

Before Timaru District Council Independent Hearing Panel

In the Matter of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**Act**)

And

In the Matter the Proposed Timaru District Plan – Large Format
Retail Zone

Evidence Summary of Hannah Lee Hoogeveen on behalf of Redwood Group

(Planning)

Dated 24 July 2024

Summary of Key Points

Since preparing my evidence, I have reflected on the s42A Summary Statement by Liz White.

1. The key points raised in my evidence related to four matters:
 - (a) Support for the changes to the provisions of the LFR Zone and inclusion of the Former Showgrounds Precinct as appended to the s42A report as they related to Redwood's submission in terms of alignment with the ODP provisions;
 - (b) Seeking that the remainder of the ODP provisions are included in the LFR Zone (Former Showgrounds Precinct);
 - (c) Seeking a Restricted Discretionary activity status for "additional" activities in the LFR Zone (Former Showgrounds Precinct), including childcare, healthcare, and one visitor accommodation facility; and
 - (d) Seeking a Residential sub-precinct for two areas of the site that could be utilised for residential activity as a Restricted Discretionary activity.

Matters of Agreement

2. Regarding the first two matters, I understand that Ms White agrees that these ODP Commercial 2A zone provisions relating to gymnasiums and recreation facilities up to 6000m² should be included in the PDP. Furthermore, I understand that Ms White agrees that the ODP Commercial 2A zone discretionary activity rule for 6% GFA exceedance should be included in the PDP. Therefore, I will not repeat my evidence relating to these points other than to say I think it is the most effective and efficient way to address some of the consented activities on the site and to enable a level of growth into the future, subject to the appropriate assessments.

Outstanding Matters

3. I understand from reading Ms White's Summary Statement that there are two key matters outstanding for the Redwood submission. These relate to "additional" activities sought in the LFR Zone (Former Showground Precinct), and residential activity.

"Additional Activities"

4. Mr Gardner-Hopkins has spoken to the matter of scope relating to "additional" activities (childcare, healthcare, and one visitor accommodation facility) in the LFR Zone (Former Showgrounds Precinct).

5. If the Hearings Panel finds that there is scope for these “additional” activities as relief arising from Redwood’s primary submission, I consider that these “additional” activities would be appropriate in the LFR Zone (Former Showgrounds Precinct) for the following reasons:

Healthcare and Childcare

- (a) Approximately 600 jobs will be created in the Former Showgrounds Precinct when fully developed.
- (b) Healthcare facilities and childcare facilities are both non-retail activities that provide a necessary service to residents and workers. In the maps included in my evidence, the LFR Zone presents an opportunity to provide these services in close proximity to places of employment as well as existing and future residential land. I also set out that there is also limited opportunity for childcare and healthcare in Timaru North.
- (c) The economic evidence of Ms Hampson concludes that the site/Formal Showgrounds Precinct is an efficient location for childcare and healthcare services that support the local community and will not adversely affect the wider centre network, including the amenity of the City Centre Zone¹.

Visitor Accommodation

- (d) The LFR Zone provides a policy framework for other activities to occur in the Zone (LFRZ-P6). Ms Hampson has undertaken an assessment and could support one visitor accommodation facility on the site as a restricted discretionary activity. In her view, one visitor accommodation facility in the Former Showgrounds Precinct would not have an adverse effect on the vitality, role or function of the city centre, and there are several economic benefits and minimal costs².
- (e) The LFR Zone can absorb the externalities of a visitor accommodation building and operational effects.
- (f) It is not unusual to enable visitor accommodation on main roads in towns and cities around New Zealand, and I consider that spatially, it is an appropriate location for a limited provision of visitor accommodation (subject to the appropriate assessments).

¹ Para 76 of Ms Hampson’s economic evidence.

² Economic statement of evidence by Ms Natalie Hampson, Paragraph 67

Residential Activity

6. As notified, residential activity is already an activity for which the LFR Zone provides a consenting pathway, by way of a Discretionary activity anywhere in the Zone.
7. As I noted in my evidence, Redwood has effectively “maximised” the permitted activity rules of the Zone (i.e., got consent for 34,000m² GFA). As such, they know what the full development of the site will look like as per the consented plans appended to my evidence. Two identified areas of zoned land within the site are not used for commercial activities and could be utilised for urban purposes in the future. These areas are shown on the proposed Residential Sub-Precinct Plan appended to my evidence.
8. As we now know what the realisation of the large-format development provisions will look like on the site/within the Former Showgrounds Precinct, I consider it would be more effective and efficient to more sharply focus the residential activity provisions as they relate to the Former Showgrounds Precinct. In this regard, rather than a Discretionary activity applying across the entire zone, I consider it would be more appropriate to use a Restricted Discretionary activity status for residential activity to certain parts of the LFR Zone (Former Showgrounds Precinct) that could accommodate residential activity subject to the appropriate assessments.
9. In the northern part of the site/Former Showgrounds Precinct, there is an area of grassed land opposite residentially zoned land (on the north side of Bridge Road). Subject to design and the appropriate assessments detailed in the matters of discretion proposed in my evidence, I consider that the southern side of Bridge Road would be just as appropriate for residential activity as the northern side of Bridge Road.
10. The proposed Residential Sub-Precinct also covers an area of land in the south of the site/Former Showgrounds Precinct that adjoins the Taitarakahi Creek and open space network along this creek. This presents an opportunity to increase passive surveillance over a portion of this open space network, and the adjacency of residential units to the creek would afford a level of amenity to residents.
11. It was suggested in the s42A Report that rezoning could be an option for residential activity on the site. I consider that whilst that is an option, it would preclude the use of those parts of the site for any future expansion or ancillary uses (such as loading, storage, parking) associated with permitted activities in the LFR Zone. This split-zoning of the same property would be inefficient as resource consents would then be required if any of the land were to be required for purposes ancillary to the LFR Zone (for example, if Bunnings required a larger loading space to the north of their tenancy).

12. Overall, I consider that a sub-precinct plan would be the most effective and efficient to method to provide some provision for residential activity in the Former Showgrounds Precinct.