

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS  
FOR TIMARU DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**I MUA NGĀ KAIKŌMIHANA WHAKAWĀ MOTUHAKE  
TE KAUNIHERA Ā-ROHE O TE TIHI O MARU**

<b>IN THE MATTER</b>	of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)
<b>AND</b>	
<b>IN THE MATTER</b>	of the hearing of submissions in relation to the <b>Proposed Timaru District Plan</b>

**HEARING TOPIC:** (Hearing Stream B): B2 – Urban Zones

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF JOSHUA NEVILLE  
ON BEHALF OF KĀINGA ORA – HOMES AND COMMUNITIES**

**CORPORATE**

**24 JULY 2024**

---

---

## SUMMARY STATEMENT

- 1.1 My name is Joshua Neville, I am Team Leader – Development Planning for the South Island at Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities (**Kāinga Ora**). I am authorised to present this evidence on behalf of Kāinga Ora in support of our primary submission and further submissions (submitter #229) on the proposed Timaru District Plan (**pTDP**).
- 1.2 Kāinga Ora have not lodged legal submissions or other expert evidence for this hearing stream.
- 1.3 I provided a brief introduction to Kāinga Ora and context for our involvement in Timaru for the benefit of the panel in Hearing Stream A. I will not repeat this information here.

## HEARING STREAM B – B2 URBAN ZONES

- 1.4 Kāinga Ora has a broad interest in the topics covered by Hearing Stream B, and had made a fulsome submission, and further submission on these matters. I won't address extensively all elements of our submission, or the corporate statement we lodged in support of our submission, but in broad terms, Kāinga Ora has reviewed the relevant Section 42A report and generally we support the recommendations made by Ms White. We ask the panel to consider a limited number of matters further.
- 1.5 These matters include:
- a) Policy GRZ-P1 – regarding the use of the term 'maintain' as opposed to 'anticipated' in reference to character and qualities of the residential zone,
  - b) Outdoor living space requirements in the general residential zone; and lastly
  - c) The zoning on the Kāinga Ora owned development site at Grey Road.
- 1.6 In making the submission on the pTDP, Kāinga Ora sought a framework that was enabling of residential development and in particular redevelopment at a higher density. A framework that provides for good onsite amenity and functionality, and balances the effects of development, whilst avoiding blunt controls. We believe this can be achieved through well-defined built form standards, and clear objectives and policies. If the controls in a plan are set right, then sufficient flexibility is provided to enable housing variety and choice within respective zones, while still reflecting anticipated urban form outcomes.
- 1.7 At a practical level, it is our experience that the approach outlined above leads to everyone having a clearer understanding of the outcomes of any given zone, and development and design being much better informed. I touch on this in my evidence at section 3, but any consideration of built form matters also need to consider matters such as subdivision, earthworks, transport, etc. and the direction and intent of some of our submission points in abstract can lose some of the intent behind our submission. Thus, our evidence statement discusses this and why we sought some matters through our submission.
-

## **Policy GRZ-P1**

- 1.8 As I discuss this through my evidence more fulsomely in section 5, Kāinga Ora disagrees with the conclusion of Ms White with respect to Policy GRZ-P1. Where the plan seeks to use the term ‘maintain’ as opposed to ‘anticipated’ in reference to character and qualities of the residential zone, we believe this needs to be amended. The use of the term maintain in our experience creates a higher barrier for consenting when redeveloping sites, and in practise will favour the status quo. This favouring of the status quo creates a challenge for decision-making for resource consents and a conservative approach to maintain character has led to situations where we have had consents notified, rather than looking at achieving alignment with an anticipated urban form. I have provided some recommended wording in my statement and note Ms White has suggested in her summary statement she may consider this further.

## **Outdoor living space requirements in the general residential zone**

- 1.9 As discussed in section 5 of my statement, Ms White has accepted the Kāinga Ora submission points relating to outdoor living space in part. The parts of the submission points not accepted are addressed more fulsomely in section 5, but a key matter we recommend the panel look at further is that we support alternative relief to provide a pathway for a reduction of outdoor living space reflective of the size of the dwelling in the general residential zone. The current requirement of 50m<sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of 5m, is larger in size than some smaller dwelling may require and without sufficient discretion, the ability for a consent pathway will be a challenge. To support future housing choice and variety we recommend that this matter of discretion is added to the plan. This is in part due to us opposing minimum site sizes in the General Residential Zone (though not considered in this hearing), whilst still expecting the plan to provide for sufficient on-site amenity for residents.

## **Grey Road Development Site**

- 1.10 Kāinga Ora own a development site on Grey Road, bounded by Arthur Street and Theodosia Steet. We sought for this to be rezoned to medium density residential and opposed the mapping of a ‘specific control area – potential Large-Scale Retail’ overlay on the site. Ms White has recommended this overlay be removed and the site retain its Medium Density Residential zoning. We support in full this recommendation and are able to discuss this further, if the panel seeks clarity.

## **CONCLUSION**

- 1.11 Kāinga Ora appreciate the thorough work of Ms White in her S42a report and broadly support her recommendation. The few remaining matters we seek changes are not in overall opposition to the direction of the s42a recommendations but rather aim to better reflect the intent of our original submission. We believe that these adjustments will enhance the Plan’s ability to help deliver the housing outcomes needed in Timaru whilst providing for an anticipated level of amenity and appropriate urban form. I am now happy to take any questions and thank the panel for their time.