

Resource Consent Submission Form

Reference Number: REF250403111

Submitted On: 02/04/2025 03:34 p.m.

NOTES TO SUBMITTER:

The closing date for serving submissions on the consent authority is the 20th working day after the date on which public or limited notification is given. If the application is subject to limited notification, the consent authority may adopt an earlier closing date for submissions once the consent authority receives responses from all affected persons.

You must serve a copy of your submission on the applicant as soon as is reasonably practicable after you have served your submission on the consent authority.

If you are a trade competitor, your right to make a submission may be limited by the trade competition provisions in Part 11A of the Resource Management Act 1991.

If you make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991, you must do so in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions and you may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the hearings commissioner or commissioners. You may not make a request under section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991 in relation to an application for a coastal permit to carry out an activity that a regional coastal plan describes as a restricted coastal activity.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- it is frivolous or vexatious;
- it discloses no reasonable or relevant case;
- it would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further;
- it contains offensive language;
- it is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

All submissions (including name and contact details) are published and made available to the public from our offices and on our website. Personal information will also be used for the administration of the notified resource consent process. All information collected will be held by Taupō District Council, 46 Horomatangi Street, Taupō, with submitters having the right to access and correct personal information.

Resource Consent Applicant Details

| | |
|--|----------------------------|
| Taupō District Council reference number(s): | RM200118A |
| Applicant name | Seven Oaks Kinloch Limited |
| Application for: | Resource consent |

Submitter Details

| | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Full name of submitter: | katey Coubrough |
| Contact name: | katey Coubrough |
| Designation: | |
| Contact phone number: | 0272456425 |
| Email address: | katey.coubrough@xtra.co.nz |

Postal address:: 23 Bodes Lane, RD 1, Taupo 3377

Are you a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308B of the Resource Management Act 1991? No, I am not

Do you wish to receive any further correspondence prior to the decision being issued? Yes

Privacy Statement:

Submitters are advised that the information supplied in written submissions may contain personal information within the meaning of the Privacy Act 1993. By taking part in this public submission process, submitters have agreed to any personal information (including names and contact details) which is contained in their submission being made available to the public as part of the consultation and decision making process. All information collected will be held by Taupō District Council. Submitters have the right to access and correct personal information. Following the submission period, copies of all submissions will be available on our website.

Submission

The specific parts of the application that my submission relates to are: change of conditions to Subdivision Consent RM200118A to remove Stage 9 from that consent and to incorporate this area into the proposed subdivision.

With the minimum and average lot size being 1ha and 1.5ha for Kinloch Low Density and 800m² and 1000m² for Kinloch Residential, this results in the potential for 10 residential lots (1ha / 1000m²) and six low density lots (10ha / 1.5ha). As such, the proposed subdivision will result in a higher density of lots than anticipated for the Kinloch Low Density zone, by an additional 68 lots compared to 16 lots enabled by the District Plan."

My submission is: In opposition of the application or specific parts of it

Please detail the reasons for making your submission: Residents that have lived in Kinloch or move here do so because they enjoy and appreciate the village feel and environment as it is. Kinloch Community Structure Plan was put in place in engagement with the community. Other developers have observed the structure plan in their works.

The KCSP notes:
The need for a holistic approach to managing growth in Kinloch was driven by community concerns and a strong desire to protect the unique environment of the Kinloch settlement and its environs. Taupo District Council has responded to these concerns by issuing a brief requiring the preparation of a community structure plan to:

- Recognise community values and aspirations
- Provide for the foreseeable needs of future development through an integrated approach to infrastructure planning
- Provide a more detailed level of managing growth and development than the Proposed Taupo District Plan or the Transitional District Plan.
- Put in place a strong policy framework to recognise the

values that give Kinloch its unique environment, and provide for future infrastructure requirements

Setbacks

The subdivision consent decision for the Oakdale development highlighted the importance of protecting reserve land in Kinloch, and as a result, restrictions were placed to ensure that houses bordering the Okaia Scenic Reserve would be limited to 4.5m height for the entirety of the building that is within 50m of the Okaia Scenic Reserve, and buildings must have a 15m setback from the reserve. These measures were put in place to protect the natural amenity and sightlines of Kinloch.

It is good to see that the developer proposes a similar height restriction for residential development within 50m of Otaketake and Okaia Scenic Reserves, however, the proposed minimum building setback for all lots of 7.5m from the Scenic Reserve is inconsistent with previous development decisions in Kinloch

There is already a loss of environment to the bush amenities around the village due to the reduced setbacks from Seven Oaks developments that have already been undertaken.

Density

The proposed residential subdivision fails to meet a number of the performance standards and development controls for the Kinloch Low Density Environment. The proposal would result in 84 residential lots on an area of land where Kinloch residents could expect 16 were the KCSP to be followed.

It is acknowledged that in response to submissions received when the subdivision application was previously notified, the Applicant has increased the minimum lot sizes to 800m², however this is still a significant departure from the minimum lot sizes anticipated for the Kinloch Low Density Environment. Only ten of the 84 lots proposed are within the Kinloch Residential Zone, the remaining 74 lots are within the Kinloch Low Density Environment, where a minimum lot size of 1ha is expected.

The proposed minimum lot size of 800m² is also significantly smaller than the lots created through the neighbouring Oakdale subdivision, also within the Kinloch Low Density Environment. Within the Oakdale subdivision lots range in size from 1200m² to 1ha. This is considered a more appropriate benchmark for comparison than the Lisland Drive subdivision referenced in the Application, which is located within the Kinloch Residential Zone.

The KCSP clearly sets out the density splits considered appropriate for Kinloch, highlighting that 'high density' in Kinloch provides for average lots of 1,000m².

When considered against the high-density provisions for Kinloch, and the minimum lot sizes provided for through previous subdivision consents in Kinloch, the proposal still represents a significant departure from what could be anticipated in this context.

This density increase will also pose a significant visual pollution of the area, as viewed from walkways (W2K and, K2K and O2K) and the lake (looking back towards Kinloch).

Increased density also increases the need for Kinloch infrastructure. While there have been recent upgrade to waste water treatment and ongoing development of the potable water treatment is ongoing - one hopes that these upgrades have been undertaken with a design capacity that is significantly increased to allow for all future development of Kinloch area.

Taupo DC has recently undertaken some minor 'safety improvements' of Whangamata Rd intersections however, this does not negate the fact that the current road corridor does not allow for safe alternate transport choices (in fact it could be argued that the 'improvements' have actually made alternate transport modes more dangerous to undertaken within this corridor). For residential buildings, a single dwelling is generally estimated to generate 8 to 9 equivalent car movements per day (ecm/d), so when shifting a development from 16 lots to 84 lots, that increases the potential traffic volumes on Whangamata road to 666 additional vehicle movements per day (74*9). This road corridor has peak traffic between 7.30-9am and 2.45-5.30pm. What is the Council/developer's plan or requirement to provide corridor width and lane defect upgrades to support further traffic movements?

This application to substantially exceed density and setback conditions, as per the Kinloch Community Structure plan, is non-complying, undermines the integrity of the district plan and sets a precedent for future developments. As such I do not support this application.

Alternatively, please upload document detailing the reasons for making your submission:

I seek the following decision from the Taupō District Council:

I do not support this application.

- Decline the application to increase density.
- Decline the application to reduce lot sizes.
- Decline the application to reduce minimum setbacks

Do you wish to attend the hearing?

No

Delegation of functions, powers and duties:

I request*, pursuant to section 100A of the Act, that you delegate your functions, powers, and duties to hear and decide the application to 1 or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the local authority (please refer to the Notes to Submitter on Step 1).