



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:

[Stephanie Mercer](#)

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

Click to enter text.

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:

[Owner of section within the allotments zoned Rural Lifestyle within Shaw and Hislop Streets](#)

### 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: [Stephanie Mercer](#)

Date: [3 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: [stephanieamercer@outlook.com](mailto:stephanieamercer@outlook.com)

Telephone: [0278168118](tel:0278168118)

Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the Act): [24 Memorial Avenue, Parkside, Timaru](#)

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)**

Yes    No

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

**Additional template for multiple further submission points**

Name of person making further submission: Stephanie Mercer						
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
Agnes Baekelandt	87.1	Considers that the small allotments along Shaw Street & Hislop Street, are effectively part of the urban precinct of Geraldine, are small scale and have all infrastructural services connected. These are zoned RLZ and across the road from the Medium Density Zone, MRZ. The existing RLZ properties cannot meet the standards of the RLZ.	Support in part	Proximity of allotments to Talbot forest and impact of urban intensification on biodiversity. Intent of the zoning was to retain biodiversity and amenity/character values.	Allow in part	Retain current zoning of Rural Lifestyle Zone; Allow exemption from setback, site coverage and minimum lot size standards only; amend RLS-S8 for these allotments to remove the "no closer than 20m" requirement for distance between tree plantings.
Agnes Baekelandt	87.2	Considers that the standards of the RLZ zone, including RLZ-S1 (height); RLZ-S3 (site coverage); RLZ-S4 (boundary setbacks); RLZ-S5 (boundary treatments); RLZ-S6 (colour reflectance) and RLZ-S8 (Trees) unfairly penalise owners of sites that are effectively within the urban precinct of the Geraldine. Suggests exemption from these standards for sites <2000m2.	Support in part	Proximity of allotments to Talbot forest and impact of urban intensification on biodiversity. Intent of the zoning was to retain biodiversity and environmental amenity/character values. If the allotments are exempt from the standards, especially those relating to planting, there would likely be adverse effects on biodiversity and other environmental amenities. I consider that the standards are not onerous and do not impinge on property ownership rights. As for the setback standards, the original setbacks for the Geraldine Downs Rural Zone 4a of 6m (for frontage) and 3m for other boundaries would be more appropriate for these allotments than the proposed 8m setbacks for all boundaries. Do not support the full exemption from these standards for sites <2000m2. RLZ-S8 requirement for trees to be planted no closer than 20m is not achievable for these small allotments; support exemption or amendment for these allotments from this portion of the standard.	Allow in part	Retain current zoning of Rural Lifestyle Zone; Allow exemption from setback, site coverage and minimum lot size standards only. Retain all other standards but amend RLZ-S8 for these allotments to remove the "no closer than 20m" requirement for distance between tree plantings.
Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Chung	103.1	Oppose the Rural Lifestyle Zone of 2, 4, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street which are small in size, fully serviced, with an urban amenity and are located across the road from the Medium Density Zone (MRZ). The properties are below the minimum site area of 5000 sq metres for new Lots referred to in the RLZ-R2 and are unable to achieve the yard setback required in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. A better graduation of zoning would be achieved to zone the lots subject to this submission as General Residential Zone.	Support in part	I consider that the original setbacks for the Geraldine Downs Rural Zone 4a of 6m (for frontage) and 3m for other boundaries to be more appropriate for these allotments than the proposed 8m setbacks for all boundaries.	Allow in part	Retain current zoning of Rural Lifestyle Zone; amend setback standard to original as in rural zone 4a or provide exemption to these allotments.
Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Chung	103.2	RLZ-S1 Height of buildings and structures Oppose RLZ-S1 as it relates to 2, 4, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street. The standard when applied to these small Lots are overly restrictive and un-necessary within the urban precinct of the Geraldine Community.	Oppose	I consider that retaining this as a matter of discretion is appropriate, particularly given the height limit of 4.5m within 50m of a residential area. Given the proximity of the allotments to Talbot forest there is potential for negative impacts of urban intensification on biodiversity. Intent of the zoning was to retain biodiversity and amenity/character values.	Disallow in full	Retain current standard
Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Chung	103.3	Oppose RLZ-S3 as it relates to 2, 4, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street. The standard when applied to these small Lots are overly restrictive and un-necessary within the urban precinct of the Geraldine Community	Support	I consider that given the relatively small size of the allotments, a coverage of 10% is not achievable for many. Consider exemption should apply for these allotments.	Allow	Provide exemption from this standard for Shaw & Hislop Street allotments
Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Chung	103.4	Oppose RLZ-S4 as it relates to 2, 4, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street. The standard when applied to these small Lots are overly restrictive and un-necessary within the urban precinct of the Geraldine Community. Building setbacks of 8 metres on these small Lots are unrealistic.	Support	I consider that the original setbacks for the Geraldine Downs Rural Zone 4a of 6m (for frontage) and 3m for other boundaries to be more appropriate for these allotments than the proposed 8m setbacks from all boundaries.	Allow	Amend to original standard as in rural zone 4a or provide exemption to these allotments.
Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Chung	103.5	Oppose RLZ-S5 as it relates to 2, 4, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as the standard impinge on property ownership rights with the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township. The properties are small in nature with subdivision consent granted by Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties, not rural residential properties. The standard is therefore an un-necessarily restriction without providing a benefit to the natural rural landscape of the Geraldine Downs. Such controls are inconsistent with other properties in the Geraldine Township.	Oppose	I consider that boundary treatment standard should be retained, as the natural character of the allotments given the proximity to Talbot forest and the recent native afforestation on the Pekapeka Gully track should be preserved.	Disallow in full	Retain current standard

Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Choung	103.6	Oppose RLZ-S6 as it relates to 2, 4, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as the standard impinge on property ownership rights with the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township. The properties are small in nature with subdivision consent granted by Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties, not rural residential properties. The standard is therefore un-necessarily restriction without providing a benefit to the natural rural landscape of the Geraldine Downs. Such controls are inconsistent with other properties in the Geraldine Township.	Oppose	I consider that the reflectivity standard is appropriate given the proximity to Talbot forest and the potential effects of reflective materials on native fauna (such as the Pekapeka bat and native birds).	Disallow in full	Retain current standard.
Joseph John McKenzie and Catherine Bo Choung	103.7	Oppose RLZ-S8 as it relates to 2, 4, 12 Shaw Street and 6 & 6A Hislop Street as the standard impinge on property ownership rights with the urban precinct of the Geraldine Township. The properties are small in nature with subdivision consent granted by Council with the intent of them being developed as residential properties, not rural residential properties. The standard is therefore un-necessarily restriction without providing a benefit to the natural rural landscape of the Geraldine Downs. Such controls are inconsistent with other properties in the Geraldine Township.	Support in part	I consider that the small number of required plantings, and juvenile maturity (2.5m tall) is not an onerous standard and is in keeping with the surrounding landscape of Talbot forest and Pekapeka gully. Additionally, native plantings would support further biodiversity within the area, which is the intent of the standard. Standard RLZ-S8 should however be amended for these allotments to remove the "no closer than 20m" requirement for distance between tree plantings.	Allow in part	Retain current standard but amend for these allotments to remove the "no closer than 20m" requirement for distance between tree plantings.
Malpati Regenvanu	180.1	Considers that properties on Shaw and Hislop Streets, Geraldine are part of the urban precinct of Geraldine, are small scale and have all infrastructural services connected, with an urban amenity including streetlights, kerb and channel etc. Along Shaw Street these RLZ sites are across the road from the Medium Density Zone, MRZ. The MRZ provides for higher density settlement in town centres. A better graduation of zoning would be achieved to zone the lots subject to this submission as General Residential Zone, GRZ. They are not rural residential properties.	Oppose	Proximity of allotments to Talbot forest and impact of urban intensification on biodiversity. Intent of the zoning was to retain biodiversity and amenity/character values.	Disallow in full	Retain current zoning of Rural Lifestyle Zone
Malpati Regenvanu	180.2	Considers that when RLZ is applied to the properties at 2, 4, 6 and 12 Shaw Street and 6 and 6A Hislop Street, none of the relevant zone standards can be met such as setbacks, site coverage and minimum lot size. The lots are too small to be included in this Zone.	Support in part	The setback standards, site coverage and minimum lot size should not apply to the allotments within this zone given their subdivision prior to the proposed district plan. However, other standards should still apply as they are not onerous and do not impinge on property ownership rights, and contribute positively to the natural environment given the proximity to Talbot forest and Pekapeka Gully. Standard RLZ-S8 should be amended for these allotments to remove the "no closer than 20m" requirement for distance between tree plantings.	Allow in part	Allow exemption from setback, site coverage and minimum lot size standards only. Retain all other standards. Standard RLZ-S8 should be amended for these allotments to remove the "no closer than 20m" requirement for distance between tree plantings.
David Walter & Charlotte Marie Hussey	218.1	Opposes the Zoning of properties on Shaw and Hislop Street as Rural Lifestyle Zone. These properties are small and effectively part of the urban precinct of Geraldine and all have infrastructure services connected. Across the road is the MRZ, a better graduation of zoning would be achieved to zone the lots subject to this submission as General Residential Zone. None of the existing lots can meet the RLZ standards	Support in part	Proximity of allotments to Talbot forest and impact of urban intensification on biodiversity. Intent of the zoning was to retain biodiversity and amenity/character values.	Allow in part	Retain current zoning of Rural Lifestyle Zone; Allow exemption from setback, site coverage and minimum lot size standards only. Retain all other standards. Standard RLZ-S8 should be amended for these allotments to remove the "no closer than 20m" requirement for distance between tree plantings.
David Walter & Charlotte Marie Hussey	218.2	Opposes the Zoning of properties on Shaw and Hislop Street as Rural Lifestyle Zone. These properties are small and effectively part of the urban precinct of Geraldine, and all have infrastructure services connected. Across the road is the MRZ, a better graduation of zoning would be achieved to zone the lots subject to this submission as General Residential Zone. None of the existing lots can meet the RLZ standards. Suggests exemption for sites <2000m2	Support in part	Proximity of allotments to Talbot forest and impact of urban intensification on biodiversity. Intent of the zoning was to retain biodiversity and environmental amenity/character values. If the allotments are exempt from the standards, especially those relating to planting, there would likely be adverse effects on biodiversity and other environmental amenities. I consider that the standards are not onerous and do not impinge on property ownership rights. As for the setback standards, the original setbacks for the Geraldine Downs Rural Zone 4a of 6m (for frontage) and 3m for other boundaries would be more appropriate for these allotments than the proposed 8m setbacks for all boundaries. Do not support the full exemption from standards of sites <2000m2. Standard RLZ-S8 should be amended for these allotments to remove the "no closer than 20m" requirement for distance between tree plantings.	Allow in part	Retain current zoning of Rural Lifestyle Zone; Allow exemption from setback, site coverage and minimum lot size standards only. Retain all other standards. Standard RLZ-S8 should be amended for these allotments to remove the "no closer than 20m" requirement for distance between tree plantings.

John McKenzie	10.1	The small allotments along Shaw Street & Hislop Street, are effectively part of the urban precinct of Geraldine, are small scale and have all infrastructural services connected. These are zoned RLZ and across the road from the Medium Density Zone, MRZ. The existing RLZ properties cannot meet the standards of the RLZ.	Support in part	Proximity of allotments to Talbot forest and impact of urban intensification on biodiversity. Intent of the zoning was to retain biodiversity and environmental amenity/character values. If the allotments are exempt from the standards, especially those relating to planting, there would likely be adverse effects on biodiversity and other environmental amenities. I consider that the standards are not onerous and do not impinge on property ownership rights. As for the setback standards, the original setbacks for the Geraldine Downs Rural Zone 4a of 6m (for frontage) and 3m for other boundaries would be more appropriate for these allotments than the proposed 8m setbacks for all boundaries. Standard RLZ-S8 should be amended for these allotments to remove the "no closer than 20m" requirement for distance between tree plantings.	Allow in part	Retain current zoning of Rural Lifestyle Zone; Allow exemption from setback, site coverage and minimum lot size standards only. Retain all other standards. Standard RLZ-S8 should be amended for these allotments to remove the "no closer than 20m" requirement for distance between tree plantings.
John McKenzie	10.2	Considers that standards of the RLZ zone, including RLZ-S1 (height); RLZ-S3 (site coverage); RLZ-S4 (boundary setbacks); RLZ—S5 (boundary treatments); RLZ-S6 (colour reflectance) and RLZ-S8 (Trees) are unfairly penalises owners of sites that are effectively within the urban precinct of the Geraldine. Suggests exemption for sites <2000m2.	Support in part	Proximity of allotments to Talbot forest and impact of urban intensification on biodiversity. Intent of the zoning was to retain biodiversity and environmental amenity/character values. If the allotments are exempt from the standards, especially those relating to planting, there would likely be adverse effects on biodiversity and other environmental amenities. I consider that the standards are not onerous and do not impinge on property ownership rights. As for the setback standards, the original setbacks for the Geraldine Downs Rural Zone 4a of 6m (for frontage) and 3m for other boundaries would be more appropriate for these allotments than the proposed 8m setbacks for all boundaries. Do not support full exemption from all standards for sites <2000m2. Standard RLZ-S8 should be amended for these allotments to remove the "no closer than 20m" requirement for distance between tree plantings.	Allow in part	Retain current zoning of Rural Lifestyle Zone; Allow exemption from setback, site coverage and minimum lot size standards only. Retain all other standards. Standard RLZ-S8 should be amended for these allotments to remove the "no closer than 20m" requirement for distance between tree plantings.