

Before the Independent Hearing Panel  
Appointed by the Timaru District Council

Under Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)

In the matter of Submissions on the Proposed Timaru District Plan

Between **Various Submitters**

And **Timaru District Council**

Respondent

---

Matt Bonis – Hearing G - s42A summary statement

Growth

4 July 2025

---

## Introduction

1. My name is Matt Bonis. My qualifications, experience, statement as to conflicts of interest and confirmation of the observation of the Code of Conduct is recorded in my s42A Report<sup>1</sup>. I reconfirm the Code of Conduct commitment.
2. I have read all the submissions, further submissions, submitter packages received on 20 February 2025 in response to the directions of the Panel set out in Minutes 6 and 13, submitter evidence received by 30 June 2025, and relevant technical documents and higher order objectives relevant to my s42A report.
3. The purpose of this summary is to provide the Panel and submitters with the following:
  - (a) A brief summary of key issues raised in submissions.
  - (b) Corrections I wish to make in my s42A Report.
  - (c) A list of issues raised in evidence prior to the hearing, including identifying (where possible):
    - (i) Issues that are resolved on the basis of pre-circulated evidence; or
    - (ii) Issues that remain outstanding pending the hearing of evidence.
  - (d) Updates to the recommendations contained in my s42A Report.
4. The technical experts who provided evidence upon which I relied in preparing the section 42A report have considered the matters relevant to their expertise raised in Evidence and will be available to provide additional comment and answer questions on these matters at the Hearing.
5. The Summary responds to the requirements of Panel Minutes 7 and 8, and 37.
6. On 3 July 2025 the Panel issued Minute 41 relating to landscape and amenity clarification from the Council experts and legal counsel. A response to this Minute will be tabled prior to, or at the Hearing commencing on **8 July 2025**.

## Summary of key issues

7. Given the nature of the Future Development Area (**FDA**) Chapter and the submissions (and rezoning requests) received, the key issues were grouped in the section 42A report as follows:
  - (a) Key Issue 1 (FDA Objectives and Policies), Key Issue 2 (FDA Specific activities and rules within the FDA), Key Issue 3 (miscellaneous provisions).

---

<sup>1</sup> S42A Report – Growth. Bonis [1.1.1, 1.1.2]

- (b) Key Issue 4: Amendments to the notified FDAs including submissions seeking extensions or amendments to Development Area Plan timing in SCHED15.
  - (c) Key Issue 5: Amending proposals for additional FDA overlays.
  - (d) Key Issue 6: Urban (General Residential or General Business zone) rezoning requests.
  - (e) Key Issue 7: Rural Lifestyle Zone rezoning requests.
  - (f) Key Issue 8: Miscellaneous (Examples include Primeport Sub#175.7 alignment of Urban Area with Port Zone).
8. In relation to Evidence received:
- (a) Key Issues 1<sup>2</sup>, 2<sup>3</sup> and 3<sup>4</sup> - FDA Chapter Provisions: Evidence has been received from Primeport<sup>5</sup> and the Canterbury Regional Council.<sup>6</sup>
  - (b) Site specific evidence (and a summary of positions) has been received in relation to the following:
    - i. Key Issue 4 – Amendments to notified FDAs
      - FDA1 / FDA4 Timaru: Sub 227 R Westgarth and J Gibson.
      - FDA2 Timaru: Further Sub.272 Travers. Extension of FDA2.
      - FDA3 Geraldine: Sub.128 W & E Scott.
      - FDA3 Geraldine: Sub 72 L Burden.
      - FDA6 Temuka: Sub 237 RSM Trust.
      - FDA10 Timaru: Sub No.33 Ford et al.
      - FDA11 Geraldine: Sub 160 Payne.
      - FDA13 and FDA14 Timaru: Sub No. 248 Whitewater and Sub No. 157 De Joux.
    - ii. Key Issue 6: Urban (General Residential or General Business zone) Rezoning Requests.
      - 10 Burke Street, Pleasant Point: Sub No. 231 Blackler.
      - 236 North Meadows, Timaru: Sub No.19 North Meadows.
      - Connoor Road, Timaru: Sub No.20 O’Neill.
      - 240 King Street, Temuka: Sub No.145 Johnston.
    - iii. Key Issue 7: Rural Lifestyle Rezoning Requests.
      - Geraldine Downs, Geraldine: Sub No 19 Waitui Deer Farm.

---

<sup>2</sup> S42A [Section 7]

<sup>3</sup> S42A [Section 8]

<sup>4</sup> S42A [Section 9]

<sup>5</sup> EIC Seaton. Primeport Further Sub No 175 to CRC [Sub No.183.9] Consistency of definition for *Urban Development* [15] to reference *Port Zone*.

<sup>6</sup> EIC Francis (CRC) [20, 21, 35] ‘In my opinion the policy framework is robust’.

- Brookfield Road, Timaru (Bluerise): Sub No. 30 McKnight.
- iv. Key Issue 8 – Miscellaneous.
- Timaru Port, Primeport. Submission (Sub No. 175.7).
9. No evidence was received in relation to Key Issue 5 (additional FDAs<sup>7</sup>).

### Summary of Issues in evidence received

10. In relation to the Evidence received, I consider the following initial matters are relevant to bring to the attention of the Panel and submitters:

#### *Jurisdictional matters – Further Submission No.272. Evidence Jess Bould.*

11. It is considered that the outcomes sought in the evidence of Ms Bould for Travers further submission No.272 are outside of the scope of the original submission.
12. Further submission No. 272 relates to original submissions 203, 211, and 216.
13. The original submissions<sup>8</sup> do not seek to spatially extend FDA2 as sought in the evidence of Ms Bould. A further submission cannot expand on the scope (spatial extent or provisions) beyond that raised by the original submission<sup>9</sup>.

#### *Growth Forecasts – Evidence Sonia Dolan. Sub No.s 231 (Blackler), 128 (Scott), 190 (North Meadows), 227 (Westgarth and Gibson) and 237 (RSM Trust).*

14. Ms Dolan in her Planning evidence for the above parties has criticised the Property Economics (PE) Timaru District Residential Capacity Report (2024) and Industrial Land Economic Assessment (2025) used within the evidence of Mr Tim Heath and relied upon within the s42A Report.
15. Mr Heath, who prepared the PE Reports, is a qualified economist with significant experience preparing similar capacity analyses. No technical evidence has been provided by an expert to challenge the PE analysis. I have consulted with Mr Heath who considers that her criticisms are unfounded and is prepared to respond in more detail at the hearing or in reply.
16. Ms Dolan states that ‘*the Property Economics report has not been peer reviewed to analyse the data and confirm the assumptions made<sup>10</sup>*’ and ‘*I recommend the Property Economics Report be peer reviewed<sup>11</sup>*’.
17. In terms of an initial response:

---

<sup>7</sup> Refer s42A [11.1.1]

<sup>8</sup> S42A [10.2.7]

<sup>9</sup> RMA1991 Schedule 1, Clause 8(2) ‘*must be limited to a matter in support or opposition to the relevant submission....*’. Further submission cannot extend the scope of the original submission and can only seek allowance or disallowance in whole or part of the original submission: *Offenberger v Masterton DC* [W053/96](#) (PT).

<sup>10</sup> EiC Dolan. Sub 128 [15]. The statement is replicated in all other briefs of evidence.

<sup>11</sup> EiC Dolan. Sub 128 [49]. The statement is replicated in all other briefs of evidence.

- (a) The s42A Preliminary Report containing the PE Residential Capacity report was issued on 29 October 2024, seven months in advance of the receipt of submitter evidence. Questions 1 and 2 requested submitters test that analysis through technical experts and respond in their submitter packages; I repeated this message with submitters during site visits.
  - (b) I agree with Ms Vella's legal submissions that *'Submitters advocating for changes to the PDP have the evidential burden of establishing a case for those changes and are required to forward a proper evidential basis to support their submission'*<sup>12</sup>.
18. I consider that the PE Residential (2024) and Industrial (2025) Reports remain as a robust base for the Panel to rely on in their deliberations.

*Application of Future Urban Zone – Evidence Sonia Dolan. Sub No.s 231 (Blackler), 128 (Scott), 190 (North Meadows), 227 (Westgarth and Gibson) and 237 (RSM Trust).*

19. Ms Dolan has requested in her Evidence that the pathway for rezoning the above submissions should now be undertaken by way of Future Development Zone (**FUZ**), rather than by the notified FDA framework<sup>13</sup>. She suggests that a FUZ could be subject to a structure plan that would also incorporate further technical investigations, with infrastructure funding to subsequently be worked through between the developer and council<sup>14</sup>.
20. I note that both the FDA or FUZ mechanism provides a two-stage process by which land is urbanised (or zoned for Rural Lifestyle activities). I understand the main difference between the mechanisms is that the FUZ process is implemented by a Special Purpose Zone – Future Urban Zone embedded in a district plan, whereas the FDA in the PTPDP is by way of overlay. Both mechanisms require a subsequent plan change to enable urban development<sup>15</sup>.
21. An overview of the FDA mechanism is provided in the s42A Report<sup>16</sup>.
22. Ms Dolan's approach also has potentially unintended consequences for those parties she represents in terms of the application of the NPS-HPL. The National Planning Standards nest Future Urban Zones as a Special Purpose Zone<sup>17</sup>. Under the NPS-HPL, 'urban' is defined as meaning 'any of the following zones: (a)... (e) any special purpose zone, other than a Maori Purpose Zone'<sup>18</sup>.

---

<sup>12</sup> TDC. Hearing G. Legal Submissions. Vella [22, 23]

<sup>13</sup> EiC Dolan. Sub No 128, [27 – 30], Sub No. 227 [28 -31] The statements are replicated in all other briefs of evidence.

<sup>14</sup> EiC Dolan. Sub No. 227 [30] As replicated in other briefs of evidence.

<sup>15</sup> Refer example: New Plymouth District Council Decision FUZ [2.2 – 2.4]

<https://proposeddistrictplan.npdc.govt.nz/media/3cspkdh/recommendation-report-31-fuz.pdf>

<sup>16</sup> S42A [2.1.2 – 2.1.11]

<sup>17</sup> National Planning Standards. 2019. Section 4 – District Plan Standards.

<sup>18</sup> NPS-HPL. Clause 1.3 Interpretation.

23. Under the NPS-HPL, application of a Future Urban Zone as sought in the amending proposal by Ms Dolan is an urban zoning request and triggers application of Clause 3.6(4).
24. For those sites represented by Ms Dolan where she is now promoting a FUZ (including Sub No.231 Blackler, Sub No.190 North Meadows, Sub No.227 Westgarth as relates to FDA4<sup>19</sup>, and Sub No. 237 RSM Trust), the Panel would need to be satisfied that clauses 3.6(4)(a) to (c) (conjunctively) would be met for each site, noting the PE capacity analysis and paucity of technical evaluation for each site relating to Clause 3.6(c).
25. I consider that the FDA framework established in the notified PTDP remains appropriate.

*NPS-Highly Productive Land*

26. The relevance of the NPS-HPL is provided in the s42A Memo<sup>20</sup>, s42A Report as related to each 'request' submission, and within legal submissions<sup>21</sup>.
27. In relation to the evidence received, I consider that:
  - (a) For Sub No.30 McKnight. The analysis from Mr Millner is considered sufficient in terms of the consideration under cl3.10 as a Rural Lifestyle zoning is sought.
  - (b) For Sub No.190 North Meadows. The balance site is a combination of LUC 2 and 3. No expert evaluation has been provided in terms of cl3.6(4)(c). I also consider that clauses 3.6(4)(a) and (b) have not been demonstrated.
  - (c) For Sub No. 231 Blackler. The site is a combination of LUC 2 and 3. No expert evaluation has been provided in terms of cl3.6(4)(c), and I do not consider that it has been demonstrated that clauses 3.6(4)(a) and (b) have been met.
  - (d) Submission No.157 (De Joux) relates to FDA14. The site(s) is LUC3 and hence HPL. No expert evaluation has been provided.
  - (e) Submission No. 237. RSM Trust. The site is LUC3. Whilst a technical evaluation is provided by the AgriBusiness Group in relation to the NPS-HPL clause 3.6(c), I do not consider that the rezoning would achieve the conjunctive requirements of the NPS-HPL clauses 3.6(4)(a) and (b). I also note given the findings of the AgriBuisness Group that there would appear to be little to distinguish this site's productive capacity from much of the wider surrounding area. I also note that the requirements of the NPS-HPL clause 3.6(5) also need to be met.

---

<sup>19</sup> S42A [10.1.14]

<sup>20</sup> Applicability of NPS-HPL to proposed re-zonings – Growth Topic, dated 21 January 2025

<sup>21</sup> Commencing at [38]

### Corrections to my s42A Report

28. I addressed the definition of ‘Urban Development’ as related to the submission from Canterbury Regional Council [183.9], agreeing with the amendment recommended by Mr Willis the s42A Reporting Officer relating to the Energy and Infrastructure Chapter<sup>22</sup>.
29. The evidence from Ms Seaton for Primeport appropriately identifies that Mr Willis subsequently updated that definition within his reply statement to the Panel to respond to the further submission from Primeport to Sub No. 183.9 ensuring that the ‘Port Zone’ was referenced in the definition.
30. I agree, and note that the consistent definition as recommended by myself and Mr Willis is provided in the legal submissions of Ms Vella. The recommended definition is:

Urban Development	<p><del>has the same meaning as in section 9 of the Urban Development Act 2020 which includes:</del></p> <p><del>a. development of housing, including public housing and community housing, affordable housing, homes for first-home buyers, and market housing;</del></p> <p><del>b. development and renewal of urban environments, whether or not this includes housing development;</del></p> <p><del>c. development of related commercial, industrial, community, or other amenities, infrastructure, facilities, services, or works.</del></p> <p>means development within an area zoned as a Residential Zone, Settlement Zone, Commercial and Mixed Use Zone, General Industrial Zone, <b>Special Purpose Port and Māori Purpose zones</b>, and Open Space Zone or a Sport and Active Recreation Zone that are adjacent to the aforementioned zones. It also includes development outside of these zones which is not of a rural or rural lifestyle character and is differentiated from rural development by its scale, intensity, visual character and the dominance of built structures. For the avoidance of doubt, it does not include the provision of regionally significant infrastructure in Rural Zones<sup>23</sup>.</p>
-------------------	--

### Further Submission FS No.267 Wayne Shield

31. The Group G Hearing Schedule incorporates submissions from Mr Sheild. Mr Sheild is a further submitter [267.1FS] opposing original submission No.145.1 Tristram Johnson.
32. The original submission seeks a GRZ zoning for 340 King Street, Temuka as zoned under the PTDP as GRUZ.
33. The reasons for opposition in the further submission are:

*Council by multiple studies and the plan process has made an informed decision to zone this land rural because it reflects the actual land usage and the character of the surrounding area. The applicants sole reason for wanting the*

<sup>22</sup> S42A 9.1.22

<sup>23</sup> ECan [183.9]

*zoning changed to general residential zone is to enable the applicant to subdivide. A recent application for subdivision resource consent by the applicant was declined after a hearing in front of a Commissioner. That decision made it very clear that subdivision for residential usage was not in keeping with the surrounding area. Council district plan cannot isolate individual address for change of zoning without considering the affect on the integrity of its proposed plan and any change here would be detrimental to the whole area.*

34. I refer the Panel and Mr Sheild to the s42A Report [6.1.5, 6.1.6] which sets out response to further submissions (as consistent across all s42A Reports):

*Further submissions have been considered in the preparation of this report, but in general, they are not specifically mentioned because they are limited to the matters raised in original submissions. Further submissions are not listed within Appendix 2.*

35. The s42A Report recommends acceptance of original submission No.145.1 Tristram Johnson<sup>24</sup>. The relevant analysis refers to the submitter package provided by technical experts for the submitter, and Council's Landscape evidence and Infrastructure Team. Consequently, 267.1FS is recommended to be rejected.

#### **List of resolved and outstanding issues**

36. A list of resolved and outstanding issues, based on the evidence received, is provided at **Appendix A**. Note that Appendix A does not attempt to reflect whether the issue is agreed between submitters who did not pre-circulate evidence for Hearing G.

#### **Updates to recommendations**

37. I have not provided a preliminary view at this time on the evidence submitted (except as identified in this statement), as I wish to hear the evidence and the Panel's questions. In some instances, I may need to seek further advice from the Council's technical experts before I provide updated recommendations. I understand that I will have the opportunity to provide a formal response to the matters heard at the hearing.
38. I acknowledge the evidence of Ms Wharfe on behalf of Sub No.190 (Payne) and that of Ms Francis, Mr Trewartha and Mr Massey Sub No.189 (CRC) as these relate to the s42A Recommendation in relation to FDA11.
39. For the sake of brevity I understand that the remaining contested matters associated with FDA11 relate to density of any associated rezoning to RLZ (1.5ha vs 2.0ha), and the implications of 'establishing an immediate pathway (for the RLZ rezoning) for FDA11 ... without understanding the reality of the ability to get resource consents from the Regional Council, a false expectation of the ability to successfully subdivide could be created'<sup>25</sup>. I consider that further caucusing between the submitter, ECan and relevant TDC experts may

---

<sup>24</sup> S42A [12.3.13]

<sup>25</sup> EiC Francis [49]



be useful to recommend an appropriate solution, if the Panel were minded directing that. However, my initial view is that a 1.5ha density as sought by Ms Wharfe would likely create conflict with the application of SUB-S1(4).

40. At this stage, based on the evidence lodged and technical advice, I recommend acceptance of the following:

- (a) Sub No. 30: O'Neill - Extension of the Brookfield SCA by 2.26Ha as sought in the Evidence of Mr Ross, as subject to further consideration as to plan mechanism(s) to provide certainty to secure the mitigation recommended by Mr Greenshields<sup>26</sup> and agreed by Ms Pfluger relating to visual effects on the skyline from public viewpoints. It is noted that the TPDP already contains specific provisions relating to the Brookfield SCA. I have spoken to Mr Ross in relation to this matter. I am otherwise satisfied based on the evidence received that issues associated with application of the NPS-HPL<sup>27</sup> and appropriate controls exist in relation to earthworks<sup>28</sup> to manage impacts on cultural values to reasonable levels.
- (b) Sub No.228: Westgarth – Alignment boundary of FDA1/FDA4. Ms Pfluger has advised me that based on receipt of the 1m contour information requested in the s42A Report that the amending proposal associated with the realigned boundary is the more appropriate. I agree.

**Matt Bonis**  
**4 July 2025**

---

<sup>26</sup> EiC Greenshields [8.6]

<sup>27</sup> EiC Milner [6.6]

<sup>28</sup> EiC Ross [9.7 – 9.11]

## APPENDIX A

### Status of issues raised in evidence – Growth – Hearing Stream G

Notes:

1. *This table only addresses submissions where evidence has been received, it is not considered that the other submission points therefore have been resolved.*
2. *Status: The status of the issue reflects my understanding of the status of resolution as between those submitters who pre-circulated evidence for Hearing G. It does not attempt to reflect whether the issue is agreed between submitters who did not pre-circulate evidence for Hearing G.*
3. *Status: An asterisk (\*) against the status denotes where I have made an assumption based on the amendments I have recommended. However, I am not certain as to that status because the amendments I have recommended are different to that sought by the submitter.*
4. *Relevant submitters: Relevant submitters are those who pre-circulated evidence for Hearing G. Other submitters who did not pre-circulate evidence may be interested in the issue (as submitters in their own right, or as further submitters) but they have not been listed here. Orange shading identifies matters still outstanding.*
5. *The Further Submission Sub.272 Travers. Extension of FDA2 is not included in the table below as it is outside the scope of any original submission.*

Issue (raised in evidence)	Relevant spatial area	Status		Relevant submitter(s) that pre-circulated evidence
Key Issue 1:	FDA Objectives and Policies	Resolved		Sub 189 Canterbury Regional Council -evidence of Ms Francis (planning) [16 – 21, 35]
Key Issue 2:	FDA Specific activities and rules within the FDA	Resolved		Sub 189 Canterbury Regional Council -evidence of Ms Francis (planning) [16 – 21]
Key Issue 3:	Miscellaneous Provisions	Resolved		Sub 189 Canterbury Regional Council -evidence of Ms Francis (planning) [16 – 21]  Sub 175.7 Primeport -evidence of Ms Seaton (planning) [Definitions 15 – 19], [Urban Area Boundary and Port Zone Boundary 20 – 22]
		Rezone FDA1 to GRZ	Outstanding	Sub 227 R Westgarth and J Gibson

Key Issue 4: Amendments to notified FDAs	FDA1 / FDA4 Timaru: Sub 227 R Westgarth and J Gibson. Amending proposal in evidence seeks for FDA1 and FDA4 to be rezoned Future Urban Zone (FUZ) <sup>29</sup>	Amendment to FDA1 / FDA4 boundary	Resolved <sup>30</sup>	-evidence of Ms Dolan (planning)
		Amendment to SCHED15 for FDA4	Outstanding	
	FDA3 Geraldine: Sub.128 W & E Scott. Amending Proposal in evidence seeks Future Urban Zone (FUZ) <sup>31</sup>	Rezone to GRZ.	Outstanding <sup>32</sup>	Sub 128 Scott -evidence of Ms Dolan (planning) - evidence of Mr Chang (infrastructure) - evidence of Mr Facey (transport)
	FDA3 Geraldine: Sub 72 L Burden.	Expand FDA3 / zone as FDA <sup>33</sup> .	Outstanding <sup>34</sup>	Submissions – Sub 72 Burden
	FDA6 Temuka: Sub 237 RSM Trust. Amending Proposal in evidence seeks Future Urban Zone (FUZ).	Rezone to GRZ <sup>35</sup>	Outstanding <sup>36</sup>	Sub 237 RSM Trust -evidence of Ms Dolan (planning) - evidence of Mr Chang (infrastructure) - desktop study Molyneux (Geotech) - evidence of Mr Facey (transport) - letter Agribusiness Group, unauthored (NPS-HPL)
	FDA10 Timaru: Sub No.33 Ford et al. Amending proposal in submissions seeks 2Ha minimum allotment size for extended area sought.	Extend FDA10 <sup>37</sup>	Outstanding <sup>38</sup>	Sub No.33 Ford et al Submissions of Mr Rabbidge.

<sup>29</sup> EiC Dolan. Sub 227. [8]

<sup>30</sup> S42A [10.1.24, 10.1.25]

<sup>31</sup> EiC Dolan. Sub 128. [8]

<sup>32</sup> S42A [10.3.36]

<sup>33</sup> Statement. L Burden.

<sup>34</sup> S42A [10.3.12].

<sup>35</sup> EiC Dolan. Sub 237. [8]

<sup>36</sup> S42A [10.6.27]

<sup>37</sup> Submission [3] Rabbidge. Sub No. 33

<sup>38</sup> S42A [10.10.19]

	FDA11 Geraldine: Sub 160 Payne. Amending Proposal in evidence seeks 1.5Ha minimum allotment size 'where not accessed via SH79) through application of SCA <sup>39</sup> .	Rezone to RLZ.	Outstanding <sup>40</sup>	Sub No.33 Ford et al -evidence of Ms Wharfe (planning)  Sub No.189 Canterbury Regional Council -evidence of Ms Francis (planning) -evidence of Mr Trewartha (groundwater) -evidence of Ms Massey (contamination)
	FDA13 Timaru: Sub No. 248 Whitewater and Sub No. 157 De Joux.	Rezone to GIZ.	Outstanding <sup>41</sup>	FDA13 Timaru: Sub No. 248 Whitewater and Sub No. 157 De Joux. -evidence of Mr Hole (planning) [10 – 24]
	FDA14 Timaru: Sub No. 157 De Joux.	Submission to amend SCHED15 to 'priority areas – 5 years'	Outstanding <sup>42</sup>	FDA14 Timaru: Sub No. 157 De Joux. -evidence of Mr Hole (planning) [25 -38]
Key Issue 6: Urban (General Residential or General Business zone) Rezoning Requests	10 Burke Street, Pleasant Point: Sub No. 231 Blackler. Amending Proposal in evidence seeks GRZ now or Future Urban Zone (FUZ).	Rezone as GIZ <sup>43</sup> .	Outstanding <sup>44</sup>	Sub 231 Blackler -evidence of Ms Dolan (planning) - evidence of Mr Chang (infrastructure) - evidence of Mr Carr (transport)
	236 North Meadows, Timaru: Sub No.19 North Meadows. Amending proposal seeks to rezone all 34ha to GIZ or FUZ.	Rezone to GIZ (34Ha) <sup>45</sup> . S42A Recommends accept in part, in relation to that 14ha area consented.	Outstanding <sup>46</sup> .	Sub 231 Blackler -evidence of Ms Dolan (planning) - memo Davis Oglivie (unauthored) (infrastructure).

<sup>39</sup> Also note Evidence of Canterbury Regional Council Francis [52] FDA11

<sup>40</sup> S42A [10.11.32]

<sup>41</sup> S42A [10.13.20, 10.14.19]

<sup>42</sup> S42A [10.14.21]

<sup>43</sup> EiC Dolan. Sub 231. [8]

<sup>44</sup> S42A [12.7.14]

<sup>45</sup> EiC Dolan. Sub 190. [8]

<sup>46</sup> S42A 10.6.27]

	Connoor Road, Timaru: Sub No.20 O'Neill. Amending proposal in submissions now seeks application of FDA.	Submission sought rezoning to GRZ <sup>47</sup>	Outstanding <sup>48</sup>	Sub No.20 Ford et al Submissions of Mr Rabbidge.
	240 King Street, Temuka: Sub No.145 Johnston.	Submission sought to rezone to GRZ	Resolved <sup>49</sup>	240 King Street, Temuka: Sub No.145 Johnston. - evidence of Ms McMullen (planning)
Key Issue 7: Rural Lifestyle Rezoning Requests.	Geraldine Downs, Geraldine: Sub No 19 Waitui Deer Farm. Evidence supports amending proposal for deferred zoning, and 'concept' plan	Submission sought broad application of 2Ha SCA over Geraldine Downs RLZ <sup>50</sup> .	Outstanding <sup>51</sup>	Geraldine Downs, Geraldine: Sub No 19 Waitui Deer Farm - evidence of Ms McMullen (planning)
	Brookfield Road, Timaru (Bluerise): Sub No. 30 McKnight. Amending proposal in evidence relates to 2.66Ha RLZ (sufficient for five additional lots), and balance as GRUZ, with supporting HPL and Landscape assessment <sup>52</sup> .	Submission sought rezoning to RLZ and 'offer' to Council for Open Space Zone (OSZ).	Resolved*  (Amendments required landscape mitigation mechanism)	Brookfield Road, Timaru (Bluerise): Sub No. 30 McKnight - evidence of Mr Rabbidge (surveying) - evidence of Mr Ross (planning) - evidence of Mr Greenshields (landscape) - evidence of Mr Milner (NPS-HPL)
Key Issue 8 – Miscellaneous	Timaru Port, Primeport. Submission (Sub No. 175.7)	Urban Area to encompass the Port Zone	Resolved <sup>53</sup> .	Timaru Port, Primeport. Submission (Sub No. 175.7) - evidence of Ms Seaton (Planning).

<sup>47</sup> No timing or mechanism is identified in the Submissions to be included in SCHED15.

<sup>48</sup> S42A [10.10.19]

<sup>49</sup> S42A [12.3.13]

<sup>50</sup> Conceptual Layout for 199 Waitui Drive 27 June 2025. Abbott.

<sup>51</sup> S42A [13.2.18]

<sup>52</sup> EiC Ross [4.2 – 4.6]

<sup>53</sup> EiC Seaton. Sub No 175 [24].