

Before the Independent Hearings Panel at Timaru

under: the Resource Management Act 1991

in the matter of: of submission 215 of Te Pūkenga- New Zealand
Institute of Skills and Technology (Te Pūkenga), Trading
as Ara Institute of Technology to the Proposed Timaru
District Plan

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF RYAN BROSNAHAN (PLANNING) FOR TE
PŪKENGĀ**

HEARING B - B2 URBAN ZONES

Dated: 4 July 2024

INTRODUCTION

- 1 My full name is Ryan Brosnahan, and I am a Senior Consultant at Resource Management Group Limited (RMG), a planning consultancy based in Christchurch. I hold a Bachelor of Arts from the University of Canterbury, and a Master of Environmental Policy from Lincoln University. I am an intermediate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and have over 9 years' experience as a resource management planner.
- 2 My evidence relates to the submission of Te Pūkenga pertaining to the Proposed Timaru District Plan. I am familiar with the original submission made by Te Pūkenga on 6 December 2022 and the planning issues discussed in the submission. I have been authorised by Te Pūkenga to provide evidence on its behalf in respect of its original submission.
- 3 In preparing this evidence, I have reviewed and considered the following:
 - 3.1 Proposed Timaru District Plan
 - 3.2 Section 42A Report: Proposed District Plan Residential and Commercial and Mixed-Use Zones, prepared by Liz White (dated 18 June 2024);
 - 3.3 Section 42A Report: Proposed District Plan Residential and Commercial and Mixed-Use Zones: Appendix 1 - Changes-Recommended to Provisions;
 - 3.4 Section 42A Report: Proposed District Plan Residential and Commercial and Mixed-Use Zones: Appendix 2 – Recommended Responses to Submissions.

CODE OF CONDUCT

- 4 Although this is not an Environment Court hearing, I note that in preparing my evidence I have reviewed the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023. I have complied with it in preparing my evidence on technical matters. I confirm that the technical matters on which I give evidence are within my area of expertise, except where relying on the opinion or evidence of other witnesses. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from my opinions expressed.

SUBMISSION

- 5 Te Pūkenga’s submission (Submission 215) relates to the proposed zoning of their Timaru Campus as Medium Density Zone (MRZ) in the Proposed Timaru District Plan. Te Pūkenga considers that their site does not exhibit the characteristics of the MRZ. Consequently, the current zone, policy framework and rule provisions are not fit for purpose.
- 6 The relief sought by Te Pūkenga is that a Special Purpose Tertiary Education Zone (SPTEZ) should be established for the Timaru Campus, with the inclusion of a suite of relevant objectives, policies and rules. As an alternative, Te Pūkenga would also accept a Mixed-Use Zone (MUZ) for their site provided changes to the objectives, policies and rules are made, recognising and enabling tertiary education activities specifically.

SECTION 42A REPORT

- 7 As noted in her s42A Report, the submitter and I met with Ms White on 27 March 2024 to better communicate the matters raised in Te Pūkenga’s submission. As a consequence of that meeting, Ms White’s s42A Report is reflective of those discussions. Ms White recommends the rejection of Te Pūkenga’s request for a SPTEZ, and application of the MUZ instead. A Tertiary Education Precinct will apply to the site to allow for a slightly amended approach to be taken to other sites in the MUZ.
- 8 Te Pūkenga agrees with the reasons for that zoning recommendation and accepts the proposed rezoning of the site to MUZ, subject to Ms White’s other recommended changes.
- 9 All other consequential changes to the MUZ policies and rules are accepted by Te Pūkenga. I provide commentary on some of these amendments specifically as follows:
 - 9.1 The recommended insertion of *PRECX-P1 Tertiary Education* recognises the contribution of Te Pūkenga to the District’s and Region’s social and economic wellbeing. In addition, the policy will enable the ongoing use and development of tertiary education services, as well as complimentary activities which allow

for the efficient use of the Precinct's facilities. The new policy will also manage built form within the precinct to reflect its existing character and the operational and functional needs of tertiary education services.

9.2 Importantly, the amendments to *MUZ-R10 Buildings and structures* will provide a permitted pathway for new buildings and structures for tertiary education activities and facilities up to 1000m². I agree with Ms White that the larger size of the site, as well as the nature of existing built form, justifies a higher threshold being applied before further consideration of built form is required.

9.3 The amendments to *MUZ-R8* would also permit residential activity for students, staff or security purposes associated with any tertiary education service; and apply a discretionary status for other residential uses. I agree with Ms White that this approach is justified in the Precinct to reflect that more general residential uses need to be managed to ensure they integrate with tertiary education services.

CONCLUSION

10 In conclusion, I consider that all of Te Pūkenga's submission points have been adequately addressed in the s42A report such that there are no outstanding issues.

11 For this reason, I consider that the amendments recommended by Ms White in her s42A Report should be accepted by the Panel.

12 Unless directed to by the Panel, Te Pūkenga does not seek to appear at the hearing given that there is agreement on the recommendations of Ms White.

Dated: 4 July 2024



Ryan Brosnahan