

Resource Consent Submission Form

Reference Number: REF240347265

Submitted On: 25/03/2024 03:24 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):	RM 230338-339 and RM 200118B
Applicant name	Keith McConnell
Application for:	Resource consent

Submitter Details

Full name of submitter:	Keith McConnell
Contact name:	Keith McConnell
Designation:	
Contact phone number:	0272514727
Email address:	keith_52@me.com

Postal address:: 74 Kenrigg Road, 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:

We oppose the application for subdivision and land use consent submitted by Seven Oaks Kinloch Limited.

The principal planning document that guides development within the Kinloch Community is the Structure Plan, adopted in September 2004. I consider this structure plan instrumental in delivering the amenity values described above. The proposed density of the subdivision is an alarming contrast and deviance from the Structure Plan with 100 lots proposed, where only 14 would be permitted under the Taupo District Plan (TDP). As proposed, the subdivision would lead to significant adverse effects on the overall amenity values of the Kinloch village.

My submission is:

In opposition of the application or specific parts of it

Please detail the reasons for making your submission:

The principal planning document that guides development within the Kinloch Community is the Structure Plan, adopted in September 2004. I consider this structure plan instrumental in delivering the amenity values described above. The proposed density of the subdivision is an alarming contrast and deviance from the Structure Plan with 100 lots proposed, where only 14 would be permitted under the Taupo District Plan (TDP). As proposed, the subdivision would lead to significant adverse effects on the overall amenity values of the Kinloch village.

We note the proposed setback and building coverage is consistent with development in a typical low-density zone, however is such a significant departure to what is permitted by Section 4a of the TDP the effects would be significant. The proposed coverage and density will see houses effectively piled on top of each other. This could be considered a desirable planning outcome in Taupo or other

centres, however is a complete contradiction to the Kinloch Structure Plan and the planning framework of the TDP.

Based on the points contained above, We submit the development as proposed is an inappropriate location. As We consider the adverse effects generated by the proposal to be significant, We request that the Applicant undertakes an assessment of alternative locations as required under Sch. 4(6)(1) of the RMA.

We note effects on natural hazards has not been addressed in the Planning Officer's S95 report. Given the significant increase in density We submit that it would be beneficial to have an understanding on effects on natural hazards and in particular, flooding and whether the proposed development has sufficiently mitigated natural hazard and flooding risk.

I consider the relevant objectives and policies of the TDP to clearly set parameters relating to lot size and building coverage. I consider the application is contrary to the planning framework of the TPD.

As such, I consider the application is unable to pass the gateway test of 104D and submit that consent cannot be granted.

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

I seek the following decision from the Taupō District Council:

As this proposed activity is non-complying under the TDP, the gateway test of S104D must be able to be passed before consent can be granted. I consider the effects on amenity to be more than minor. I also consider there to be an unacceptable risk of precedent being set should consent be granted. Should the Commission consent a development which represents a significant departure from the Structure Plan, this will open the gate for future development which does not meet minimum development standards.

I consider the relevant objectives and policies of the TDP to clearly set parameters relating to lot size and building coverage. I consider the application is contrary to the planning framework of the OPD.

As such, I consider the application is unable to pass the gateway test of 104D and submit that consent cannot be granted.

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).