

Before the Hearing Panel  
Appointed by the Timaru District Council

Under                      The Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**)

In the matter of        The Proposed Timaru District Plan

---

**Evidence of Andrew Willis in response to Minute 7 (17 May 2024)**

14 June 2024

---

**Respondent's solicitors:**

Michael Garbett | Jen Vella  
Anderson Lloyd  
Level 12, Otago House, 477 Moray Place, Dunedin 9016  
Private Bag 1959, Dunedin 9054  
DX Box YX10107 Dunedin  
p + 64 3 477 3973  
michael.garbett@al.nz | jen.vella@al.nz

**anderson  
lloyd.**

## Introduction

- 1 This evidence responds to Minute 7, which was issued by the Hearing Panel on 17 May 2024 (**Minute 7**).
- 2 In Minute 7, the Hearing Panel requested that I:
  - (a) Revisit paragraphs 15(a) to (h) of my summary statement and identify whether I consider that the matters listed can now be classified in accordance with paragraph [7](b) above or remain outstanding or subject to my comments in paragraph 16 that:

*...the remaining matters are finely balanced and/or potentially have integration implications (such as the approach to reverse sensitivity or households per hectare).*
  - (b) In responding to sub paragraph (a) above, cross reference the evidential basis for the updated recommendations;
  - (c) Revisit and tidy up the typographical and formatting errors in my recommended version of SD-O1;
  - (d) Consider the changes requested by Forest and Bird during the hearing regarding:
    - (i) additional subclause (5) to SD-O3;
    - (ii) proposed amendments SD-O4; and
    - (iii) additional subclause (7) to SD-O9 (similar to SD-O1 and SD-O7 for consistency).

## Status of submission points post Hearing A

- 3 In response to the hearing panel's requests listed under 2 above, I have attached a table titled "Status of issues raised in evidence - post Hearing A – Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development" at **Appendix A**.
- 4 The table represents:
  - (a) a 'stock take' of the issues identified at paragraph 15(a) – (h) of the summary of my section 42A report (6 May 2024) (**May summary**); and
  - (b) a response to the other questions at 2(d) above from the Hearing Panel.

- 5 The table has been prepared on the following basis:
- (a) It addresses only those matters referred to in paragraphs 15(a) – (h) of the May summary, which were the key outstanding matters (as far as I understood them) based on pre-circulated evidence. It does not therefore address the status of all submission points;
  - (b) It takes account of the evidence filed prior to Hearing A, any evidence tabled at Hearing A and further evidence filed by submitters in response to the questions identified in Minute 7;
  - (c) It addresses whether each of those matters is resolved between submitters who provided evidence for Hearing A. It does not seek to identify whether the matter is resolved with submitters who did not present evidence at the hearing, as the position of those submitters is unknown;
  - (d) Where it is not clear whether an issue is resolved with all relevant submitters,<sup>1</sup> some relevant submitters, or unresolved, I have made an assumption based on my own judgement as to whether I think the matter is resolved or not. For example, where I have made some amendments to address the issue but in a manner that is different to that sought by the submitter, I have marked that 'resolved\*' as I think the matter has been addressed, albeit in a different way.
- 6 Against that background, the table identifies:
- (a) The issue identified in my summary statement, or raised by the Hearing Panel;
  - (b) The relevant provisions of the PDP to which the issue relates;
  - (c) The status of the issue, classified in accordance with the Panel's request at para [7] of Minute 7, as follows: 'resolved between all', 'resolved with some', 'unresolved'. As noted above, this reflects my understanding as to the status of matters as between submitters who presented evidence on those matters only (and not all submitters);
  - (d) The relevant submitters who presented evidence for each issue, including cross-references to relevant sections of their evidence;

---

<sup>1</sup> By 'relevant submitters', I am referring to those who presented evidence at Hearing A.

- (e) The reasons for my agreement or disagreement with the submitter; and
- (f) My updated recommendation in track changes format, following consideration of all of the evidence. Recommendations post Hearing A are shown in blue font, to distinguish them from recommendations made in my section 42A report.

**Questions raised by the Panel**

- 7 The Panel requested that I tidy up the typographical and formatting errors in my recommended version of SD-O1. My revised recommended version of SD-O1 is provided in Appendix B.
- 8 The Panel also requested that I consider the changes requested by Forest and Bird during the hearing. These are addressed in the table at Appendix A.

## Appendix A – Status of issues raised in evidence - post Hearing A – Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development

### Notes:

- 1 *Status: The status of the issue reflects my understanding of the status of resolution as between those submitters who provided evidence at Hearing A. It does not attempt to reflect whether the issue is agreed with or by submitters who did not present evidence to Hearing A.*
- 2 *Status: An asterisk (\*) against the status ('resolved with all', 'resolved with some', 'unresolved') denotes where I have made an assumption based on my own judgement as to whether I think the matter is resolved or not, based on the amendments I have recommended. However, I am not confident as to that status because the amendments I have recommended are different to that sought by the submitter.*
- 3 *Relevant submitters: Relevant submitters are those who presented evidence at Hearing A. Other submitters who did not present evidence to Hearing A may be interested in the issue (as submitters in their own right, or as further submitters) but they have not been listed here.*

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
Refer to Iwi Management Plans in the introduction.	SD Introduction	Unresolved	TRONT [185.15] – Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 69.	I remain of the view, as set out in my s42A report, that IMPs do not need to be separately identified in the introduction – it would be an anomaly.	No change recommended.

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
Add the Maori Purpose Zone as an area where residential development capacity can be provided.	SD-O1(i)	Resolved with all	TRONT [185.17] – Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 71 to 73.	The relief sought was unclear in the submission. The evidence of Ms Pull has clarified what was sought and I agree with the submission.	<p>1. Amend SD-O1 as follows:</p> <p>1. There is sufficient residential development capacity in existing and proposed urban areas to meet demand and household choice, provided through:</p> <p>a. ... ; and</p> <p>e. the Maori Purpose Zone.</p>

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
Add a new clause that enables new residential development and choices to be considered against the Strategic Directions and Growth Strategy	SD-O1(i)	Unresolved	TRONT [185.17] – Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 71 to 73.	New residential development would also need to be considered against other relevant proposed plan provisions and the higher order planning framework. In addition, I do not agree with incorporating by reference the Growth Strategy as a document to assess residential development against as this was not the intended purpose of that document.	No change recommended
Remove the requirement to connect to reticulated sewer and water infrastructure in the Rural Lifestyle Zone.	SD-O1(ii)	Resolved with all	D Payne [160 and FS 160] - Wharfe evidence (22 April 2024), para 5.20 & 5.33.	While reticulated services are preferred, the requirement to connect to a reticulated sewer network is inconsistent with SUB-P15 in the Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) and Policy RLZ-P1.	Amend SD-O1(ii)(e) as follows:  e. are capable of efficiently connecting to <b>reticulated</b> sewer and water infrastructure; <del>and</del>

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
Amend to ensure that reverse sensitivity effects from rural lifestyle developments are avoided in the first instance.	SD-O1	Resolved with all*	Fonterra [165.25] – Tait evidence (23 April 2024), para 11.2, 11.4 & 11.5.	Requiring the avoidance of all reverse sensitivity effects from RLZ activities is considered onerous. Changes are recommended to the s42A report version that are more aligned with the CRPS and respond in part to Fonterra’s submission.	Amend SD-O1(ii) as follows:  <u>...avoid significant reverse sensitivity effects on existing and permitted rural activities do not limit or preclude the operation or establishment of rural production activities;</u>
Application of the NPS-IB to the National Grid	SD-O2(v); SD-O2(vi)	Resolved with all	Transpower [159.26] – McLeod evidence (22 April 2024), para 40 to 45; McLeod supplementary evidence (31 May 2024), para 7, 9 & 10.	Transpower supported SD-O2 but is concerned with the s42A recommended changes made to SD-O2 to respond to the Director General of Conservation submission to give effect to the NPS-IB. The new recommended changes disapply the s42A recommended NPS-IB changes from the National Grid as requested but are different to the wording provided in Ms	Amend SD-O2 as follows:  5. <u>outside of the National Grid, indigenous biodiversity is maintained and enhanced and restored where necessary so that there is at least no overall loss;</u>  6. <u>significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of</u>



Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
				McLeod's supplementary evidence.	indigenous fauna are identified and their values recognised, protected and <del>where appropriate,</del> enhanced, and where ecological integrity is degraded <u>outside of the National Grid, restored;</u>
Remove the reference to the 'values' of historic heritage	SD-O2(viii)	Unresolved	Fonterra [165.26] –Tait evidence (23 April 2024), para 11.12 to 11.14.	The values of historic heritage are a key component of historic heritage and justify identification	No change recommended.
Include references to Ki uta ki tai and the values of important landscapes and features.	SD-O2	Resolved with all	TRONT [185.18] – Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 74 and 77.	It is appropriate to reference Ki uta ki ta and the values of important landscapes and features.	Amend SD-O2 as follows:  The District's natural and historic environment is managed so that:  1. ...;  2. an integrated management approach is adopted that recognises

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
					<p>that all parts of the environment are interdependent (<a href="#">Ki uta ki tai</a>);</p> <p>3. ...;</p> <p>4 important landscapes and features <a href="#">and their values</a> are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development;</p> <p>...</p>
<p>Include references to access and use for indigenous biodiversity and habitats of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats.</p>	<p>SD-O2</p>	<p>Unresolved</p>	<p>TRONT [185.18] – Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 74 and 77.</p>	<p>Adding ‘access’ and ‘use’ outcomes to indigenous biodiversity and habitats is inconsistent with the purpose of the clause and would apply beyond mana whenua.</p>	<p>No change recommended</p>

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
Carbon emissions reduction and mitigation should both be recognised in SD-O3.	SD-O3	Resolved with all	Port Blakely [94.2] – Cocking evidence (22 April 2024), para 28.	Carbon emissions reduction and mitigation are different concepts and should  not be conflated.	Amend SD-O3 as follows:  ...  3. encouraging efficiency in urban form and settlement patterns <u>and encouraging activities which reduce or mitigate carbon emissions;</u> And  ...
Use nature-based solutions and provide space for the habitat of indigenous biodiversity to adapt and respond to climate change	SD-O3	Resolved with all*	Forest & Bird [156.39] – Snoyink summary statement (9 May 2024), para 9 to 11.	I consider it is appropriate to manage indigenous biodiversity to promote resilience to the effects of climate change and note this is consistent with the approach in the Proposed Plan’s natural hazards and coastal hazards provisions and the CRPS. However, I do not agree that a reference to ‘nature-based solutions is appropriate’ as I am unclear what these are and consider it is not needed with my	Add the following clause to SD-O3  <u>3. manage indigenous biodiversity to promote resilience to the effects of climate change; and</u>

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
				alternative recommended wording.	
Include how natural hazard risk is identified	SD-O4	Unresolved	TRONT [185.19] - Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 78 to 90.	Natural hazard 'risk' is determined by assessing consequence and likelihood as a standard approach, so it is not necessary to repeat these statements in the strategic direction.	No change recommended.

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
Incorporate matauranga for the Māori Purpose Zone	SD-04	Resolved with all*	TRONT [185.19] - Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 78 to 90.	Knowledge is already utilised when assessing natural hazard risk and observational or community knowledge of natural hazards is often inaccurate given the long recurrence intervals involved and the need to consider future climate change matters. A better approach is to require consultation with mana whenua when determining acceptable risk and responses. I also consider this is better addressed in the Natural Hazards Chapter where the topic detail is located, and note that the Panel will need to consider this change as part of that topic hearing.	Amend NH-P1 as follows:  NH-P1 Identification of natural hazards and approach to management within Natural Hazard Areas  ...  4. the ability for communities to recover after a natural hazard event-; <u>and</u>  <u>5. for the Māori Purpose Zone, the outcome of consultation with mana whenua.</u>  Add the following matter of discretion to NH-R4 Natural Hazard Sensitive Activities, NH-R7 Natural Hazard Sensitive

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
					Activities and NH-R8 Subdivision:  <u>x. for development within the Māori Purpose Zone, the outcome of consultation with mana whenua.</u>

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
Include references to habitats of indigenous flora and fauna.	SD-O4	Unresolved	Forest & Bird – Snoyink summary statement (9 May 2024), para 12.	This objective is about natural hazard risk management. SD-O2 covers indigenous biodiversity matters. I consider it is repetitious to include indigenous biodiversity matters in SD-O4 and it would change the focus of the objective.	No change recommended.
Ability for Kāti Huirapa to carry out customary activities in accordance with tikaka	SD-O5(vi)	Resolved with all	Opuha Water Ltd (OWL) [181.22] - Crossman evidence (22 April 2024), para 4.18 and 4.23.	There are valid safety concerns around multiple operational areas. At an SD level it is not unreasonable to provide opportunities for the restrictions	Amend SD-O5(vi) as follows:  6. <u>Where it can be undertaken safely</u> , Kāti Huirapa are able to carry out customary activities

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
			TRONT [185.2] – Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 94 to 97.	included in the more detailed chapters	in accordance with <a href="#">tikanga tikaka</a> ;
Ability for Kāti Huirapa to retain and enhance access to sites and areas of significance.	SD-O5(iv)	Resolved with all	Opuha Water Ltd (OWL) [181.22] – Crossman evidence (22 April 2024), para 4.18 and 4.23.	There are valid safety concerns around multiple operational areas, however it is understood that OWL’s concerns relate to changes or future access requirements rather than existing access. SASM-P4 clearly seeks to retain existing access and enhance access where appropriate. Given this and OWL’s clarification I consider the SD addition is appropriate.	Amend SD-O5(iv) as notified (copied below):  4. <a href="#">Where appropriate</a> , Kāti Huirapa retains, and where <a href="#">it can be undertaken safely appropriate</a> is able to enhance access to their sites and areas of significance;
TRONT [185.2] – Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 94 to 97.					
Māori reserve land is defined as Māori land, so delete ‘reserve’	SD-O5	Resolved with all	TRONT [185.2] – Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 92.	Amending the text to the defined term is appropriate.	Amend SD-O5 as follows:  ...



Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
Add 'cultural' to clause vi so that Kāti Huirapa are able to carry out customary and cultural activities in accordance with tikanga.	SD-O5	Resolved with all	TRONT [185.2] – Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 99.	I anticipate that 'cultural activities' are 'customary activities' and therefore am comfortable with this addition.	5. Māori <u>reserve</u> lands <u>are is</u> able to be used by Kāti Huirapa for their intended purposes;  6. <u>where it can be undertaken safely</u> , Kāti Huirapa are able to carry out customary <u>and cultural activities</u> in accordance with tikanga;  <u>...and</u>  8. <u>Kāti Huirapa's culture and identity is recognised in the design of Future Development Areas.</u>
Add a new clause viii so that the amenity values of Kāti Huirapa are reflected in the landscape of new development	SD-O5	Resolved with all*	TRONT [185.2] – evidence of Ms Pull (19 April 2024) para 98.	There is merit in the proposal, however it is uncertain what this means and how it would be applied in the Proposed Plan. I recommend alternative wording to achieve a similar outcome.	8. <u>Kāti Huirapa's culture and identity is recognised in the design of Future Development Areas.</u>
Delete 'intended purpose' from clause v.	SD-O5	Unresolved	TRONT [185.2] – Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 93.	These words provide direction on how the land is to be used and this is further elaborated in the Māori Purpose Zone chapter.	No change recommended

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
Add an advice note that SD-O5 applies District Wide and contains direction that applies to the implementation of other Strategic Directions	SD-O5	Unresolved	TRONT [185.2] – Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 69.	Not required as all the strategic directions apply district wide or generally, and contain direction that applies to the implementation of other strategic directions. Also, including this advice note creates confusion as it implies that the other strategic directions do not apply district wide and do not contain direction that applies to the implementation of other strategic directions. This is not the case	No change recommended
Ensuring that reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities are avoided.	SD-O6	Resolved with all	Fonterra [165.30] –Tait evidence (23 April 2024), para 11.21.	SD-O6 was amended in response to Fonterra’s submission (and similar submissions from Silver Fern Farms [172.15], Alliance Group [173.13] and Synlait [163.2]) in my s42A report. However, this amendment conflated a number of matters and could have been clearer. I therefore recommend further changes in response to the evidence.	Amend SD-O6 as follows: ... 2. providing opportunities for a range of business activities <u>and other compatible activities</u> to establish and prosper, provided that commercial activities outside of commercial areas are

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
					<p>limited so they do not detract from the role and function of the City Centre and Town Centre zones, <del>or the industrial zones;</del> and</p> <p><u>3. the use and development of commercial and industrial zones is not compromised by the establishment of sensitive activities.</u></p>
The protection (as opposed to management) of regionally significant infrastructure and the Redruth waste management facility as RSI or additional infrastructure.	SD-O8, Infrastructure and Energy Chapter, Definition of RSI	Unresolved	Enviro NZ [162] - Rossiter evidence (22 April 2024), para 5.1 to 5.6 and 6.17; Rossiter supplementary evidence (30 May 2024), para 3.2 to 3.4.	Requires consideration at the IE Chapter hearing	Defer conclusions on this matter until the IE Chapter hearing.

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
New infrastructure also needs to co-ordinate with the growth of existing development or change of existing development.	SD-O8(ii)	Resolved with all	Fonterra [165.31] – Tait evidence (23 April 2024), para 11.22.	The change is appropriate as changing uses may have different infrastructure requirements.	Amend SD-O8(ii) as follows: ... 2. the provision of new network infrastructure is integrated and co-ordinated with the nature, timing and sequencing of <u>both</u> new development <u>and the growth or change</u> of existing development; ...
Amendments to the chapeau, and clauses (i) and (vi) for clarity and to avoid duplication	SD-O9	Unresolved	Fonterra [165.32] – Tait evidence (23 April 2024), para 11.23 to 11.32.	These changes are not necessary.	No change recommended.
Amendments to clause (iii) to avoid in the first instance adverse effects on primary production,	SD-O9(iii)	Unresolved	Fonterra [165.32] – Tait evidence (23 April 2024), para 11.23 to 11.32.	Amendments are proposed to include a stronger outcome statement to direct what the management of adverse effects is to achieve, but limit the	Amend SD-O9(iii) as follows: ...

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
as well as rural industry.				application of SD-O9(iii) to only activities which limit or preclude the operation or establishment of rural production activities, consistent with the CRPS.	3. managing the adverse effects, <u>including reverse sensitivity effects</u> , of new sensitive activities <u>so that these do not limit or preclude the operation or establishment of rural production activities</u> ; <del>or primary production.</del>
Primary production should be 'enabled' in the rural zone rather than 'prioritised' as mana whenua activities can and should occur in rural areas.	SD-O9	Unresolved	TRONT [185.22] - Pull evidence (22 April 2024), para 106 & 107.	In my opinion primary production should be prioritised in the rural zone over non rural activities and I consider this approach is consistent with the Proposed Plan's GRUZ and RLZ provisions.	No change recommended.
Integrate the protection and maintenance of indigenous biodiversity into the rural area	SD-O9	Resolved with all*	Forest & Bird – Snoyink summary statement (9 May 2024), para 13 to 17.	I understand the submitter's concerns, and I agree that indigenous biodiversity values are an important component of rural areas. However the SDs are to be read together and SD-O2 (the natural and historic environment) already requires	Amend SD-O9 as follows:  5. identifying and maintaining the character, qualities and

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
				indigenous biodiversity outcomes (clauses 5 and 6). For this reason, I do not favour adding an additional clause. However, on balance, I am comfortable including a reference back to SD-O2 natural environment values to clarify this link.	amenity values of rural areas, <u>including their natural environment values</u> ; and
Various changes to the FDA Chapter.	FDA Chapter	Unresolved	ECan [183.19] – Francis evidence (22 April 2024), para 33 to 48.	While my s42A report responded to ECan’s submission points on the relationship / crossover between the UFD and FDA chapter, the changes Ms Francis is seeking are to the FDA chapter. I consider the analysis of these changes is better covered by that chapter author.	No changes recommended to the UFD chapter. Defer consideration of the requested amendments to the FDA hearing.
Include a minimum yield of 12 households per hectare (HH per ha) for any new urban	UFD-O1	Unresolved	ECan [183.21] – Francis evidence (22 April 2024), para 49 to 73.	If a minimum HH per ha requirement was recommended, it should be located in the FDA chapter. I therefore recommend that the assessment of this	No change recommended to the UFD chapter. Defer consideration of the requested amendments to the FDA hearing.

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
FDAs in the Proposed Plan				matter is covered by the FDA chapter author.	
Avoiding areas with important natural, cultural and character values, as opposed to avoiding significant adverse effects on areas with these values.	UFD-O1(6)	Unresolved*	Forest & Bird – Snoyink summary statement (9 May 2024), para 18 to 22.	Provision needs to be made for settlement growth. I consider that natural, cultural and character values are important to protect, however there are many other competing requirements when locating settlement growth. I note that the NATC and NFL provisions do not seek to avoid all adverse effects (e.g. NATC-P4 and NFL-P3 and NFL-P4). However, I consider that referring to 'significant' effects may too 'blunt'. As an alternative, I recommend rewording this clause to avoid 'inappropriate' adverse effects on areas with important natural, cultural and character values (as opposed to 'significant' adverse effects), with the topic specific chapters providing the detail on what is 'inappropriate'.	Amend SD-O1(6) as follows:  6. avoids <u>significant inappropriate adverse effects</u> on areas with important natural, cultural and character values;

Issue	Relevant provisions	Status	Relevant submitter	Reasons for s42A officer position	S42A officer recommendation <i>post-hearing changes are shown in blue font</i>
Delete the reference to “where appropriate” for enabling papakāika.	UFD-O1(8)	Resolved with all	TRONT [185.23] – Pull evidence (19 April 2024), para 111.	I do not consider it appropriate to enable papakāika everywhere in the District and this is not provided for by the Proposed Plan. However, the words ‘where appropriate’ may unintentionally limit their establishment. As such, I recommend replacing ‘where appropriate’ with a reference to Māori land.	Amend UFD-O1 as follows:  ...  <del>8. where appropriate,</del> enables papakāika to occur <u>on Māori land</u> <del>on ancestral lands</del> ;



## Appendix B – Recommended Amendments to SD-O1 post Hearing A

*Note: clause 2 has been reformatted into subclauses a. to e. (under RMA Schedule 1 clause 16(2)). These formatting changes are not shown in track changes.*

SD-O1	Residential Areas and Activities
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is sufficient residential development capacity in existing and proposed urban areas to meet demand and household choice, provided through:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. <del>the use of</del><sup>2</sup> existing zoned greenfield areas;</li> <li>b. a range of densities in existing urban areas; <del>and</del><sup>3</sup></li> <li>c. higher residential densities in close proximity to the Timaru and Geraldine town centres, and Highfield Village Mall;</li> <li>d. the new Future Development Areas identified for the General Residential Zone-; <del>and</del></li> <li>e. <u>the Maori Purpose Zone.</u><sup>4</sup></li> </ol> </li> <li>2. limited rural lifestyle development opportunities are provided where they:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. concentrate and are attached to existing urban areas;</li> <li>b. achieve a coordinated pattern of development;</li> <li>c. <u>avoid significant reverse sensitivity effects on existing and permitted rural activities do not limit or preclude the operation or establishment of rural production activities;</u><sup>5</sup></li> <li>d. <u>recognises</u><sup>6</sup> <u>the productive capabilities of the soils and location;</u><sup>7</sup> and</li> <li>e. are capable of efficiently connecting to <u>reticulated</u><sup>8</sup> sewer and water infrastructure; <del>and</del></li> </ol> </li> <li>3. limited residential opportunities are maintained in existing rural settlements, subject to adequate servicing-; <del>and</del></li> <li>4. <u>the location of new residential areas and activities avoids creating significant conflict with incompatible zones and activities.</u><sup>9</sup></li> </ol>	

<sup>2</sup> RMA Schedule 1, Clause 16(2)

<sup>3</sup> RMA Schedule 1, Clause 16(2)

<sup>4</sup> TRONT [185.17]

<sup>5</sup> Fonterra [165.25]

<sup>6</sup> RMA Schedule 1, Clause 16(2)

<sup>7</sup> Federated Farmers [182.28]

<sup>8</sup> Clause structure reordered under RMA Schedule 1, Clause 16(2)

<sup>9</sup> Silver Fern Farms [172.12] and Alliance Group [173.11]