



Our Ref: s92 Further Information Request  
 File: 1598 / 12763 335 00

21 August 2023

Barker & Associates

Attention: Katherine Hu  
 Email: [katherineh@barker.co.nz](mailto:katherineh@barker.co.nz)

Dear Ms Hu

## SECTION 92 RMA FURTHER INFORMATION REQUEST – APPLICATION FOR SUBDIVISION AND LANDUSE, KAINGA ORA AND RUAPEHU DISTRICT COUNCIL, 6 TEI TEI DRIVE, OHAKUNE (RDC Ref: RC 1598)

This letter is in relation to your application for Subdivision and Land use consents on land legally described as Lot 2 DP 54909.

Section 92(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 allows for a consent authority at any reasonable time before its decision to request further information in relation to the application.

You are required to provide the following additional information in relation to the above application:

### Extent of Works

1. **Please clarify** the extent and nature of works shown on the various plans in the Engineering Drawing set with regards to works in and around proposed Lot 205 (Local Purpose Reserve). The Wetland Assessment recommends that in order to offset the direct effects of the proposed subdivision works on Wetland 2, that the wetland should be extended into the area contained within Proposed Lot 205. The Wetlands and Stormwater Memorandum sets out the potential for a small stormwater wetland in the area of Proposed Lot 205. It would thus appear that works will be required in the area of Proposed Lot 205 which is currently shown as outside the extent of works.

### Wetlands

2. The Stage 1 Earthworks Proposed Contour Plan provided in Appendix 4 to the application indicates that the 10m wetland buffer zone extends onto Proposed Lots 1, 2 and 3. Assuming that the “buffer zone” relates to the National Environmental Standard for Freshwater (“NES-F”), **please clarify** what the implications of the NES-F “buffer zone” is for the construction of dwellings on Proposed Lots 1-3 in the future, and confirm whether or not the consents to be sought for the project from Horizons under the NES-F address that matter.

### Concept Masterplan

3. Noting that earlier concepts of the Masterplan for the site indicated retention of the existing



shared path from Snowmass Drive to Tei Tei Drive on its existing alignment, **please provide** an explanation of the rationale for the proposal to realign the shared path to in part require path users to use local streets in the subdivision (see also information requests later in this letter under the Integrated Transportation Assessment heading).

4. **Please confirm** whether the indicative size of the water tank notation shown on the Indicative Lot Layouts is accurate to the size that will actually be provided. This is particularly important on the Lots that are proposed to be under 450m<sup>2</sup> in site area given the outdoor stacked parking arrangement that is proposed on those lots.
5. **Please clarify** whether the Indicative Lot Layouts recognize and provide for the building foundation restriction within the 45 degree zone of influence from pipe inverts as set out at section 8.4.2 of the Geotechnical Interpretative Report. Please provide alternative complying layouts if not.
6. With respect to the Typical Stream Interface plan at page 18 of the Concept Masterplan, **please clarify** how the desired shared path along the length of the reserve can be achieved while taking into account the recommendations set out in the Stream Assessment Report, particularly with regards to ecological restoration planting for at least 10m either side of Waterway B.

#### Stream Assessment

7. **Please clarify** how the recommendations of the Stream Assessment in terms of ecological enhancement and restoration are proposed to be implemented.

#### Arboricultural

8. **Please clarify** whether the trees and vegetation that are recommended to be retained as set out in the Arboricultural report are proposed to be retained as part of the proposed subdivision. If they are not, please provide an assessment of the effect of not retaining them along with any required measures to remedy, mitigate or offset their loss.

#### Construction Noise and Vibration

9. The site will require bulk earthworks to form the subdivision. The Geotechnical report submitted with the application sets out that a large area of uncontrolled fill exists on the subject site that will need to be dug out and replaced with engineered fill as part of subdivision formation works. The compaction process may require multiple phases and will require rolling/compaction of the fill. The area affected is adjacent to existing residential development on neighbouring sites.
10. Further, the Geotechnical Report (para 8.3.2) sets out that given the high moisture content of the silts and clays that will be encountered during earthworks the material will need to be carefully managed to ensure it is worked at optimum moisture content in order to achieve required compaction, and that if intermittent rainfall occurs during the summer months the earthworks period could be lengthened considerably. A lengthened earthworks period will mean lengthened duration of potential effects on adjacent properties.
11. The application (Section 8.3.3) states that "*noise and vibration effects to adjacent properties during earthworks can be appropriately managed, and a number of consent conditions are anticipated to ensure all works are carried out in accordance with best practice*". Appendix 2 to the application records that the proposed activity will be able to comply with Rule DR 3.3.2 which in turn requires compliance with the noise limits of NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics – Construction Noise. No further information or analysis is provided.

12. Accordingly, **please provide** a report from a suitably qualified and experienced acoustic/vibration expert that sets out in more detail what measures will be employed to ensure that construction noise and vibration effects will be avoided, remedied or mitigated on the occupants of and buildings on adjoining and adjacent sites, including those sites fronting Tei Tei Drive.

### Geotechnical/Services

13. **Please provide** a copy of the Geotechnical Factual Report dated 17 February 2023.
14. The Geotechnical Interpretative Report ("GIR") assumes that the formation of the subdivision will require minor cuts and fills in the order of 1m. The Assessment of Effects ("AEE") report at section 4.1 sets out that *"fill depths of up to approximately 2.3m are proposed within the low-lying parts of the site and cut depths of up to approximately 1.7m"*. Accordingly, given the cut and fill assumptions in the GIR are proposed to be exceeded, **please provide** either (i) confirmation from the authors of the GIR that the recommendations it contains remain applicable, and/or (ii) any additional geotechnical analysis and recommendations to address actual cut and fill depths.
15. In order to accurately identify which of the proposed lots are within the areas of the site currently containing uncontrolled fill, **please provide** a plan showing the scheme plan of subdivision overlaid on CMW Drawing 2 "Geotechnical Hazard Plan".
16. Section 6.3 of the GIR notes that during geotechnical testing in the late spring/early summer period groundwater was encountered at relatively shallow levels. Section 8.4.4 of the GIR notes that due to the high groundwater table, disposal of concentrated stormwater flows to ground is not considered suitable. **Please clarify** how this finding has been taken into account in the design of the proposed drainage swales and what the implications of the high groundwater table are for the functioning of the swales.
17. Section 8.2 of the GIR sets out that a building restriction line set back at least 5m from the crest of the open drains on the site is required to define a Slope Instability Hazard Zone for structures, unless alternative slope instability mitigation measures are implemented. **Please confirm** which of the methods set out in Section 8.2 are to be employed, and in the event that the Slope Instability Hazard Zone is preferred, provide a plan showing the 5m building restriction line overlaid on the scheme plan of subdivision.
18. Given that the prevailing wind in the Ohakune area is from the west/nor'west towards adjoining residential development, control of dust during the earthworks phase will be important. While the AEE (Section 7.5.2) notes that water will be applied to the site to control dust during construction, **please provide** information on any other specific dust control measures to be utilised (eg will soil stockpiles be covered?) to ensure that Ruapehu District Plan Standard RE3.3.11 is able to be complied with.
19. **Please provide** information that demonstrates that the proposed depth of reticulated services and associated invert levels to be installed in the proposed subdivision is appropriate taking into account adjacent reticulation depths.
20. **Please provide** any other information that has been prepared to respond to the last bullet point in Section 10 (Further Work) of the Geotechnical Interpretative Report.

## Hydrology

21. Section 3.1.3 of the Hydrology Assessment sets out parameters for channel design to accommodate a 1:400 ARI storm event. One of the parameters is to have 1:1 side slopes. **Please provide** information to demonstrate that this recommendation, along with the expected channel section set out in Enclosure 3 to the Hydrology report, can be reconciled with the recommendations in Section 8.2 of the GIR as to channel slope stability.
22. **Please clarify**, in light of the earthworks that are proposed to be undertaken at the site, what the recommended minimum building floor level to apply to the proposed residential lots is.
23. Allied to above, please provide information that reconciles the statement in the Engineering Services report (page 11) that *"Care will need to be given when elevating the building platforms to mitigate the flood waters as this potentially could exacerbate flooding on neighbouring properties"* with .

## Integrated Transport Assessment ("ITA")

24. The cross-sections for the 18m wide Primary Road and the 14m wide Secondary Road indicate allowance for recessed parking within the sidewalk, with swales next to the sidewalk. **Please clarify and assess** the safety and efficiency of how this arrangement will work for pedestrians where recessed parking occurs (ie will they be required to walk on the carriageway or in the swale to get around parked cars?).
25. Allied to the above the Masterplan for the site proposes to realign the existing straight line shared path from Snowmass Drive to Tei Tei Drive to require path users to in part use Road E (Rural Lane) and Road A (Primary Road). Both of these proposed carriageway cross-sections require cyclists to share the carriageway with vehicles with no specific provision for cyclists. **Please provide** additional assessment of the safety and efficiency of this arrangement compared to the existing and any alternative cross-sections to address the issue.
26. **Please provide** details of the proposed traffic calming measures to be implemented on the various proposed carriageways. It is noted that given the climate in Ohakune with snow and ice occurring during the colder months, traditional measures such as speed humps may in themselves become a hazard and not be appropriate. Allied to this, one of the traffic calming measures set out in the ITA (Section 3.5) is to avoid the establishment of long, straight roads. On the face of it, Roads A and C would appear to be long and straight meaning the implementation of other traffic calming measures takes on additional importance.
27. In light of the increased traffic movements that would be generated on Tei Tei Drive from the residential subdivision, **please provide** details of what design measures are proposed to allow pedestrians and cyclists to safely cross the existing/extended Tei Tei Drive to and from the destinations on the northern side of the street (eg Carrot Park, Ohakune town centre). These measures should also take into account the proposed provision of the local purpose reserve (Lot 205) along the northern frontage of the site, which it appears is to be extended if future stages of subdivision at the site occur, and which is noted in the Concept Masterplan as "Additional Amenity Space for the community - linking in with the playground".
28. **Please provide** comment from NZ Transport Agency/Waka Kotahi on the adequacy of the existing Tei Tei Drive/SH 49 intersection to safely and efficiently cater for vehicle movements from the proposed residential subdivision.

### Service Confirmation

**29. Please provide** correspondence from the relevant utility service provider confirming that the proposed subdivision can be supplied with electricity connections.

### Proposed Consent Conditions

**30. Please provide** a consolidated set of proposed consent conditions that address the recommendations in the various technical reports and the AEE.

The consent authority is requesting this information to enable it to determine the potential for adverse effects to be created by your proposal. Your application will remain on hold awaiting this information.

The time period starting at the date the further information was requested and ending when you provide the information will be excluded from the processing time in accordance with Section 88C of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Section 92A of the Resource Management Act 1991 applies to further information requests. This section states:

*“92A Responses to request*

- (1) An applicant who receives a request under section 92(1) must, within 15 working days of the date of the request, take one of the following options:
  - (a) provide the information; or*
  - (b) tell the consent authority in a written notice that the applicant agrees to provide the information; or*
  - (c) tell the consent authority in a written notice that the applicant refuses to provide the information.**
- (2) A consent authority that receives a written notice under subsection (1)(b) must –
  - (a) set a reasonable time within which the applicant must provide the information; and*
  - (b) tell the applicant in a written notice the date by which the applicant must provide the information.”**

Please provide the Council with the requested information by 11 September 2023, or advise the consent authority whether you agree or refuse to provide the requested information.

Should you require further information or assistance regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Yours sincerely




Grant Eccles  
**CONSULTANT PLANNER**

Request 2 - part 2



Print Date: 12/12/2022  
Print Time: 1:41 PM




 Scale: 1:3370  
Original Sheet Size A4

Projection: NZGD2000 / New Zealand Transverse Mercator 2000  
Bounds: 1806268.14052773,5633297.37730511  
1807184.75288147,5633802.94073369

The information provided is an indication only and needs to be validated in the field.  
The RDC accepts no responsibility for errors or omissions for loss or damage resulting  
from the reliance or use of this information. Cadastral information is derived from LINZ's  
Digital Cadastral Record System (CRS) CROWN COPYRIGHT RESERVED.



 Scale: 1:3370  
Original Sheet Size A4

Projection: NZGD2000 / New Zealand Transverse Mercator 2000  
Bounds: 1806419.55339843,5633400.97526431  
1807336.16575217,5633906.53869289

The information provided is an indication only and needs to be validated in the field.  
The RDC accepts no responsibility for errors or omissions for loss or damage resulting  
from the reliance or use of this information. Cadastral information is derived from LINZ's  
Digital Cadastral Record System (CRS) CROWN COPYRIGHT RESERVED.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Min Kim [mailto:Min.Kim@ruapehudc.govt.nz]

**Sent:** 20 March 2023 12:20 PM

**To:** fraserm@barker.co.nz [mailto:fraserm@barker.co.nz], Ree Anderson [mailto:ree@reeanderson.co.nz], Giles Tait [mailto:Giles.Tait@kaingaora.govt.nz], Colleen McCorkindale [mailto:Colleen.McCorkindale@kaingaora.govt.nz], sunilp@cheal.co.nz [mailto:sunilp@cheal.co.nz], fraserm@barker.co.nz [mailto:fraserm@barker.co.nz]

**CC:** Richard Gibbs [mailto:richard.gibbs@ruapehudc.govt.nz], Min Kim [mailto:Min.Kim@ruapehudc.govt.nz], Vini Dutra [mailto:Vini.Dutra@ruapehudc.govt.nz], Grant Eccles [mailto:geccles@tonkintaylor.co.nz], KatherineH@barker.co.nz [mailto:KatherineH@barker.co.nz], Stuart Watson [mailto:Stuart.Watson@ruapehudc.govt.nz], Danielle Rogers [mailto:DRogers@tonkintaylor.co.nz]

**Subject:** Meeting Minutes - Pre-application meeting: 6 Teitei Drive development

Some people who received this message don't often get email from min.kim@ruapehudc.govt.nz. [Learn why this is important](#)

**CAUTION: External email. Do not click or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. If unsure use the Report Phishing button.**

Good afternoon,

Please find the attached meeting minutes.

Katherine – Please forward this email to any attendees who are not listed on this email.

Thank you.

Kind regards,

Min Kim

-----  
Min Kim  
Consents Manager

**Ruapehu District Council**

Ruapehu District Council | Private Bag 1001 | Taumarunui 3946 | New Zealand  
Phone: 07 895 8188 ext: 237 | Fax: 07 895 3256 | Mobile:  
email: Min.Kim@ruapehudc.govt.nz | RDC website: [www.ruapehudc.govt.nz](http://www.ruapehudc.govt.nz)

**If you are not the intended recipient of this email please notify the sender and immediately delete the email and any attachments - Thank you.**



## Pre-application meeting: 6 Teitei Drive development 15/03/2023 13:00-14:00pm, Microsoft Teams.

### 1 People

People present

- Min Kim, Vini Dutra, Ewen Skinner, Stuart Watson, Ree Anderson – Ruapehu District Council (RDC)
- Sunil Prasad – Cheal Consultants (CC)
- Colleen McCorkinsdale, Fletcher Wilson, Giles Tait – Kainga Ora (KO)
- Katherine Hu, Fraser McNutt – Barker and Associates (B&A)
- Todd Langwell – TPL (transport)
- James Pattullo – Isthmus (urban design)
- Grant Eccles, Danielle Rogers – Tonkin & Taylor Ltd (T+T) - for RDC

Apologies

- Richard Gibs – RDC

### 2 Agenda

- Brief introduction and overview of the project background (Giles)
- Overview of proposed concept plans and design approaches (James)
- Resource consent (RC) pathways, activity status and key RC considerations, and information requirements (Fraser)
- Approaches on roading layouts and information/matters to be covered in technical report (James / Fraser)
- Approach and initial design thinking of stormwater (Sunil)

### 3 Summary of questions & discussion

- **Giles (KO)** – This is a shovel ready project with hard deadlines with an aim to be on site doing works approved under resource consent by December 2023. The tight deadlines on the project are from a financial point of view to work with funding provided to KO. The aim is to lodge the resource consent application by end of April.
  - Ngāti Rangi have been involved in meetings and development agreements between KO and RDC. B&A are waiting on a signed agreement between all parties.
  - s 9(2)(g)(i)
- **James (Isthmus)** – The project includes sports fields, good connectivity with walkways, roads and town centre. No requirement for further facilities as everything is relatively local.
  - Amenity considered within the site with the proposed stream and the existing cycle way on northern part being brought forward to front of houses rather than the back.
  - Stormwater - indicative locations of ponds are shown with the attempt to leverage that value with the community.
  - Resilience of the site taken into account to allow future development to the south.
  - Allowance for SW swale in road width, flexibility with street layout.
- **Fraser (B&A)** – 38 lots proposed for Stage 1 with the potential for more lots on western side to total 44 lots.

- Not applying under Comprehensive Residential Development Rule in the Ruapehu Operative District Plan (ODP) and rather for a landuse consent for residential development under Rule 3.2.4 as a non-complying activity due to failure of density condition (RE 3.3.2). Feeling that with the effects aside, they are still achieving the intentions of the ODP.
- Working with Horizons Regional Council to check if consents are required.
- Prelim discussions have already been undertaken with RDC.
- **Grant (T+T)** – queried whether the application would simply be a subdivision consent. Action is to check the District Plan and see if landuse consent would be necessary to authorise the houses on the under 450m2 lots on the assumption they were approved.
  - Interested if any wetlands present and how the 3 waters engineering is going to work.
  - As the proposal does not comply with density standards, and the development has its sole access to the wider roading network via the Teitei Drive/SH49 intersection, it is highly likely that Waka Kotahi will be regarded as an affected party and their written approval should be sought by the applicant – gaining their approval should not be an issue if Teitei Drive/SH49 intersection adequately designed. A Traffic Impact Assessment (TIA) will be required to support the application and address safety and efficiency in the normal manner including specific consideration of any measures that may be required on Teitei Drive to address pedestrian movements across the road coming and going from the development to the Carrot Park.
  - Vinny's team to advise on whether there is sufficient 3 waters capacity to handle the demand from the development.
  - Departure from roading standards not fatal as long as roading function still works and integrates appropriately with adjoining landuse.
  - The more comprehensive the information, the better when applying. Expects that the application will contain a full and thorough notification assessment and assessment of effects. No opinion one way or the other on notification/non-notification at this point but encouraged to see complying lot sizes along the site boundary with Snowmass.
- **Ree (RDC)** – Colleen interested in Roading Hierarchy. Roads are not the only a transport medium but also represent open space and can complement reserves.
- **Sunil (CC)** – From a civil perspective, there are 44 lots for stage 1 and it will be challenging to get gravity feed to the network.
  - Proposing gravity main to stage 2 boundary and pump station and rising main further north. Wastewater connecting to the 100mm pipe.
  - The groundwater table is 300m and shallower in some places. As this is quite shallow and pond needs to be quite deep, more soil will need to be used to build up the pond.
  - Storage tanks or retention devices are proposed for SW attenuation on each lot to capture roof water. This will help with SW on the site and keep the pond smaller.
  - Need to confirm rising main route, however, balance lot owned by RDC so no need for easement.
- **Todd (TPL)** – The application is working with design team to integrate the development with surrounding environment.
  - In context the application for Stage 1 is only 44 lots and may not trigger anything at this stage. Approximately 40 vehicle movements is not high volume.
  - James to provide more feedback on roads and hierarchy and SW requirements.
  - Flexibility available to widen carriageways or walkways etc.
  - Can't see any Significant issues with Stage 1 development.

**4 Next steps/actions:**

- Ruapehu District Council to confirm whether a landuse consent (for residential activity) and/or a subdivision consent is required for the activity – ASAP.
- Applicant to continue with preparation of application and maintain contact with RDC regulatory team as required.

RELEASED UNDER THE OFFICIAL  
INFORMATION ACT 1982

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Ree Anderson [mailto:ree@reeanderson.co.nz]

**Sent:** 5 March 2021 9:47 AM

**To:** Rachael Hurzeler [mailto:Rachael.Hurzeler@kaingaora.govt.nz]

**CC:** Neil Mayo [mailto:Neil.Mayo@kaingaora.govt.nz], Rebecca Van Orden [mailto:rebecca.vanorden@ruapehudc.govt.nz]

**Subject:** Fwd: LIM 6 Teitei Drive, Ohakune

Hi Rachael

Please find below a link to the LIM for the TeI Tei site in Ohakune.

Hopefully this means you have all the information needed.

Please can you confirm receipt and let me know if you have any further queries.

Most appreciated.

Kind regards, Ree

Ree Anderson | Director | [ree@reeanderson.co.nz](mailto:ree@reeanderson.co.nz)

Tel: +64 27 687 9709 | PO Box: 56097 Dominion Road, Auckland, 1446

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Rebecca Van Orden <[rebecca.vanorden@ruapehudc.govt.nz](mailto:rebecca.vanorden@ruapehudc.govt.nz)>

**Subject: FW: LIM 6 Teitei Drive, Ohakune**

**Date:** 5 March 2021 at 9:40:51 AM NZDT

**To:** Clive Manley <[Clive.Manley@ruapehudc.govt.nz](mailto:Clive.Manley@ruapehudc.govt.nz)>, Tessa Owen <[Tessa.Owen@ruapehudc.govt.nz](mailto:Tessa.Owen@ruapehudc.govt.nz)>, Margaret Hawthorne <[Margaret.Hawthorne@ruapehudc.govt.nz](mailto:Margaret.Hawthorne@ruapehudc.govt.nz)>, Ree Anderson <[ree@reeanderson.co.nz](mailto:ree@reeanderson.co.nz)>

Hi everyone,

Please see below link for completed LIM for 6 Teitei Drive.

Thanks  
Rebecca

-----  
Rebecca Van Orden      BMS (Hons)  
Team Leader Community Property  
**Ruapehu District Council**

Ruapehu District Council | Private Bag 1001 | Taumarunui 3946 | New Zealand  
Phone: 07 895 8188 ext: 276 | Fax: 07 895 3256 | Mobile: s 9(2)(a)  
email: [rebecca.vanorden@ruapehudc.govt.nz](mailto:rebecca.vanorden@ruapehudc.govt.nz) | RDC website: [www.ruapehudc.govt.nz](http://www.ruapehudc.govt.nz)

-----  
**From:** Claudia Zimmer <[Claudia.Zimmer@ruapehudc.govt.nz](mailto:Claudia.Zimmer@ruapehudc.govt.nz)>  
**Sent:** Friday, 5 March 2021 9:37 am  
**To:** Rebecca Van Orden <[rebecca.vanorden@ruapehudc.govt.nz](mailto:rebecca.vanorden@ruapehudc.govt.nz)>  
**Subject:** LIM 6 Teitei Drive, Ohakune

Dear Rebecca

Thank you for the application for LIM for the property 6 Teitei Drive, Ohakune .

[This is the link to your LIM.](#) We recommend that you save the document to your computer to be able to access it as we will delete it from One Drive on or after 5 April 2021.

Please advise if you have problems accessing the information. I am available in the office from 8am to 5pm, Tuesday to Thursday on 07 895 8188 extension 201. For enquiries outside these days and hours, please contact Customer Services.

If you have any further questions in relation to this LIM, please do not hesitate to contact Council.

Yours sincerely

Claudia Zimmer  
**Land Information Memorandum (LIM) Officer**

-----  
Claudia Zimmer

ext: 201  
**Land Information Memorandum (LIM) Officer**

-----  
**CAUTION: External email. Do not click or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. If unsure use the Report Phishing button.**

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Ree Anderson [mailto:ree@reeanderson.co.nz]

**Sent:** 2 March 2021 5:55 PM

**To:** Rachael Hurzeler [mailto:Rachael.Hurzeler@kaingaora.govt.nz]

**CC:** Neil Mayo [mailto:Neil.Mayo@kaingaora.govt.nz], Clive Manley [mailto:Clive.Manley@ruapehudc.govt.nz], Margaret Hawthorne [mailto:Margaret.Hawthorne@ruapehudc.govt.nz], Rebecca Van Orden [mailto:rebecca.vanorden@ruapehudc.govt.nz], Ewen Skinner | Morrison Low [mailto:e.skinner@morrisonlow.com], Tessa Owen [mailto:Tessa.Owen@ruapehudc.govt.nz]

**Subject:** Information for Tei Tei Drive-Project 2 Ohakune

Kia ora Rachael

Please find responses to your information requests as follows:

1. CE Clive Manley has confirmed that there is flexibility in having some lots that are sold at market price to offset overall costs to council.
2. An urgent LIM report has been requested and will be available on the 8 March 2021
3. There has been no master plan / bulk and location studies for Tei Tei Drive. An aerial shot of the site is attached below – generally the thinking was development would start on the northern sections of the site.
4. The site is 9.4536Ha in total size. This area contains a waterway that will reduce the land available for development.
5. The CIP funding sought for TeiTei was \$5,303,341 for the site development (Civils, infrastructure, building platforms and planning) for 44 lots. There was also a component of project establishment / due diligence costs that we were seeking to recover – indicatively this would have been an additional \$200K.
6. Attached below is the Cheal feasibility report that has all geotechnical information on the site.

Hope this helps. Any queries please let me know.

Kind regards, Ree

[Click to Download](#)

Feasibility Report - Teitei Dr\_Full.pdf  
24.1 MB

Ree Anderson | Director | [ree@reeanderson.co.nz](mailto:ree@reeanderson.co.nz)

Tel: +64 s 9(2)(a) | PO Box: 56097 Dominion Road, Auckland, 1446

**CAUTION: External email. Do not click or open attachments unless you recognise the sender and know the content is safe. If unsure use the Report Phishing button.**