

13/7/2023

Joanne Skuse
Consultant Senior Planner
Gore District Council

By email: jskuse@propertygroup.co.nz

Dear Joanne,

RE: Response to Request for Information – Resource Consent Application LU23031 & SC23032

Please see below a response to the queries raised in your letter dated 13 June 2026 requesting further information in relation to the Resource Consent Application LU23031 & SC23032.

Management of the complex.

1. Confirm if the application is for a managed social housing complex and demonstrate how this will continue when subdivided, as the proposed subdivision alters the ownership model.
2. GDC will not manage the green area (Lot 101). It will remain in the control and management of the Applicant. Please provide details on how the area will be managed to maintain amenity for the development and surrounding neighbourhood. E.g. frequency of mowing, litter picking etc. How will this maintenance continue following the subdivision?
3. Please provide details on how the pedestrian walkway and other common areas within the ROW will be managed by the joint owners (*highlighted yellow in Figure 1*)?
4. Further to point 3, given the number of parties subject to the ROW ownership and additional properties currently utilising it (Area RD, RB, A, A and S), where do responsibilities lie in terms of general maintenance and street lighting? How will the cost share be dealt with?
5. Has a unit title subdivision with a body corporation type of mechanism been considered?

Response:

In response to query 1, the District Plan does not differentiate between types of residential uses. However, the proposed development is being consented and implemented by Kāinga Ora and meets the objective set out in Section 12 of the Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Act 2019. The proposed development will assist Kāinga Ora in meeting their functions as set out in Section 13(1) of the aforementioned legislation, which includes the following:

Housing

- (a) to provide rental housing, principally for those who need it most:
- (b) to provide appropriate accommodation, including housing, for community organisations:
- (c) subject to subsection (2),—
 - (i) to provide people with home-related financial assistance; and
 - (ii) to make loans, or provide other financial assistance, to local authorities and other entities for housing purposes:
- (d) to give people (including people on low or modest incomes who wish to own their own homes) help and advice on matters relating to housing or services related to housing:
- (e) to provide housing or services related to housing as agent for the Crown or Crown entities:

The subdivision application provides for a fee simple project with a resident's association. The Applicant would be happy to consider mechanisms that the Council considers may be appropriate to maintain the complex use as achieving the functions set out in Section 13(1) of the Kāinga Ora – Homes and Communities Act 2019.

The Council Agenda dated 6 July 2023 notes under the Housing and Business Capacity subsection,

- *There was a growing need for affordable homes, with more households experiencing rental stress and an increase in housing need. Despite rising house prices and rents, Gore was still a relatively affordable market compared with other areas of New Zealand.*
- *Recent resource consent data indicated a preference for greenfield development with rural living opportunities rather than residential infill. Historically however, long term population growth had primarily been residential infill development.*

The proposed development responds positively to both these matters by providing additional housing to help meet the increased housing need within an infill development, rather than occupying greenfield land.

In terms of query 2, the walkway and green spaces which I have labelled Lots 100, 101 & 102 should be individual lots. These will be jointly owned by all properties in the development. While the development remains in Kāinga Ora ownership the asset manager will need to maintain these areas.

In terms of the responses to queries 3-5, please refer to the revised Scheme Plan contained in **Attachment A**.

The changes include-

- The Schedule of Easements are shown and include specifics on the party wall easements for each lot,
- Lot 101 (Easement Y) to be held in 1/24 shares both Lots 1-24 (a greenspace for recreation)
- Lot 102 (Easement Z) to be held in 1/6 share for the benefit of Lots 16-21 as a Jointly Owned Access Lot this enables both vehicle and pedestrian use and access for proposed Lot 16.
- Lot 102 (Easement Z) is also a pedestrian Right of Way for the remaining properties within the development to walk direct to Oxford Street.

For the pedestrian Right of Way, the advice received is that occupiers (lets assume proposed Lot 4) will want to walk through the JOAL so it should be formalised at this stage.

With respect to query 5th, yes a Unit Title and body corporate arrangement has been considered as part of the proposal. Whilst a unit title provides some benefit in terms of the ongoing maintenance of the open space areas, there are possibly challenges in securing engagement with each occupier. It is therefore proposed a fee simple development with a Residents Association provides for improved outcomes and certainty for the overall development.

Timing of development

6. Please detail the sequencing of development. For example, is it anticipated that infrastructure and roading will be installed, followed by the construction of all buildings and accessory buildings, and then 223 224c certification applied to subdivide the buildings on their own title?
7. How is the sequencing to be ensured/cross referenced across the two decisions? Volunteered conditions may be useful to support this.

Response:

The construction process will begin with the installation of the haul road, in the same location as the vested cul-de-sac. After the haul road has been constructed, the construction process will involve excavation and piling work, which will begin at the eastern end of the cul-de-sac for the units and gradually progress eastward towards Hamilton Street.

During this process, it is expected that two piling rigs will be present on the site, operating on both the north and south sides. As the piling work advances towards Hamilton Street, civil drainage and infrastructure construction will commence at the eastern end of the cul-de-sac and follow the piling rigs in the same direction.

After the completion of piling and civil drainage work, the construction of the units will commence. The building process will start at the western end of the site and gradually move eastward towards Hamilton Street, following the same progression as the piling and infrastructure work.

This sequence of activities indicates a systematic approach to the construction project, starting with site preparation, followed by infrastructure development, and concluding with the building of the units.

The sequencing of the applications will have the Land Use Consent prepared by Planz Consultants Ltd assessed and approved which then becomes part of the existing environment. The subdivision of land then follows creating the fee simple titles and open space areas for the managing of the Residents Association.

In response to query 7, we can do this by defining the timing of the works i.e the Land Use Consent and the construction works that relate to the road and ROW upgrade, residential units and fencing, and finally the Subdivision can cut across that as the last step with title then issued. Residents can occupy the site whilst the titles are being raised by LINZ.

It is our understanding both consent applications will be assessed in unison (applying the sequencing described above) and Council issues a single decision applying both components.

Title:

8. Provide a record of title less than 3 months old.
9. Provide the following easement instruments (highlighted):
10. Summarise the land covenant detailing any relevance to the application.

Response:

A copy of the requested Title and easement instruments is contained in **Attachment B**.

With respect to query 10, this Easement Instrument relates to the future use of the site following the removal or decommissioning of the former tavern. The easement restricts the site from being used for the sale of liquor either as an on-license or off-licence. The easement has no relationship or implication to the proposal.

Design

11. The AEE discusses an assessment by a "TAG Panel" consisting of urban design, planning and landscape experts. Provide this expert input/report relied upon in order to conclude the proposed development is appropriate.
12. The average density is proposed as 320m², however taking into account the non-developable areas (resultant developable area is approx. 4922m²) the density is akin to 205m², this is considered to be at the higher end of a medium density development. This is markedly different from the surrounding environment and what is anticipated by the District Plan for this low density zone. Provide specific urban design comment assessing the effects on the environment of medium density development in this location, as well as effects on the immediately adjoining neighbours.

Response:

Please refer to **Attachment C** for copies of the TAG Panel reviews. Attachment C also includes specific urban design comment assessing the effects on the environment of medium density development in this location, as well as effects on the immediately adjoining neighbours.

In summary, the proposed development is supported by experts in urban design, architecture, landscape architecture and it is considered that the level of amenity created by the proposed design, relative to the existing environment, represents an enhancement in the amenity of the site and is far more consistent with the surrounding residential environment and what is anticipated by the District Plan for the low density zone than what has currently exists. It is therefore considered that the density non-compliance does not create any adverse effects on neighbouring residents that are minor or more than minor.

Design

13. Clarify whether the decks proposed are raised or flush with the ground. The elevations do not provide adequate details. Confirm whether the deck structures for unit 12, 14 and 17 will breach the 1m yard setback.

Response:

The architects have advised that “(a)ll decks are raised above the ground to align with the minimum FFLs set over the site due to the flooding risk established. Decks offset from ground levels range from 340mm to 770mm. The decks for units 12, 14 and 17 have been reduced to avoid breaching the offset. We have proposed some additional privacy measures to align with raised deck areas only where the following parameters are met; any deck within 5m of a boundary fence and if there is not a blank neighbouring wall within this distance”.

Design

14. The masterplan and 3D renders include a wall structure encroaching into the road reserve. Approval from Council will be required for this structure. Please assess whether or not it will interfere with sightlines when existing the complex.
15. The 3D renders include signage for the development on the wall mentioned in point (11). Confirm whether this is in accordance with the permitted standards or apply for consent accordingly.

Response:

The wall structure and signage has been removed from the amended plans contained in **Attachment D**.

Plans:

16. Provide elevations free from trees, shadows, fences etc. to clearly show the built form proposed.
17. Provide elevations for every unit or each unit typology if they are repeated through the development.
18. Provide northern and southern elevations of the complex as a whole, depicted by green lines below.
19. Provide an elevation of the built form facing the shared boundary with 25 Hamilton Street, depicted by red line below.
20. Detail the rationale behind the shading diagrams. Is the permitted built form based on maximising the standards but meeting density requirements? Please provide separate diagrams of a compliant scheme vs the proposal for June 21 date; and September 21 date.

Responses:

In response to query 16, please refer to revised Architectural Drawings (pg. 23-24) in **Attachment D** for additional elevations excluding trees, shadows and fences.

In response to query 17, please refer to revised Architectural Drawings (pg. 33-48) for each unit typology and elevations.

In response to query 18, please refer to revised Architectural Drawings for North, South and mid-road elevations as per markup. (pg. 20-24).

In response to query 19, please refer to revised Architectural Drawings (pg.22) for additional elevations of Units 21-24 as per markup.

In response to query 20, the architects have advised the following:

“The shading rationale takes the same block footprint from the eaves of the building up to the compliant recession planes. Anything that is above the recession plane has been truncated vertically. This provides the red dashed shadow outline in the plans.”

The shadows shown on the plans are the proposed shadows. This gives a compliant baseline shadowing. We have highlighted the areas in yellow the proposed massing which breaches the recession plane. There are limited breaches compared to the compliant massing.

To confirm, we have provided 21 June (Winter), 21 September (Equinox) is now also included and shown the compliant shadow outline (red) and the proposed”.

Scheme Plan and Easements:

21. Provide a memorandum of easements detailing the existing easements covering the right of way and proposed easements.
22. Lot 102 provides pedestrian access to the cul-de-sac users, what legal mechanism is in place to enable persons from the cul-de-sac units to utilise the right of way to access Oxford Street.
23. Provide further information on the legality of the use of the right of way areas over 13A and 13C Oxford Street for the Lots 16-21.
24. Demonstrate the Applicant can fulfil their legal obligations under right of way during construction for example, keeping the right of way clear from obstruction.

Responses:

Please refer to the amended Scheme Plan as **Attachment E**. The Schedule of Easements now reflect the party walls and include the following additions to clarify ownership and user rights, including-

- Lot 101 (Easement Y) to be held in 1/24 shares both Lots 1-24 (a greenspace for recreation)
- Lot 102 (Easement Z) to be held in 1/6 share for the benefit of Lots 16-21 as a Jointly Owned Access Lot this enables both vehicle and pedestrian use and access for proposed Lot 16.
- Lot 102 (Easement Z) is also a pedestrian Right of Way for the remaining properties within the development to walk direct to Oxford Street.

In response to query 22, a ROW easement will be created for Lots 1-15 and 23,24 over Lots 101 and 102 for the provision of access over Lot 102.

With respect to question 23, as there is no development on #13 Oxford Street it is challenging to pre-empt the future demand on the Right of Way. One mechanism to assess potential future effects would be to assess the RoW on the basis that #13C Oxford Street is developed to the maximum permitted potential and include within that assessment the demand from proposed Lots 16-21. Whilst this approach is presumptive, it would nonetheless enable Council to consider the full suite of effects of the proposed applicant had the land at #13C been fully developed.

Referring to the Transport Assessment it concludes that the occupiers of proposed Lots 16-21 are not likely to carry out vehicle movements typical of a standard residential activity, but rather significantly less. On that basis, whilst the number of users of the RoW are potentially exceeded when the subject site and #13C are considered in unison, the effects arising are not likely to exceed that of a permitted use. Dimensionally, the RoW is unable to be widened without the approval of #13 Oxford Street although it is sufficiently wide to enable the passing of two vehicles with ease.

Potentially the application could be redesigned such that vehicles to proposed Lots 16-21 are required to use the access formation over proposed Lot 100. This would increase vehicle movements internally within the development. It would future-proof any potential development for the landowners of #13c Oxford Street, however this is a perverse outcome given the subject site subject to this application has rights to use the RoW yet are precluded from doing so by virtue of protecting the development potential of #13C.

Having read the Transportation Assessment, it is my opinion the effects of the proposed demand on the RoW by the applicant and also the potential future use by the owners of #13C Oxford will create less than minor effects on the transportation network or safety of the residents.

In response to Question 24, the applicant will ensure the lawful used of the Row will not be obstructed as part of the future development. It is anticipated a condition to that effect would carry into the consent decision.

Contaminated Land:

25. The report by ENGEO states at section 8.1 consent is required as a restricted discretionary activity under the NES for the soil disturbance, soil disposal, change in land use and subdivision.

Update the AEE to assess the activity addressing the findings in the ENGEO report...

26. Whilst the ENGEO report appears to offer options for managing the contaminated area on site: either retaining the soil onsite and capping it, or removing the soil off site; it is not clear from the application how the Applicants intends to proceed.

Provide details of how the contaminated soil is going to be managed.

27. Attachment F states the Soil within the building footprints and halos will be managed under the 'General Kāinga Ora Contaminated Site Management Plan (Kāinga Ora, July 2022). Provide a copy of this document and summarise how the health and safety of workers and contractors during the construction of the project will be managed.

Responses:

In response to queries 25 and 26, the updated DSI provided in **Attachment F** contains soil sampling, laboratory analysis, and a risk assessment and is therefore, considered to be adequate.

The DSI including the remediation / material handling requirements has been prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced practitioner in accordance with the NES-CS and general accordance with the current edition of Contaminated Land Management Guidelines No 5: Site investigation and analysis of soils and Contaminated Land Management Guidelines No 1: Reporting on contaminated sites in New Zealand. Therefore, the remediation approach and recommendations are considered adequate for the site and proposal.

A RAP, OSMP and SVR for the site and proposal will also be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced practitioner in accordance with industry standards and guidelines. These documents will control the transport, disposal, and tracking of excavated soil and other materials and recommend any necessary measures to mitigate any environmental effects to be less than minor. The measures that will be implemented to avoid, remedy or mitigate the identified adverse effects are summarised in Section 6 and Table 5 attached. Through implementation of these measures, it is concluded that the potential environmental effects associated with the proposed programme of remedial works will be less than minor.

The Applicant is amenable to considering the Councils standard condition/s regarding the timing and nature of reviewing consent conditions relating to the management and remediation of contaminated soil. The Applicant agrees to adopt ENGEOs recommendations. In doing so, the site is suitable for this proposal.

Considering the above, any adverse effects of this proposal including its contaminated soil on the future occupants of the site, as well as surrounding environment will be mitigated to be less than minor.

Conditions offered to mitigate potential effects arising from earthworks on the contaminated site include:

- *The consent holder must dispose of all material removed from the site at a suitable facility for contaminated soil.*
- *In the event of uncovering or disturbance of unexpected contamination – as evidenced by discoloured soils, staining, odours, general refuse, or fibrous materials (asbestos) the following must occur:*
 - a. *Stop work in the area of discovery;*
 - b. *Notify the Site Manager to be of any contaminated material identified;*
 - c. *Notify [the Buller District Council](#) as soon as practicable;*
 - d. *Area to be cordoned off until the material has been identified and decisions made on how to progress;*
 - e. *Site Manager to contact a SQEP to assess the nature of the material; and*
 - f. *Work must only re-commence once the consent holder is advised it is appropriate to do so by a SQEP.*
- *The consent holder must:*
 - a. *Be responsible for all contracted operations relating to the exercise of this consent; and*
 - b. *Ensure that all personnel (contractors) working on the site are made aware of the conditions of this consent for management of contaminated soils, have access to the contents of consent documents, including the PSI/DSI report ; and*

c. *Ensure compliance with land use consent conditions.*

Please find attached in **Attachment F** the Kāinga Ora Contaminated Site Management Plan referred to in the ENGEO report.

The delineation testing has identified an impacted area of:

- 4 m north of HM1;
- 2 m east of HM1;
- 2 m south of HM1; and
- 2 m west of HM1.

The required remediation is to a depth of 0.8 m bgl.

If removal off site was the preferred option this would require the excavation, removal and disposal of an area of soil approximately 24m² to a depth of 0.8 m bgl. The volume of soil requiring removal in this scenario is approximately 19.2m³.

Following the excavation and removal of the fill material around HM1, validation sampling will be required to confirm the remaining fill in the identified area of lead contamination is below the Residential SCS.”

In response to query 27, Please also find attached the Residential Property- Sampling and Analysis (SAP) guidance document in which Kāinga Ora have provided a high level (statistically derived) generic conceptual site model (CSM) for existing Kāinga Ora residential properties (non-HAIL site) that could undergo re-development. In our report we have used this provided document to assume that dwellings comprise of contamination “hot spots” on site within the dripline/curtilage area surrounding structures on-site. In their SAP it is assumed that concentrations in these areas are occasionally an order of magnitude above the NES-CS low density residential SCS of 210 mg/kg. Asbestos is the other key contaminant of concern and is assessed as part of the PSI site walkover/inspection (inspection of buildings and ground surface). Where asbestos products are found in poor condition, ENGEO will note this in the DSI report.

As per the SAP, to be conservative, we are assuming that the dripline/curtilage area extends 2 m from the main dwelling and to a depth of 0.3 m. If other significant structures exist on a property, there will be additional drip line/halo impact assumptions.

To summarise, material within the building ‘halo’s’ will be addressed as contaminated at a ‘magnitude above the NES-CS low density residential SCS’. Where asbestos products are noted in ENGEO DSI investigations, the building Halo’s should be treated as contaminated above BRANZ ‘all land use’ guideline criteria (2017).

Transport:

28. ... please provide evidence of how the complex will remain a social housing complex in perpetuity; or, additional assessment of the reduced road width based on a residential complex.
29. The Calibre ‘Pavement Plan’ drawing shows the intersection with Hamilton Street has a kerb radius of 8.7m which is less than the 9.0m minimum radius required in Clause 3.3.7 in the Bylaw. A dispensation will be required. Please assess.
30. Underground electricity, telecommunications cables and water mains are located under the proposed footpath of the vested road. The bylaw requires such services to be located under the berm. A dispensation will be required. Please assess.
31. Detail the separation distance from the vehicle access directly onto Hamilton Street and the development access. In accordance with Table 3.3c in the Bylaw, these require a minimum separation distance of 19m from the property boundary closest to cul-de-sac road. A dispensation will be required. Please assess.
32. The section of right of way from the application site to Oxford Street will require repair and a reseal; the established evergreen hedge which overhangs the western edge of the ROW reduces its effective width, will need to be trimmed; and the vehicle crossing at Oxford St will need to be upgraded in accordance with drawing R03 in the Bylaw. Demonstrate the easements documents enable such works.

Responses:

Please find contained in **Attachment G** a response to the transport engineering queries. The additional points are also noted:

The updated 'Pavement Plan' drawing is contained in **Attachment H**.

In response to query 30, the Project Engineers have advised:

Section 6.3.8.1 as follows:

Water mains should:

- (a) Be aligned parallel to property boundaries.*
- (b) Not traverse steep gradients.*
- (c) Be located to maintain adequate clearance from structures and other infrastructure.*
- (d) Be laid in the road berm outside of the carriageway and any associated drainage features.*
- (e) Be laid within legal public road reserves where practicable. Easements of a minimum width of 3.0m shall be provided for all water supply systems that are to be vested in the Council or the system owner where they cross any private land.*

Given that the above says "should" rather than shall or must, we query whether a dispensation is needed. Can you please clarify?

The watermain complies with all except for (d). Given the narrow road width and building set back from the road boundary that has been agreed to, it is considered best that the watermain is located away from the houses. This locates it under the footpath as we have shown.

This Easement Instrument relates to the future use of the site following the removal or decommissioning of the former tavern. The easement restricts the site from being used for the sale of liquor either as an on-license or off-licence.

In response to query 31, the Project Engineers have advised:

Plan C300 has been updated to show the vehicle crossing distance from the boundary.

Table 3.3C has been mis-labelled Table 4.3C in the bylaw. The table provides a distance "K" where the property access can be located relative to the side road. Drawing R14 shows these dimensions. K on this drawing is the distance from the centre of the vehicle crossing to the property boundary at the intersection.

The required distance is 19m.

The distance of the centre of the Unit/Lot 1 vehicle crossing to the boundary is 22.2m.

The distance of the centre of the Unit/Lot 24 vehicle crossing to the boundary is 9.8m.

With regards to Lot 24 a complying entrance cannot be constructed from Hamilton St. A complying vehicle crossing can be constructed from Road 1 however this would require redesign of the dwelling on that lot and compromise the outdoor living area of that lot.

In response to query 32, the Project Engineers have advised:

We have downloaded the Easement Instrument. There is nothing specific in the easement instrument regarding maintenance therefore the provisions of the Land Transfer Regulations give the implied powers. From the 2002 Reg.s that the easement was created under the right of way rights and powers are as follows:

6 Rights of way

- (1) A right of way includes the right for the grantee in common with the grantor and other persons to whom the grantor may grant similar rights, at all times, to go over and along the easement facility.
- (2) The right to go over and along the easement facility includes the right to go over and along the easement facility with or without any kind of—
 - (a) vehicle, machinery, or implement; or
 - (b) domestic animal or (if the servient land is rural land) farm animal.
- (3) A right of way includes—
 - (a) the right to establish a driveway, to repair and maintain an existing driveway, and (if necessary for any of those purposes) to alter the state of the land over which the easement is granted; and
 - (b) the right to have the easement facility kept clear at all times of obstructions (whether caused by parked vehicles, deposit of materials, or unreasonable impediment) to the use and enjoyment of the driveway.

It can be seen maintenance is allowed for and the right of way needs to be kept clear and of obstructions.

Landscaping:

33. Alectryon excelsus (Titoki) do not grow well in Gore given the cold. Please propose an alternative or provide supporting evidence that the tree specie is appropriate for the climate.
34. North Island Kowhai (tetraptera) produces a better, more full specimen tree than the South Island variety. Would KO consider this specie?

Responses:

The Applicant is happy to accept conditions of consent requiring the use of alternative tree species rather than Titoki and the North Island Kowhai rather than the South Island Kowhai.

Geotech:

35. Confirm the proposed foundations for the buildings and that the earthworks calculations are based on this method.
36. Detail the number of truck movements estimated for the earthworks and proposed access route. Is it anticipated that the ROW to Oxford Street will be utilised?
37. Detail the estimated timeframe to complete the earthworks overall.
38. Detail the estimated timeframe to install piles if this method is to be used.
39. The Geosolve report states...:

Has this been undertaken or is it anticipated to occur during detailed design of the project? Note current geotechnical engineering will be required for the building platforms especially where demolition excavation has taken place for the basement section, and removal of underground services.

Responses:

In response to query 35, the Project Engineers have advised:

The volume of earthworks shown is an estimate based on comparison of the predevelopment surface to the designed finished surface. It does not take into account the foundation type and any undercutting or over excavation required for specific foundation types, the roading or servicing and is subject to detailed design which may alter the finished ground levels. The additional volume of earthworks for these is not significant and does not impact on the mitigation measures required or conditions that will need to be imposed. While further calculation or refinement of the quantities may give a volume closer to the total final volume of earth moved the final volume will depend on many factors that will not be known until the work is being completed. Also the foundation type and parameters will be subject to review through the building consent process and may change. We consider that sufficient information has been provided to assess the likely effects of the proposed work and enable Council to impose suitable conditions to appropriately mitigate likely effects.

In response to query 36, the Project Engineers have advised:

The Number of truck movements would be on average 11.25 per day over an estimated 5 month that is made up of the following below.

- *Average truck movements over core civil construction period (5 months): 1.25 truck / truck and trailer movements per hour.*
- *The first month of bulk earthworks would be 2 – 2.5 trucks per hour and reducing after this.*

- *We are looking to backload in most situations to reduce the truck movements.*
- *Drainage elements and pavement construction would be truck only a number of cases with the rest being truck and trailer.*

The estimated timeframes to complete earthworks overall is 5 months.

The estimated timeframes to install piles is 18-22 days.

Please find attached as **Attachment I**, a copy of the site-specific Project Safety Environmental Plan prepared by Southbase Construction.

In response to query 39, an updated Geotech Report has been prepared by ENGEO and is contained in **Attachment J**. This report forms part of the resource consent application.

Consultation:

40. Please provide details of the consultation undertaken and responses received. Adjoining neighbours and the users of the right of way are of particular importance.

Response:

Consultation undertaken with neighbours and information provided to the wider public includes a letter to neighbours sent May 2022; Stuff article dated 18 May 2022; Letter to neighbours 26 January 2023; Stuff article dated 26 January 2023; Stuff article 15 March 2023; Otago Daily Times article 16 March 2023, Article on Kainga Ora Website dated 23 March 2023; Kāinga Ora Facebook dated 22 March 2023; Kāinga Ora LinkedIn article dated March 2023. Where available copies of these documents and links are available in **Attachment K**.

I have not been provided with details of any responses received.