

Date: Thu, 28 Nov 2024 3:24:00 AM (UTC)
Sent: Thu, 28 Nov 2024 3:24:05 AM (UTC)
Subject: FW: 24-05-01 further information request (A3541083) Seven Oaks
From: Louise Wood
To: Sarah Hunt <Sarahh@cheal.co.nz>;
CC: Heather Williams <hwilliams@taupo.govt.nz>;
Attachments: 24-05-01 further information request (A3541083).docx

Hi Sarah

I'm just looking over the new application and what was not completed in the earlier application.

In terms of the Landscape Visual Assessment, the peer review of the first application concluded that the effects would be no more than minor. I am confident that the revised plan and Assessment from Mansergh Graham will also conclude the same and with the reduced density it is not necessary to get another peer review done of that report.

In May of this year a further information letter was sent out following the close of submissions. Can you clarify for me whether the new application and expert reports have addressed the queries in this attached letter? In particular, does the new CKL Traffic Assessment address the Abley questions posed in the attached further information letter? If so, I will forward the CKL new report to Abley for review.

I am assuming the other aspects of the letter have been addressed in this new application including the ecological effects and density discussion.

Thanks

Louise

Louise Wood

Senior Resource Consents Planner - Kaiwhakamahere Whakaaetanga Rawa Taiao

Positivity | Harmony | Empathy | Communication | Woo |

Taupō District Council • 30 Tongariro Street, Taupō 3330
Private Bag 2005 • Taupō Mail Centre • Taupō 3352 • New Zealand

D +64 7 376 0749 **T** +64 7 376 0899 **E** lwood@taupo.govt.nz

Follow us on [Facebook](#)

www.taupo.govt.nz



GREAT LAKE TAUPŌ

Taupō District Council

30 Tongariro Street, Taupō 3330
Private Bag 2005, Taupo Mail Centre
Taupō 3352, New Zealand
T 07 376 0899
F 07 378 0118
E info@taupo.govt.nz
www.taupo.govt.nz

1 May 2024

Cheal Consultants Ltd
PO Box 165
TAUPO 3351

Attn: Sarah

On all correspondence please
quote:
RM230338-230339

Dear Sarah

**PROCESSING OF RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION
SEVEN OAKS (KINLOCH) LIMITED - OKAIA DRIVE, KINLOCH**

Your application for resource consent for the proposal at the above address was lodged with Taupō District Council on 10 November 2023, was publicly notified on 4 March 2024 and received 25 submissions (23 in opposition, 2 neutral).

Section 92 - Further information

The submissions have been summarised, see the attached document for this summary. This further information request is about some queries that have been raised in submissions, and also in regard to the Abley transportation review.

Waikato Regional Council (WRC)

The submission from WRC states that a resource consent is required for earthworks in a High Risk Erosion Area. Please provide some explanation of why you consider that this site is not a High Risk Erosion Area, or apply for the required consent and give evidence of that application being lodged. Please note the application may go on hold pursuant to section 91 of the RMA should an application be necessary.

Stormwater Management

A number of submissions raised concerns around management of stormwater both during construction and for individual lot development. Please provide further information on stormwater management and sediment controls to be implemented during construction ensuring that there is pre-treatment prior to soakage to ensure water quality is maintained; and clearly demonstrate management of stormwater to prevent runoff into adjoining reserves.

Indigenous Biodiversity

A number of submissions raised concerns about the effects of the proposal on the adjoining reserves that contain significant indigenous vegetation and threatened fauna species. Please provide additional assessment on ecological effects and consider the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS) policies that seek to maintain or enhance indigenous biodiversity.

Infrastructure Capacity

A number of submissions raised concerns about there being insufficient capacity within the existing Council water and wastewater networks to cater for the additional density of lots proposed. The

submission from Fire & Emergency NZ specifically refers to water supply capacity for fire fighting purposes and that the proposal must not adversely impact on the existing wider firefighting water supply.

Please provide some further analysis and assessment of the number of additional lots proposed and whether there is sufficient capacity for the additional lots within the existing networks, without there being detriment to existing supply (such as water supply for firefighting) to existing areas. The FENZ submission also includes some recommended conditions of consent, please confirm whether those conditions are accepted (should consent be granted).

Lack of Amenities

A number of applications raised concerns that Kinloch does not have sufficient community amenities or shopping facilities etc. at present, let alone to provide for the additional density of development that is proposed and that during peak holiday season there is significant pressures on community facilities, such as the boat ramp and existing Kinloch Store. It is noted that as mentioned in the first further information request last year that the provision of a commercial neighbourhood shopping area within the proposed development may be an opportunity to meet the demand for such amenities, and in turn offer some mitigation of the effects of the additional density proposed on the existing amenities.

Please provide additional assessment on the potential effects of the proposal on the existing Kinloch amenities and how they might be mitigated.

Transportation / Traffic Effects

A number of submissions raised concerns about the traffic noise effects from vehicles associated with the additional density proposed on the road network within Kinloch; around the small size of some of the lots and the likely impact of off-site parking of vehicles; that there are insufficient transport options and links to amenities (with Taupo being 20km away) which will perpetuate the use of cars as the dominant mode of transport, creating further emissions that cause climate change. The WRC submission stated concerns that the proposal is inconsistent with the integrated land use and transport objectives and policies in the WRPS, as well as being inconsistent with the priorities of the Taupo Transport Strategy.

Please provide assessment on the potential effects of these transportation related impacts and how they might be mitigated, with specific consideration given to the WRPS and Taupo Transport Strategy objectives and policies.

Abley Transportation Review

Abley have reviewed the response provided from CKL on 11 April 2024 and have raised the following further queries on that response:

- Intersection modelling – ITA Section 7.4 (page 2 of CKL response)

The lack of calibration of the Wairakei / Poihipi intersection has been acknowledged and the Google traffic layer has been referred to as a proxy for queuing at the intersection. In lieu of survey data this is accepted and it is confirmed that this generally aligns with the applicant's evening peak Sidra model performance. It is noted that the morning peak Sidra model has not been checked and based on my understanding of the traffic environment the intersection performance may be worse in the morning peak. Can the morning peak intersection model please be checked using the Google traffic layer or on-ground survey data?

- Section 92 modelling (bottom of page 2 of response through to end of p3)

It is noted that a Stantec March 2022 report is relied on. Can additional detail be provided to confirm when the Stantec data was collected and demonstrating that the modelling undertaken on this basis is appropriately calibrated against the real-world performance of the two key intersections in both the morning peak and evening peak periods?

Also please note that Council have surveyed both intersections on 28th and 29th November 2023 at part of the Northern Access study and this data is offered to provide a more up-to-date baseline for the applicant's assessment. This includes full turning movement counts, separate heavy and light vehicle counts and extensive queue length observations on all approaches. It is recommended that this be used as a baseline, that is in the event that the Stantec ITA and underlying data is not satisfactorily calibrated. Otherwise it is unclear whether the applicant's assessment is understating or overstating the impacts of the development on the intersections.

- Tongariro / Spa intersection performance (bottom of page 4 of response)

The inclusion of a northbound merge in the Sidra modelling layout is acknowledged. The RFI point requested an assessment of the Tongariro / Spa intersection in the evening peak which has not been included in the response. It is noted that the Sidra 9 intersection file shared with the review team included full modelling of both the Norman Smith / Wairakei and Spa / Tongariro intersections with and without the development traffic in the evening peak hour. Both intersections have been modelled as operating with extensive delays on critical movements of up to 10 minutes delay but this is not formally reported outside of the Sidra 9 file.

A comprehensive assessment of the performance of both intersections is requested including addressed the matter of model calibration as requested under point 2 above. It is reiterated that the impacts (which are very significant in terms of delays and queueing according to the Sidra file provided) may be understated or overstated, without suitable evidence being provided that the model is calibrated.

Density / Character & Amenity

The vast majority of submissions raised concerns about the proposal being a significant deviation from the Kinloch Community Structure Plan (KCSP) and District Plan in terms of the density of development proposed, and the concerns regarding the adverse effects on Kinloch's unique character and amenity, and its village 'feel'.

As it stands, following an initial assessment of the proposal and taking into account the submissions, it is likely that the recommendation of the section 42A report will be to decline the application. This is based on:

- The additional density of lots proposed is significant at 84 more lots than specified within the Kinloch Residential and Low Density zones
- 17 of those lots are well below the minimum and average lot sizes for the Kinloch Residential zone (800m²-1000m²)
- The scheme plan layout does not reflect the radial density layout of decreasing density to the north as expressed in the KCSP and District Plan Kinloch subdivision rules
- Inconsistency with the District Plan objectives and policies
- The resulting adverse effects on character and amenity will likely be more than minor, to significant

Process

Section 92A(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 requires you to respond in writing by **27 May 2024**. In your response you must either:

- a) Provide the information, or
- b) Advise me that you agree to provide the information. Following this I will send you a letter confirming the new date by which the information must be provided, or
- c) Advise me that you will not be providing the information. Please note that this may result in your application being declined.

If you have any questions regarding this letter please call me on 07 3760749 or email me at lwood@taupo.govt.nz.

Yours sincerely



Louise Wood
SENIOR RESOURCE CONSENTS PLANNER