

31 August 2023

Mapua Boat Ramp Community Trust  
C/- Davis Ogilvie & Partners Limited  
Level 1  
42 Oxford Street  
Richmond 7020

Dear Mapua Boat Ramp Community Trust

**Further Information Request for Resource Consent Application No. RM230253-  
RM230259 & RM230388 – Mapua Boat Ramp**

I refer to your application for resource consent described above. An initial assessment of the application has been made and, pursuant to Section 92(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“the Act”), further information is now being requested in relation to the application as follows:

Scope of Activity Clarifications

1. Please clarify the proposed hours of operation for the boat ramp and how this will be controlled on an ongoing basis. The application states that the boat ramp will only be open during ‘daylight hours’ however these hours are not specified and will vary throughout the year. There are varying technical terms associated with ‘daylight’ including astronomical, nautical and civil twilight and these change every day and include transition periods. Boat users routinely launch pre-dawn and return after dusk in order to be on the water during the best fishing times, so it is unclear how realistic the control on daylight hours will be, what the term ‘daylight’ actually means in this context, and how this will be controlled on a daily basis given daylight times change throughout the year?
2. The application states that the boat ramp will be open to the public but will also be controlled by a control arm for which users will require a card (to be obtained from the Community Boat Ramp Trust). Please confirm that ‘public’ usage of the ramp is intended to be available to those who obtain a card only and no casual public usage is proposed to be allowed for? Is there a limit on the number of cards that will be issued? How will applications for cards and use of the cards be managed and how will the ‘induction’ process work? Will the ramp be available for short-term visitor use and any members of the public for one-off usage or will membership of the Mapua Boat Club be required?
3. Please provide further detail on the type of control arm proposed – is it a vertical arm or sliding gate? How will the timing and sensor system operate to allow for a range of vehicle and trailer sizes entering and exiting without allowing non-card holders to enter?

**Tasman District Council**  
**Email** [info@tasman.govt.nz](mailto:info@tasman.govt.nz)  
**Website** [www.tasman.govt.nz](http://www.tasman.govt.nz)  
**24 hour assistance**

**Richmond**  
189 Queen Street  
Private Bag 4  
Richmond 7050  
New Zealand  
**Phone** 03 543 8400  
**Fax** 03 543 9524

**Murchison**  
92 Fairfax Street  
Murchison 7007  
New Zealand  
**Phone** 03 523 1013  
**Fax** 03 523 1012

**Motueka**  
7 Hickmott Place  
PO Box 123  
Motueka 7143  
New Zealand  
**Phone** 03 528 2022  
**Fax** 03 528 9751

**Takaka**  
78 Commercial Street  
PO Box 74  
Takaka 7142  
New Zealand  
**Phone** 03 525 0020  
**Fax** 03 525 9972

4. The application refers to the “*removal of motorboat launching from the Grossi Point and the associated trailer parking, that at present adversely affects the natural character of Grossi Point.*” Please clarify what is intended/proposed here as it is not apparent that a private applicant can close another launching area that is not under private ownership? Please provide any information or detail on discussions with other parties that has occurred already in relation to this point.
5. Please confirm that the “Future Development Area” shown on the plans including the landscaping, rotunda and pathways shown on Page 2 of the Landscape Master Plan, do not form part of this application? If so please remove these features from the plans to avoid confusion at notification stage, and add a notation with red line surrounding this area stating “Future Development Area – Not part of this consent application”.
6. Please clarify whether the proposed cycle parking bay includes a structure/building and if so whether this is within 3m of Tahi Street and triggers an additional requirement for consent?
7. Please clarify what areas of the proposed parking area are exclusively for boat parking and how the use of this area will be controlled to prevent long term parking of boats or trailers and which areas will be available for recreational use and what areas are proposed to be open to the public for other activities and general use?
8. Please provide an updated assessment of alternatives in the context of the Tasman Boat Ramp Study and Indicative Business Case (October 2021) findings which are not addressed in the application.

*The above matters are required to fully understand the scope of the activity and provide clarity around key details prior to the applications being notified.*

#### TRMP Land Use Consent Assessment Clarifications

9. Please provide an assessment of Permitted Activity Rule 17.10.3.1(a)(i) and 17.10.3.1(b) of the TRMP noting the following:
  - It appears the activity does not comply with Permitted Activity Rule 17.10.3.1(a)(i) as the activity includes the construction of buildings within an indicative reserve. 3, 5 & 11 Tahi Street are classified as an indicative reserve (Mapua Waterfront Park) and the Sea Scout building is proposed in this area.
  - It appears the activity does not comply with Permitted Activity Rule 17.10.3.1(b) as buildings will not be located within 3 metres of any boundary. The Sea Scout building is located across the internal boundary between 5 Tahi Street (Record of Title NL6C/850) and 11 Tahi Street (Record of Title NL7B/371).
  - There is no specified rule or activity status for non-compliance under Permitted Activity Rule 17.10.3.1(a) and (b) above therefore consent appears to be required as a Discretionary Activity for these aspects per Section 87B of the RMA.
10. The application includes an application for signage under Controlled Activity Rule 16.1.5.2 but this rule no longer applies to the Recreation Zone (Plan Change 73 decisions changed this). Resource consent instead appears to be required for a Restricted Discretionary Activity under Rule 16.1.5.4. Please review and confirm.

11. Please update the assessment of Permitted Activity Rules 17.10.2.1(b), 17.1.2.1(b), and 17.9.2.1(b) in relation to noise and associated cascading rules depending on the outcomes of the noise assessment requested below.

*The above matters are required to clarify and confirm what consents are required under the TRMP.*

### Noise

12. Please provide a noise assessment from a suitably qualified noise specialist in relation to all aspects of the proposed activity including (but not restricted to) vehicle usage and engine noise, boat engine noise, boat trailer noise, people noise. Please include assessment of noise levels at adjoining residential properties including properties adjoining both the ramp and carpark area. Please also take into consideration the questions in relation to scope of the activity including operating hours also raised in this RFI when preparing the noise assessment to ensure there is alignment in the assessments.
13. In relation to the functions proposed to be allowed for in the "Sea Scouts" building, please clarify what functions are intended to be provided for, including whether there will be functions with amplified music (such as weddings and birthdays), and please clarify what time functions will finish or be restricted to (if at all)? Please also address usage of the Sea Scouts building for functions in the noise report.

*The above matters are required as no noise assessment has been provided with the application and Council's Team Leader – Environmental Health has reviewed the application and noted that there are likely to be noise effects which have not been assessed, and the claim in the application that the activity will comply with the TRMP noise limits is unsubstantiated.*

### Lighting

14. If usage of the ramp is proposed outside of daylight hours (refer queries above regarding whether it is realistic that the ramp will be operational during daylight hours only, what is meant by daylight hours, and how this will be controlled), please provide an assessment of light spill and lighting effects from the activity including headlight sweep on adjoining residential properties from vehicles using the ramp and carpark.

*This information is required as there is no assessment of lighting effects in the application and it is unclear exactly when the ramp will be open for usage and whether vehicle and other lighting will be required.*

### Transport, access and parking

*Please note that Council is arranging a peer-review of the transport report by an external suitably qualified expert which will be undertaken at the applicant's cost, and there are likely to be additional further information matters which arise from this review. The matters below have been raised by other Council staff in relation to transport and are raised now for clarity.*

15. Please provide an assessment of queuing effects associated with boats queuing prior to the boat ramp control arm being opened, noting that there will be a desire to launch as soon as the ramp is open in the morning to be on the water for the best fishing times (refer clarifications sought in RFI Point 1).

16. Will the carpark allow for boat parking associated with launching at Grossi Point?
17. Please provide further assessment of the lack of formal surfacing and marking of the carpark areas. Boat parking is proposed for 78 vehicles and trailers but no layout is shown supporting this, and there is no detail on how parking is going to be managed without any markings. Additionally, the lack of surfacing of the area is likely to lead to damage and disturbance of the soil and grassed area and vehicles may get stuck, particularly when it is wet.
18. Please provide comment on whether any implications for a future proposal for a pedestrian/cycle/bridge across the channel to Rabbit Island have been considered as part of this proposal. This is currently in the Council's Transportation Activity Management Plan in the 2031-41 timeframe. Council's Transportation Manager has noted that the bridge could affect the use of a new boat ramp, and vice versa, in terms of where the bridge can be positioned and operational issues if boat users need to pass under the bridge to access Tasman Bay.
19. Please provide further assessment of the design and safety implications for the walkway along the waterfront which is proposed to cross the ramp. Drivers will be reversing their trailers at this point, which will limit their visibility, and there are some potential safety issues associated with that. Additionally what stops vehicles driving over and or parking temporarily on the footpaths adjacent to and crossing the ramp?

*The above information is required to fully understand and assess the transport effects of the development in addition to Council's external peer review of the transport assessment which may raise further matters.*

#### Wastewater

20. Please review the comments below from Council's Wastewater Engineer and confirm whether these matters are acceptable and volunteered as part of the application:

*Council does not want ducts installed for the replacement pipework. The reason why is that if a duct is left Council then has to excavate up large sections of foreshore to provide enough trench to allow the installation of a new pipework access with an excavator would be almost impossible. The preference is to install new pipework in anticipation of only needing to join the old to new pipework at the ends as follows:*

#### *HDPE Pressure main.*

1. *The existing 200mm diameter HDPE Pumping main must be located on both sides of the proposed boat ramp.*
2. *It the boat ramp is to be built over the existing 200mm diameter pressure main, a new 355 OD PE 80 PN12.5 pressure main is to be laid to the west of the existing pressure main.*
  - a. *Commencing 10m generally north of the rock base of the proposed boat ramp to a point*
  - b. *5m from generally south of the proposed rock base.*
  - c. *An PE bend is to be installed to generally follow the existing radius of the pressure pipe as it heads towards the estuary.*
  - d. *Both ends of the PE pipe is to be fitted with flanges and stainless-steel backing rings.*

- e. *Stainless steel blank flanges are to be install at both ends of the PE pipework.*
- f. *A 25 mm dia stainless steel valve is to be installed on the stainless steel blank flange. This will allow the new HDPE pipe to be filled with water to 50% of the 355mm dia pressure pipes pressure rating. The stainless valve is to be capped off and wrapped in denso tape in accordance with the LDM drawings 707 and 708.*
- g. *All stainless steel bolts and fittings are to be wrapped with denso in accordance with the LDM drawings 707 and 708.*

*150mm Diameter gravity sewer.*

1. *The existing 150mm diameter u PVC Gravity reticulation must be located on both sides of the proposed boat ramp.*
2. *A new 150mm dia Heavy walled PVC gravity pipe is to be laid parallel to the existing gravity sewer from:*
  - a. *Commencing 10m generally north of the rock base of the proposed boat ramp to a point*
  - b. *Adjacent to the existing wastewater manhole and clear of the proposed rock base.*
  - c. *The new gravity sewer is to be laid at the same single grade as the existing.*
  - d. *The ends of the new gravity sewer are to have the ends blanked off.*

*All new pipework is to be CCTVed on completion, the video film is to be provided to Council.*

*All new and existing pipework is the GPS surveyed and the as built information provided to Council.*

*Steel plate (600x600) is to be located approximately 300mm above the ends of all new pipework so that the pipe ends could if required be located with a metal detector.*

*The above information is required to fully understand and assess the effects of the proposal on existing wastewater infrastructure.*

Boat activity and navigational safety

21. Please provide a detailed operational and navigation safety assessment and plan from a suitably qualified and experienced person that addresses the operation of the proposed boat ramp and the proposed mitigation measures that form part of the application. The application currently contains various references to how the ramp will operate and potential safety measures, but it is not clearly detailed what is actually being proposed and how the boat ramp will safely function, and what the effects conclusions are in relation to the boat ramp usage. In preparing the operational and navigation safety assessment and plan, please ensure the following matters are addressed:

- *Launching and retrieving procedures, including for sole operators. As there is no pontoon or space to load/unload passengers, how will boats be launched and held stationary while vehicles and trailers are being parked particularly for sole operators?*
- *An assessment of issues and the risks of 'side-sweeping' boats when launching and retrieving onto trailers due to the current (i.e. swinging around while fixed to the front of the boat trailer while trying to load and unload).*

- Procedures and usage of the existing wharf pontoon for loading and unloading including available space both on the wharf and on the water.
- Usage of the two lane ramp in tidal current and whether two trailers can safely unload/load at the same time, and whether angled launching and retrieving will be necessary and/or achievable due to the currents in this location.
- Boat queuing in the channel.
- How boats will be managed from drifting into/underneath the wharf in the event of being caught out in tidal current or engine failure when launching/retrieving. If specific measures are proposed (e.g. safety ropes or similar) please provide exact details on these, how effectively they will function and any residual risks.
- Interaction with swimmers and other water users particularly at the wharf.
- Details of any additional safety signage not already specified in the application.
- An assessment of risks associated with increased crossings of the Mapua Bar and how this will be managed.
- How education and provision of information on hazards associated with the tidal currents and crossing the Mapua Bar will be managed and provided.
- How the “induction process” associated with the use of key cards will work, the extent to which the ramp will be open to the public, and how the club will measure and manage how experienced boat operators are and whether they will be able to use the boat ramp, and whether card sharing will be allowed or limited to specific boat skippers.
- Whether the ramp can safely function as proposed without additional hard engineering safety measures such as rock groynes noted in the harbourmaster comments below.
- An overall assessment of risks and consequential adverse effects conclusions in relation to effects on boat users and other water users in the area including members of the public.

Please also ensure that the assessment takes into consideration the summarised comments outlined below from Council’s Harbourmaster.

- *Objectively from a navigation safety perspective the Waterfront Park site carries more safety issues (due to structure hazards, and conflicting user groups) than other nearby sites.*
- *In the resource consent application, Section 4.17 (page 50) regarding “debris from floods getting caught up on the boat ramp”, debris and logs will accumulate against the wharf structure with outgoing (ebb) tides, it is important to note that it will be necessary to have on-going removal of these debris to ensure that these debris don’t become a safety issue for the users of the adjacent ramp.*
- *Regarding “Tidal flow hazards to boats using the boat ramp” it is important to note that the OCEL report quoted that “the proposed launching ramp can be used as an all tide launching ramp for “experienced boat operators” aware of the strong current flow once their boat is off the trailer”.*
- *The Davis Ogilvie report states that the ramp is to be called the “Mapua Community Boat Ramp” and that it is to be run by the “Mapua Boat Ramp Trust” but it is not clear how open to the public the boat ramp will be, although in page 17 it states that the ramp “will be available for public use”. It is those without local knowledge that are the most likely to get into trouble in this environment, and the application needs to be clear on who has responsibility to educate ramp users to the local hazards. The Davis Ogilvie report states*

*that there will be an induction for new card holders “including instruction of any tidal hazards at the boat ramp”.*

- *Regarding night time use of the ramp it is stated that “the boat ramp will be only available for use during daylight/ entry barrier will not open at night time”. On the longest day (22 December) evening civil daylight will be at ~05:51, most fishers want to get on the water before daylight to set their gear. Boat ramp use increases considerably during the summer snapper fishing season, and it can be expected that people will be queuing to gain access to the closed ramp. Another issue with having time restricted use of the ramp will be when boaties have been delayed and won't be able to access their vehicle and trailer during the hours of darkness. Again (as with debris removal from the Wharf structure) this will require an ongoing commitment from members of the Mapua Boat Ramp Community Trust to be available to lift the barrier arm when necessary. It is not an option for unattended trailer boats to be tied alongside the existing floating pontoon or wharf at night as they are likely to sink if the tide changes and they are held stern on to the tidal current.*
- *Regarding the “Assessment of alternative sites” it is stated that the site “provides for an all-tide access and is sheltered by the wharf structure from the high tide flows (and winds)”. Although this is the case during flood tides, during ebb (outgoing) tides the wharf structure will create a hazard to the users of the boat ramp as they may drift into it and as the tide pushes against the upstream side of the boat it is likely to flood and capsize. Also the wharf is used by swimmers during summer (signage does not stop the swimmers) and increased boating activity upstream of the wharf (during ebb outgoing tides) will create an increased safety risks between these conflicting user groups.*
- *In the “Conclusion” to 4.17 it is reported that Gary Teear from Coastal Engineering firm OCEL in his report (Appendix 15) has confirmed that the boat ramp can be constructed safely in the specified location and used by boats users without being adversely affected by tidal flows in the Mapua Channel”. This was conditional on the boat operators being “experienced boat operators” aware of the strong current flow once their boat is off the trailer (conclusions, page 3).*
- *We also may have conflict between the position of the ramp and our designated mooring licencing area, the ramp looks to in part overlay the moorings area, and it looks like we will need to move two moorings to allow safe boat access to the ramp. Moored vessels and other obstructions may cause significant issues for boat skippers who are unfamiliar with navigating in tidal current. It needs to be clarified clearly how this is all proposed to be dealt with.*

22. The application notes that two moorings “will probably need to be removed” to enable functioning of the ramp. Please specify the moorings that will need to be removed, who they are owned by, how they will be removed and any consent obligations or separate ownership matters that will need to be addressed in order to enable their removal?

*The above information is required to fully understand and assess the navigational and operational effects of the proposed boat ramp on water users.*

### Property ownership

23. Council's property team have advised that a deed of lease would be required to enable this activity prior to it being able to commence, however this would only be considered and/or entered into upon the completion of the resource consent application if resource consent is granted. Please confirm that the applicant understands these obligations which are separate to the RMA consenting process?
24. Please provide comment on any implications of the proposal for the proportion of remediated land that will be retained in public ownership and usage, noting that as part of the remediation agreements Council committed to retaining at least 40% of the remediation land in public ownership (refer Page 26 of Ministry for the Environment Review Report <https://environment.govt.nz/publications/remediation-of-the-fcc-mapua-site/>).

*This information is required to understand the intended property/ownership structure associated with the proposal.*

### Reserves and public access

25. Staff support the walkway (and swale) on the south side of the access road and ramp which connects the coastal walkway with Tahī Street and the indicative walkway on the opposite side of the road (which will ultimately provide a connection to Langford Drive in the future). However, Chapter 10 of the NTLDM specifies a minimum width of 2m for pedestrian pathways and that they should be paved. The application is only showing an exposed aggregate pathway with a width of 1m on the plans. Please amend this detail or provide reasons and justification for allowing the reduced width? Please also show this pathway on the indicative cross sections, it is not currently shown?
26. The landscape plans show an indicative walkway adjoining the south side of the boat parking area in the general location of the indicative walkway in the TRMP. Please confirm this will be landscaped and formed in accordance with the specifications in the NTLDM and provide specific detail in relation to this?
27. Reserves staff are comfortable with the relocation and amended design of the pétanque area. They recommend that the BBQ/picnic tables/seating adjoining the pétanque area are removed from the plans prior to notification, but they support the seating near the open space area for the sea scouts or other functions. Please consider and address these comments and provide updated plans.
28. Please clarify if the existing seating (some of which was donated by community members) and three existing tables are proposed to be reused elsewhere in the Park? Note it is recommended that the applicant discusses the relocation of the existing seating and tables with Council's reserve staff prior to amending the plans and confirming this detail.
29. Please provide assessment from your landscape architect on whether the ramp will obstruct the views from the existing waterfront viewing platform and an assessment of any effects? This platform currently provides expansive views up the estuary to the eastern hills, and the Reserves Team consider it important that this is preserved.



30. Please provide further detail on how rubbish and recycling is proposed to be dealt with, including associated odour effects (from fish carcasses etc)? Please note that reserves staff don't support additional bins near the boat ramp or building because of the maintenance required and issues associated with the holding and disposal of fish waste. They note that there are existing facilities in the service area adjoining the north side of the park.
31. Please clarify how many toilets are proposed within the buildings?
32. Please provide further detail on how access to the park be managed and staged during construction?

*This information is required to understand and assess the effects of the proposal on reserves and public space.*

#### Washdown and water supply

33. The application outlines that no washdown facilities will be provided for. Please clarify whether this is in relation to the boat ramp only, and whether any washdown facilities will be available for the Sea Scouts building and how this will occur and where it will discharge to?

*This information is required to clarify the statements in the application in relation to non-provision of washdown facilities.*

#### Coastal processes and natural hazards

34. Please provide an assessment from a suitably qualified and experienced person of the effects of the boat ramp structure on the processes and morphology of the inlet channel. This assessment should address (a) the potential for scour of the inlet channel through interaction between the ramp structure(s) and tidal currents, and (b) the potential for scour of the channel to undermine the clay bund and rock armouring that lines the edge of the inlet channel to protect the former fruit growers site.

Please note a peer review of this assessment and the Ocel report of the tidal current survey may be referred for peer-review by a coastal engineer with expertise on the interaction between coastal processes and engineered structures.

*This information is required to allow for a more in-depth assessment of effects by Council's Coastal and Natural Hazards team.*

#### Stormwater

35. Please provide details on the planting proposed for the treatment swale.
36. Please clarify how the private stormwater lines are proposed to be provided for and intended future maintenance arrangements, noting that it appears the proposal includes a private stormwater line under Tahi Street which will need a LTO or similar as it will not be a Council asset.

*This information is required to understand and assess the effects of the stormwater discharges prior to notification.*

### Contaminated Land and Earthworks

37. Please clarify if material at a depth greater than 0.5m will be encountered during the proposed works and how this soil will be managed. Please explain the location of soil to be disturbed and the finished contours showing where the contaminated material disturbed will be placed.
38. Please clarify if any groundwater will be intercepted as part of the earthworks for foundation/services and if dewatering is anticipated.
39. Please clarify what measures are proposed along Tahi Street. This area was not remediated and contamination may remain. As part of the management of soils from beneath the road, a testing regime will be required to determine disposal options for surplus soils.
40. Please provide a detailed dust, erosion and sediment management plan which should explain where the waste material will be taken to and how it will be handled and contained. If site soils are not suitable for foundations, the report will need to show where the surplus soil will be stockpiled and the dust, erosion and sediment controls which will be in place once the final designs are produced. A plan should also be in place if the cap is inadvertently disturbed and contaminated soils encountered. Appropriate controls will need to be in place during the works and information on the final placement of soils will be required and evidence that the cap is appropriately reinstated.
41. If excess soil requires removal from the site, please provide details of the licensed facility which can accept the contaminant concentrations of up to 200mg/kg DDT, 60mg/kg dieldrin and 5000mg/kg copper. Please also clarify the obligations under HSNO and the proposed disposal of persistent organic pollutants notice. Currently there is a lack of detail on managing hazardous waste and disposal in this regard.
42. Please clarify how the cap integrity will be maintained during the works.
43. As parts of the proposed boat ramp will include disturbance of marine sediments, please provide an assessment of the effects of disturbing the contaminants which are on the marine foreshore. The preliminary engineering report states that up to 600mm of excavated material is required in the foreshore to install the ramp and will be left to disperse with tidal action. The vertical and lateral extent of sediments impacted by pesticide residues has not been provided.
44. As the contaminants on the site are enclosed in engineered designed cells with clay bund and rock armouring along the sea wall, please provide an engineering assessment to confirm that the integrity of the structure designed to contain the contaminants will not be compromised by the proposed boat ramp. This must include the potential effects of scour from the completed ramp.
45. It is noted that an existing groundwater monitoring well, BH1a (bore ID WWD23445 on Council's bores database) is shown on plans to be capped as part of the preliminary boat ramp design. This is a long-term groundwater monitoring bore which is needed for ongoing groundwater monitoring purposes. This will need to remain accessible. It may be possible to alter the location slightly, however the new bore would need to be installed and sufficient paired data obtained from both wells to demonstrate its suitability as a replacement. A number of other bores may be

impacted by the proposed car park, building and boat ramp. Similarly, practical access needs to be maintained to these monitoring bores. Please address these matters.

*This information is required to understand and assess the effects of the proposal on contaminated land and human health and clarify the statements and assessment contained in the application. Please note that there are a number of other matters that Council is seeking further information on. If this results in changes to the design then it will be necessary to review these changes in terms of how it may impact or be impacted by the presence of contaminated soils at the site.*

Section 92A(1) of the Act requires you to respond to the Council by 22 September 2023 (being 15 working days from the date of this request), in one of three ways. You must either:

- 1 provide the information requested to the Council; or
- 2 advise the Council in writing that you agree to provide the information (you may wish to choose this option if you are unable to provide all the information by the date specified above); or
- 3 advise the Council in writing that you refuse to provide the information.

Should you choose Option 2, then the Act requires the Council to set a reasonable time within which the information must be provided. Therefore, in the event that you choose Option 2, I propose that the information be provided by 20 December 2023. If you are unable to provide the information by this date, please contact me as soon as possible so that we can discuss the reasons and set an appropriate alternative date.

Please note that the Council may decline your application pursuant to Section 104(6) of the Act if it considers that insufficient information is available to enable a decision to be made on your application. This may occur if you either:

- (a) choose Option 3 above (ie, refuse to provide the information);
- (b) do not provide the requested information within the period specified in the paragraph above (or the agreed alternative date); or
- (c) do not respond at all to this information request.

In accordance with Section 88B and 88C of the Act the processing of your application will be placed "on hold" from the date of this letter to the date of receipt of the information requested or, if you refuse to provide the information, the date the advice of refusal is received by the Council.

Once the Council has received the requested information, it will be assessed to determine its adequacy and the Council will proceed to publicly notify your applications in accordance with Section 95A(2)(a), following your request by email on 22 June 2023 to have the applications publicly notified. Council will require you to pay the notified application deposit fee before undertaking this public notification.

Please note that this request is intended to obtain the further information necessary to publicly notify the application only, and additional further information may be requested

following public notification and receipt of submissions, and prior to the applications advancing to a hearing or decision stage.

**Please note that the requirements of the Act outlined above are binding on you being the applicant, as well as on Council. Your opportunity to clarify or question the reasonableness of this request occurs now (within the next 15 days), not at some later date.**

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions regarding this request or any other part of this letter. My contact details are listed at the top of this letter.

Yours sincerely



Bill Harrington – Consultant Planner  
(Land Use)



Leif Pigott – Team Leader Natural Resources