BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND of an appeal under clause 14 of the First

Schedule of the Act

BETWEEN PETER JAMES HEENAN, THOMAS

ANDREW DIXON, DOUGLAS STANLEY MUNRO AND R MUNRO, JOHN DAVID SCOTT AND OAKLAND FAMILY TRUST

(ENV-2016-CHC-97)

Appellants

AND INVERCARGILL CITY COUNCIL

Respondent

Environment Judge J J M Hassan – sitting alone pursuant to section 279 of the Act

In Chambers at Christchurch

CONSENT ORDER

- A: Under section 279(1)(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991, the Environment Court, by consent, <u>orders</u> that:
 - (1) the appeal is allowed to the extent that the Invercargill City Council is directed to amend Map 7 of the Proposed Invercargill City District Plan as set out in Annexure A, attached to and forming part of this order;
 - (2) the appeal, to the extent that it relates to the land owned by Peter James Heenan, is dismissed; otherwise the appeal is extant.
- B: Under section 285 of the Resource Management Act 1991, there is no order as to costs.



REASONS

Introduction

- [1] This proceeding concerns an appeal by Peter James Heenan, Thomas Andrew Dixon, Douglas Stanley Munro and R Munro, John David Scott and Oakland Family Trust against provisions of the Proposed Invercargill City District Plan as it relates to the Residential 3 Zone.
- [2] The court has now read and considered the consent memorandum of the parties dated 26 October 2017, which proposes to resolve the appeal in so far as it concerns Peter James Heenan. Mr Heenan sought to extend the Residential 3 zoning to include his land at 319 Bainfield Road, Invercargill.¹
- [3] The appeal as it relates to the balance of the parties listed at [1] above is extant.

Other relevant matters

[4] The Southland Regional Council and Mr Wade Devine have given notice of an intention to become a party under section 274 of the Resource Management Act ("the RMA" or "the Act") and have signed the memorandum setting out the relief sought.

Orders

- [5] The court is making this order under section 279(1) of the Act, such order being by consent, rather than representing a decision or determination on the merits pursuant to section 297. The court understands for present purposes that:
 - (a) all parties to the proceedings have executed the memorandum requesting this order;



(b) all parties are satisfied that all matters proposed for the court's endorsement fall within the court's jurisdiction, and conform to the relevant requirements and objectives of the Act including, in particular, Part 2.

DATED at CHRISTCHURCH

3 / October 2017

J J M Hassan

Environment Judge



