
MINUTE 11 OF THE EXPERT PANEL

Request for Information and Unsolicited

Correspondence

Ashbourne [FTAA-2507-1087]

(22 January 2026)

Unsolicited correspondence

1. In late December 2025, the EPA received unsolicited correspondence from Roger Slattery (who was an invited party and provided comments on the application under section 53).
2. Mr Slattery believed there was a potential error in the Property Economics memorandum filed by Matamata-Piako District Council in that 148 Station Road was omitted from the mapping by mistake. Mr Slattery provided an edited version of the map which identified that property in red.
3. The Panel has decided to accept this unsolicited correspondence. This correspondence will be uploaded to the EPA website.

Request for information

4. The Expert Panel requests the following information be provided by the applicant under section 67 of the Fast Track Approvals Act in relation to this application. The Applicant is requested to file their response to the below questions to the EPA no later than **5pm 30 January 2026**.

Amended national direction instruments under the RMA

5. The Panel notes that ten new or amended national direction instruments under the RMA came into effect on 15 January 2026. Please provide an assessment with respect to those instruments of relevance to the Application (including the NPS-HPL, NPS for Infrastructure and the NPS for Natural Hazards).

Shared path along 'spine road'

6. With respect to the comments in respect of Policy 1(c) of the NPS-UD (Barker

Memorandum, page 2):

- (a) Please clarify references to the inclusion of a shared path along the 'spine road' (presumably a reference to Road 1) – a further review of the Engineering Drawings depicts footpaths of 1.8m and 2.5m for either side of this type of road, rather than shared paths.
 - (b) Please provide a plan showing the proposed shared path connection between Station Road and Smith Street.
 - (c) Please clarify the reference to the use of the Centennial Drive Reserve for commuting purposes, including a comparison of relative distance from a more direct route.
7. The Panel notes the Applicant's opposition to delivery of the solar farms being conditional on any aspect of the residential subdivision or retirement village (Barker Memorandum, at pages 2 and 3). However, the Panel also understands there is a level of interdependence in any respect, with the southern solar farm not being able to be delivered until Stage 4 of the residential subdivision.

Consent conditions for stormwater management

8. The JWS for Stormwater Management dated 11/12/25 suggested that the applicant, WRC and MPDC planner convene to agree upon the conditions that can be developed to be put forward to the panel for reviewing and implementing. It suggested that this can take place starting Monday 15th of December.
9. Please advise on the status of the development of these conditions and when they can be provided to the Panel and whether it is intended to provide an updated SMP as recommended in the JWS and whether this will be provided to the panel and if so by what date.
10. The JWS for groundwater in relation to stormwater management (also titled JWS for Stormwater Management) dated 11/12/25 recommended that consent conditions should include:
- (a) Five additional groundwater level monitoring sites equipped with datalogger
 - (b) pressure sensors to be constructed on site including two nested piezometers

in the deepest part of the basin, as shown in Figure 7.

- (c) Applicant to prepare a groundwater level synthetic hydrograph and peak recharge analysis (i.e. intensity and recurrence intervals) for the site to inform detail design.
 - (d) Detailed design phase certification process with MPDC and WRC.
 - (e) A requirement for a management plan covering maintenance and operation of the drainage network including hydrogeologist input.
11. Please advise if the above four recommendations are being implemented and the status of each, with expected timelines for providing them.

On-site wastewater servicing retirement village

12. Appendix B Tracking Table Response to Council comments, Section 2.2, Table 9 Summary of WRC Appendix B Item 15(h) noted the following WRC comment.
13. The cumulative effects of the development in terms of the wastewater discharge, in particular the loads of nutrients discharged in comparison with current land use, have not been addressed.
14. The table advised that this matter was addressed in WGA memo included in Attachment 4. The WGA memo does not address this matter.
15. Please provide a response to the WRC comment.



Sue Simons
Expert Panel Chair