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

Nick Boyes – Hearing E – s42A summary statement

Subdivision and Development Area Chapters

4 February 2025

Council'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 My name is Nick Boyes. I am a self-employed Consultant Planner trading as Core Planning and Property Ltd. I prepared the s42A report on the Subdivision and Development Areas Chapters. I confirm that I have read all the submissions, further submissions, submitter evidence and relevant technical documents and higher order objectives relevant to my s42A report. I have the qualifications and experience as set out in my s42A report.

2 The purpose of this summary is to provide the Panel and submitters with the following:

(a) Brief summary of key issues raised in submissions;

(b) Corrections I wish to make to 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 the pre-circulated evidence; or

(ii) issues that remain outstanding pending the hearing of evidence; and

(d) Updates to the recommendations contained in my s42A report.

3 Please note that the abbreviations used in this Summary are the same as those used in the original s42A report.

Summary of key issues

4 In my s42A report, I identified the following matters as the key issues raised in submissions:

(a) Consolidation of rules regarding subdivision within the SUB chapter as opposed to being spread across various chapters within the PDP.

(b) Whether references to productive land should be amended to highly productive land as defined in the NPSHPL.

(c) Whether the 40ha minimum allotment size for the GRUZ gives effect to the NPSHPL.

(d) The activity status applying to boundary adjustments (whether they should be subject to a more enabling rule framework).

(e) Whether the esplanade provisions should be included within a standalone chapter within the PDP.

(f) Whether the GRUZ subdivision provisions (minimum allotment size) sufficiently provide for managed growth allowing farmers to undertake small lot subdivision to provide for farm succession, disposal of surplus dwellings and for providing on-site accommodation for employees.

(g) Whether the 2ha minimum allotment size for the RLZ should be removed, i.e., default to 5,000m^2, regardless of whether the allotment will be connected to a reticulated wastewater system.

(h) Whether reverse sensitivity effects:

i. should be 'minimised' or 'avoided';

ii. should be expanded to protect:

- all primary production (not only intensive);
- rural industry; and
- all existing lawfully established activities.

(i) Whether indigenous biodiversity values need to be specifically recognised within the SUB objectives.

(j) Whether educational facilities should be specifically referenced in SUB-O1.7 as opposed to facilities generally.

(k) What qualifies as "fragmentation of productive land" (SUB-O3) and whether such fragmentation of land should be 'minimised' or 'avoided'.

(l) Whether lifeline utilities should be offered protection from reverse sensitivity along with other infrastructure and facilities.

(m) Whether the assessment matters relating to provision of infrastructure and esplanades should include Kāti Huirapa values.

(n) Does the ability to waive esplanade provisions adequately account for the potential operational health and safety requirements of adjoining land.

(o) Whether a more permissive approach should be taken for the subdivision of allotments for utility purposes.

(p) Whether consent notices should be used to “alert” future owners that services may not be provided to an allotment.

(q) Whether connection to the reticulated wastewater system should be required for the creation of new sites within the GIZ.

(r) Whether the exception applying for new allotments in the GRUZ from having to connect to electricity supply and telecommunication services is appropriate.

(s) Whether subdivisions should be “in general accordance” or “comply” with Development Area Plans (DAP); and whether development not in accordance with a DAP must “better” achieve the outcomes sought.

(t) What is meant by the term “associated requirements” as used in the DEV Area policy framework.

(u) Whether engineering plans need to be prepared by a ‘chartered’ engineer, or whether surveyors are also able to prepare such plans to submit to Council for approval.

(v) What scale of development within a DAP triggers the need to provide all walkway/cycleways (including those beyond the application site).

(w) Whether a residential unit on an existing site should trigger full compliance with balance of DEV Area rule framework.

(x) Whether the extent of works and contributions required discourages future development, as it requires too much land to be set aside (for esplanade, roading, walkways/cycleways etc.) without any provision for compensation.

(y) The need for greater consistency of provisions across the four Development Area Chapters.

5 Of the above, I note that those that appear to remain outstanding, with respect to evidence lodged are:

(a) Activity status of boundary adjustment subdivisions.

(b) Whether the 2ha minimum allotment size for the RLZ should be removed, i.e., default to 5,000m^2, regardless of whether the allotment will be connected to a reticulated wastewater system.

(c) The ability to waive esplanade provisions on the basis of the potential operational health and safety requirements of adjoining land.

(d) Whether the extent of works and contributions required discourages future development as it requires too much land to be set aside (for esplanade, roading, walkways/cycleways etc.) without any provision for compensation.

6 In addition to the key issues that were identified in the s42A report, I note that the following matters raised in submissions are further addressed in evidence:

(a) Whether DEV1-O1.11 and DEV3-O1.10 give effect to the NPSET (Policy 10) and Objectives 5.2.1, 5.2.2 and Policies 5.3.9 and 16.3.4 of the CRPS (Transpower).

(b) Consistency of the Note that accompanies the DEV Area rules – to clarify that the district wide chapters also apply (Transpower).

(c) Port of Timaru (namely Lot 2 DP 326718) being included in SCHED12, and therefore exclusion from esplanade reserve requirements (Prime Port).

(d) The addition of the term 'associational values' to SUB-O1 and deletion of the 'significant' threshold therein when considering cultural values (TrONT).

(e) Whether boundary adjustment subdivision should be exempt from esplanade provisions; and this being made clear in SUB-P7 and SUB-S8 (Rooney Group).

(f) Requirements and contributions associated with Road 5 shown on the DEV3 DAP (Rooney Group).

Corrections to my s42A report

7 Appendix 1 to my s42 Report included a set of recommended changes to the SUB and DEV Area Chapters.

8 There are errors within that Appendix that I would like to bring to the Hearing Panel's attention at this time.

9 The heading for new recommended rule SUB-R8 reads "Subdivision and Sites of Significance to Māori". This should read "Subdivision and Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori".

10 In the DEV Area chapters, a change was made in response to the submission lodged by the TDC [42.60-63] to ensure that developers were responsible for the stormwater, water and sewerage infrastructure within

land owned by the developer. The relief sought was correctly included within DEV1-S2, DEV2-S2 and DEV4-S2. However, in DEV3-S2 the words "their site" were not shown as strikethrough, meaning that the provision reads:

> *…shall be designed and constructed by the developer within their site land owned by the developer.*

11 This should read:

> *…shall be designed and constructed by the developer within ~~their site~~ land owned by the developer.*

12 In my original s42A report I recommended that the rules relating to subdivision are consolidated within the SUB Chapter of the PDP. This was in response to various submissions lodged by Mr B Speirs [66.45 to 66.51, 66.53, 66.54 and 66.61].

13 Some of those rules apply to specific (and defined areas) that are not otherwise identified as an overlay or other notation on the planning maps. In drafting the rule headings, I have used the convention of subdivision "and" XXX. This could lead to interpretation queries as to where those rules apply, and affects rules SUB-R4, SUB-R10 and SUB-R13. To alleviate any such concerns, I recommend that the headings of these rules be amended to read as follows:

SUB-R4	**Subdivision within ~~and~~ the National Grid Corridor**
SUB-R10	**Subdivision within a ~~and~~ Riparian Margin**
SUB-R13	**Subdivision of ~~and~~ Versatile Soil~~s~~**

14 These changes will be included in the updated chapters provided to the Hearing Panel as part of the s42A Reply Report prepared following the conclusion of the hearing of evidence.

15 I am not aware of any further corrections required to my s42A report at this time.

List of resolved and outstanding issues

16 A list of issues that are either resolved on the basis of pre-circulated evidence, or that remain outstanding pending the hearing of evidence, is attached at **Appendix A** in order to assist the Panel.

Updates to recommendations

17 I have not provided a preliminary view on all outstanding matters at this time, as I wish to hear the evidence and the Panel questions 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.

18 However, at this stage, based on the evidence lodged, I consider the following changes to be appropriate:

(a) Ms McLeod considers that the recommended changes to DEV1-O1.11 and DEV3-O1.10 do not give effect to Policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET[1].

My reasoning for not recommending the use of 'avoid' in the above objectives was based on the fact that as an identified DEV area, the land in question is anticipated to be developed for residential/urban development. In that context, I was reluctant to create a situation of a "zero threshold" for any such reverse sensitivity effects arising from this anticipated development that could be used to frustrate what is otherwise provided for by the planning framework.

As stated in my section 42A report, I do not consider that Policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET set such a "zero threshold", rather Policy 10 obligates decision-makers *"to the extent reasonably possible manage activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on the electricity transmission network and to ensure that operation, maintenance, upgrading, and development of the electricity transmission network is not compromised"* (My emphasis).

In my view there are key qualifications included within Policy 10 that are not included within DEV1-O1.11 and DEV3-O1.10, hence my view that the use of the phrase "requiring minimal effects" was more appropriate than simply requiring the 'avoidance' of all adverse effects.

[1] Refer evidence of Ainsley MacLeod on behalf of Transpower [159.104 & 106], paras 81 to 92.

However, I am agreeable to the use of the term "avoid" on the basis that additional qualifying text is added to DEV1-O1.11 and DEV3-O1.10, as follows:

> *~~there are~~ ~~is minimal~~ avoid adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, on the ~~national grid~~ National Grid that would otherwise limit the ability of the electricity transmission network to be operated, maintained, upgraded and developed.*

Such amendments will be the subject of further discussions with the submitter and I anticipate that this may lead to agreed wording being presented by the submitter to the Panel.

(b) In response to the submissions made by TrONT, the s42A report recommended the use of the term "associational" natural and physical features being added to SUB-P4, but not SUB-O1.2. Having reviewed the evidence[2], I now consider that to retain consistency, the term associational should also be used in SUB-O1.2 as follows:

> *respond positively to the physical and associational characteristics of the site and its context; and…*

(c) The other matters raised in the evidence of Ms Pull is the removal of the term "significant" from SUB-O1.5. As noted in the s42A report, SUB-01.5 refers to both "natural and cultural values". Therefore, the relief sought in the TrONT [185.58] submission has implication beyond the assessment of cultural values.

To address this concern, I suggest alternative changes to SUB-O1.5 to achieve the relief sought by the submitter. This includes reference to the identified natural and cultural values; being those referred to in other chapter/s of the PDP, such as under the Natural Environment and Historic and Cultural Values topics:

> *protect ~~significant~~ identified natural and cultural values; and…*

I anticipate this amendment will be the subject of further discussions with the submitter and may lead to agreed wording being presented by the submitter to the Hearing Panel.

[2] Refer evidence of Rachael Pull on behalf of TRONT [185.58], paras 71 to 77.

Permitted activity status for boundary adjustments

19 Rooney Group [174, 191, 249, 250, 252] have suggested a permitted activity status for boundary adjustments under SUB-R1[3]. By Mr Hole's own admission such a permitted activity rule for subdivision is uncommon, but considers that permitted activity status for a "simple" boundary adjustment subdivision would be more efficient. In my view there are various rule requirements that would need to be added to SUB-R1 prior to considering a permitted activity status, and such rules would not be applicable in all zones (as is the case in the example provided from the Proposed Te Tai o Poutini Plan). Overall, I remain of the view that a controlled activity status is appropriate for boundary adjustments and note that this is the typical approach to such subdivision.

Minimum allotments size in the RLZ

20 D & S Payne [160.3] have suggested amended wording for SUB-S1.4(4)[4]. In my view the use of the phrase *"In areas in proximity to urban areas…"* is subjective and uncertain. No doubt such a provision would lead to various landowners arguing that their land was "in proximity" to an urban area and can therefore be developed to a minimum allotment size of 5,000m^2.

21 As set out in the s42A report, in my view connection to a reticulated sewerage system is a good proxy as to whether a site is in close proximity to an urban area. This ensures that future rural lifestyle site down to a size of only 5,000m^2 is both appropriately serviced and sufficiently close to an existing residential/urban area that the impact on rural character and amenity is more likely to be acceptable.

22 Given the spatial distribution of RLZ within the PDP, I do not favour a blanket reduction in the minimum allotment size down to 5,000m^2. There are areas identified for RLZ zoning that in my view would not likely be appropriate, or able to absorb, such a density of residential development. Having reviewed the evidence of Ms Wharfe on behalf of the submitters, I consider that the primary relief sought, i.e., whether the submitter's landholding contained within the block of land defined by Main North Road, Templer Street and Bennett Road to the north of Geraldine township is appropriate for more intensive RLZ development, will be the subject of the Growth Hearing topic scheduled for Hearing G. In my view that is the appropriate forum for that specific consideration.

---

[3] Evidence of Nathan Hole, paras 25 to 29.

[4] Evidence of by Lynette Wharfe, para 1.9, 10.44 and 11.2.

Greater recognition of reverse sensitivity effects

23 The letter by tabled by Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock on behalf of KiwiRail [187.61, 64] continues to seek changes to SUB-O1.8 and SUB-P9.7 to provide greater recognition for the potential reverse sensitivity effects resulting from subdivision.

24 In terms of SUB-O1.8, I remain of the view that the notified wording reflects that used in the CRPS, which acknowledges there will be circumstances where it is "impractical" to avoid adverse effects on regionally significant infrastructure. In that context it is considered appropriate to retain reference to having "minimal adverse effects"; particularly given the reference to both 'regionally significant infrastructure' and 'intensive primary production' within the one clause of this objective.

25 SUB-P9 relates specifically to 'Residential subdivision'. In my view reverse sensitivity effects are less relevant in relation to residential subdivision as presumably such effects were considered at the time of re-zoning and found to be acceptable. As worded, SUB-P9 seeks to minimise conflicts between residential activities and adjoining land uses. Whilst this might include reverse sensitivity, it also includes direct effects (such as traffic increases from residential development). In my view narrowing the scope to refer only to reverse sensitivity effects is a less desirable outcome.

26 I also note that reverse sensitivity effects of subdivision are already specifically addressed in SUB-P5, and changes have been recommended to both this policy and SUB-O1 to increase the recognition of reverse sensitivity effects within the PDP from that notified. Therefore, I remain of the view that no further amendment to SUB-P9.7 is required in the context of the other changes already recommended.

Esplanade waivers

27 Evidence from Rooney Group [174, 191, 249, 250, 252] seek two changes related to esplanade waiver requirements:

a) provision for consideration of a waiver where adverse effects may result from the creation of the esplanade provision or threats to stock or an inability to farm or utilise private land; and

b) that all boundary adjustment subdivisions should be exempt[5].

[5] Refer to the evidence of Nathan Hole, paras 21 to 24; and 30 to 33.

28 SUB-P7.3 sets out the circumstances where the requirements around the provision of an esplanade reserve or strip can be waived; these are also reflected in SUB-S8 'Esplanade reserves and strips'. The circumstances include whether *"it is impractical to provide all or part of the required esplanade reserve or esplanade strip due to the physical characteristics and/or constraints of the site."*

29 In my view this adequately addresses the reasons when a reduction or waiver on the provisions for esplanades would be appropriate. Specifically, I consider that "threats to stock" sets a low bar for any future subdivider to seek to reduce and/or waive the esplanade requirements. An inability to farm or utilise private land would indicate the presence of some 'out of the ordinary' physical characteristic or constraint that is also referenced in the provisions. Therefore, I remain of the view that no further amendment to SUB-P7 is required.

30 In terms of differing requirements in relation to boundary adjustments, the PDP treats all forms of subdivision the same way when it comes to the provision of esplanades. The subdivision process provides the opportunity to obtain esplanade reserves/strips. In my view to exclude boundary adjustments from this process would likely remove the ability for Council to acquire esplanade along many surface waterbodies moving forward. I do not consider that the Waitaki District Plan provided compels the Council to similarly exclude boundary adjustments from the esplanade provisions.

DEV3 Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan/Road 5

31 Rooney Group [174, 191, 249, 250, 252] owns the undeveloped land within DEV Area 3. The Development Area Plan accompanying DEV3 includes Road 5, which is an extension of Seadown Road to link with Meadows Road. The submitter/s are concerned with who bears the cost of delivering the road[6].

32 DEV3-S5 'Vesting of roads services and infrastructure', includes the following Note:

> *The actual cost of road, utility services and walkway/cycleway construction will be apportioned between the developer and Council, with that apportionment to be determined on the basis of the percentage of public versus private benefit.*

[6] Refer to the evidence of Nathan Hole, paras 34 to 44

33 On that basis it is clear that the PDP anticipates that the matters around the cost apportionment of delivering Road 5 can be addressed as part of any future resource consent process. Mr Hole has suggested that this note should refer to the design as well as construction. I do not consider that specific reference to the design is required. A road cannot be constructed without first being designed, so on that basis design costs can be considered as part of the overall construction cost of the road.

34 DEV3-S1.1 refers to it being the developer's responsibility to construct the portion of road contained within their land to be developed. Mr Hole requests that an appropriate threshold for the design and construction of Road 5 by the developer would be at the time development occurs on Lot 1 DP 911 that required frontage, or would adjoin Road 5; and that DEV3-S1 is amended to include such wording.

35 It is noted that it is possible that large scale development within the southern portion of Lot 1 DP 911 may require the construction of Road 5 notwithstanding that such development may not have frontage to, or adjoin it.

36 On balance I prefer the wording as set out in the PDP as notified, with the requirement to construct Road 5 being considered at the time of any future development of the land when the specific detail of the development is known; and consequently that the requirement for Road 5 to service such development can be considered on an evidential basis.

Further consequential amendments required

37 As set out above, my original section 42A recommended that the rules relating to subdivision are consolidated within the SUB Chapter of the Proposed District Plan. It is noted that these changes would require consequential amendments to the Introduction to the SUB Chapter, which currently lists other chapters containing rules relating to subdivision. This list would need to be updated to reflect the recommended changes.

38 I also recommended changes to the various DEV Area Chapters in order to retain some consistency of provisions across the four Development Area Chapters. I note that DEV3-P1 and DEV3-P2 each refer to the Washdyke Industrial Development Area, whereas these policies for the remaining DEV Areas each refer to the respective Development Area 'Plan'.

39 On that basis I recommend that DEV3-P1 and DEV3-P2 are amended to refer to the 'Washdyke Industrial Development Area Plan'. As with the other changes recommended to retain consistency, this can rely on Clause 10(2)(b) of the RMA.

40 These changes will be included in the updated chapters provided to the Hearing Panel as part of the s42A Reply Report prepared following the conclusion of the hearing of evidence.

Nick Boyes
4 February 2025

APPENDIX A

Status of issues raised in evidence –Subdivision and Development Area Chapters – *Hearing E*

Notes:

1 *Status: The status of the issue reflects my understanding of the status of resolution as between those submitters who pre-circulated evidence for Hearing E. It does not attempt to reflect whether the issue is agreed between submitters who did not pre-circulate evidence for Hearing E.*

2 *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.*

3 *Relevant submitters: Relevant submitters are those who pre-circulated evidence for Hearing E. 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.*

4 *Orange shading identifies matters still outstanding.*

Issue (raised in evidence)	**Relevant provision(s)**	**Status**	**Relevant submitter(s) that pre-circulated evidence**
Activity Status of Boundary Adjustments / removal of the 40HA GRUZ minimum allotment size	SUB-R1 & SUB-S1	Resolved	Milward Finlay Lobb [60.26] – Evidence of Melissa McMullan, para 7.3.
		Outstanding	Rooney Group [174, 191, 249, 250, 252] – Evidence of Nathan Hole, paras 25 to 29.
Permitted activity status for subdivision described in SUB-R2	SUB-R2	Resolved – submitter acknowledges and accepts the description of practical difficulties associated with subdivision as a permitted activity given in the Section 42A Report and on that basis agree with the Section 42A Report recommendation.	Transpower [159.83] – Evidence of Ainsley MacLeod, Appendix A.
Notes that accompanies the Development Area Rules (to include reference that the district wide chapters also apply).	DEV1 & DEV3, Rules - Note	Resolved – submitter supports a consistent approach across the Development Area	Transpower [159.104 & 106] – Evidence of Ainsley MacLeod, Appendix A.

Issue (raised in evidence)	Relevant provision(s)	Status	Relevant submitter(s) that pre-circulated evidence
		provisions in the Proposed District Plan.	
Whether DEV1-01 and DEV3-O1 give effect to Policy 10 of the NPSET and Policy 16.3.4 of the CRPS and Policy EI-P3(2).	DEV1-O1.11 and DEV3-O1.10	Outstanding	Transpower [159.104 & 106] – Evidence of Ainsley MacLeod, paras 81 to 92.
Minimum allotment size for the RLZ	SUB-S1.4(4)	Outstanding	D & S Payne [160.3] – Evidence of by Lynette Wharfe.
Greater recognition of reverse sensitivity effects, including on rural industry	SUB-O1, SUB-O3, SUB-P3, SUB-P5, SUB-P14 and SUB-P15	Resolved	Fonterra [165.82, 165.83, 165.84, 165.85, 165.86, 165.145 and further submissions 165.29FS, 165.46FS, 165.48FS, 165.49FS and 165.51FS] – Evidence of Suzannah Tait, paras 6.1 to 6.3.
	SUB-O1, SUB-O3, SUB-P3, SUB-P5, SUB-P9, SUB-P14, SUB-S1	Resolved	Silver Fern Farms Ltd [172] – Hearing Statement of Steve Tuck
	SUB-O1, SUB-O3, SUB-P3, SUB-P5, SUB-P9, SUB-P14, SUB-S1	Resolved	Alliance Group Ltd [173] – Hearing Statement of Doyle Richardson
	SUB-O1, SUB-P9	Outstanding	KiwiRail [187.61, 64] – Hearing Statement Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock
	SUB-R1, SUB-R3	Resolved	KiwiRail [187.65, 66] – Hearing Statement Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock
	SUB-O3	Resolved	NZ Pork Industry Board [247] – Hearing of Hannah Ritchie, paras 11 to 13.
	SUB-O2, SUB-OXX, SUB-P5, SUB-P6, SUB-R2	Resolved	Chorus NZ [176], Connexa [208], One NZ Group [209] and Spark [210] – Evidence of Tom Anderson, para 8.

Issue (raised in evidence)	Relevant provision(s)	Status	Relevant submitter(s) that pre-circulated evidence
Whether indigenous biodiversity values need to be specifically recognised within the within subdivision objectives.	SUB-O1, SUB-P5, SUB-P2, SUB-P7, SCHED 12	Resolved	Department of Conservation [166.80] – Evidence of Elizabeth Williams, Appendix 1.
Port of Timaru exclusion from esplanade reserve requirements be extended from Unwin Street to Talbot Street, effectively to encompass the full length of Lot 2 DP 326718.	SCHED 12	Resolved	Prime Port Ltd [175] – Evidence of Kim Seaton, para 75
Consistency with CRPS	SUB-O2, SUB-P2, SUB-P4, Sub-P5, SUB-P6, SUB-P15, SUB-R3	Resolved	Canterbury Regional Council [183.1, 183.4, 183.98, 183.99, 183.100, 183.101, 183.102, 183.103, 183.104
Reference to associational values and appropriateness of significant value threshold.	SUB-01	Outstanding	TRONT [185.58] – Evidence of Rachael Pull, paras 71 to 77.
Assessment matters including Kāti Huirapa values onsite or downstream of the site.	SUB-P2, SUB-P4, SUB-P6, SUB-R1, SUB-R2, SUB-R3, SUB-S2, SUB-S4, SUB-S8	Resolved	TRONT [185.59 to 64 – Evidence of Rachael Pull, paras 78 to 81
Subdivision and the resultant fragmentation of rural land affects the productive potential of that land, particularly on highly productive land at the rural-urban fringe, where horticultural operations are often located due to proximity of labour supply and markets.	SUB-O1, SUB-O3 & SUB-P5	Resolved by more explicitly recognising reverse sensitivity in SUB-O1; and deletion of 'intensive' from SUB-O3 and SUB-P5 so that effects on horticultural production activities are captured in the consideration of reverse sensitivity effects.	Horticulture NZ [245.64 & 65] – Statement of Evidence (Charlotte Wright), paras 4 & 5.
Esplanade Waivers	SUB-P7.3, SUB-S8	Outstanding	Rooney Group [174, 191, 249, 250, 252] – Evidence of Nathan Hole, paras 21 to 24; and 30 to 33.

Issue (raised in evidence)	**Relevant provision(s)**	**Status**	**Relevant submitter(s) that pre-circulated evidence**
DEV3 Road 5	DEV3-R1, DEV3-S1 to S3, DEV3 DAP,	Outstanding	Rooney Group [174, 191, 249, 250, 252] – Evidence of Nathan Hole, paras 34 to 44.
Connection to electricity supply and telecommunication for new allotments in the GRUZ.	SUB-S5	Resolved	Chorus NZ [176], Connexa [208], One NZ Group [209] and Spark [210] – Evidence of Tom Anderson.