

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource
Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of Submissions and Further
Submissions on the
Proposed Wellington City
District Plan

Minute 47

Stream 6 Follow Up (3)

Minute 47 - Stream 6 Follow Up (3)

1. Having reviewed the Stream 6 Council Reply, there are two issues that we wish to address further.
2. Firstly, in relation to Mr Jeffries' Reply on the Airport Zone, he has recommended that AIRPZ-R3 be amended with the effect that non-Airport activity in the Airside Precinct would be a discretionary activity.
3. While, at first sight, Mr Jeffries' reasoning appears sound, he has properly drawn our attention to the fact that this is a shift in position on his part from what was set out in the Joint Witness Statement to which he was a party, and that he is not aware of Ms O'Sullivan's view on it.
4. We consider that Ms O'Sullivan should have the opportunity to provide a comment on this shift of position if she wishes. She has leave to provide that comment not later than 1pm on Friday 12 April.
5. The second point we wish to address relates to the Quarry Zone. Firstly, while the historical information provided by Ms van Haren-Giles is very helpful, there are aspects of the background to the existing use certificate that we remain unclear on. We therefore request that we be provided with a complete copy of the application documents. If there is commercially sensitive information buried in the detail, it should be redacted.
6. Secondly and more substantively, the Hearing Panel has reached a tentative conclusion that the two disputed areas (Part Section 16, and Part Sections 17 and 18) should be provided for by way of Precinct within the Quarry Zone akin to that applying at Kiwi Point. The drafting Ms van Haren-Giles has provided for a restricted discretionary rule is helpful (we are not of a mind to recommend quarrying have a status that is any more enabling than restricted discretionary in these new areas) but we are concerned that Ms Whitney has not had an opportunity to provide feedback on that draft rule, and we also wonder whether additional precinct-specific objectives and/or policies might be required to support that rule.
7. Accordingly, we request Ms van Haren-Giles and Ms Whitney conference as soon as practicable to address these issues against the assumption that the Hearing Panel's initial views will be reflected in its final recommendations.

8. We also request that between them, Ms van Haren-Giles and Ms Whitney provide us with two sets of maps identifying the proposed precincts, in a form that we can refer to in our report. One set should utilise the ridgeline mapped in Ms van Haren-Giles' Reply as the boundary of the precinct/zone on the harbour side. One should not.



Trevor Robinson

Chair

For the Wellington City Proposed District Plan Hearings Panel

Dated 8 April 2024