

**Before a Board of Inquiry  
Northern Corridor Improvements Project**

---

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 ('the Act')

In the matter of a Board of Inquiry appointed under section 149J of the Act to consider notices of requirement for designations and resource consent applications by the New Zealand Transport Agency for the Northern Corridor Improvements Project

---

**Joint memorandum regarding the Harbour Hockey relocation  
resource consent process**

Dated 12 July 2017

---

---

**KENSINGTON SWAN**

89 The Terrace  
PO Box 10246  
Wellington 6143

Ph +64 4 472 7877  
Fax +64 4 472 2291  
DX SP26517

Solicitor: N McIndoe / C M Sheard  
[nicky.mcindoe@kingtonswan.com](mailto:nicky.mcindoe@kingtonswan.com)/[christina.sheard@kingtonswan.com](mailto:christina.sheard@kingtonswan.com)

## May it please the Board

1 By email dated 7 July 2017 the Environment Protection Authority sought views from parties who could be impacted by the Harbour Hockey Relocation resource consent decision. This memorandum sets out the response of the New Zealand Transport Agency ('**Transport Agency**'), Auckland Council and the Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust and North Harbour Hockey Association ('**HHCT**'). HHCT was the applicant for the relocation resource consents, and has submitted on the Northern Corridor Improvements Project.

2 The Board has asked for views on managing the input of information into the Board of Inquiry process. Each of the Board's questions is set out, and responded to, below.

**Is it important for this topic to be covered in the general evidence about recreation, or can it be dealt with as a stand-alone topic?**

3 The parties consider this topic *could* be dealt as a stand-alone topic, but is most conveniently covered in the general evidence about recreation, because:

- a The Transport Agency and Council witnesses who primarily address effects on the hockey stadium are the same witnesses who address effects on recreation; and
- b The Transport Agency, Council and HHCT are working towards agreed proposed designation conditions regarding impacts on the hockey stadium. Accordingly, there are expected to be few, if any, matters in dispute.

**Is there a need for an additional expert conferencing session to deal with this topic?**

4 The parties consider additional expert conferencing is not required. The recreation witnesses, Ms Barrett and Mr Greenaway, have already conferenced on this issue. Neither witness was involved in the resource consent applications for the replacement hockey stadium, and so they are unlikely to be able to assist the Board further.

**Is there a need for rebuttal [or supplementary] evidence to be provided before the topic is heard?**

5 Counsel for the Transport Agency expects to update the Board on this matter when presenting opening legal submissions. If the Board has remaining

questions about the relocation resource consent decision, Ms Williamson for the HHCT may be best placed to respond to these. This could occur either when she appears before the Board, or in written evidence if the Board preferred.

**Dated 12 July 2017**



**N McIndoe / C M Sheard**  
Counsel for the NZ Transport Agency

---

**G Lanning / W Bangma**  
Counsel for Auckland Council



**S Williamson**  
For Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust  
and North Harbour Hockey Association.

questions about the relocation resource consent decision, Ms Williamson for the HHCT may be best placed to respond to these. This could occur either when she appears before the Board, or in written evidence if the Board preferred.

**Dated 12 July 2017**

---

**N McIndoe / C M Sheard**  
Counsel for the NZ Transport Agency



---

**G Lanning / W Bangma**  
Counsel for Auckland Council

---

**S Williamson**  
For Harbour Hockey Charitable Trust  
and North Harbour Hockey Association.