

Before the Independent Hearing Panel  
Appointed by the Timaru District Council

Under	Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 ( <b>RMA</b> )
In the matter of	Submissions on the Proposed Timaru District Plan
Between	<b>Various</b>
	Submitters
And	<b>Timaru District Council</b>
	Respondent

---

**Andrew Willis – Hearing I - s42A summary statement**

**Natural Hazards Chapter – Flood Assessment Area Overlay**

Date 29 September 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 Andrew Willis. I am the director of Planning Matters Limited (an independent planning consultancy based in Christchurch). I prepared the s42A report on the Natural Hazards Chapter and the subsequent s42A report on the Natural Hazards Chapter – Changes to the Flood Assessment Area Overlay (the **FAAO**). 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 My s42A report on the Natural Hazards Chapter – Changes to the Flood Assessment Area Overlay (in response to ECan [183.28]), provided the background to this matter (at paragraphs 1.1.4 to 1.1.12).
- 3 In addition, as set out in my s42A report (for example paragraph 1.1.16), I have relied on and continue to rely on the technical flooding evidence of Mr Griffiths (for **ECan**).
- 4 Mr Griffith's evidence on the further submissions subject to this hearing was not available when I prepared my s42A report. ECan subsequently provided evidence in support of their submission from Mr Griffiths (flooding) and Ms Francis (planning). In accordance with paragraph 3 of Panel Minute 47 (dated 9th September 2025), the timeframe for further submitter evidence was delayed in order to enable the further submitters to review the ECan evidence prior to lodging their own evidence.
- 5 The purpose of this summary is to provide the Panel and submitters with the following:
  - (a) A brief summary of key issues raised in further submissions;
  - (b) Commentary on the ECan evidence provided, including (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 subsequent analysis; and
  - (c) Updates to the recommendations contained in my s42A report.

## Summary of key issues

- 6 In my s42A report, I identified the following matters as the key issues raised in further submissions:<sup>1</sup>
- (a) Some further submitters state that there is no record of flooding at their identified properties and therefore these properties should be excluded from the revised FAAO;
  - (b) Some further submitters do not support extending the FAAO to additional areas of the district without more detailed flooding evidence;
  - (c) Some further submitters identify negative consequences from extending the FAAO, such as additional costs and insurance concerns.

## List of resolved and outstanding issues

- 7 In his evidence (paragraph 17 and Appendix 1) Mr Griffiths identifies an area of Blandswood that could be removed from the FAAO and states that this includes the properties of further submitters: Aaron Carson [8FS] in relation to Lots 3 & 7 DP 46155; Scott Jensen [67FS] in relation to Lots 13 & 14 DP 8214; and Christine Purdie [290FS] in relation to Lots 1 & 2 DP 10398. I accept Mr Griffith's evidence on these properties and recommend that the area of Blandswood identified as being suitable for removal from the FAAO, is removed.
- 8 Mr Griffiths supports retaining the remainder of the revised FAAO, commenting on shortcomings of the notified FAAO (paragraph 21), the process and costs for how the FAAO could be made more accurate (paragraph 22) and concluding in paragraph 23 that the revised FAAO *"strikes a reasonable balance between the potential costs associated with 'over-capture' and 'under-capture' of areas subject to flooding, and the potential costs of avoiding any over-capture through detailed modelling and mapping."*
- 9 Mr Griffiths also responds to further submitter concerns about LIMs and recommends LIM entries that clarify that district plan hazard overlays are generally intended to identify areas that **may** be susceptible to a given hazard, rather than areas that are known to be susceptible, and are used

---

<sup>1</sup> Contained in section 2.1.2 of my s421A report.

to define areas where a site specific hazard assessment is warranted before new hazard sensitive buildings or activities are established.

- 10 Mr Griffiths also supports my recommend amendment to the definition of “Flood Assessment Area” in my section 42A report, as the current definition is inaccurate and misleading and considers that the recommended amendment to the definition (along with his suggested LIM wording above) may help to alleviate concerns raised in some further submissions about the meaning of the FAAO, or it being misconstrued by others.
- 11 I accept Mr Griffiths advice on these matters.
- 12 No evidence was provided by any of the further submitters on the FAAO amendments and none of the further submitters requested to be heard at this hearing. As such, it is unclear if the issues identified at paragraph 6 are resolved or not with respect to the position of the further submitters (and therefore I have not provided an Appendix A issue status update). If only ECan’s evidence is assessed (as the only evidence provided), I consider all the matters are resolved as I accept the evidence of Mr Griffiths.

#### **Updates to recommendations**

- 13 Based on the evidence provided by ECan, I consider the following to be appropriate:
  - (a) Remove from the FAAO the area of Blandswood identified in Mr Griffiths evidence (at Appendix 1 to his evidence) as “Area that could be removed”.
  - (b) Retain the remainder of the FAAO (i.e. excluding the Blandswood area), as amended by the FAAO provided in Mr Griffith’s Memo included with my s42A report at Appendix 8.

**Andrew Willis**  
**29 September 2025**