
Under	the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA)
In the matter of	an appeal under Clause 14(1), First Schedule of the RMA in relation to the proposed Second Generation Dunedin City District Plan (2GP)
Between	Director General of Conservation Appellant
And	Dunedin City Council Respondent

Notice of wish for Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited to be party to proceedings pursuant to section 274 RMA

31 January 2019

To: The Registrar
Environment Court
Christchurch

- 1 Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited (**OGNZL**) wishes to be a party pursuant to section 274 of the RMA to the following proceedings:

Director General of Conservation v Dunedin City Council (ENV-2018-CHC-243)
being an appeal against decisions of the Dunedin City Council on the 2GP.

- 2 OGNZL made a submission and further submissions on the 2GP¹.
- 3 OGNZL is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C or 308CA of the RMA.
- 4 OGNZL is interested in part of the proceedings.
- 5 The part of the proceedings OGNZL is interested in is:
- (a) The Council's decisions on the following Rules dealing with vegetation clearance: Rule 10.3.2.A paragraphs (a)(ii), (a)(v)(1) and (2)²; Rule 10.3.2.3³ paragraph (d)(ii); and Rule 10.3.2.A⁴ paragraph (a)(xii).
- 6 In respect of the relief sought by the appellant OGNZL:
- (a) opposes the relief sought in respect of Rule 10.3.2.A(a)(ii) / Rule 10.3.2.1(a)(ii). OGNZL considers it appropriate that the erection of fences be considered 'indigenous vegetation clearance – small scale'.
 - (b) opposes the relief sought in respect of Rule 10.3.2.A(a)(v)(1) and (2) / Rule 10.3.2.1 (a)(iv)(1) and (2). OGNZL considers it appropriate to provide for permitted indigenous vegetation clearance for the construction of tracks associated with permitted land use or city-wide activities.

¹ Original Submission 1088 (24 November 2015); Further Submission 2439 (3 March 2016)

² The appellant has advised OGNZL that the appeal contains provision numbering from the Marked Up Decision Version of the 2GP published on 7 November 2018. The Marked Up Decision Version contained minor numbering errors which were corrected in the Corrected Decisions Version published on 13 December 2018. In the Corrected Decisions Version Rule 10.3.2.A is Rule 10.3.2.1, and (a)(v)(1) and (2) is (a)(iv)(1) and (2).

³ Rule 10.3.2.3 in the Marked Up Decision Version is Rule 10.3.2.2 in the Corrected Decisions Version.

⁴ As per footnote 2 above. Paragraph (a)(xii) in the Marked Up Decision Version is (a)(xi) in the Corrected Decisions Version.

- (c) opposes the relief sought in respect of Rule 10.3.2.2(d)(ii) / Rule 10.3.2.3(d)(ii). OGNZL considers it appropriate that the erection of fences be considered 'indigenous vegetation clearance – small scale'.
 - (d) opposes the relief sought in respect of Rule 10.3.2.A(a)(xii) / Rule 10.3.2.1(a)(xi). OGNZL considers that permitted activity status for the removal of Manuka vegetation that adversely affected by Manuka Blight is appropriate.
- 7 OGNZL agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Dated this 31st day of January 2019



Jackie St John

Land and Consenting Lawyer, Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited

Address for service of person wishing to be a party

Oceana Gold (New Zealand) Limited
22 Maclaggan Street, Dunedin 9016
PO Box 5442, Dunedin 9058
Contact person: Jackie St John; E: jackie.stjohn@oceanagold.com; P: 03 479 4736

Advice

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

