

**BEFORE THE CHRISTCHURCH REPLACEMENT DISTRICT PLAN
INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act and the
Canterbury Earthquake (Christchurch
Replacement District Plan) Order 2014

AND

IN THE MATTER of the Natural and Cultural Heritage
Proposal (Stage 3)

**MEMORANDUM OF COUNSEL FOR CANTERBURY CRICKET
ASSOCIATION INC (SUBMITTER 3455) REGARDING HANDS OFF HAGLEY
MEMORANDUM DATED 13 MAY 2016**

Dated 17 May 2016

Pru Steven QC
Canterbury Chambers
PO Box 9344
Christchurch 8149

Telephone: (03) 343 9834
Email: pru@prusteven.co.nz

MAY IT PLEASE THE PANEL

- 1 This Memorandum is filed on behalf of Canterbury Cricket Association Inc (Submitter 3455) (**Canterbury Cricket**) in relation to a Memorandum to the Panel dated 13 May 2016 from Hands Off Hagley (**HOH**).
- 2 Canterbury Cricket has an interest in the Chapter 9.3 Permitted Activity standards for temporary events in relation to Hagley Oval, the majority of which is affected by a heritage setting pertaining to the listed Umpires Pavilion (No 242).
- 3 Canterbury Cricket was actively involved in mediation sessions pertaining to the setting and Chapter 9.3 rules applying to the same, and, as explained in Counsel's Submissions to the Panel dated 3 February 2016, it could live with these rules notwithstanding that the extent of the heritage setting over the Oval remained unaltered.
- 4 HOH has now raised two issues:
 - An (alleged) inconsistency between the Chapter 9.3 permitted activity standards for temporary events and those contained in Chapter 6 (for temporary events); and
 - That the Chapter 9.3 permitted activity standards for temporary events are more enabling than the relevant conditions in the Environment Court Decision No [2013] NZEnvC 184 (for redevelopment of the Oval).
- 5 By its Memorandum, HOH requests that the Panel direct the Council to address the matter of inconsistency relating to provisions of temporary activities in Chapters 9 and 6 as raised in its Memorandum, prior to the filing of closing submissions.
- 6 Canterbury Cricket would be prejudiced by a reopening of a contest of the temporary activity rules, particularly as it has abandoned the opportunity to pursue its original submission in relation to the heritage setting for the Umpires Pavilion.

- 7 Canterbury Cricket notes that there will be many parties affected by any change to the Chapter 9.3 permitted activity rules, as they will apply to all sites with heritage listings, and not just the Hagley Oval.
- 8 Although it will have the opportunity to lodge final submissions, Canterbury Cricket wishes to signal its opposition to the issues being raised in this way by HOH, prior to the Council circulating its final amended proposal as directed by the Panel.

Dated this 17th day of May 2016.



P A Steven QC

Counsel for Canterbury Cricket Association Inc