

Tanya Copeland

From: Emma Dixon <edixon@cfma.co.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 26 March 2024 10:12 am
To: Tanya Copeland
Subject: RE: RC230278 - Landscape and Visual Assessment clarifications/assessments

You don't often get email from edixon@cfma.co.nz. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi again Tanya

Apologies to keep hassling you however we need an indication of timeframes please as it is impacting on sale and purchase agreements and renegotiation of them.

Thank you

Kind Regards

Emma Dixon Resource Management Planner
BSc

DD: +64 3 441 6089

Cell: 0274 046 233

E: edixon@cfma.co.nz


Please note I work part time, Mon – Thurs 9.00am – 3.00pm



CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD

LAND SURVEYORS - LAND DEVELOPMENT - PLANNING CONSULTANTS

QUEENSTOWN | DUNEDIN | CHRISTCHURCH | GORE

A: 309 Lower Shotover Road, **T:** +64 3 441 6044 **W:** www.cfma.co.nz 
Po Box 553, Queenstown

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Emma Dixon
Sent: Tuesday, March 19, 2024 11:21 AM
To: Tanya Copeland <Tanya.Copeland@codc.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: RC230278 - Landscape and Visual Assessment clarifications/assessments

Hi Tanya

Can you please advise when you will be able to get back to us on the below?

Thanks

Kind Regards

Emma Dixon Resource Management Planner
BSc

DD: +64 3 441 6089

Cell: 0274 046 233

E: edixon@cfma.co.nz


Please note I work part time, Mon – Thurs 9.00am – 3.00pm



CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD

LAND SURVEYORS - LAND DEVELOPMENT - PLANNING CONSULTANTS

QUEENSTOWN | DUNEDIN | CHRISTCHURCH | GORE

A: 309 Lower Shotover Road, **T:** +64 3 441 6044 **W:** www.cfma.co.nz 
Po Box 553, Queenstown

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Emma Dixon

Sent: Wednesday, March 13, 2024 11:42 AM

To: Tanya Copeland <Tanya.Copeland@codc.govt.nz>

Cc: Ben Espie <ben@vivianespie.co.nz>

Subject: RE: RC230278 - Landscape and Visual Assessment clarifications/assessments

Hi Tanya

I have spoken with the landscape architect and below are our responses to your queries:

Happy to jump on a call with the three of us if that is easier to discuss any of the below in more detail.

Thanks

Kind Regards

Emma Dixon Resource Management Planner
BSc

DD: +64 3 441 6089

Cell: 0274 046 233

E: edixon@cfma.co.nz


Please note I work part time, Mon – Thurs 9.00am – 3.00pm



CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD

LAND SURVEYORS - LAND DEVELOPMENT - PLANNING CONSULTANTS

QUEENSTOWN | DUNEDIN | CHRISTCHURCH | GORE

A: 309 Lower Shotover Road, **T:** +64 3 441 6044 **W:** www.cfma.co.nz 
Po Box 553, Queenstown

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Tanya Copeland <Tanya.Copeland@codc.govt.nz>

Sent: Friday, March 8, 2024 11:39 AM

To: Emma Dixon <edixon@cfma.co.nz>

Subject: RE: RC230278 - Landscape and Visual Assessment clarifications/assessments

Hi Emma,

My notification recommendation identified a couple of potential issues with the scope and assumptions of the Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment from Vivian + Espie. I would prefer to address these with you and Ben Espie prior to confirming the notification decision in case it changes the conclusions reached in the report and/or in my notification recommendation. Are you able to please address the following:

1. Receiving environment – The assessment of visual effects appears to be based on an incorrect assumption of the receiving environment. The other huts, particularly the one constructed in the last few years on Pt Sec 20 are unconsented and do not form a legitimate part of the receiving environment. Can you please advise whether this changes the conclusions reached in the report, particularly paragraphs 31, 45, 46, 50.
We are not aware of the legality of the hut on Pt Sec 20. There is another hut on Sec 24, approximately 1km away that has been there for at least 14 years that we know of possibly longer, it predates Plan Change 5, so could have potentially been erected as a permitted activity. The landscape assessment discusses these huts and compare the experience of seeing a building on the proposed platform in this application, to those existing hut. However, these huts are not relied upon to find the proposed platform an acceptable addition to the environment. Even if those huts were to be removed, it would not alter the discussion of the effects of the platform subject to this application.

2. Scope – The assessment fails to adequately assess the full scope of the application. The servicing of the proposed residential building platform will require the presence of 4-5 water tanks and solar panels in order to provide potable water, firefighting provision and power supply. The presence of these structures needs to be fully considered within the Vivian + Espie report.
Correct, this could have been better covered off in the assessment. The tanks will likely be at least partially buried in the hillside, inside the curve of the access way and will be situated behind a future house so will unlikely to be viewed from outside of the site. As previously discussed, the solar system could be a ground mount array further north on the site so will be positioned at a lower level and as such unlikely to be seen from outside of the site. Given the size of the house, a 4kw system is likely to be sufficient (although dependant on the type/number of appliances installed). A 4kw system requires 10 x 400w solar panels. Each solar panel is 1.7m x 1m in size, installed in a double line, would result in a solar face area of approximately 8.5m x 2m, which is small enough to ensure it can be positioned within the site so that it is unable to be viewed from outside of the site.

The applicant is happy to accept a condition of consent that ensures that no associated structures such as, but not limited to solar panels or water tanks are located on site such that they are not able to be viewed from outside of the site.

3. Scope – The landscape and visual assessment uses the notion comparing a dwelling (future dwelling on the RBP) to a back country hut and further qualifies this by indicating that a future dwelling will be “periodically occupied.” Can you please expand on your logic with this comparison. Typically a hunting hut is accessed on foot, used occasionally and creates domestication effects of a different nature and scale to that of a permanent dwelling.
Agree with your conclusions that a hunting hut will have quite a different usage to a residential dwelling. The envisaged building (and our proposed design controls) is discussed such that it will be akin to a hut, but the activity (i.e. a building platform) is assessed as it is proposed. The proposal of a building platform is not being compared to a hut in the sense that a hut is permitted, it is not permitted. Therefore the conclusions reached in the report are still valid.

4. Conceptual designs – The landscape and visual assessment appears to rely heavily on a conceptual design, governed by some design controls. Given the location of this within the ONL, can you please provide an assessment of the level of certainty that these design controls provide to mitigate visual effects of a future dwelling in the absence of specific building design plans detailing lighting, glazing, nature of eaves, screens and garaging for example.

We are happy to be guided by council on this point. If you wish to add more detail/substance to the design control condition to cover something that you believe is lacking, then we are happy to work together on this. Alternatively, we would also consider stamping the indicative house design plans as approved if that would provide more certainty to council as to the likely building that will be constructed on site in the future.

5. Size of residential building platform – The landscape and visual assessment relies on a proposed design control restricting all domestic elements to the 192m2 residential building platform. The conceptual designs show a modest three bedroom dwelling as occupying the majority of the building platform. Can you please provide commentary around the practicalities of restricting all domestic activities to the identified RBP. In particular, I am interested in how the storage of vehicles, trailers, machinery, woodsheds, vegetable gardens, visitors vehicles, clothes lines, water storage tanks and solar panels etc will be managed within the confined area of the RBP.

The landscape report says that “outdoor living or domestic curtilage activities will be confined to the area of the proposed building platform”. Given the topography and the earthworks design (with disturbed ground being re-grassed of in tussocks / grey shrubs), I don’t see where or why domestic activities would go anywhere other than within the platform. We are talking about a small building. I imagine that a small clothesline would be on the deck. I don’t see that there would be any vehicle or trailer storage other than in the carport, which is also large enough for a firewood stack. Machinery storage and vege gardens will not be practical on this site. Visitor vehicles would most practically park up on the paper road, or there is a gently graded grass area to the north of the platform where vehicle could park

As I have already used a section 92 (1) request, I am unable to place this application on hold for this information. I would appreciate if we could work together to address the above as I think the overall process will be improved with this additional clarification/assessment.

Thanks

Tanya

Tanya Copeland
Planner - Intermediate



+64 21 273 2034

Tanya.Copeland@codc.govt.nz

1 Dunorling Street, Alexandra 9320

www.codc.govt.nz

CODC supports flexible working arrangements, including working outside the office and sometimes irregular hours. I may have sent this outside of your working hours and only anticipate a response during your working hours.

If you have received this email and any attachments to it in error, please take no action based on it, copy it or show it to anyone. Please advise the sender and delete your copy. Thank you.

From: Emma Dixon <edixon@cfma.co.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, March 6, 2024 2:06 PM
To: Tanya Copeland <Tanya.Copeland@codc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: RC230278 - Further Information Request

You don't often get email from edixon@cfma.co.nz. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Tanya

Are you please able to provide an update on progress on this one?

Thanks

Kind Regards

Emma Dixon Resource Management Planner
BSc

DD: +64 3 441 6089

Cell: 0274 046 233

E: edixon@cfma.co.nz

Please note I work part time, Mon – Thurs 9.00am – 3.00pm



CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD
LAND SURVEYORS - LAND DEVELOPMENT - PLANNING CONSULTANTS
QUEENSTOWN | DUNEDIN | CHRISTCHURCH | GORE

A: 309 Lower Shotover Road, **T:** +64 3 441 6044 **W:** www.cfma.co.nz 
Po Box 553, Queenstown

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Tanya Copeland <Tanya.Copeland@codc.govt.nz>
Sent: Monday, February 26, 2024 11:33 AM
To: Emma Dixon <edixon@cfma.co.nz>
Subject: RE: RC230278 - Further Information Request

Hey Emma,

Apologies, I have been swamped with some hearing decisions the last couple of weeks. I am going through this application today for you and will look to have a notification decision completed in the next day or so.

Cheers

Tanya

From: Emma Dixon <edixon@cfma.co.nz>
Sent: Wednesday, February 21, 2024 10:19 AM

To: Tanya Copeland <Tanya.Copeland@codc.govt.nz>
Subject: FW: RC230278 - Further Information Request

You don't often get email from edixon@cfma.co.nz. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Tanya

Are you please able to update me on where this application is at with processing?

Many thanks

Kind Regards

Emma Dixon Resource Management Planner
BSc

DD: +64 3 441 6089


Cell: 0274 046 233

E: edixon@cfma.co.nz

Please note I work part time, Mon – Thurs 9.00am – 3.00pm



CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD
LAND SURVEYORS - LAND DEVELOPMENT - PLANNING CONSULTANTS
QUEENSTOWN | DUNEDIN | CHRISTCHURCH | GORE

A: 309 Lower Shotover Road, **T:** +64 3 441 6044 **W:** www.cfma.co.nz 
Po Box 553, Queenstown

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Emma Dixon
Sent: Friday, February 9, 2024 9:27 AM
To: Tanya Copeland <Tanya.Copeland@codc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: RC230278 - Further Information Request

Hi Tanya

Further to my earlier emails of 29th Jan and 1st Feb, please find attached the water test results.

These have come back high for e-coli, which is not a surprise. It is proposed to use UV treatment to ensure it is safe for drinking water purposes. All other aspects of the water supply are within the normal range.

If you are able to please send through an update on where this application is at, once you have had a chance to process all of the information supplied, that would be appreciated.

Thank you

Kind Regards

Emma Dixon Resource Management Planner
BSc

DD: +64 3 441 6089

Cell: 0274 046 233

E: edixon@cfma.co.nz


Please note I work part time, Mon – Thurs 9.00am – 3.00pm



CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD

LAND SURVEYORS - LAND DEVELOPMENT - PLANNING CONSULTANTS

QUEENSTOWN | DUNEDIN | CHRISTCHURCH | GORE

A: 309 Lower Shotover Road, **T:** +64 3 441 6044 **W:** www.cfma.co.nz 
Po Box 553, Queenstown

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Tanya Copeland <Tanya.Copeland@codc.govt.nz>

Sent: Thursday, January 4, 2024 2:59 PM

To: Emma Dixon <edixon@cfma.co.nz>

Subject: RE: RC230278 - Further Information Request

Hi Emma,

Happy new year. Hope you managed to get a bit of a break.

Thanks for your response to my s92(1) request for this application, I know it was a bit of a big one to deal with. I have reviewed it and have determined that more information is needed in order to fully satisfy the request. I have also determined that there are potentially other resource consents that may be required for the proposal which I have also discussed. I am interested at this stage to give you the opportunity to provide additional detail or commentary on this to help me understand whether these further consents are required or not prior to officially determining whether a s91 deferral is needed.

1. Subdivision vs Boundary Adjustment

I appreciate that it is difficult for customers to understand how a proposal of this nature is likely to be considered by Council. As a planning team, are always available for a pre-application meeting or able to review proposals prior to lodgement to ensure that a proposal is drafted and submitted with the best chance of progressing through the process easily.

Council has previously obtained a legal opinion with respect to boundary adjustments and how they are determined given the absence of a definition within the District Plan. Our legal advice confirms that the nature of the new boundaries within the application does not meet the threshold for being a boundary adjustment. The new boundaries are in entirely new locations, especially with respect to the intersecting road parcel. Council will be assessing the application as a subdivision pursuant to Rule 4.7.4 (iii) and as applicable also to Rule 4.7.6L (e). Please provide any additional assessment that you may deem necessary.

2. Water Supply

Council needs to assess the adequacy and appropriateness of a potable water supply at the time of resource consent, to ensure consents are not granted that are not able to be given effect to. Given the amendment to the water supply you have now proposed, can you please provide details of the proposed water take (where it is coming from – e.g. Water race, spring, irrigation pipe) and a plan showing the location of the take and a revised scheme plan showing any easements which may be required. Please also supply evidence of the amount of water available from the water supply as Council needs to confirm the quantity of water will be sufficient to supply the dwelling and provide the buffering within the four 30,000 L tanks. A water test to

confirm the potability of the water is also required. Depending on the information provided, additional consent may be required pursuant to Rule 4.7.3 (v) for a breach of 4.7.6G (b).

3. Access track

The information you have provided confirms that earthworks required for the access track breach standard 4.7.6J of the District Plan. The standards allow a cut batter to exceed 2m for a maximum length of 3m, whereas the exceedance described is 6m. My assessment is that this will trigger an additional resource consent as a restricted discretionary activity under Rule 4.7.3 (vi) and also potentially under Rule 4.7.4 (i) as a breach of 4.7.6L 1 (b).

4. Right of way

I am not able to locate the section 348 approvals that you have mentioned as they do not appear to be tied to either of the properties in the normal way. I need this information to confirm the legality of the right of way to determine whether upgrades are needed.

5. Solar panels

The construction of solar panels on the site may trigger additional resource consent under Rule 4.7.4 (i) as a breach of standard 4.7.6L 1 (a).

6. Other potential additional consents

In addition to the above, I consider that further resource consents may be required.

Existing hut – there does not appear to be a relevant resource consent for a residential activity for this hut. I would be interested in information which you might have to either demonstrate existing use rights, or determining whether the hut may require resource consent as a residential activity/second residential activity. Earthworks for the building platform – Can you please confirm the quantity of earthworks required for the building platform and whether this would form part of the application or not. The plans submitted show cut/fill batters and I need to understand whether this is indicative of future works or whether it would be undertaken as part of this application.

Thanks

Tanya

Tanya Copeland
Planner - Intermediate



+64 21 273 2034

Tanya.Copeland@codc.govt.nz

1 Dunorling Street, Alexandra 9320

www.codc.govt.nz



CODC supports flexible working arrangements, including working outside the office and sometimes irregular hours. I may have sent this outside of your working hours and only anticipate a response during your working hours.

If you have received this email and any attachments to it in error, please take no action based on it, copy it or show it to anyone. Please advise the sender and delete your copy. Thank you.

From: Emma Dixon <edixon@cfma.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, December 18, 2023 2:26 PM
To: Tanya Copeland <Tanya.Copeland@codc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: RC230278 - Further Information Request

You don't often get email from edixon@cfma.co.nz. [Learn why this is important](#)

Hi Tanya

Apologies for the delay in coming back to you on this one, I have been waiting on others to provide information to me. Some of which I still don't have, however in order to keep things moving I have answered as best I can and submitted back to you.

Thanks

Kind Regards

Emma Dixon Resource Management Planner
BSc

DD: +64 3 441 6089

Cell: 0274 046 233

E: edixon@cfma.co.nz

Please note I work part time, Mon – Thurs 9.00am – 3.00pm



CLARK FORTUNE McDONALD

LAND SURVEYORS - LAND DEVELOPMENT - PLANNING CONSULTANTS

Our offices will be closed Dec. 23 - Jan 14 for the holiday

A: 309 Lower Shotover Road, **T:** +64 3 441 6044 **W:** www.cfma.co.nz 

Please consider the environment before printing this email

From: Tanya Copeland <Tanya.Copeland@codc.govt.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, October 24, 2023 1:32 PM
To: Emma Dixon <edixon@cfma.co.nz>
Subject: RC230278 - Further Information Request

Hi Emma,

I have attached a further information request for this application – Grant Hensman and Ann & Robin Jones

Please give me a call if you have any questions on it.

Cheers

Tanya Copeland
Planner - Intermediate



- +64 21 273 2034
- Tanya.Copeland@codc.govt.nz
- 1 Dunorling Street, Alexandra 9320
- www.codc.govt.nz



CODC supports flexible working arrangements, including working outside the office and sometimes irregular hours. I may have sent this outside of your working hours and only anticipate a response during your working hours.

If you have received this email and any attachments to it in error, please take no action based on it, copy it or show it to anyone. Please advise the sender and delete your copy. Thank you.

Scanned by **Trustwave SEG** - Trustwave's comprehensive email content security solution. Download a free evaluation of Trustwave SEG at www.trustwave.com

Scanned by **Trustwave SEG** - Trustwave's comprehensive email content security solution. Download a free evaluation of Trustwave SEG at www.trustwave.com

Scanned by **Trustwave SEG** - Trustwave's comprehensive email content security solution. Download a free evaluation of Trustwave SEG at www.trustwave.com

Scanned by **Trustwave SEG** - Trustwave's comprehensive email content security solution. Download a free evaluation of Trustwave SEG at www.trustwave.com
