

From: "Antony Vogt" <antony@jsl.nz>
Sent: Thu, 7 May 2026 16:52:25 +1200
To: "Nicola Laurenson" <nicola@laurensonplanning.co.nz>
Subject: Re: Te Arei Road

Hey Nicola,

My responses are below in blue:

- These distances are in the S92 response (reproduced below), it is 110m for the double crossing (which is now the location of Crossing 2)
- Crossing 1 is 10m further to the west than Crossing 2 (that's the minimum separation distance that we have to do to comply, instead of double crossing) so is 100m
- And Lot 3 is also 100m as below:



The client believes there is telecommunications across the road currently servicing the school/daycare.

Vehicle Crossing	East	West
1	Exceeds 160m (230m+)	100m
2	Exceeds 160m (230m+)	110m
3	100m	Exceeds 160m (240m+)
4	60m	290m

That "brow" in the road there is pretty much where the two crossings are going to go on the left (between second and third power poll (blue line)), so by the time a driver slows down to look for trains and gets over the tracks, they have at most 100m (but they won't be going 100kmph either).

We have not technically surveyed the exact distance, but I have been to the site and walked over.



And I believe he said it was VDSL.

Thank you,

Cheers,

Antony Vogt | Planner | BEP | Int.NZPI
Prospero Place Stratford | + (029) 048 11006



Juffermans Surveyors Ltd

From: Nicola Laurenson <nicola@laurensonplanning.co.nz>

Sent: Wednesday, May 6, 2026 3:57 PM

To: Antony Vogt <antony@jsl.nz>

Subject: RE: Te Arei Road

Hi Antony

I am trying to wrap this up, but I am still unclear on the ability of the proposal to comply with TRAN-R1 and SUB-S6.

I have copied my original request below.

Lots 1 and 2 crossing points appear to comply with sight vis to the east (based on the s92 response commentary). Is this correct and what distance is achieved?
What is sight vis to the west from these crossing points?

Lot 3 appears to comply with sight vis requirements to the west (based on s92 commentary). Is this correct and what distance is achieved?
What is the sight vis to the east?

For completeness, please advise sight vis from the Lot 4 entrance as well.

Also (and this came up in peer review) do you know if there is a telecoms line within 200m of the site and if compliance with SUB-S6 will be via clause (2)1 or clause (2)3?

From your email I have the following:

Vehicle Crossing	East	West
1	Exceeds 160m (230m+)	?
2	Exceeds 160m (230m+)	?
3	?	Exceeds 160m (240m+)
4	60m	290m

Please fill in the gaps. Please also confirm that the site distances have been checked on site noting the vertical curve here.

Here is an image sitting on the train tracks looking east



Regarding telecoms it appears you are saying that the proposal can comply with SUB-S6(1) so it will be a requirement that a connection be made to this hardwire service for all allotments. What telecoms are available at this site that the applicant proposes to connect to? Fibre? Broadband? I can only see ADSL at this site which is being phased out.

Please let me know when you can pass on this information so that I can complete my report.

Thanks
Nicola

From: Antony Vogt <antony@jsl.nz>
Sent: Monday, 13 April 2026 12:06 pm
To: Nicola Laurenson <nicola@laurensonplanning.co.nz>
Subject: Re: Te Arei Road

Hey Nicola,

Apologies for the belated response, latest APA took a while to come in.

Sounds like a great idea to me.

I've had a look and it seems there is only the further information and associated assessment in the S92 around the crossings.

- Crossing 1 & 2 can comply with the 160m line of sight requirement to the east (230m+) and Lot 3 can comply with the line of sight requirement to the west (240m+) as below:



- For the existing crossing at Lot 4, you wouldn't get more than 60m looking East and 290m+ looking West as below:



Please find approvals from the neighbor and Poultry operator attached.
The client believes there is telecommunications across the road currently servicing the school/daycare.

Thank you,

Cheers,

Antony Vogt | Planner | BEP | Int.NZPI
Prospero Place Stratford | + (029) 048 11006



Juffermans Surveyors Ltd

From: Nicola Laurenson <nicola@laurensonplanning.co.nz>

Sent: Monday, March 23, 2026 3:19 PM

To: Antony Vogt <antony@jsl.nz>

Subject: RE: Te Arei Road

Hi Antony,

I have been preparing the notification report for the LUC to be signed of under delegated authority (So that we don't have to get the commissioner to determine that before they can look at the substantive decisions). I note that in your AEE you said there was a written approval from the poultry operator (snip below). Did you send this to me? I cannot find it. Please send it through again.

Ta
Nicola

6. The extent to which the reduction in setback would impact on the future ability for road widening requirements.

The non-compliance associated with this application relates to the setback from the poultry operation. In this regard, the wider subdivision application has ensured that the sitting and placement of these platforms are effectively mitigated from road users and the surrounding farmland as a result of smart sitting as well as consent conditions around building form, colour and vegetative screening. The proposed consent conditions associated with SUB21/47978 are adopted in full and are argued to suitably address all rural character and amenity adverse effects.

The written approval from the Poultry Operator is provided as Appendix D.

6.2 Earthworks on a site containing or adjoining a natural waterbody

1. The matters set out in WB-P2 and WB-P3.

From: Nicola Laurenson
Sent: Friday, 20 March 2026 11:05 am
To: Antony Vogt <antony@jsl.nz>
Subject: RE: Te Arei Road

Hi Antony,

Are you able to please direct me to the information stating the proposed/ existing sight lines from new and existing crossings?

Lots 1 and 2 crossing points appear to comply with sight vis to the east (based on the s92 response commentary). Is this correct and what distance is achieved? What is sight vis to the west from these crossing points?

Lot 3 appears to comply with sight vis requirements to the west (based on s92 commentary). Is this correct and what distance is achieved? What is the sight vis to the east?

For completeness, please advise sight vis from the Lot 4 entrance as well.

Also (and this came up in peer review) do you know if there is a telecoms line within 200m of the site and if compliance with SUB-S6 will be via clause (2)1 or clause (2)3?

Ta
Nicola

From: Antony Vogt <antony@jsl.nz>
Sent: Monday, 16 March 2026 4:04 pm
To: Nicola Laurenson <nicola@laurensonplanning.co.nz>
Subject: Re: Te Arei Road

Hey Nicola,

Sure did!

Yip, please see LUC for dwellings and Earthworks, and please see an updated set of draft conditions incorporating Lot 3.
Clients working on updated APA.

Thank you,

Cheers,

Antony Vogt | Planner | BEP | Int.NZPI
Prospero Place Stratford | + (029) 048 11006



Juffermans Surveyors Ltd

From: Nicola Laurenson <nicola@laurensonplanning.co.nz>
Sent: Monday, March 16, 2026 9:39 AM
To: Antony Vogt <antony@jsl.nz>
Subject: RE: Te Arei Road

Hi Antony, I hope that you had a nice weekend.

The Governance team are looking for an update so they can stay in the loop about when to set the hearing date. How are you tracking on the below items?

Thanks,

Nicola

From: Nicola Laurenson
Sent: Tuesday, 24 February 2026 7:05 pm
To: 'Antony Vogt' <antony@jsl.nz>
Cc: Richard Watkins <richard.watkins@npdc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Te Arei Road

Hi Antony,

I have made a notes in your email below in red.

To be able to complete the draft hearing report I require the following from you:

- A Land use consent application to allow future dwellings on Lots 1 and 2.
- The updated written approval of the neighbours showing they agree to the amendments.
- An updated set of conditions where Lot 3 is inserted in the relevant places.

My draft hearing report is going to be sent for review tomorrow and I will complete reporting when I return from some unplanned sick leave in late March.

I am available to discuss this email until Friday and then will be away from Monday next week.

Kind regards,

Nicola

From: Antony Vogt <antony@jsl.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, 24 February 2026 12:18 pm
To: Nicola Laurenson <nicola@laurensonplanning.co.nz>
Subject: Re: Te Arei Road

Hey Nicola,

Thank you for the call the other day, yes I have been working through these gaps and can confirm that the client is seeking the written approval (**Great thanks**) with these modifications listed specifically:

- Two separate Driveways (10m Apart) **Noted**
- Building platform areas on Lot 3, which will adopt the same consent conditions for suitable mitigation as proposed for Lots 1 and 2. **Please update the proposed condition provided in November 2025 to include the mitigation proposed for Lot 3**

Please see updated Scheme Attached. **Noted thank you**

As understood, a land use consent is required for these future buildings as well as for works within 10m of a waterbody to remove the old driveway and establish vegetative cover/fencing as per the proposed Esplanade Strip Condition. Could these please be bundled. I have included the waterbody non compliance as a matter for the subdivision and can condition it in the subdivision. **When do you think you will be able to provide the land use consent application for Lots 1 and 2?**

In regard to timing, we simply disagree. The application was lodged under the old plan and was subject to a lengthy S92 which required extra funding and significant outside technical input. We are able to detail sufficient background works being undertaken as well as an overall reduction in scope far before the subdivision rules were beyond challenge in May 2025. As the application was never withdrawn and a decision to decline never made by NPDC, it is requested this be assessed further by the Commissioner as part of their decision. **We have disagreement on this matter – I agree the commissioner will make the decision.**

In regard to the provision of another application/assessment under the New Plan, I do not see the value in doubling the same assessment as I agree with 99% of what you're saying. If extra expert evidence is really required by the Commissioner to make a decision, could I please rather then, have a copy of your S42a so that I may review and reference specifically the section/conclusions I disagree with while adopting all other parts. **I have prepared my draft assessment and this is going for review shortly.**

This is consistent with the S92 information already provided. Essentially the clients justification for the scope of the hearing is "Does NPDC have the ability to grant the application subject to the underlying uniqueness of the application, even though it contradicts the new Plan". **I have considered precedent, unfairness and plan integrity in my draft assessment and this will go for review shortly**

We believe the safeguarded "**discretionary**" activity status as well as all the work that has been done over the last couple of years ensures that the Environmental Effects are appropriately managed and therefore able to be granted.

We understand NPDC does not agree with that position but we would please like the commissioner to please decide.

Thank you,

Cheers,

Antony Vogt | Planner | BEP | Int.NZPI

Prospero Place Stratford | + (029) 048 11006



Juffermans Surveyors Ltd

From: Nicola Laurenson <nicola@laurensonplanning.co.nz>
Sent: Tuesday, February 24, 2026 10:36 AM
To: Antony Vogt <antony@jsl.nz>
Cc: Richard Watkins <richard.watkins@npdc.govt.nz>
Subject: RE: Te Arei Road

Hi Antony,

Further to yesterday's email, I have had comments back from the DE about the entrance way as follows:

"a 'double vehicle crossing' is not acceptable to NPDC (it is not something actually in our standard as such). The Lot 1 & 2 crossings will require 10m separation minimum. This 10m is measured centreline-centreline of the crossings, so I believe they are definitely achievable in the proposed location when bringing sight line considerations into question also."

As part of the below work required, are you able to also please update the scheme plan to show the crossings and I understand this will require an updated written approval from the neighbour given they provided written approval on the basis of the 'double crossing' .

FYI - The recommended DE conditions include the construction of the crossings for Lots 1 – 3 and an upgrade for Lot 4 (re-seal).

Let me know if you have any queries,

Nicola

From: Nicola Laurenson
Sent: Monday, 23 February 2026 3:17 pm
To: Antony Vogt <antony@jsl.nz>
Cc: Richard Watkins <richard.watkins@npdc.govt.nz>
Subject: Te Arei Road

Hi Antony,

Following on from our discussion on the phone last week I wanted to know if you have considered what we talked about.

I do not think that a commissioner will be pleased if we proceed to hearing with known matters to resolve.

These include (but not limited to) the land use consent for future development of allotments, the vehicle crossings for Lots 1 and 2 (and if the neighbour will still agree to an alternative), mitigation for dwellings and future development on Lot 3.

I have worked back through the timeline of the District Plan, and it does not look like there is any unfairness relating to the timing of the provisions becoming operative when considering the time at which the applicant came back to Council to re start the proposal. The subdivision rules were beyond challenge in May 2025, and we received more information from you in August. The applications you referred to were granted prior to the ODP subdivision rules becoming in operative.

The Council can put the application on hold under s91 before a hearing to allow you to provide the additional application. I think that you should use this opportunity to provide an updated application for the subdivision and Land Use outlining your assessments against the Part Operative District Plan. The assessments I have to use from Rex are against the ODP which is no longer a consideration of consent.

Happy to discuss with you again if need be.

Kind regards

Nicola

Nicola Laurenson MNZPI
PRINCIPAL PLANNER
Ngāmotu / New Plymouth

Phone 027 241 6012
nicola@laurensonplanning.co.nz
Hours 9am - 4pm Mon, Tue, Thu & Fri

