

**IN THE MATTER OF:
AND IN THE MATTER OF:**

the Resource Management Act 1991
Proposed Plan Change 49 - Open
Spaces (PC49) to the Operative Upper Hutt
District Plan; and Variation 1 to PC49

MINUTE (9a) OF THE INDEPENDENT HEARING PANEL APPOINTED BY UPPER HUTT CITY COUNCIL

Correction to Minute 9 – inclusion of response from Donald Skerman

Introduction

1. You have received this Minute because you have either made a submission, have been involved in the preparation of, or are an expert witness in the matter of Plan Change 49 and Variation 1 to the Operative Upper Hutt District Plan (PC49 and Variation 1).

Response to Minute 7 from Donald Skerman

2. Minute 9 recorded and set out five responses which were received to Minute 7.
3. A drafting error meant that the response of Donald Skerman was not included in Minute 9.
4. The Panel confirms that Donald Skerman's response was received on February 2 2024. It was considered by the Panel and was taken into account prior to making the decision and instructions set out in Minute 9.

Amendments by inclusion to Minute 9

5. An inclusion shall be read in Minute 9 as 10 (f) Donald Skerman February 2 2024
6. An inclusion shall be read in Minute 9 as new paragraph 10.6 as follows.

10.6 Donald Skerman Response

Donald Skerman 02 February 2024

Dear Hearings Manager

Please pass this email note to the hearing panel

Dear Commissioners

Regarding your intention to hold an expert conference on ecological matters, I am concerned that too much emphasis is being placed on which sections of the Spur can currently be classed as Significant Natural Areas rather than the importance of the land as a

wildlife corridor and the potential for the recovery of the native bush and wildlife over time which would be degraded by a road/infrastructure corridor.

In my oral submission 28 Nov 2023 I made the point that a road/infrastructure corridor would provide "too wide a gap for smaller birds and invertebrates to cross (Note that vegetation doesn't need to be rare to facilitate migration)" (Point 1 on Slide 6). I made this point in response to the submissions by Guildford Timber Company which seemed to argue that much of the spur wasn't important because it didn't have rare vegetation and no endangered wildlife was found.

As well as the ecological benefits of not having a wide road/infrastructure corridor through the Spur, the recreational opportunities of the land are better served by having narrow walking and cycling tracks which allow a continuous canopy to be maintained for a much more pleasant experience.



Sue Wells

Chairperson, on behalf of the Independent Hearings Panel

22/02/2024

Advice Note:

1. This note is about the procedure for the reconvened hearing. It is intended to be of assistance particularly for lay submitters.
2. The purpose of this reconvened hearing is very focussed. It is not a rebuttal hearing, nor is it intended to be a second bite at the cherry. It is to help the Panel in its deliberations and to ensure that there are no gaps in the Panel's knowledge on the specific issue. The point of focus for this hearing is to ensure the Panel has the information it considers necessary with respect to the relevant RPS provisions.
3. In both the submissions phase to this and at the hearing, the Panel will be adopting an "add knowledge" approach. In short, if you have already made a submission there is no requirement to re-submit what you have done so far.
4. Any queries on this matter should be directed to the Hearings Manager, Hayley.Boyd@uhcc.govt.nz