IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of Submissions and Further Submissions on the Proposed Hutt City District Plan

---

Minute 23

Proposed District Plan – Hearing Stream 8: Benmore Crescent – Requests for information and directions for expert conferencing.

---

18 November 2026

Introduction

1. The Hutt City Council (HCC) Proposed District Plan (PDP) Hearing for Hearing Stream 8 - Benmore Crescent was held on Wednesday 11 and Thursday 12 November 2026. The proceedings were adjourned pending receipt of further information from various parties and as signalled, we also consider that the planners that participated at the hearing should conference on the various matters raised.

2. The purpose of this minute is to set out the specific directions and information we requested during the hearing proceedings and the timetable for receiving that information.

Requests from submitters

<u>For Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira</u>

3. Can Te Rūnanga advise whether it supports the provisions proposed by Waste Management (attached to Ms Goodwin's evidence) and consider whether they address the cultural values and long-term aspirations of the Rūnanga for the site, including consideration on whether the matters of discretion are sufficient.

<u>For Ms McRae (landscape expert for Waste Management)</u>

4. We request that three representative cross sections of 30 Benmore Crescent through to Mary Huse Grove are provided. These should show the topography, representative elevations for otherwise permitted buildings up to 22 m high, the existing vegetative screening and the view lines from the residential properties. The purpose is to test whether the landscape and height standards are adequate for activities permitted under a General Industrial Zone or as amended by the proposed Precinct provisions.

5. Can Ms McRae also provide commentary on whether further standards are needed, such as a minimum planting height for the screen planting along the rail corridor.

<u>For Ms Goodwin (planner for Waste Management)</u>

6. Prior to conferencing can Ms Goodwin provide a marked-up version with deletions

struck through and additions underlined of Waste Management's preferred set of precinct provisions that reflects the hearing discussion, to avoid multiple versions.

Conferencing

Ms Goodwin, Mr Gibson and Mr Osborne

7. In light of the above can the three planners involved discuss a revised set of provisions for a potential precinct. Particular matters we seek guidance on are:

    a. An outline of how the objectives and policies for the recommended precinct relate to those of the General Industrial Zone, the aim of which is to identify unintended consequences or mismatches and confirm alignment with higher order documents.
    b. Whether the precinct should apply to the whole site or just the area of the proposed waste management facility.
    c. Where the vehicle movement threshold of 2,900 comes from, (in which case can the planners confer with Mr Georgeson and Mr Benner) to confirm that the intersection configuration into and out of 30 Benmore Crescent is sufficient to accommodate the maximum levels of activity otherwise permitted under a General Industrial Zoning or as modified by specific precinct provisions.
    d. Whether there is scope within the submissions to introduce a precinct or scope to consider a Light Industrial Zone (or any other zone or combination of zones) for all or part of the site.
    e. Whether there is scope to either extend or restrict the permitted rules and associated standards in the General Industrial Zone in terms of both activities and bulk and location matters.
    f. Whether there is scope, a necessity or desirability for landscape standards to be reworked.
    g. Whether in terms of noise and separation standards, is there a benefit to residential occupiers in Mary Huse Grove from having the underlying zoning for the rail corridor designation as General Residential or General Industrial.

h. Can the planners also provide further commentary in respect of s32AA of the Objectives and amended provisions give effect to when assessing the effectiveness and efficiency of those provisions.

8. As has been the case with previous directions for conferencing the Panel requires that the report on the expert conference will take the form of a joint witness statement signed by the experts.

9. Joint witness statements are to make clear that all parties agree to comply with the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for expert witnesses. To that end, a primary aim of the conferencing is to assist the Panel by the experts trying to reach agreement on matters within their field of expertise, to narrow any points of difference between them, and to clearly identify any remaining points of difference.

10. Consistent with the Code of Conduct, joint witness statements are to include:

    a. Identification of all material regarded by the experts as primary data;
    b. The key facts and assumptions that are agreed upon by the experts;
    c. Identification of any methodology or standards used by the experts in arriving at their opinions and any reasons for differences in methodology and standards;
    d. The issues that are agreed between the experts and the reasons for those agreements, including an assessment of their level of confidence in the likelihood of any outcome or conclusion in those agreements;
    e. The issues on which the experts cannot agree and the reasons for those disagreements;
    f. Identification of any issue which the experts agree is not adequately addressed by the evidence lodged to that point in the proceeding and the reasons for that inadequacy; and
    g. Any reservation by any expert about a matter of substantive law or procedure on which they are uncertain.

Request for reporting officer's right of reply

11. The Council is, of course, free to reply on any matters arising during the hearing

that it considers worthy of a response, but the following are further matters on which the Hearing Panel would appreciate feedback.

12. Can Mr Osborne provide examples of interfaces between industrial and residential zones across the district, including:

    - The existing activities in the industrial zones at those interfaces, to show what effects are being managed, and
    - Whether any natural or man-made buffers exist at those interfaces (such as bunds, setbacks, recreation areas, rail corridors)

13. Additionally, can Mr Osborne advise on whether a precinct approach is used elsewhere in the Proposed District Plan for a site in an industrial zone.

14. Further, do the Wellington or Porirua District Plans give any guidance in their policies, matters of discretion or elsewhere on the management of effects from waste management facilities.

15. Considering our question regarding underlying zoning as part of conferencing can Mr Osborne advise as to the most appropriate underlying zoning for the designated rail corridor. Can we also be advised of what if any, the convention is for underlying zone apportionment within the PDP.

From here

16. Can the parties confer on timing for the commencement of conferencing and for the receipt of the cross sections we have requested from Ms McRae. Our intention is that conferencing and all other information including Council's right of reply should be received by us on or before 18 December 2026.

17. Should the timing be problematical or if there are any other procedural questions arising from this Minute, please address those to us through the Hearings Administrator, Ms Shetty Saritha.Shetty@huttcity.govt.nz with an office phone number of **04 560 1039** in the first instance.



Lindsay Daysh

Independent Commissioner

Chair Hutt City Proposed District Plan Hearing Panel

18 November 2026