**Questions for Bupa witnesses:**

Richard Stephenson

Para 14 How do the development contributions compare at this site?

Marc Barron

None

Boyd Wilson

Para 14 Who directed Bupa to the current site?

Para 29 Is the drain side planting required to offset water quality effects in the Cross Country Drain or is it merely amenity planting?

Para 42 This seems at odds with the evidence of Marc Barron, paragraph 30. Please explain?

Paul Murphy

None.

Ian Constable

None.

Greg Knell

Paras 2.5 and 9.18 Following on from my question to Boyd Wilson above, if the CCD planting is for amenity purposes and is not related to the effects of the proposal on CCD water quality, would the ‘agreed planting’ more appropriately either be 1) reflected in the consent document as an advice note, or 2) as a side agreement with HBRC outside of the consent document?

Para 8.2 Isn’t it the case that the Bupa proposal is clearly inconsistent with a majority of the Rural Zone objectives and policies (understandably as it is a non-rural land use), but that is simply one matter to have regard to under a s104 assessment, and is to be weighed against the fact that South Pirimai is a HPUDS 2017 reserve area that is deemed suitable for retirement villages where they cannot reasonably be located within preferred HPUDS greenfields areas?

Para 9.25 *I understand that Mr Knell and Mr Lambert for NCC are in the process of finalising a revised suite of conditions that address the matters in my questions arising from the S42A Report. I may have further questions of clarification when I view that final suite of conditions, so I have not raised any questions here relating to the conditions attached to Mr Knell’s evidence.*