landscape.</li> <li>5. These concerns relate to both the spatial extent of the overlay, which [REDACTED] considers should be limited to areas that not have been significantly modified through intensive farming and other development, and/or ensuring the associated rules do not unreasonably restrict the continuation of lawfully established activities, including a degree of expansion or amendment.</li> </ol>	

				<p>6. [REDACTED] is also eager to ensure that new consenting requirements are not unnecessarily introduced into the District Plan – when in reality, at least in the case of [REDACTED]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ [REDACTED]</li> <li>○ the inclusion of provisions in the District Plan will, in the case of irrigation takes, only duplicate what is already required (for example a requirement to consider the Iwi Management Plan of Kati Huirapa when undertaking activities that might require Regional Council section 13 consents).</li> </ul> <p>7. [REDACTED]</p> <p>8. [REDACTED]</p> <p>9. To put the above another way, the take of water and irrigation/reasonably contemplated farming activities should be able to occur without issue.</p>	
<a href="#">99.12</a>	SCHED7 – Schedule of sites and areas of significance to Kati Huirapa	SCHED7D – Wai taoka areas	SASM23 Rakitata (Rangitata) River (including south branch) The river and its catchme	SASM23 [REDACTED] position is: <i>Oppose in part</i> <i>Comments relating to feedback</i> [REDACTED] supports the inclusion of appropriate overlays to protect sites and areas of significance to Maori, where the rules applying to such overlays are necessary to protect those identified values. [REDACTED] notes though that the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan and National	

			<p>nt are highly significant in cultural tradition. The awa was al</p>	<p><i>Environmental Standards for Freshwater do seek to protect certain values and/or ensure they are properly considered during consent applications.</i></p> <p><i>Some of the area included within SASM23 as drafted includes area that has been farmed (including intensively) for a long time. [REDACTED] is therefore concerned about the level of duplication that arises from the extent of this overlay and/or the rules that apply to SASM23.</i></p> <p><i>Feedback on the provisions</i></p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p>	
<a href="#">119.6</a>	SCHED7 – Schedule of sites and areas of significance to Kati Huirapa	SCHED7D – Wai taoka areas	SASM23 Rakitata (Rangitata) River (including	<p><i>Rather than identifying specific sites and areas, a broad view and area has been identified. This, I believe, overstates significantly the current objective of the stated policies for SASM-P1-8. The area for Wai Taoka includes both river (water) and land. Should this area not be limited to actual waterway? I can understand trying to protect the river by restricting what the neighbouring farming policy is, however this protection is achieved via the consenting and farm environment plans already in place by ECAN.</i></p> <p><i>I also note that the environmental outcomes of the Rangitata river are very good under the protection of ECAN.</i></p> <p><i>Mahika kai is a required section in the farm environment plans required under current consents to farm. I believe this section of the TDC plan is a unnecessary duplication.</i></p>	