

**IN THE MATTER**                      **of the Resource Management Act 1991**  
**AND**

**IN THE MATTER**                      **of a Plan Change to the Operative  
Hamilton City District Plan under  
Schedule 1 of the Act, referenced as  
Plan Change 3 (PC3)**

**IN RELATION TO: TEMPLE VIEW BOUNDARY ALTERATION**

**HAMILTON CITY COUNCIL DECISION**

**CORRECTION TO MINOR ERROR IN FINAL DECISION, UNDER SCHEDULE 1, CLAUSE 16, RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991 (RMA)**

**INTRODUCTION**

The above decision was completed by the Hearing Panel and is dated 26 August 2019.

The decision along with other relevant material relating to the Plan Change was uploaded to the Council website on Tuesday 10 September 2019.

The Council advised today of an error in the drafting of the name of one of the submitters to the Plan Change in two instances in the Decision Report.

While Ms. Crystal Mann is correctly recorded under *Details of the Plan Change: Temple View Boundary Alteration* on page 2 of the Decision report, there is a typographical error made when referencing the same submitter at paragraphs 7.7 and 7.11 of the Decision Report.

In both cases, the corrected references should read or refer to “Ms. Mann”.

**STATUTORY CONSIDERATIONS**

Schedule 1, Clause 16 of the RMA 1991 provides for the amendment of a Plan in the following circumstances:

- (2) *A local authority may make an amendment, without using the process in this schedule, to its proposed policy statement or plan to alter any information, where such an alteration is of minor effect, or may correct any minor errors.*

My determination is that the above matter is a typographical error and that it is necessary to correct this. The matter therefore can appropriately be addressed under the above clause of the Act.

**CORRECTION**

The amended paragraphs in the Decision Report therefore should read, with the correction underlined in this instance to make the change clear:

- 7.7 Ms. Mann (Submitter #5) opposed the rezoning in its entirety based upon the change in character that would result from the development of formerly rural land. Ms. Mann also questioned whether there was any need for the land to be used for urban (residential,

community and retail) purposes, and also suggested that the soils were unsuitable for development.

And, at

- 7.11 The land rezoning and supporting objectives, policies, rules and assessment criteria for development of the Precincts are an appropriate resource management approach to provide for the major re-development of the area and to provide for additional housing stock. Therefore, Ms. Mann's submission is not supported and is rejected for the reasons noted above.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M Kivell', with a horizontal line underneath the name.

Murray Kivell  
Hearing Panel Chair  
11 September 2019

c:\users\murray\documents\kivell consulting\kcl23\_templeview plan change\correction\_11sept2019.docx