



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:

Sid McAuley

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 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:

I will be directly affected by the proposed rules in the Proposed Timaru District Plan because I own and operate a private aircraft, including from my own property within the Timaru District.

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: Sid McAuley Date: 4/08/2023

(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: sid@coolpak.co.nz and philip.maw@wynnwilliams.co.nz

Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the Act):

126 Hilton Highway Washdyke Timaru, New Zealand 7910 Washdyke 7910

Contact person: *[name and designation, if applicable]:* __Sid McAuley_____

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 - Service will be completed within 5 working days after this submissions is served on the Timaru District Council

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

Additional template for multiple further submission points

Name of person making further submission: Sid McAuley - Submission Reference Number #57						
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
Ian Sinclair	39.1	Considers an additional class of operations on private airstrips in the GRUZ should be permitted to allow for recreation, gatherings of pilots and aircraft. This would preserve the existing use of aircraft owners currently enjoy. There is no adverse effects compared to normal farming activities and there is no existing issue with such activities.	Support	We have never received a complaint about aircraft landing or taking off on our property. We agree there are no adverse effects from recreational or private aircraft use compared to aircraft use for farming activities. There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites.	Allow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.
John Evans	45.1	Oppose GRUZ-R14 PER-3 which imposes a limit of 10 take-offs and landings per month. This is overly restrictive and limits existing use rights. Aviation and private airstrips have been operating for 75 years and have not created an issue, and the noise duration is such that impacts are low compared to other permitted uses.	Support	We have never received a complaint about aircraft landing or taking off on our property. There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites.	Allow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.
Helicopters South Canterbury 2015 Ltd	53.25	Deletion of PER2 and PER3 from GRUZ-14 as the rules are overly restrictive and are not supported or justified in the section 32 Report. Private airstrips are often used for flight training purposes, through the consent of landowners. These environments offer better instructional value for certain aspects of training versus established airports. PER-3 will limit the ability of pilots to receive adequate training within our district.	Support in part	PER2 and PER3 of GRUZ-14 are overly restrictive and are not supported or justified by the section 32 report. The limitation of 10 take-offs and landings per month interferes with practicing take-off and landings to keep current and pilot training. It is important there are no limitations on the number of take-offs and landings to ensure pilot safety and ensure pilots are able to sufficiently practice take-offs and landings in the rural environment. Requiring a resource consent for such activities would have an adverse effect on pilot and aircraft safety.	Allow in part	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.
Louise Aubrey	59.1	Considers the limit of 10 take-offs and landings per month is overly restrictive and excessively limits the existing use and rights of aviators operating aircraft on private airstrips. This will make recreation, business, training and social gatherings such as fly-ins virtually unachievable which will have a detrimental impact on businesses, recreation opportunities and mental health of residents.	Support	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites. Restricting take-off and landings to 10 per month would have adverse effects on businesses, recreation opportunities and mental health persons in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.	Allow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.

Station Air Ltd	61.1	Considers the limit of only 10 take-offs per month is overly restrictive and heavily hinders the abilities of aviators, aviation clubs and business owners to continue their activities.	Support	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites. Restricting take-off and landings to 10 per month would have adverse effects on businesses, recreation opportunities and mental health persons in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.	Allow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.
Simon Pemberton	64.1	Considers that the proposal to limit takeoffs and landings to ten per month would be restrictive and would excessively limit the use, and the right to use private airstrips for recreation, business, primary production requirements and emergency purposes.	Support	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites. Restricting take-off and landings to 10 per month would have adverse effects on businesses, recreation opportunities and mental health persons in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.	Allow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.
Jeremy Talbot	79.1	Oppose GRUZ-R14 as it is too restrictive on owners of small light aircraft on a small property which are used for a range of activities including flight training, farming, transportation and social events. As the operation of small flights is largely weather dependent, owners tend to make the most of them on a fly day (e.g., 26 were seen on a small airstrip on a fly day). Considers the 500m from any boundary is unworkable either due to constraints on space, or practically with the strip needing to be placed in to the prevailing wind.	Support	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites. Restricting take-off and landings to 10 per month would have adverse effects on businesses, recreation opportunities and mental health persons in the district that undertake or rely on these activities. In addition, it does not take into account take-offs and landings are weather dependant. The limitation of 10 take-offs and landings per month interferes with practicing take-off and landings to keep current and pilot training. It is important there are no limitations on the number of take-offs and landings to ensure pilot safety and ensure pilots are able to sufficiently practice take-offs and landings in the rural environment. Requiring a resource consent for such activities would have an adverse effect on pilot and aircraft safety.	Allow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.
Ballance AgriNutrients Limited	86.13	Opposes this overly restrictive rule as it conflicts with GRUZ03 - Protecting Primary Production, and to prevent significant unintended negative impacts on agricultural production in the Timaru District and the subsequent economic and social aspirations of the district and region. Considers restrictions on the number of days a rural airstrip can be used over a certain period does not take into account delays associated with inclement weather, the use of one airstrip for more than one farm, the number of take offs and landings typically required in one hour of operation, or one day. The rule does not consider the use of airstrips for a range of different activities, which need to take place at different times of the year	Support in part	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites. Restricting take-off and landings to 10 per month would have adverse effects on businesses, recreation opportunities and mental health persons in the district that undertake or rely on these activities. In addition, it does not take into account take-offs and landings are weather dependant.	Allow in part	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.
Judith Margaret Coldicott	118.1	Oppose the restriction in GRU-R14.PER-3 which limits the number of aircraft movements on private land. Considers private flying, flight training, and associated aviation on private land have been part of Timaru's history and helped to build the country. Considers the rule is an attempt to resolve a perceived problem, where one does not exist.	Support in part	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites. Restricting take-off and landings to 10 per month would have adverse effects on businesses, recreation opportunities and mental health persons in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.	Allow in part	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.

				The limitation of 10 take-offs and landings per month interferes with practicing take-off and landings to keep current and pilot training. It is important there are no limitations on the number of take-offs and landings to ensure pilot safety and ensure pilots are able to sufficiently practice take-offs and landings in the rural environment. Requiring a resource consent for such activities would have an adverse effect on pilot and aircraft safety.		
Russell Kenneth Brodie	125.1	Oppose GRUZ-R14.P3 that limits aircraft or helicopter movements on private land within the district.	Support	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites. Restricting take-off and landings to 10 per month would have adverse effects on businesses, recreation opportunities and mental health persons in the district that undertake or rely on these activities. The limitation of 10 take-offs and landings per month interferes with practicing take-off and landings to keep current and pilot training. It is important there are no limitations on the number of take-offs and landings to ensure pilot safety and ensure pilots are able to sufficiently practice take-offs and landings in the rural environment. Requiring a resource consent for such activities would have an adverse effect on pilot and aircraft safety.	Allow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.
Fire and Emergency New Zealand	131.38	Support GRUZ-R14 as it allows for flights for emergency purposes as a permitted activity.	Support in part	I agree that flights for emergency purposes should always be allowed to occur as a permitted activity for the health and safety of the District.	Allow in part	Retain GRUZ-R14 – PER-1 as notified.
New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association	132.31	Opposes the overly complex rule GRUZ-R14 which includes unduly restrictive setbacks which are not supported or justified by the s32 Report. Rule should be more enabling.	Support in part	PER2 and PER3 of GRUZ-14 are overly restrictive and are not supported or justified by the section 32 report. There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites. Restricting take-off and landings to 10 per month would have adverse effects on businesses, recreation opportunities and mental health persons in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.	Allow in part	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.
Rooney Holdings Limited	174.85	Supports the provisions of the rule for primary production.	Oppose	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites including in association with primary production activities. Restricting take-off and landings in relation to primary production would have adverse effects on rural communities in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.	Disallow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.
Federated Farmers	182.20 1	Oppose GRUZ-R14. Supports the submission by the New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association to delete PER-1 and PER- 2 and replace with alternative wording. The definition needs to support the permitted activity defined in the rule. Support of PER-3.	Support in part	I agree that flights for emergency purposes should always be allowed to occur as a permitted activity for the health and safety of the District. In respect of takes and landings for other purposes there is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites. Restricting take-off and landings to 10 per month would have adverse effects on businesses, recreation opportunities and mental health persons in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.	Allow in part	Retain PER-1 GRUZ-R14 as notified. Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.

GJH Rooney	191.85	Supports the provisions of the rule for primary production	Oppose	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites including in association with primary production activities. Restricting take-off and landings in relation to primary production would have adverse effects on rural communities in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.	Disallow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.
Cessna 180/185 Group, Aircraft Owners and Pilots Association, Sports Aircraft Association, Recreational Backcountry Pilots Association	201.1	The submitter considers that aircraft landings in rural areas have minimal effect on conservation, landscape or wilderness values in those areas where fixed-winged aircraft can be landed. Noise effects are already adequately managed in the current District Plan, as mentioned by the Stage 2 Noise and Vibration report by Malcolm Hunt and Associates (Page 14), which states: Overall however, the existing district plans are considered a sufficient deterrent. [...] no significant changes to the overall approach to land use controls in aircraft noise affected areas are considered necessary. Rule GRUZ-R14 is unnecessarily onerous and unduly penalises recreational aircraft owners. It provides arbitrary rules which are not correlated to noise effects. The necessity of this rule is questionable. Oppose to PER-2.2.b as it should allow private airstrip owners to use their airstrip at any time and under any circumstances if the airstrip is located nearby a noise sensitive activity owned/occupied by the airstrip or helicopter landing site operator. Oppose to PER-3, especially the 10 trip per month restriction which are not based on fact.	Support in part	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites, including in association with primary production activities. Restricting take-off and landings to 10 per month would have adverse effects on businesses, the rural community, recreation opportunities and mental health persons in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.	Allow in part	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.
Horticulture New Zealand	245.11 7	Considers the use of aircraft for primary production should be provided as a permitted activity. There is no justification in the s32 Report for the proposed setbacks and time limits and would sterilise use of rural production land.	Support	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites including in association with primary production activities. Restricting take-off and landings in relation to primary production would have adverse effects on rural communities in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.	Allow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements.
Rooney Group Limited	249.85	Supports the provisions of the rule for primary production.	Oppose	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites including in association with primary production activities. Restricting take-off and landings in relation to primary production would have adverse effects on rural communities in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.	Disallow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements
Rooney Farms Limited	250.85	Supports the provisions of the rule for primary production.	Oppose	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites including in association with primary production activities. Restricting take-off and landings in relation to primary production would have adverse	Disallow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements

				effects on rural communities in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.		
Rooney Earthmoving Limited	251.85	Supports the provisions of the rule for primary production.	Oppose	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites including in association with primary production activities. Restricting take-off and landings in relation to primary production would have adverse effects on rural communities in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.	Disallow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements
Timaru Developments Limited	252.85	Supports the provisions of the rule for primary production.	Oppose	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites including in association with primary production activities. Restricting take-off and landings in relation to primary production would have adverse effects on rural communities in the district that undertake or rely on these activities.	Disallow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements
Grant Coldicott	254.1	Oppose the restriction in GRU-R14.PER-3 which limits the number of aircraft movements on private land. Considers private flying, flight training, and associated aviation on private land have been part of Timaru's history and the submitter's recreational aircraft operation generates insignificant effects and often not noticed by close neighbours. Considers the restriction are unnecessary with no public benefit.	Support	There is a very low impact on surrounding activities from the take-off and landing on airstrips and helicopter landing sites. Restricting take-off and landings to 10 per month would have adverse effects on businesses, recreation opportunities and mental health persons in the district that undertake or rely on these activities. The limitation of 10 take-offs and landings per month interferes with practicing take-off and landings to keep current and pilot training. It is important there are no limitations on the number of take-offs and landings to ensure pilot safety and ensure pilots are able to sufficiently practice take-offs and landings in the rural environment. Requiring a resource consent for such activities would have an adverse effect on pilot and aircraft safety.	Allow	Amend GRUZ-R14 as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deletion of PER2 and PER3; or • Amend PER2 and PER3 to allow for unrestricted movements