



**GREAT LAKE TAUPŌ**

Taupō District Council

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](mailto:info@taupo.govt.nz)  
[www.taupo.govt.nz](http://www.taupo.govt.nz)

7 February 2024

Cheal Consultants Ltd  
PO Box 165  
**TAUPO 3351**

**Attn: Sarah Hunt**

On all correspondence please  
quote:  
RM230066-67

Dear Sarah

**PROCESSING OF RESOURCE CONSENT APPLICATION  
BRUCE BARTLEY FAMILY TRUST - 36 LOCHEAGLES RISE, KINLOCH**

Your application for resource consent for the proposal at the above address was publicly notified on 24 November 2023 and submissions closed on 15 January 2024. Eight submissions were received, two in opposition and six in support, no submitters wish to be heard at a hearing. As such, pursuant to section 100 of the RMA a hearing need not be held.

As discussed at our meeting last Friday regardless of whether a hearing is held or not, because there are two submissions in opposition it is appropriate for the decision on the application to be made by an independent commissioner instead of in-house via delegated authority. This is to ensure transparency for yourself as applicant and for those submitters, and it has been our process in previous similar situations where applications have been notified.

My section 42A planning report now needs to be prepared which will have a recommendation included to either approve or decline the application. This report goes to the Commissioner and assists him (Bill Wasley) with the decision making on the application.

As discussed at our meeting, to reach a recommendation to approve the application I have to be confident in my assessment that the effects of the proposal can be mitigated to an acceptable / minor level. As noted in the Boffa Miskell final peer review report, a comprehensive mitigation planting plan should be prepared as an integral part of the application to effectively mitigate the anticipated level of effects to a minor level.

The planting plan submitted by Hudson Associates was reviewed by the Boffa Miskell landscape architect and the conclusions were that *'the proposed planting and its style is not considered to be in harmony with the wider landscape pattern, fails to achieve any of the stated objectives in the assessment, particularly in terms of seamlessly integrating with the neighbouring Outstanding Landscape Area and landscape, as well as mitigation in breaking up the buildings scale and mass.'* I attach a copy of that email of 25 October 2023.

*Section 92 - Further information*

Based on that advice, to reach a recommendation of approval of this application, I consider that a comprehensive planting plan is required as recommended on page 9 of the Boffa Miskell final peer review, and it needs to address the following:

37. This planting plan should, at a minimum, aim to achieve the following outcomes:

- Mitigate the visual effects of the proposed retaining: The planting plan should incorporate vegetation that helps to visually soften and integrate the retaining structures within the landscape.
- Break up the bulk and sprawl of the building through the introduction of tree species: The planting plan should include strategically placed trees that effectively reduce the perceived scale and mass of the building, creating a more harmonious and visually appealing composition.
- Provide comprehensive planting around the building: The planting plan should encompass a well-designed and cohesive planting scheme that encircles the building, integrating it into the wider landscape patterns and enhancing its visual integration within the surroundings.

The planting plan should be prepared by a qualified landscape architect or an expert in the field and be submitted for approval to the consent authority before the commencement of any construction activities. The plan should include details of the proposed vegetation, including the selection of appropriate tree species, their locations, spacing, and any necessary maintenance requirements. The planting plan shall be implemented and maintained in accordance with the approved design.

Section 92A(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 requires you to respond in writing by **28 February 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 recommendation being to decline (should this eventuate, you can opt to have a hearing to present your case).

#### *Process*

As this is the second further information request pursuant to section 92 of the RMA, the application cannot go on hold.

#### *Section 37*

If no hearing is held a decision is to be made within 20 working days from the close of submissions, which is 13 February 2024. Therefore, an extension of time is sought under section 37 of the RMA. I anticipate following receipt of the required landscaping plan as noted above, that another four to five weeks would be required (completion of my s42A report, negotiation on recommended conditions, decision making of the commissioner). Please confirm approval of this extension of time.

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

Yours sincerely



Louise Wood  
**SENIOR RESOURCE CONSENTS PLANNER**