

**IN THE ENVIRONMENT COURT
AT AUCKLAND**

ENV-2016-AKL-000220

UNDER THE Resource Management Act 1991 ("**RMA**") and the
Local Government (Auckland Transitional
Provisions) Act 2010 ("**LGATPA**")

IN THE MATTER of an appeal under section 156(3) of the LGATPA

AND

IN THE MATTER of section 274 of the RMA

AND

IN THE MATTER of hearing Topic 050 City Centre of the Proposed
Auckland Unitary Plan

BETWEEN **STRAND HOLDINGS LIMITED**

Appellants

AND **AUCKLAND COUNCIL**

Respondent

**NOTICE OF CENTRO INVESTMENTS LIMITED'S WISH TO BE PARTY TO
PROCEEDINGS**

7 OCTOBER 2016

RUSSELL McVEAGH

A Arthur-Young | S H Pilkinton
Phone +64 9 367 8000
Fax +64 9 367 8163
PO Box 8
DX CX10085
Auckland 1140

To: the Registrar of the Environment Court at Auckland

And to: the Appellant

And to: Auckland Council

CENTRO INVESTMENTS LIMITED ("Centro") wishes to be a party to an appeal by Strand Holdings Limited ("**Appellant**") against a decision by Auckland Council ("**Council**") to accept an out of scope recommendation by the Independent Hearings Panel ("**Panel**") in relation to the Proposed Auckland Unitary Plan's ("**Unitary Plan**") Dilworth Terrace Houses view protection plane ("**Viewshaft**").

Nature of interest

1. The Dilworth Trust Board ("**Trust Board**") was a submitter (#3477) and further submitter (#3386) on the Unitary Plan and, in particular, made a further submission on the Viewshaft.
2. Centro purchased the land at 99 - 115 The Strand, Parnell from the Trust Board in 2015. Centro is the successor of the Trust Board in terms of its further submission on the Viewshaft.
3. Centro is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C of the RMA.

Extent of interest and reasons

4. Centro is interested in the entirety of the proceedings.
5. The appeal seeks that the Viewshaft be deleted in its entirety.
6. Centro supports the deletion of the Viewshaft as sought by the Appellant. This is because the Viewshaft:
 - (a) will not promote the sustainable management of resources, will not achieve the purpose of the RMA, and is contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA;
 - (b) will not meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations;
 - (c) does not manage the use of resources in a way that enables the community to provide for their social and economic well-being;
 - (d) does not represent an efficient use and development of natural and physical resources;
 - (e) does not avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects on the environment; and
 - (f) does not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Respondent's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of other available means and is therefore not appropriate in terms of section 32 and other provisions of the RMA.

Relief sought

7. Centro supports the relief sought by the Appellant and in particular, seeks that:
- (a) the Viewshaft be deleted in its entirety; and
 - (b) any consequential relief which may be required as a result of allowing all or any aspects of the appeal.
8. Centro agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

CENTRO INVESTMENTS LIMITED by its solicitors and authorised agents Russell McVeagh:


Signature:

A A Arthur-Young / S H Pilkinton

Date:

7 October 2016

Address for Service:

C/- S H Pilkinton
 Russell McVeagh
 Barristers and Solicitors
 Level 30
 Vero Centre
 48 Shortland Street
 PO Box 8/DX CX10085
 AUCKLAND 1140

Telephone:

+64 9 367 8000

Facsimile:

+64 9 367 8163

Advice

1. If you have any questions about this notice, contact the Environment Court in Auckland.