

**BEFORE A PANEL OF INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS  
AT WELLINGTON**

**I MUA NGĀ KAIKŌMIHANA WHAKAWĀ MOTUHEKE  
O TE WHANGANUI-A-TARA**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991  
**AND**  
**IN THE MATTER** of the hearing of submissions on Te Mahere -  
Rohei Tūtohua the Wellington City Proposed  
District Plan

**HEARING TOPIC:** Stream 9 – Infrastructure and Risks

---

**SUMMARY STATEMENT OF MATTHEW ARMIN LINDENBERG  
ON BEHALF OF KĀINGA ORA – HOMES AND COMMUNITIES**

**(PLANNING)**

**14 JUNE 2024**

---

---

**Instructing solicitor:**  
C E Kirman  
Special Counsel  
Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities  
PO Box 14594  
Central Auckland 1051  
E: [claire.kirman@kaingaora.govt.nz](mailto:claire.kirman@kaingaora.govt.nz)

## 1. SUMMARY STATEMENT

- 1.1 The purpose of this summary statement is to provide an overview of my position in relation to the matters outlined in my primary evidence and the associated amendments I have recommended to the provisions (as set out in **Attachment B** of my primary statement).

### Objectives INF-O3 and Policy INF-P7

- 1.2 Having reviewed the supplementary statement of Mr Anderson on behalf of the Council, I generally support the proposed amendments to Policy INF-P7, which incorporate the recommended amendments set out in my primary statement with regards to the re-naming / re-phrasing of the policy heading – which is now proposed to refer to “*Incompatible subdivision, use and development*”.

### Rule INF-R22 (National Grid)

- 1.3 The supplementary statement of Mr Anderson (for the Council), as well as the rebuttal evidence of Ms Whitney (for Transpower), have addressed the proposed amendments recommended in my primary statement with regard to Rule INF-R22 (National Grid).
- 1.4 While Mr Anderson does not support my proposed amendments to the notification clause within Rule INF-R22 (now proposed to be Rule INF-NG-R58), I note Ms Whitney does support in part my proposed amendments to the wording of the notification clause. Ms Whitney, in response to my proposed amendments, has proposed an alternate re-wording of the notification clause. I confirm I have reviewed Ms Whitney’s proposed re-wording of the notification clause in her rebuttal evidence and I consider Ms Whitney’s proposed re-wording to generally be appropriate and acceptable. I consider it is reasonable to expect that – where a resource consent is required for a Non-Complying activity within the National Grid Yard – such an application would be limited notified to Transpower, where written approval has not previously been sought / provided by the applicant.

### Policy INF-NG-P61 (National Grid)

- 1.5 As part of the proposed amendments set out in my primary statement, I proposed amendments to Policy INF-NG-P61 – to replace reference to the term “*reverse sensitivity effects*”, with a reference to “*adverse effects from incompatible subdivision, use and*

*development*'. The reasoning behind my proposed amendment to Policy INF-NG-P61 is the same as that set out in paragraph 6.2 of my primary statement, in relation to the same wording change I proposed to Policy INF-P7.

1.6 I confirm I continue to support my proposed amendment to Policy INF-NG-P61 – to seek to amend the existing reference to “*reverse sensitivity*” and replace it with a reference to “*adverse effects from incompatible subdivision, use and development*”, consistent with the wording and framing of Policies 8 and 39 of the Wellington Regional Policy Statement (WRPS).

1.7 I also note my proposed amendments to the Infrastructure Chapter / National Grid Sub-Chapter provisions are consistent with the amendments I proposed to the Noise Chapter provisions of the PDP, through my evidence in relation to Hearing Stream 5 (Noise).

*Transport Chapter Standards TR-S1 (Vehicle trip generation) and TR-S7.2(d) (Design requirements for on-site vehicle parking)*

1.8 I have reviewed the supplementary statement of Mr Wharton, on behalf of the Council, and note he does not support my proposed amendments to the stated number of vehicle movements (within Rule TR-S1), nor the requirement for electrical vehicle-charging facilities for residential on-site parking spaces.

1.9 I note I continue to support my proposed amendments to Rules TR-S1 and TR-S7.2(d), for the reasons set out in my primary statement.



**Matthew Lindenberg**

**14 June 2024**