

Memorandum

Attention:	Matt Bonis
Company:	on behalf of Timaru District Council
Date:	28/07/2025
From:	Kylie Hall - Principal Planner
Message Ref:	Response to Evidence received by TDC on Growth Chapter (as related to cultural matters)

Background

My full name is Kylie Susan Hall. I hold a Master in Environmental Policy with Honours from Lincoln University and a Bachelor of Arts degree majoring in Geography and Sociology from the University of Canterbury. I have 21 years' experience in planning and policy with a predominant focus on land development and the preparation of resource consent applications. I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute (NZPI).

I have been in the role of Principal Planner with Aoraki Environmental Consultancy (AECL) for five and a half years. AECL is the mandated legal entity that represents Te Rūnanga o Arowhenua (Arowhenua). AECL act on behalf of Arowhenua in relation to environmental matters, including resource consents, private and Council Plan Changes, District Plan reviews, Environment Court cases and the preparation of Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) reports.

I was asked by Mr Matt Bonis in his role as a s42A author to provide preliminary consideration of the evidence received to assist the Panel and submitters prior to the Hearing commencing on the 8th July. This was appended to the s42A Report. I did not attend the Hearing; however, I have been kept fully informed and consulted with by Matt Bonis both prior to the Hearing including a review of his draft s42A Report conclusions, and all decisions made post the hearing.

I have been asked by the Independent Hearings Panel to consider the additional cultural evidence only, provided by the submitters (Sub 30 McKnight, FDA-11 Sub 160 Payne, FDA-14 Sub 143.198 Waka Kotahi (Minute 8)). Please find my consideration of additional cultural evidence within Annexure A.

I confirm I have read the Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court New Zealand Practice Note 2023 and that I have complied with it when preparing my evidence. Other than when I state I am relying on the advice of another person, this evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

Response to Cultural Evidence received by TDC on Growth Chapter

The purpose of this attachment is to assist the Independent Hearings Panel to understand if Te Runanga o Arowhenua support those submissions that have resulted in changes as a consequence of the Hearing. In addition to this, the attachment also sets out if the views of Te Runanga o Arowhenua have changed on those submissions that have not been altered as a result of the Hearing.

For a number of submitters, we were requested to provide feedback, which was by way of analysis and reporting – and a collated response was provided for (and funded by) Timaru District Council. The analysis identified in many instances concerns with the proposed growth, specifically in relation to infrastructure provisions, effects on the mauri of waterways in relation to wastewater disposal, and riparian treatment for the same. We did not receive any commentary, or requests from parties to discuss these matters further, with the exception of O'Neill Sub. No 20 and only a matter of days prior to the Hearing commencing.

Pleasant Point

Sub: 231	T Blackler	10 Burke Street, Pleasant Point
Comment:	<p>AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing. Rezone to General Residential Zone (GRZ) or Future Urban Zone (10.6 ha). In addition, no mechanism to ensure implementation, such as an Outline Development Plan approach, is proposed.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>No additional information supplied. Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final recommendation. AECL reiterate their concerns with the development, and associated realignment of Pleasant Point Stream in terms of water quality and quantity.</p>	

Geraldine

Sub: 19	Waitui Deer Farm	Geraldine Downs
Comment:	<p>Milward Finaly Lobb approached AECL on behalf of Arowhenua prior to the Hearing to seek feedback on the submitter's proposal. AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing and understood the submitter sought to extend the 2 ha minimum allotment to all 10ha areas. In addition, no mechanism to ensure implementation, such as an Outline Development Plan approach, is proposed.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>No additional information supplied. Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final recommendation.</p>	

Sub: 128	Scott	FDA3 Geraldine
----------	-------	----------------

Comment	<p>AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing and understood the submitter sought to rezone DA3 to GRZ now.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>No additional information supplied. Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final recommendation.</p>
---------	--

Sub: 72	Lee Anne Burdon	73 Connelly Street, Geraldine.
Comment	<p>AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing and understood the submitter sought to extend the FDA3 area by 8.87 ha.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>No additional information supplied. Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final recommendation.</p>	

Sub: 160, 109, 108	Payne, Harper, Joint Group	FDA11 Bennett Road, Geraldine
Comment	<p>AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing and understood the submitter sought to rezone FDA11 (56 ha) to RLZ now. It is understood there was the offer to amend the proposal through accepting limits on minimum allotment size but seeks 1.5 ha rather than 2 ha as recommended in s42A Report.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>A revised development plan has not yet been assessed by AECL or Arowhenua. Arowhenua are happy to continue working with this submitter, the submitter's consultant and Council to come to a solution that ensures the values associated with Raukapuka Stream are protected and rūnanga continue to have access to their waterways for mahika kai purposes. Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final recommendation.</p>	

Timaru

Sub: 272	G and J Travers	Via Pages Road, Timaru
Comment	<p>AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing and understood the submitter sought to extend the FDA2 with an additional 26.6 ha (General Residential – Priority – 5 years).</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>No additional information supplied. Arowhenua remain concerned that without an appropriate ODP that the subdivision development will be undertaken in an ad hoc fashion and without appropriate consideration for the cultural landscape. Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final recommendation.</p>	

Sub: 33	Ford et al	Via Pages Road, Timaru
Comment	<p>Milward Finaly Lobb approached AECL on behalf of Arowhenua prior to the Hearing to seek feedback on the submitter's proposal. AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing and understood the submitter sought to extend the FDA10 area to include an additional 21 ha (Rural Lifestyle – Priority – 5 years). Also seeking 2 years. No correspondence has been entered into between the submitter and AECL following the Hearing.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>No additional information supplied. Arowhenua remain concerned that without an appropriate ODP that the subdivision development will be undertaken in an ad hoc fashion and without the consideration of the cultural landscape and in particular Taitarakihi Creek. Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final recommendation.</p>	

Sub: 190	North Meadows	236 North Meadows Road
Comment	<p>AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing and understood the submitter sought to rezone GIZ, 34 ha. Use FUZ for land consented land use area and designation land.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final recommendation.</p>	

Sub: 20	O'Neill	Connoor Road
Comment	<p>Milward Finaly Lobb approached AECL on behalf of Arowhenua prior to the Hearing to seek feedback on the submitter's proposal. AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing and understood the submitter sought to identify the site as an FDA and rezone the GRUZ land to GRZ (6.67 ha). No correspondence has been entered into between the submitter and AECL following the Hearing.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Given the cultural significance associated with the submission site, do not support the rezoning of this land. Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final recommendation.</p>	

Sub: 227	Westgarth and Gibson	Pages Road (FDA1/FDA4)
Comment	<p>AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing and understood the submitter sought to rezone FDA1 to General Residential, Realign FDA4 / FDA1 boundary, FDA4 should be priority rather than 10 years plus.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p>	

	Arowhenua remain concerned that without an appropriate ODP the subdivision development will be undertaken in an ad hoc fashion and without the consideration of the cultural landscape and in particular Taitarakihi Creek. Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final recommendation.
--	---

Sub: 211	Pages Trust et al	Pages Road (FDA1/FDA2/FDA4)
Comment	<p>AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing and understood the submitter sought to rezone the Rural zoned land to General Residential, and the development should be priority rather than 10 years plus.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Arowhenua remain concerned that without an appropriate ODP the subdivision development will be undertaken in an ad hoc fashion and without the consideration of the cultural landscape and in particular Taitarakihi Creek. Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final recommendation.</p>	

Sub: 30	McKnight	Brookfield Road, Timaru (Blue Rise)
Comment	<p>Milward Finaly Lobb approached AECL on behalf of Arowhenua prior to the Hearing to seek feedback on the submitter's proposal. AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing. As a result of the hearing and the information provided to Matt Bonis to set out the reasoning for the concern with the original submission, the submitter has been willing to narrow the scope of their relief sought to allow for five additional allotments in order to protect the cultural and biodiversity values associated with Ōtipua Creek.</p> <p>The positive collaboration between the submitter's consultant, Matt Bonis and AECL and the willingness of these parties to work together to find a positive outcome, and a joint witness statement has been signed by all parties.</p> <p>Response:</p> <p>Arowhenua supports the narrowed relief sought by the submitter along with the recommended setbacks and planting as set out in the JWS.</p>	

Sub: Whitewater 248 / De Joux 157 (FDA13) De Joux 157 (FDA14)	Whitewater, De Joux	FDA13 and FDA14
Comment	<p>AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing and understood the submitter sought to rezone FDA13 GIZ now and FDA14 GRZ now.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p>	

	Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final recommendation.
--	---

Temuka

Sub: 237	RSM Trust	FDA6 Geraline
Comment	<p>AECL provided technical cultural evidence in regard to this request prior to the Hearing and understood the submitter sought to FDA6 to GRZ now, or as 5 years in SCHED 15.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final recommendation.</p>	

Other

Sub: 143	New Zealand Transport Authority/Waka Kotahi	Future Development Areas
Comment	<p>No cultural evidence was provided. No correspondence has been entered into between the submitter and AECL following the Hearing. A number of the submission points raised during the hearing were to improve the safety of road users, which Arowhenua support.</p> <p>Recommendation:</p> <p>Arowhenua concurs with the assessment set out in the s42A planning report and final decision.</p>	