

From: [Sally Gepp](#)
To: [Mia Turner](#)
Cc: [Charlotte Coyle](#); [Joshua Leckie](#)
Subject: RE: Bendigo - process [LN-LNDMS.FID1277015]
Date: Friday, 17 July 2026 9:55:00 am

Dear Mia

I refer to our emails regarding the informal workshops that MGL is convening.

At this stage Sustainable Tarras does not intend to participate in the informal workshop process.

All consent processes require a lot of work by fully engaged submitters, but MGL's approach to this fast-track process, in particular the inadequacy of its application to support a project with such complex and significant impacts on the environment and the community, has added a huge burden and greatly increased the time that Sustainable Tarras and its experts and counsel have needed to spend on the process. Sustainable Tarras prepared extensive comments on the application which unfortunately Mr Chrisp did not read (as he confirmed in response to questions). It then made its experts available for conferencing and hearings - which required review of the multiple responses to requests for information issued by the Panel. It is now clear that the workshops are not simply a planners' review of conditions but a more substantive multi-disciplinary process. While MGL has advised the Panel that it will cover the cost of Ms Allan's involvement (without ever discussing this directly with me, Sustainable Tarras representatives or Ms Allan), it would not be fair to have her attend without the support of Sustainable Tarras' technical experts and counsel.

It is also unclear whether Sustainable Tarras' input will make any difference, given Mr Chrisp's dismissive approach to material that was carefully prepared and filed by Sustainable Tarras previously. I am very much aware that there was a lot of material to review and respond to in a short timeframe, because of course commenters are under the same pressures and are expected to read everything that may be relevant to their comments - so this was a significant failure by Mr Chrisp that undermines his planning opinions.

In addition, having reviewed the Conditions Workshopping Tracker, we are concerned that topics have been siloed and treated as not dependent on RFI 11 responses or other information yet to come, when that information is very clearly relevant to the conditions in question. Just to give a couple of examples, the Tracker has Landscape and Ecological Rehabilitation as a condition topic that is not reliant on RFI 11 response because questions 18 and 19 regarding Ardgour Rise and Bendigo Conservation Covenant assessment are "assumed not to require condition updated". In addition to being information that Sustainable Tarras has been requesting since it first lodged its comments, this approach suggests the applicant has already predetermined the outcome of those assessments (and that the assessment by Ms Gilbert that the Panel has also directed will similarly not change outcomes at all). Transport is also identified as a topic that can proceed now, when there is as yet no landscape assessment of the amended Ardgour Rise alignment. Those are just examples. Obviously the response on cultural impacts (RFI 11 at 17) will cut across several topics including landscape and ecology, yet the Tracker has "Tangata Whenua" as a topic that has "No reliance on RFI 11 response".

Third, we are concerned that only entities with a planner have been invited to participate in this process (despite it not being a planners only workshop) and consider it is unfair and contrary to natural justice for interested parties who have participated in this process in a meaningful way not to be participating (such as EDS, Hayden Johnston, Ross Hannan). I note you have not responded to my question yesterday asking how MGL is proposing to involve parties who do not have a planner in the workshop process.

Last, in terms of timing the workshops now run well into September and we are concerned about how any outputs will meaningfully inform the Panel's decision. This overlaps with our concerns about the volume of significant new information coming in response to RFI 11 (such as new downstream catchment and groundwater modelling, updated assessments of ecological impacts, potential alternative approaches to ecological mitigation) and how commenters will be enabled to respond to that information.

Sustainable Tarras may wish to have an observer at one or more of the workshops, so please continue to provide information about dates, venues and topics.

Regards

Sally Gepp KC
Barrister

Tel: 021 558 241

3 Brookside, Nelson 7010

www.sallygepp.co.nz

This email is from Sally Gepp, Barrister. The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential to the intended recipient. They may not be disclosed to or used by or copied in any way by anyone other than the intended recipient. If this email is received in error, please contact me on 021 558 241 and then delete the email. I do not accept responsibility for viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments.

From: Sally Gepp

Sent: Thursday, 16 July 2026 9:37 am

To: 'Mia Turner' <mia.turner@laneneave.co.nz>; Joshua Leckie <joshua.leckie@laneneave.co.nz>

Cc: Charlotte Coyle <charlotte.coyle@laneneave.co.nz>

Subject: RE: Bendigo - process [LN-LNDMS.FID1277015]

Hi Mia

Thank you for the updates.

Please note that Bridget Gilbert is unavailable 31 July to 14 August.

Sustainable Tarras is considering its involvement in the workshop process. As Ms Allen has been away she hasn't sent me the most recent correspondence on the workshops. Going forward, can I be copied in please.

How is MGL proposing to involve parties who do not have a planner in the workshop process?

Regards

Sally Gepp KC
Barrister

Tel: 021 558 241

3 Brookside, Nelson 7010

www.sallygepp.co.nz

This email is from Sally Gepp, Barrister. The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential to the intended recipient. They may not be disclosed to or used by or copied in any way by anyone other than the intended recipient. If this email is received in error, please contact me on 021 558 241 and then delete the email. I do not accept responsibility for viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments.

From: Mia Turner <mia.turner@laneneave.co.nz>

Sent: Wednesday, 15 July 2026 4:38 pm

To: Sally Gepp <sally@sallygepp.co.nz>; Joshua Leckie <joshua.leckie@laneneave.co.nz>

Cc: Charlotte Coyle <charlotte.coyle@laneneave.co.nz>

Subject: RE: Bendigo - process [LN-LNDMS.FID1277015]

Hi Sally,

Thanks for your email.

In terms of the additional landscape information requested by the Panel:

- We did not file a memorandum responding to Minute 35 prior to the processing being suspended.
- We are currently in the process of finalising Rhys Girvan's supplementary evidence. Once completed we will circulate this to the Panel and landscape architects well in advance of the processing resuming on 17 August.

For clarity Mr Girvan's supplementary evidence will be provided separately from Matakanui Gold's response to question 18 of RFI 11.

With regards to the upcoming workshops please see **attached** correspondence that was circulated to all planning experts on Monday 13 July.

The **attached** covers the aspects raised in Marie's email. While the **attached** does not expressly identify areas of agreement and disagreement for each workshop topic, as confirmation of any points of disagreement on the proposed conditions is still required from the attendees, we have taken anticipated areas of agreement and disagreement into account when allocating time to each topic.

The workshop schedule has also been sequenced so that discussion of conditions reliant on the RFI 11 outputs occurs later in the process.

The following attendees will attend all workshops on behalf of MGL:

- Mark Chrisp and Nicolai Berry (Planning).
- Cheryl Low (Environment Manager at MGL).
- Mary Askey (Principal Environment Advisor at MGL).

The following attendees will attend select workshops on behalf of MGL:

- Damian Spring (CEO).
- Emily Walker (Project management/environmental at MGL)
- David Thurston (Technical services manager at MGL) will attend the geotech workshop.
- Technical expert input on an as needed basis.

We note that Sustainable Tarras' planner has been included in the workshopping correspondence. Are you able to provide an indication of whether Sustainable Tarras intends to participate in the workshops?

Please let me know if you have any questions or would like to discuss.

Kind regards

Mia Turner
Associate

Lane Neave

Level 1
2 Memorial Street, Queenstown 9300
PO Box 701, Queenstown 9348

Tel: +64 3 409 0321 | Fax: +64 3 409 0322
DDI: +64 3 377 6912 | Mobile: +64 21 222 4632

Email: mia.turner@laneneave.co.nz
Web: www.laneneave.co.nz

From: Sally Gepp <sally@sallygepp.co.nz>

Sent: Wednesday, 15 July 2026 3:00 pm

To: Joshua Leckie <joshua.leckie@laneneave.co.nz>; Mia Turner <mia.turner@laneneave.co.nz>

Subject: Bendigo - process

Dear Josh and Mia

I'm writing to request clarification on two process issues.

Landscape matters

In Minute 35 the Panel advised that the information provided by the Applicant was not sufficient nor in a form suitable for the landscape architects to be able to provide the Panel with advice on what the specific landscape related character and values of the Covenant area are and the effects of the proposal on those values. Paragraph [5] contains a direction for the Applicant to instruct Mr Girvan to lead the compilation of a suitable GIS base model that he considers to be appropriate to allow the assessment to occur, and sets out the Panel's expectation that in doing so, Mr. Girvan will collaborate with all landscape architects who participated in

expert conferencing to ensure the model is sufficient and appropriate for an evaluation. Paragraph [6] directs the Applicant, following production of the Model, to instruct Mr. Girvan to provide further expert evidence on the specific existing landscape character and values within the BCC area, and the effects the proposal will have on those values. It goes on to say that upon receipt of that additional evidence, the Panel will likely invite further evidence in response from each of the landscape experts. In [7] the Panel invites the Applicant to address it on a reasonable time limit for compliance with those requirements.

Did the applicant file a memorandum in response to [7]?

I note this issue was picked up again by the Panel in RFI 11:

18. Please provide assessments by the ecological and landscape experts addressing whether the revocation of the covenant will compromise values of regional, national or international significance.

Ms Gilbert had been liaising with Mr Girvan and on 7 July advised me that “Rhys G has circulated the GIS mapping to the landscape experts. Rhys will be producing supplementary landscape comments re the Covenant by 8 July, with reply comments from the other landscape experts expected by 15 July.” However, nothing was received on 8 July and on 15 July she provided a further update from Mr Girvan as follows:

With the project currently on hold, my understanding is that the Panel is not able to instruct any review of additional evidence during this period. I am continuing to complete my supplementary assessment based on the GIS model I previously provided access to. This now also includes a link to the GNS geology layer. Please let me know if you or anyone else is having difficulty accessing the model or the linked information. I will pass on any updates regarding timing once I have greater clarity.

What is the applicant’s intention regarding its response to those matters, including allowing time for other landscape architects to comment on the information?

Workshops

I have seen a few of the emails between planners in relation to the workshops, including one from Ms Payne at DOC advising that the following information is required to support an efficient process (I have copied verbatim):

- **Detailed workshop plan** – Given the proposed timeframes, there are concerns regarding the availability of representatives from DOC, CODC and Kā Rūnaka particularly in relation to workshops proposed to commence the week 14th July, this is acknowledged in your latest email. If the upcoming week of the 14th July is proving challenging, the following week which is outside of a holiday period is less likely to have such resourcing constraints and possibly is a better alternative to explore. Additionally, the current approach lists out topics in relation to each week but does not have specific dates for each topic (which would support a more efficient commitment/use of time).
- **Identification of areas of agreement and disagreement in relation to each workshop topic and topics where further information is required to support**

the discussion on specific conditions - This would assist in prioritising topics for discussion and would include providing context in situations where feedback to date has not been reflected in the latest condition set. Progressing matters where there is limited disagreement initially and potentially clarifying any issues that may not be capable of being addressed through these workshops would support an efficient use of time. It is noted that some of the matters proposed to be worked through in week 2 and potentially week 1 would likely be informed by the further RFI response, which may be in conflict with the earlier table circulated.

- **Proposed terms of engagement** – clearly articulating the purpose of the workshops, roles and responsibilities of participants, expectations regarding conduct and participation. This would help ensure a transparent, efficient and well-understood process for all parties.
- **Workshop outputs and reporting** – clarity regarding how workshop outcomes will be documented and communicated to the Panel to best support them in this process, including how differing views will be presented and how balanced and objective reporting of workshop discussions will be achieved.

Sustainable Tarras similarly considers that list of information is necessary to inform any decisions about participating in workshops (in particular my client is interested to know who from MGL is attending the workshops). Please can you provide this information?

Regards

Sally Gepp KC
Barrister

Tel: 021 558 241

3 Brookside, Nelson 7010

www.sallygepp.co.nz

This email is from Sally Gepp, Barrister. The contents of this email and any attachments are confidential to the intended recipient. They may not be disclosed to or used by or copied in any way by anyone other than the intended recipient. If this email is received in error, please contact me on 021 558 241 and then delete the email. I do not accept responsibility for viruses and it is your responsibility to scan or otherwise check this email and any attachments.

IMPORTANT NOTICES

The views expressed in this communication are not necessarily those of Lane Neave, unless stated otherwise. This email and accompanying attachments contain information that is confidential and may be subject to legal privilege. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not read, use, distribute or copy the contents of this email. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by reply email or collect telephone to +64 3 379 3720 and delete the original email together with all attachments. Lane Neave does not accept responsibility for: (a) any changes to this email or its attachments; or (b) for any attachments made by others, after we have transmitted it.

Lane Neave does not represent or warrant that this email or files attached to this email are free from computer viruses or other defects. Any attached files are provided, and may only be used, on the basis that the user assumes all responsibility for any loss, damage or consequence resulting directly or

indirectly from their use. The liability of Lane Neave is limited in any event to either the re-supply of the attached files or the cost of having the attached files re-supplied."