



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:

Dr William Blair Rhodes ROLLESTON

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

South Pacific Sera Limited, Dr William Rolleston

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:

As a significant local employer, ongoing business is affected by council's plans

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: Dr William Blair Rhodes ROLLESTON

Date: 2023-08-04

(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:

william.rolleston@southpacificsera.co.nz

Telephone: 03 687 4050

Postal address (or alternative method of service under section 352 of the Act): PO Box 2117
Washdyke, Timaru 7941

Contact person: *[name and designation, if applicable]*: Dr William Rolleston

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: Dr William Blair Rhodes ROLLESTON (South Pacific Sera Limited) | This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: Enter the name of the original submitter as per the SoDR. E.g. Timaru District Council | The particular parts of the original submission I/we support /oppose are: | My/our position on the original submission is: Support or oppose | 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 | Submitter | Submission |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|-----------|------------|
| Timaru District Council | 42.46 | Timaru District Council | Oppose | Amount of land consumed by the setbacks from non-rural zones or to residential units or principal buildings is excessive. Oppose - a 30m separation distance from non-residential OZS or SARZ zones does not make sense. There is not a significant risk. Fire could also affect other built up areas other than residential. | Disallow in full | Retain as notified. | 42 | 46 |
| Milward Finlay Lobb | 60.21 | Milward Finlay Lobb | Support | Opposes clause 2 as the required 20m sealing width is considered excessive. | Allow in full | Amend TRAN-S10 Vehicle access way requirements as follows: 1. Vehicle access way must meet the requirements outlined in Table 15 - Vehicle access way requirements, measured in accordance with Figure 14 in TRAN-S13. 2. Where a vehicle access way is provided in Rural Lifestyle zone, Settlement zone, Māori Purpose or General rural zone, then the vehicle access way must be formed, sealed and drained for at least the first 20m from the road boundary. Vehicle access way in other zones must be formed, sealed and drained for their entire length. 3. Where any site fronting a Primary Road (National Route, Regional Arterial, District Arterial or Principal Road) also has frontage to a Secondary Road (Collector or Local Road or a Service Lane), all vehicle access way to the site (providing for either ingress or egress) must be provided to the Secondary Road. 4. When a vehicle access way is provided in the Residential Zones, where two-way access (5.5m formed width or greater) is not provided, a passing bay is required at the boundary, and thereafter at a minimum interval of every 50m. A passing bay should have a minimum width of 5.5m and length 7m with 45-degree tapers. Table 15 [-] | 60 | 21 |
| Milward Finlay Lobb | 60.44 | Milward Finlay Lobb | Support | Considers the rule as drafted is unclear on existing use rights. | Allow in full | Amend GRUZ-R21 Rural Industry as follows: Activity status: Restricted Discretionary Where: RDIS-1 The activity is not an offensive trade and existing use rights apply for all Rural Industry established prior to the District Plan being fully operative. Matters of discretion are restricted to: [-] | 60 | 44 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.1 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Oppose | SPS opposes including the proposed definition of agricultural aviation and especially opposes the combining of manned and unmanned aircraft in the same definition. The colloquial name for unmanned aircraft is 'drones'. There is already a definition of agricultural aircraft operation in the CAA rules. This submission should be read in conjunction with the CAA Rules, especially Parts 1, 101, 102 and 137 as these provide relevant definitions and operating rules for aircraft, manned and unmanned. SPS opposes the creation of duplication of rules for aircraft as this type of rulemaking conflicts the powers of the CAA. CAA rules make clear that drones operating under part 101 must remain 4km from airstrips and heliports. Drones operating under part 102 have similar limitations to keep them away from airstrips and heliports. This separation of manned and unmanned aircraft is fundamental to the safety of all aircraft. On this basis relief from the proposed inclusion of drones with manned aircraft is sort. There are many uses of unmanned aircraft that occur in the rural zone that are not captured by the proposed definition of agricultural aviation, or the proposed refined definition of conservation activities (refer submission 132.3), or are excluded supporting activities to primary production in the rural zone. For example unmanned aircraft are used for mapping, surveying, inspection, construction, media creation (filming) all of which are excluded in the proposed definition. In addition, the proposed definition excludes supporting service/testing of the aircraft which would create a requirement to move the aircraft on the ground to a non-rural location, to test it after servicing. This would add significant costs to any aircraft's operation; more so for manned aircraft. The proposed definition includes a requirement for unmanned aircraft to operate from a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area. CAA rules forbid a drone operating within 4km of an airstrip or heliport. The proposed rule, by combining drones with manned aircraft conflicts with CAA rules. Additionally CAA rules require drones to be operated in the line of sight of it's pilot-in-command (pilot). In effect, the CAA rule requires that the take-off and landing locations of the unmanned aircraft need to be at the point that it will be operating. Requiring a unmanned aircraft to use a rural airstrip or helicopter landing area would effectively make unmanned aircraft operation almost impossible in the rural zone as the airstrip or heliport would have to be next to the point of operation. SPS proposes that if there is a need to exclude objectionable aviation activities in the rural area, that the proposed plan defines these activities explicitly, as otherwise all other potential activities are captured. Given the evolving development of the uses of unmanned aircraft, a regulatory strategy that seeks to define all acceptable uses will impose a undue burden. | Disallow in full | Do not include a definition of agricultural aviation. Do not regulate manned and unmanned aircraft as the same types of transportation systems as CAA rules for them are fundamentally different. | 132 | 1 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.2 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Oppose | There are already definitions of aircraft in the CAA rules. This is unnecessary duplication. The proposed definition (and the RMA) also inappropriately combines manned and unmanned aircraft. Unmanned aircraft are operated in different ways to manned aircraft and the combination of the two under one definition presents an undue burden to unmanned aircraft when used under the proposed rules. The burden is the forced use of airstrips and landing zones when this conflicts with the CAA's requirements for line of sight operations. SPS opposes the use of mass as a measure to differentiate between manned and unmanned aircraft. The measure is inappropriate as it is arbitrary and does not relate to the characteristics that relate to the employment of the aircraft, as it is now. SPS supports the CAA defining the rules for aircraft so there is consistency nationally. | Disallow in full | Do not include a definition of aircraft in the definitions. | 132 | 2 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.3 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | Requests a new definition of "conservation activity" is added to reflect a broader range of conservation activities. The scope of PDP definition of "Department of Conservation activity" is too narrow and does not adequately address the full range of conservation activities including weed and pest control for biosecurity and biodiversity activities. Rather than explicitly include the use of aircraft, include all means of transportation instead. This avoids a truck being excluded. | Allow in part | Add a new definition as follows: Conservation activity means the use of land or buildings or means of transportation for any activity undertaken for the purposes of protecting and/or enhancing the natural, historic and/or ecological values of a natural or historic resource. It includes ancillary activities which assist to enhance the public's appreciation and recreational enjoyment of the resource, including weed and pest control and the intermittent use of aircraft for conservation purposes. | 132 | 3 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.4 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Oppose | The definition of a day for aircraft is already defined in Part 1 of the CAA Rules. This definition will apply to any aircraft operating. There is no need to include the definition here as it is unnecessary duplication of regulation. Including a definition here just creates the opportunity for conflicting regulations. | Disallow in full | Do not add a definition of day. | 132 | 4 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.5 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Oppose | A definition of Heliport exists in Part 1 of the CAA Rules. Inclusion of a definition for Helicopter Landing Area, the equivalent of a heliport, is unnecessary duplication of regulations, it just creates the opportunity for conflicting regulations. The implied requirement for unmanned aircraft to use Helicopter Landing Areas is a significantly overly burdensome approach. CAA Rule 139 describes the requirements for Heliports - unmanned vehicles do not require this level of infrastructure to fly. It is important to distinguish that an unmanned aircraft, if restricted to using defined heliports or runways (rural airstrip) would be unable to operate as they need to operate in the pilots line of sight. If the intended work area is far from the landing area the unmanned vehicle would not be able to operate at all. Unmanned aircraft need to be flown in sight of the operator, so they need to take off and land next to where they are to operate. | Disallow in full | Do not add a definition for Helicopter landing area. | 132 | 5 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.6 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | South Pacific Sera Limited (SPS) supports the definition of improved pasture as defined in the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPSFM 2020) | Allow in full | Retain the definition | 132 | 6 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.7 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS is neutral on the definition of Plantation Forestry. Where agricultural aviation activities is not defined, the existing definition does not need changing. | Disallow in full | Retain the existing definition. | 132 | 7 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.8 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS supports the definition of Primary Production that is consistent with the NPS definition | Allow in full | Retain the existing definition | 132 | 8 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.9 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | The definition of a "Rural Airstrip", does not account for the CAA rules that require unmanned aircraft to take off and land under in sight of their pilot, which means they need to take off and land near where they work and not at a rural airstrip. Regulating unmanned aircraft as manned helicopters or fixed wing aircraft, would create a significantly onerous rule. Provide relief by not making a definition. The creation of a definition is duplication of CAA Rules. A definition of Heliport exists in Part 1 of the CAA Rules. Inclusion of a definition for Helicopter Landing Area, the equivalent of a heliport, is unnecessary duplication of regulations, it just creates the opportunity for conflicting regulations. The implied requirement for unmanned aircraft to use Helicopter Landing Areas is a significantly overly burdensome approach. CAA Rule 139-8 describes the requirements for Heliports - unmanned vehicles do not require this level of infrastructure to fly. It is important to distinguish that an unmanned aircraft, if restricted to using defined heliports or runways (rural airstrip) would be unable to operate as they need to operate in the pilots line of sight. If the intended work area is far from the landing area the unmanned vehicle would not be able to operate at all. Unmanned aircraft need to be flown in sight of the operator, so they need to take off and land next to where they are to operate. | Disallow in full | Add new definitions as follows: Rural airstrip means any defined area of land intended or designed to be used, whether wholly or partly, for the landing, departure, movement, or servicing of manned aircraft in the rural area. | 132 | 9 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|---|---------|---|---------------|--|-----|----|
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.10 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | This is supported in part as unmanned aircraft may be used for aviation operations that use hazardous substances, for example the application of herbicide for wilding pine eradication. The proposed definition is extended to include the use of hazardous substances for both agricultural and conservation operations. The definition of hazardous facility is relevant to HS-R1. The mixing and application of hazardous substances for pest control should not be limited to 'the site' as defined in the plan. Mixing may occur at a mixing point but application is on land other than 'the site'. Land based primary production is not defined in the Plan but 'primary production' is. Clause 3 should refer to 'primary production' and the new definition of 'conservation activity'. Also 'which are not located in a drinking water' Agrichemicals should be stored in accordance with NZS8409:2021 to ensure that they are safely stored. | Allow in part | Amend the definition of Hazardous Facility as follows means a facility or activity that involves the use, storage or disposal of any hazardous substance, but excludes: [...] 3. the incidental storage and use of agrichemicals, fertilisers and fuel for land based primary production activities and the incidental storage of agrichemicals, fertilisers and fuel for land based primary production or conservation activities which are not located in a drinking water; [...] 8. mixing and application of hazardous substances solely for the purpose of controlling plant and animal pests on site. | 132 | 10 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.11 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS supports strategies (SD-O2) that recognise, protect and enhance indigenous vegetation and native flora and fauna | Allow in full | Retain the strategy (SD-O2) | 132 | 11 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.12 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS supports the modification of SD-O9 to ensure strategies that enable primary production, protect versatile soils, and manage reverse sensitivities. However, clause ii) refers to 'intensive activities' which isn't defined so it is unclear what it refers to. The focus should be on ensuring that sensitive activities don't affect primary production. Clause iii) seeks to manage 'new sensitive activities'. The plan should ensure that sensitive activities do not adversely affect primary production, including reverse sensitivity effects. | Allow in full | Amend SD-O9 as follows: SD-O9 Rural Areas A range of primary primary productive activities are enabled in the rural environment to enable the ongoing use of land for primary production for present and future generations, while: i) protecting versatile soils for productive uses; ii) managing the adverse effects of intensive activities on sensitive activities; iii) managing the adverse effects of new sensitive activities ensuring that sensitive activities do not adversely affect on primary production, including reverse sensitivity effects ; [...] | 132 | 12 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.13 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS considers that the definition of hazardous facility needs to be amended to ensure that agrichemicals and fertilisers are able to be used as a permitted activity within the 'sensitive environments' as defined in the Plan. It is important that weed and pest control can occur within these areas. | Allow in full | No specific relief sought for HS-R1. AND Amend the definition of 'hazardous facility' as sought in SPS's support of submission 132.10. | 132 | 13 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.14 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS supports objective ECO-O2, that seeks to maintain and enhance indigenous biodiversity. | Allow in full | Retain as notified. | 132 | 14 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.15 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS supports policy ECO-R1, that provides for the management of pest plants and pest animals to enhance biodiversity values. | Allow in full | Retain as notified. | 132 | 15 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.16 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS supports the protection of indigenous biodiversity but the policy should provide for weed and pest control to maintain biodiversity values (ECO-P3). | Allow in full | Amend ECO-P3 as follows: ECO-P3 Protection of indigenous biodiversity in sensitive areas Protect indigenous biodiversity by providing for weed and pest control to maintain and enhance biodiversity and, by managing the clearance of indigenous vegetation in the following sensitive areas: 1. riparian areas, wetlands and springs; and 2. coastal areas; and 3. areas at higher altitude; and 4. areas on steep slopes. | 132 | 16 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.17 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS supports ECO-R1[1] that allows for the clearance of indigenous vegetation for biosecurity purposes and the removal of pest plants and animals. It is noted that clearance of native vegetation is a permitted activity below 900 m and slope is less than 30 degrees. SPS supports ECO-R1[2] that allows for the clearance of indigenous vegetation for biosecurity purposes, the removal of pest plants and animals, grown up under plantation forestry or within an area of improved pasture. | Allow in full | Retain as notified. | 132 | 17 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.18 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS supports noise effects being compatible with the zone as appropriate but it needs to be recognised that the rural zone is not a 'quiet' area. Unmanned aircraft produce noise, although typically less than manned aircraft due to being, typically, smaller in size. | Allow in full | Amend NOISE-O1 to ensure that the rural zones are not described as 'quiet' and that noise associated with primary production activities is anticipated. | 132 | 18 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.19 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | Primary production activities, and activities in support of primary production, plus conservation activities in the Rural and Open Space Zones should not be constrained by reverse sensitivity effects arising from noise sensitive activities. Relief is sort to address these points by including conservation activities and the open space zone in the definition. Adding "associated activities" to primary production, provides for activities needed to enable primary production. Slight modification of text made for clarity, by adding commas. | Allow in part | Amend NOISE-O2 as follows: NOISE-O2 Reverse sensitivity The Airport, Raceway, State Highway, railway lines and the Port and activities located within commercial mixed use and industrial zones, or conservation or primary production and associated activities, in open space or rural zones, are not constrained by reverse sensitivity effects, arising from noise sensitive activities. | 132 | 19 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.20 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | Considers noise effects being compatible with the zone is appropriate but it needs to be recognised in the description of the rural zone that it is not a 'quiet' area. (NOISE-P1) | Allow in full | Amend NOISE-P1 to ensure that the rural zones are not described as 'quiet' and that noise associated with primary production activities is anticipated. | 132 | 20 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.21 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | Considers that reverse sensitivity effects are not limited to the 'higher noise environments' listed in the policy. Noise sensitive activities should also be managed in or near rural zones to ensure that reverse sensitivity effects on primary production are avoided. For example, new residential development on the fringe of residential zoned should be designed to tolerate existing land use, through appropriate mitigations in their design. | Allow in part | In support of the original proposal to amend NOISE-P5 to "include a specific policy for reverse sensitivity from noise sensitive activities in rural zones.", it is suggested that this is implemented by rural zones being included in the list of higher noise environments by modifying point 2: [...] "2. Residential zones in close proximity to any Rural Zone, General industrial zone and areas within the Port Noise Outer Control Boundary and within | 132 | 21 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.22 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS supports the extension of allowing manned aircraft to operate in the open space zone. SPS does not support the regulation of unmanned aircraft under the same rules as manned aircraft. The CAA differentiates between manned and unmanned aircraft (drones) as they are distinctly different. The vast majority of drones are operated by uncertificated pilots flying smaller drones. Uncertificated unmanned aircraft pilots, fly under CAA part 101 rules which almost entirely prohibits them from flying outdoors at night, or over people or land that they do not have permission to fly over. Additionally, small drones when high enough cannot be heard. This mitigates the vast majority of the noise risk. inherently. Rules for drone noise are not yet established internationally. For example, EU only put out for public consultation in October 2022 a proposal for how to measure drone noise. (https://www.easa.europa.eu/en/newsroom-and-events/press-releases/easa-publishes-first-guidelines-noise-level-measurements-drones). It is proposed that until there is regulatory certainty from the CAA regarding classification of drones for noise level, regulation in the district plan be deferred. This will ensure that the district retains the economic benefits of drone use and development. | Allow in part | Amend NOISE-R1 as follows: NOISE-R1 Activities generating noise [...] Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 NOISE-S1 is complied with; and PER-2 NOISE-S2 is complied with. This rule does not apply to noise generated by: [...] 5. Manned aircraft using airstrips and helicopter landing sites for activities in, either the rural zone that complies with GRUZ-R14, or the open space zone; and 10. Aircraft using airstrips and helicopter landing sites for activities in the Natural Open Space zone that complies with NOSZ (rule numbering to be determined); [...] AND 2. Add new definitions of "helicopter landing area", "rural airstrip" and "UAV Landing Area"; 11. The operation of unmanned aircraft (drones) in any zone. | 132 | 22 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.23 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS considers it important to ensure that the description of the rural zone describes it as a noisy environment. Noise in the rural zone is from primary production and associated activities. Sensitive activities locating in a rural zone should not be anticipating a higher level of amenity in a working rural production environment. This is inconsistent with GRUZ-O3 which seeks to protect primary production from sensitive activities. | Allow in full | Amend GRUZ-O2 as follows: GRUZ-O2 Character and qualities of the General Rural Zone The character and qualities of the General Rural Zone comprise: 1. large allotments with large areas of open space; and 2. a working environment of mostly utilitarian buildings and structures where primary production and associated activities generates noise, odour, light overspill and traffic, often on a cyclic and seasonal basis; and 3. higher levels of amenity immediately around sensitive activities and zone boundaries; and 4. vegetation, pasture, crops and forestry and livestock across a range of landscapes. | 132 | 23 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.24 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | Supports recognising the importance of primary production (and rural industry) and its long-term protection but should be clear that it is reverse sensitivity effects from sensitive activities that it is protected from. | Allow in full | Amend GRUZ-O3 as follows: GRUZ-O3 Protecting primary production The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General rural zone, and primary production is protected from reverse sensitivity effects and sensitive activities. | 132 | 24 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.25 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | GRUZ-O4 refers to 'intensive activities' which isn't defined so it is unclear what it refers to. The focus should be on ensuring that sensitive activities don't affect primary production and it's associated activities. Sensitive activities locating in, or on land close to, rural zones should recognise that they are locating in or close to a working rural production environment so 'protecting' their amenity is inappropriate. It is unclear what 'land close to' residential, rural settlement, Māori purpose and Open space zones would be. Management of the boundary interface should be through mitigations in the design of the newly developed area, as described in GRUZ-P5. | Allow in part | 1. Delete GRUZ-O4 OR 2. Amend GRUZ-O4 as follows: GRUZ-O4 Protecting sensitive activities and sensitive zones Intensive primary production, mining, quarrying and other intensive activities generates no or minimal adverse effects on sensitive activities; and 2. Land close to Residential, Rural settlement, Māori Purpose and Open space zones. Sensitive activities locating in the General Rural Zone or in land close to it, anticipate effects that are generated by primary production and supporting activities and mitigate those impacts. | 132 | 25 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.26 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | Supports the enabling of primary production activities but seeks to have vehicular use acknowledged as part of the rural character, as opposed specifically to agricultural aviation. This broader definition fits with many common sources of noise in the rural environment | Allow in part | Amend GRUZ-P1 as follows: GRUZ-P1 Primary production activities Enable a range of primary production and associated activities, where they: 1. allow for the ongoing productive use of land for present and future generations; or 2. maintain the character and qualities of the General Rural Zone; and 3. meet the standards and requirements to minimise avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on sensitive activities and the environment. 4. enabling a range of compatible activities that support primary production activities, including ancillary activities, and agricultural aviation vehicle use. | 132 | 26 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|--------|---|---------|--|------------------|---|-----|----|
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.27 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | Supports the separation distances in GRUZ-P2. | Allow in full | Retain GRUZ-P2 | 132 | 27 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.28 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS supports the protection for primary production activities from reverse sensitivity effects through the policy, GRUZ-P5. | Allow in full | Retain the policy | 132 | 28 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.29 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS supports GRUZ-P10 insofar as it provides for conservation activities in the General Rural Zone but seeks to ensure that the definition of conservation activities is amended as outlined earlier. | Allow in full | Retain as notified AND Amend the definition of 'department of conservation activity' as sought earlier. | 132 | 29 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.30 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | GRUZ-R10 should make provision for all forms of equipment and means of transportation used for weed and pest control. The broader definition allows trucks and aircraft, manned and unmanned; being specific is unnecessary. | Allow in part | Amend GRUZ-R10 as follows: GRUZ-R10 Conservation activities Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 Land, buildings and structures and equipment, machinery, vehicles and aircraft means of transport are used for: 1. preservation, protection, restoration, promulgation or enhancement of indigenous species or habitats of indigenous fauna; or 2. Weed and pest control; or 3. conservation education; or 4. observation or surveying; or 5. walking tracks, board walks, pedestrian bridge. Note: any associated building and structure must be constructed in accordance with GRUZ-R13. | 132 | 30 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.31 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS does not support a definition of agricultural aviation in the district plan. The amended GRUZ-14 rule would, via that definition, inappropriately include drones under this rule which is in complete opposition to CAA rules that require drones to stay 4km from airstrips and heliports. SPS seeks relief in the plan, in alignment with CAA rules, to ensure that any rules relating to the use of manned aircraft or landing strips or heliports do not relate to the operation of unmanned aircraft. Addition of a note is proposed for rules MPZ-R21, GRUZ-R14, NOISE-R1, and NOISE-R10. | Disallow in full | SPS proposes an amendment to GRUZ-R14 (Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites) and MPZ-R21 (Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites), as well as suitable aligned relief under any other rules addressing the operations of any form of aircraft. The amendment is to add a note: Note: In accordance with CAA rules, this rule does not apply to unmanned aircraft (drones). | 132 | 31 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.32 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS supports activities that protect and enhance biodiversity. (NOSZ-P1) | Allow in full | Retain the policy | 132 | 32 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.33 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS considers that conservation activities are not limited to Department of Conservation activities. A new definition is sought for conservation activities that includes the wider range of conservation activities that can be undertaken, including weed and pest control. (NOSZ-P3) | Allow in full | Amend NOSZ-P3 as follows: NOSZ-P3 Department of Conservation activities Enable conservation activities that are consistent with a Department of Conservation plan or strategy for the area and do not generate significant adverse effects on the surrounding area or adjacent sites will enhance or protect the open space zone. AND Add the definition of 'conservation activities' as sought above. | 132 | 33 |
| New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | 132.34 | New Zealand Agricultural Aviation Association | Support | SPS does not support a definition of agricultural aviation in the district plan. The proposed new NOSZ rule would, via that definition, would require drone to use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites which is in complete opposition to CAA rules that require drones to stay 4km from airstrips and heliports. SPS seeks relief in the plan, in alignment with CAA rules, to ensure that any rules relating to the use of manned aircraft or landing strips or heliports do not relate to the operation of unmanned aircraft. Addition of a define note is proposed for rules MPZ-R21, GRUZ-R14, NOISE-R1, and NOISE-R10. | Disallow in full | SPS proposes an amendment to GRUZ-R14 (Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites) and MPZ-R21 (Use of airstrips and helicopter landing sites), as well as suitable aligned relief under any other rules addressing the operations of any form of aircraft. The amendment is to add a note: Note: In accordance with CAA rules, this rule does not apply to unmanned aircraft (drones). | 132 | 34 |
| Waka Kotahi | 143.32 | Waka Kotahi | Support | Considers it is not always possible to enhance the quality of stormwater. It is recommended that the policy be amended to state either maintain or enhance. | Allow in full | Amend SW-P2 as follows: SW-P2 Water quality Maintain and enhance stormwater quality Maintain or and enhance stormwater quality by requiring: 1. restrictions on specified cladding materials that contribute to stormwater contamination; and 2. the treatment of stormwater quality for new or increased impervious surfaces created by subdivision, use or development. | 143 | 32 |
| Waka Kotahi | 143.57 | Waka Kotahi | Oppose | Oppose the technical standards as are inflexible and overly prescriptive. Short term parking needs to be available, doesn't need to be sign posted/visible on entry as this adds unnecessary visual clutter or overly constricts design. Cyclists operating in darkness must carry lights to be on the road. The lighting is therefore not required. A 50m walking distance for short term cyclists is suitable as the people are active and capable of walking. | Disallow in part | Cycle parking spaces must meet the following minimum specifications: 1. All stands must be securely anchored to an immovable object 2. Stands must support the bicycle frame and front wheel 3. Stands must allow the bicycle frame to be secured 4. Long term parking must be located in a covered and secure area. 5. Cycle parking must be constructed to allow at least 1.1m of clear space between parking stands or other obstruction 6. Short term cycle parking must be clearly signposted or visible to cyclists entering the site 7. If in a publicly accessible space, cycle parking must be detectable by visually impaired pedestrians through use of a kick stand or other method so as to not create a hazard. 8. Cycle parking facilities must be located outside of vehicle manoeuvring areas and where there is no risk of damage from vehicle movements within the site. 9. Short term cycle parking must be located as close as possible to and no more than 5m-50m from at least one main pedestrian public entrance to the building/activity. 10. Long term cycle parking facilities must be located so they are easily accessible for staff / residents / students of the activity 11. All cycle parking spaces which are used during the hours of darkness must be illuminated in accordance with the Lighting Chapter. 12. Cycle parking facilities must be available during the hours of operation and must not be diminished by the subsequent erection of any structure, storage of goods, landscape planting or any other use. Notes: Where there is more than one public entrance to the building, it is recommended that visitor parking is apportioned between entrances in accordance with their potential usage. End of trip facilities are recommended as follows: 10 staff cycle parks or less required: none >11 staff cycle parks required: 1 shower for every 10 staff cycle parks. | 143 | 57 |
| New Zealand Defence Force | 151.1 | New Zealand Defence Force | Support | Supports rule EW-R1 but requests the deletion of PER-2 as direction on accidental discovery is provided by the advice note in the Earthworks chapter. The standard does not help protect archaeological sites as no site-specific investigation is required. Also considers it will create an administrative burden for the community and Council. | Allow in full | Amend EW-R1 as follows: EW-R1 Earthworks Activity status: Permitted Where: PER-1 EW-S1, EW-S2, EW-S3, EW-S4 and EW-S5 are complied with; and PER-2 The Accidental Discovery Protocol commitment form, contained within APP4 – Form confirming a commitment to adhering to an Accidental Discovery Protocol, has been completed and submitted to Council, prior to the commencement of any earthworks. | 151 | 1 |
| Royal Forest and Bird | 156.81 | Royal Forest and Bird | Oppose | Inclusion of "ecosystem health" inappropriate in many zones, where land is developed or used intensively. | Disallow in full | Retain CL-P1 as notified. | 156 | 81 |
| Royal Forest and Bird | 156.82 | Royal Forest and Bird | Oppose | Inclusion of "protection of indigenous biodiversity" inappropriate in many zones, where land is developed or used intensively. | Disallow in full | Retain CL-P2 as notified. | 156 | 82 |
| Royal Forest and Bird | 156.83 | Royal Forest and Bird | Oppose | Inclusion of "environmental health" inappropriate in many zones, where land is developed or used intensively. | Disallow in full | Retain CL-P3 as notified. | 156 | 83 |
| Transpower New Zealand Limited | 159.55 | Transpower New Zealand Limited | Support | Does not support the absolute requirement to connect to the Council's stormwater network. The submitter is concerned that alternative stormwater disposal options are not provided for that may be more appropriate in some circumstances. These circumstances include stormwater discharges from sites that have infrastructure already developed to manage stormwater, and are later able to connect to council's stormwater systems. These sites do not have to be Regionally Significant Infrastructure. Include SW-P3 to allow for non-road sites. | Allow in part | Amend SW-P3 Connection to reticulated stormwater networks as follows: Except where Policy SW-P4 or Policy SW-P3 applies or where stormwater is able to be managed within a site that accommodates Regionally Significant Infrastructure, require all subdivision, use and development to connect to the Council's reticulated stormwater network within reticulated infrastructure boundaries, to: 1. ensure that stormwater does not create increased flood risk on other properties; and 2. manage stormwater quality impacts through an integrated management approach. | 159 | 55 |
| Fonterra Limited | 165.25 | Fonterra Limited | Support | Considers that the fundamental land use planning issue of separation between incompatible uses should be expressed in this objective. | Allow in full | Amend SD-O1 Residential Areas and Activities as follows: [...] ii. limited rural lifestyle development opportunities are provided where they concentrate and are attached to existing urban areas, achieve a coordinated pattern of development, avoid reverse sensitivity effects on existing and permitted rural activities and are capable of efficiently connecting to reticulated sewer and water infrastructure; and [...] | 165 | 25 |
| Fonterra Limited | 165.56 | Fonterra Limited | Support | The use, storage, disposal and transportation of hazardous substances is controlled by other legislation | Allow in full | Delete HS-R1 Use and/or storage substances. | 165 | 56 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------|---------------------------------|---------|---|------------------|--|-----|-----|
| Fonterra Limited | 165.125 | Fonterra Limited | Support | It is appropriate to protect primary production from sensitive activities. This protection should also be afforded to rural industry that is located in the general rural zone. | Allow in full | Amend GRUZ-03 Protecting primary production as follows: The land resource of the General Rural Zone is not diminished by activities with no functional or operational need to locate in the General Rural Zone, and primary production and rural industry are protected from sensitive activities. | 165 | 125 |
| Fulton Hogan Limited | 170.11 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | There are many waterbodies (e.g. existing ponds) where stormwater management experience is not needed. Stormwater management does not appear to be relevant to the standards listed in PER-3. Request the rule explicitly states that replacement ponds do not require consent. Encourage a larger area, 1000m3, as per 181.42 by Opuha water. | Allow in part | Amend EI-R38 Creation of a new stormwater basin or water body (including wastewater oxidation pond but excluding a replacement of an existing pond) which exceeds 500m2. In area as follows: Activity status: Permitted Where: [-] PER-3 Any water body has been designed by a suitably qualified person, with experience in stormwater management systems, to the following standards: [-] | 170 | 11 |
| Fulton Hogan Limited | 170.13 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | Opposes CL-01 as the wording is unclear and should be amended to provide clarity and assist implementation. | Allow in part | Amend CL-01 Management of contaminated land as follows: Contaminated land is made safe for human health and its intended use before any change of use, land disturbance, development or subdivision so that human health of users and residents of the site is protected. | 170 | 13 |
| Fulton Hogan Limited | 170.15 | Fulton Hogan Limited | Support | The submitter considers the wording is confusing and it should be amended for clarity and ease of implementation. | Allow in full | Amend CL-P3 Remediation and management works as follows: Ensure that the risks to human health from any remediation of, or any management works undertaken on, contaminated land, do not increase the risks to human health from the contamination that is present, and, where possible encourage the reduction of those risks. | 170 | 15 |
| Silver Fern Farms Limited | 172.12 | Silver Fern Farms Limited | Support | Considers that the fundamental land use planning issue of separation between incompatible uses should be expressed in this objective. | Allow in full | Amend SD-01 as follows: SD-01 Residential Areas and Activities [-] iv. The location of new residential areas and activities avoids creating conflict with incompatible zones and activities. | 172 | 12 |
| Silver Fern Farms Limited | 172.14 | Silver Fern Farms Limited | Support | Considers that as drafted (iii) could be interpreted as requiring natural hazard mitigation by landowners regardless of any triggering proposal or event. Considers that the mitigation is only necessary to facilitate an activity. | Allow in full | Amend SD-04 as follows: SD-04 Natural Hazards [-] iii. for other areas, natural hazards risks are appropriately mitigated if necessary to enable a land use, development or subdivision. | 172 | 14 |
| Silver Fern Farms Limited | 172.15 | Silver Fern Farms Limited | Support | Considers the objective should recognise industry, given the importance of the sector to the district's economy. It should also reiterate the principle of separation between incompatible activities. Changes indicated in italics | Allow in full | Amend SD-06 as follows: SD-06 Business areas and Activities Business and economic prosperity in the District is enabled in appropriate locations, including by: i. providing sufficient land for a range of business and industrial activities to cater for projected growth; ii. providing opportunities for a range of business activities to establish and prosper, provided that commercial activities outside of commercial areas are limited so they do not detract from the role and function of the City Centre and Town Centre zones or the viability of industrial zones. iii. Avoiding the encroachment of incompatible activities that are sensitive to the effects of commercial and industrial activities. | 172 | 15 |
| Silver Fern Farms Limited | 172.16 | Silver Fern Farms Limited | Support | Considers the objective should recognise activities that support primary production, lest it be constructed in an inappropriately restrictive manner. Also considers that the burden of mitigation falls to new sensitive activities locating in the rural environment, not already established rural activities. And that maintenance will not always be practicable or desirable, given the land use composition of areas changes over time. | Allow in full | Amend SD-09 as follows: SD-09 Rural Areas A range of primarily primary production and supporting activities are enabled in the rural environment to enable the ongoing use of land for primary production for present and future generations, while: i. protecting versatile soils for productive uses; ii. managing the adverse effects of intensive activities on existing sensitive activities; iii. managing the adverse effects of new sensitive activities on primary production, rural industry and supporting activities; iv. avoiding activities that have no functional/operational need to locate in the rural area; v. identifying and maintaining/monitors the character, qualities and amenity values of rural areas; | 172 | 16 |
| Silver Fern Farms Limited | 172.21 | Silver Fern Farms Limited | Support | Considers that the use of 'best practice' implies there is a hierarchy of approaches or options to contaminated land management. Instead the submitter considers the policy focus should be to require site management in accordance with accepted procedures codified in standards such as the Ministry for the Environment's 'Contaminated land management guidelines'. | Allow in full | Amend CL-P2 Subdivision, use and development of contaminated land to replace the phrase 'best practice' with a reference to the particular guidelines or procedural manual that applications will be assessed against. | 172 | 21 |
| Silver Fern Farms Limited | 172.116 | Silver Fern Farms Limited | Support | Supports recognition of rural industry in this policy, given the activity is similarly vulnerable to reverse sensitivity effects and is dependent on a rural location with ample separation from sensitive activities. | Allow in full | Amend GRUZ-P5 as follows: GRUZ-P5 Protecting primary production and supporting activities Manage sensitive activities in the zone to ensure: | 172 | 116 |
| Silver Fern Farms Limited | 172.126 | Silver Fern Farms Limited | Support | Considers it appropriate the rule provides for the expansion of existing industry with a discretionary consenting pathway. | Allow in full | Retain as notified. | 172 | 126 |
| Federated Farmers | 182.202 | Federated Farmers | Support | Considers GRUZ-R15 very specific and detailed, overly prescriptive for a minor effect and an activity that is already regulated under Property Law Act. The policy restricts that matter to shading of property and roads, so the rule must only be for this purpose. Farm shelterbelts will be restricted, meaning farmers will not be able to provide shade and shelter for livestock welfare. | Allow in full | 1. Delete GRUZ-R15 Shelterbelts; AND 2. Any consequential amendments required as a result of the relief sought. | 182 | 202 |
| Canterbury Regional Council | 183.9 | Canterbury Regional Council | Oppose | By reference to specific zones, over complicates what is already a suitable definition. Support the definition of Urban development, from the Urban Development Act | Disallow in full | Retain as notified. | 183 | 9 |
| Timaru District Holdings Ltd | 186.13 | Timaru District Holdings Ltd | Support | It is appropriate that the District Plan should contain no rules controlling contaminated land and instead defer to the NES for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health. | Allow in full | Retain as notified. | 186 | 13 |
| Foodstuffs South Island Limited | 193.7 | Foodstuffs South Island Limited | Support | The policy does not fully implement Noise-02 because it does not provide for the protection of existing noisy activities from noise sensitive activities, located in a different zone immediately adjacent to the zone containing the existing higher noise environment. | Allow in full | Amend Noise-P5 Reverse Sensitivity as follows: Require noise sensitive activities located in or adjacent to higher noise environments to be located and designed so as to minimise adverse effects on the amenity values and health and safety of occupants and minimise sleep disturbance from noise, while taking into account: [-] | 193 | 7 |
| Woolworths New Zealand Limited | 242.12 | Woolworths New Zealand Limited | Support | The submitter accepts a landscaping plan for a carpark area is appropriate but considers that current standard is overly prescriptive and arduous. | Allow in full | Amend TRAN-S1 as follows: TRAN-S1 Landscaping where five or more at grade car parking spaces are provided for non-residential activities on a site All Zones 1. Where more than five at grade car parking spaces are provided for non-residential activities on a site, landscaping must be provided within a landscaping strip/s or within a planting protection area/s with a minimum dimension or diameter of 1.5 metres within, or immediately adjacent to, the parking area on the site. 2. Landscaping must consist of a combination of trees, shrubs and ground cover species. 3. Planting must be limited to indigenous vegetation sourced from within the ecological district to enhance local or regional indigenous biodiversity. 4. Landscaping may be integrated with stormwater management for the parking area, and may include the use of raingardens for stormwater collection and attenuation of stormwater runoff. 5. Trees must: a. be spaced one tree every 10 metres of road frontage (excluding access ways and any other means of access to the building) on the side of a road boundary or within a parking area; b. have a minimum stem diameter of 40mm at the time of planting and be capable of reaching a height of at least three metres at maturity; c. be planted no closer than 2m from an underground service or 1m from a footpath or kerb; 6. Landscaping strips or planting protection areas adjacent to a road boundary, or within a parking area, must be protected from damage by vehicles through the use of wheel stop barriers. Such wheel stop barriers must be located at least 1m from any tree. | 242 | 12 |
| Horticulture New Zealand | 245.5 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Considers the plan should make clear that the NES-CS does not apply to production land if it continues to be used for production purposes - refer Clause 5 (8). It is only when a change of land use occurs that the NES-CS provisions apply to production land. | Allow in full | Amend the Rules Note as follows: Note: There are no rules contained in this chapter. Reference should instead be made to the rules contained in the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011. The NES-CS does not apply to primary production land where the land continues to be used for production purposes. Only when the land use changes will the NES-CS apply. | 245 | 5 |
| Horticulture New Zealand | 245.82 | Horticulture New Zealand | Support | Supports a policy that requires Development Area Plans to provide for a comprehensive, coordinated and efficient development that integration of the area with surrounding areas and the way any conflict between areas is to be managed. | Allow in full | Amend FDA-P4 as follows: FDA-P4 Development Area Plans Require Development Area Plans to provide for a comprehensive, coordinated and efficient development that addresses the following matters: 1. ... [-]; 7. the integration of the area with surrounding areas and the way any conflict between areas and reverse sensitivity is to be managed; [-] | 245 | 82 |
| Rooney Farms Ltd | 250.13 | Rooney Farms Ltd | Support | Considers the provisions for renewable energy in the PTDP should be more enabling in line with the NPS for Renewable Energy Generation 2011. Considers a discretionary activity status for large scale (non-domestic) renewable generation does not achieve the policy intention of the NPS. | Allow in full | EI - Energy and Infrastructure 1. Amend the provisions for renewable energy to be more enabling in line with the NPS for Renewable Energy Generation 2011 2. Add a new permitted activity rule to permit large scale solar arrays on existing buildings in industrial and rural zones; and 3. Add a new enabling policy to encourage and promote large scale solar arrays to generate renewable electricity. | 250 | 13 |
| Rooney Farms Ltd | 250.16 | Rooney Farms Ltd | Support | Opposes EI-R35. It is submitted that a discretionary activity rule will not enable and facilitate large scale renewable energy generation facilities such as solar arrays on large buildings. The proposed plan should include an enabling policy and a permitted activity rule to provide for large scale solar arrays, especially on existing buildings within industrial or rural zones where electricity will be returned to the national grid on a commercial scale. | Allow in full | 1. Amend EI-R35 The installation and upgrading of large-scale renewable electricity generation activities to exclude solar arrays. And 2. Include new policy and rules to enable large scale solar arrays as requested earlier. | 250 | 16 |
| Rooney Farms Ltd | 250.19 | Rooney Farms Ltd | Oppose | Inclusion of unpainted zincalume is contrary to it's use where connection is not made to council's stormwater reticulation system. Relief from the inclusion of zincalume is requested. | Disallow in part | Amend SW-R7 Connection to reticulated stormwater networks as follows: The installation of any copper, galvanised metal, unpainted zincalume or any other unpainted metal, used in roof material, gutters, downpipes or external cladding of buildings or structures | 250 | 19 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|--------|------------------|---------|---|---------------|---|-----|----|
| Rooney Farms Ltd | 250.21 | Rooney Farms Ltd | Support | Oppose TRAN-P1(5) using the word "requiring". Considers Council should be encouraging and promoting cycle parking, not requiring it, as it is not appropriate in all circumstances. | Allow in full | Amend TRAN-P1 as follows: TRAN-P1 Active transport Encourage active transport modes such as cycling and walking by: 1.ensuring safe pedestrian access to building entrances; 2.requiring permeable road layouts; 3.requiring footpaths and other active transport infrastructure; 4.requiring consolidated settlement patterns; 5. requiring encouraging secure, sheltered cycle parking that is located in a convenient and safe position and which ensures pedestrian safety; and 6. encouraging the provision of end-of-journey facilities for staff such as bicycle parking, showers, lockers and dedicated changing spaces. | 250 | 21 |
| Rooney Farms Ltd | 250.27 | Rooney Farms Ltd | Support | Oppose TRAN-S19 referring to all zones. This standard conflicts with Light restrictions within Light Sensitive Areas as it is not clear what the standard means when it states "...that comply with the rules in the Light Chapter...". | | Amend TRAN-S19 with the following matters considered: TRAN-S19 Lighting of parking and manoeuvring 1. Provide an exemption within Light Sensitive Areas, and all activities that are not commercial or industrial. 2. Many farms (Primary Production properties) will load and unload stock in darkness at certain times of the year and it is unnecessary to require lighting of these areas for when this activity occurs. 3. Many rural or rural lifestyle residential properties will have more than 10 or more (unmarked) parking spaces. | 250 | 27 |
| Rooney Farms Ltd | 250.73 | Rooney Farms Ltd | Support | Considers RELO-P1 should also enable the use of shipping containers in the General Rural Zone as these are currently widely used within the zone. | Allow in full | Amend RELO-P1 as follows: RELO-P1 Relocated buildings and shipping containers in General Industrial Zone and General Rural Zone. Enable the relocation of buildings and shipping containers in the General Rural Zone, General Industrial zone and Port Zone. | 250 | 73 |
| Rooney Farms Ltd | 250.74 | Rooney Farms Ltd | Support | Considers RELO-P2 should be more flexible to provide for shipping containers to be screened and not readily visible but not necessarily unseen. | Allow in full | Amend RELO-P2 as follows: RELO-P2 Shipping containers in all other zones Enable shipping containers where: 1. they are screened so that they are not readily visible from any road; or [-] | 250 | 74 |