
MINUTE 5 OF THE EXPERT PANEL
Request for further information

Mt Iron Junction Housing Development Expert Panel [FTAA-2602-1173]

6 July 2026

[1] The Panel thanks the Applicant, Queenstown Lakes District Council (Council), Otago Regional Council (Regional Council) and the other parties invited to comment on the application for their comments and supporting information.

[2] The Panel is considering the process ahead and the legal requirements applying to both a potential decision to refuse consent, or alternatively one potentially granting consent subject to conditions. As a result, some of the requests below are made to help the Panel identify potential clear, workable, and defensible conditions of consent that, should the Panel come to the view they are necessary, would allow the Panel to follow the FTAA requirements for granting consent in a robust manner. This would be avoid the potential refusal of consent for what might amount to a lack of information rather than conclusive evidence of a definitively unacceptable outcome. All such requests including these notes should not be interpreted as signalling that the Panel has reached any view, even indicatively, of what the outcome of the Application should be; this is solely about equipping the Panel with all of the necessary information and tools to allow it to reach the correct outcome, whatever that may be.

[3] The Panel requests from the Applicant (and as relevant any parties identified below), under section 67 of the FTAA, the following information:

(a) Transportation issues

- (i) Please explain more clearly the potential effects of the proposal

on the SH6 / SH84 roundabout in terms of the specific traffic loading that could enter / exit via the specific access point with the Site, versus the more general issue of increased overall traffic using the roundabout. The Panel wishes to better understand the specific impacts of vehicle movements associated with the Site over and above what is understood to be a more general issue of greater traffic volumes occurring ahead of what may have been planned for by NZTA.

- (ii) In terms of a proposed financial contribution towards a SH6 / SH84 roundabout upgrade, which is acknowledged, the Panel has no understanding of where such a contribution would go or how or even if it would be used for a roundabout upgrade or in what timeframe. The Panel would be reluctant to impose a condition if it was not satisfied a reasonable mitigation of an effect would occur.
- (iii) The Panel acknowledges that this will require discussions with NZTA to determinate how any such contribution could be administered to achieve the outcome desired. As a result, the Panel directs NZTA to engage in meaningful discussions with the Applicant over this issue.
- (iv) In terms of all-weather pedestrian / cycle linkages from the Site to the SH84 underpass and/or Aubrey Road, and in the event that the Panel determined to grant consent subject to conditions requiring these, the Panel is not at this point satisfied that it has sufficient information to construct condition(s) that are sufficiently clear, certain, and justifiable. The Applicant, in consultation with the Council, Regional Council and NZTA as relevant, is requested to please assist the Panel by helping develop such conditions (it is acknowledged that at this time the

Applicant is not volunteering or necessarily agreeable to such conditions). The Panel indicatively signals that it would expect:

- (1) At least indicative alignments of potential facilities on a plan demonstrating physical plausibility in terms of applicable standards (noting that provision for potential future bus stops may conflict with potential path alignments and should be recognised to the extent possible);
- (2) Confirmation of the standards that the facility would be designed to meet (width, surface, lighting, etc.);
- (3) At least in-principle comments from the relevant land or asset-owners confirming that such a concept would meet applicable standards and that it/they would be agreeable to undertaking such upgrades in a timeframe related to the occupation of dwellings on the Site based on the Applicant's proposed approach of a financial contribution being made;
- (4) Information from a suitably qualified person explaining how the combination of alignments and standards results in a reasonable basis to estimate likely costs, what those costs may be, and which might be included in a condition requiring a contribution to be made; and
- (5) The above would not be to try to predetermine a final solution that may be agreeable to the parties but establish a reasonable and defensible basis on which to grant consent with an attributable and fair cost contribution (if the Panel determines that is appropriate) falling to the Applicant.

Supporting notes:

- The Panel acknowledges that this will require discussions with NZTA, Council and the Regional Council to address these matters.
- In furtherance of the above, the Panel confirms

that it agrees in principle with the Applicant that, to the extent that any pedestrian / cycle routes for the public align with the Site, it is appropriate for this route to traverse through the Site rather than following the outer boundaries of the Site around the highways and exposed to the roundabout.

- In furtherance of the above, the Panel confirms that in terms of at least the potential connection from the Site to the SH84 underpass, it has no view on whether a new facility along the edge of SH84 or a suitably upgraded (surface and lighting) existing lower section of Mt Iron trail might be the more appropriate (either could be potentially workable subject to agreement from the relevant landowner(s) and operator(s).
- In furtherance of the above, the Panel is not satisfied that there would be an alternative path route to Aubrey Road other than along the side of SH6 (subject to accommodating a potential future bus stop).
- The Panel finally wishes to signal that this is a key issue before it. If consent were to be granted subject to conditions on this, those conditions need to be fair and reasonable to the interests of the Applicant, NZTA, Council and Regional Council. The Panel confirms that depending on the outcome of this matter, a limited hearing with these parties may be required. This point is expanded on below.

(b) Fire Risk

Please provide a formal report from a suitably qualified expert on fire risks and how these will be mitigated, including in terms of any limitations that might apply to the extensive proposed landscaping on and around the Site.

(c) Effects on Old Racecourse Road neighbours

(i) In the event that the Panel agrees with the comments and supporting evidence provided by the Old Racecourse Road neighbours relating to their reasonable amenity and privacy, it is not clear what such a response may reasonably entail or require. Indicatively, something in the order of a 3-4m setback along the boundary, with all but 1m from the wall of any dwelling (to maintain access around dwellings and for maintenance) planted in a dense hedge sufficient to reasonably screen the proposed development from view at the ground level of neighbours close to the boundary (perhaps 4-6m in mature height) may be required if the neighbours' concerns are ultimately agreed with. The Panel suggests that such a scale and linearity of vegetation would not be uncommon or inappropriate in rural or semi-rural environments (from the point of view of the neighbours' amenity values and existing land use zoning) and could potentially address at least some of the key concerns expressed to the Panel.

(ii) In doing so it is recognised that such a requirement would require amendments to at least some of the house types and locations proposed on the plans, and the Panel would not impose any conditions of consent requiring design changes without having a clear understanding of what those changes are likely to entail. The Applicant is requested to consider this issue and provide to the Panel what in its view would be a 'least-possible-impact' solution to address the neighbours' concerns about proximity and

visual impact / overlooking, acknowledging that at this time the Applicant is not volunteering or supportive of such condition or associated changes. This is to help the Panel evaluate the impacts and appropriateness of potential solutions to the issues raised by these adjoining neighbours.

Supporting Note:

The Panel wishes to signal that this is a key issue before it. If consent were to be granted subject to conditions on this, those conditions need to be fair and reasonable to the interests of the Applicant and adjoining neighbours at Old Racecourse Road. The Panel confirms that depending on the outcome of this matter, a limited hearing with these parties may be required.

(d) Urban design

The Panel is not persuaded by proposals for design optimisations to the end walls of dwellings through some post-consent future certification process where it is not clear what outcome is specifically to be achieved or on what basis certification may be given or withheld. The Panel suggests that the Applicant's proposed reliance on provisions from the Medium Density Residential zone does seem to indicate an expectation for and need to achieve high-quality building elevations and enablement of passive surveillance. In the event that the Panel agrees with concerns identified by the Council, updated end wall elevations are requested now as part of the consent plans, even if they are themselves indicative and could form the basis of a defensible and certain detail design / certification approach.

(e) Landscape treatments SH6 and SH84.

With reference to the previous comments relating to greater information on potential pedestrian / cycle routes through the Site or around the Site's highway frontages and noting the Panel's agreement

that there is sense to a 'through site' public route as has been proposed (subject to the ability to connect pedestrians to any future bus stop location(s), the Panel requests confirmation that the proposed landscape screening around the Site's highway boundaries has been maximised. If there are opportunities to provide more comprehensive or denser landscape screening, the Panel requests an updated landscape plan to this end with an explanation provided of where such additional landscaping could be provided and what it could entail.

Supporting Notes:

The Panel is not seeking at this time to replace or change the proposed highway frontage landscaping solution, especially if long-term pedestrian / cycle networks remain uncertain and the long-term provision for visual connection and passive surveillance from the Site to the highway frontages is deemed appropriate. The Panel is seeking to understand what highway landscape screening improvements may be appropriate to consider depending on where the broader issue of pedestrian / cycle facilities lands.

(f) **Hazardous substances**

The Applicant's response to potential health and safety effects relating to potential carcinogens used at the service station in relation to close-proximity dwellings is appreciated. However as far as the Panel can ascertain this has not been provided by a suitably qualified person with expertise in air quality matters and this limits the reliance that can be placed on it.

At issue is whether or not there is a need to ensure the long-term safety of nearby building occupants such as by provision of mechanical ventilation and/or limitations on the placement of outdoor living spaces adjacent to the service station. The Panel continues to have no view on this matter but requests confirmation from a suitably qualified expert

in air quality and emissions that any relevant potential health effects have been identified and suitably mitigated.

(g) Economics

The Panel thanks Ms Hampson for her comments. Unfortunately, these comments have not addressed all the issues the Panel highlighted in its second Minute. We would be assisted by the Applicant advising the Panel of the proposed price point(s) that its housing is envisaged to be sold at compared to Wanaka's median prices. We believe this is appropriate for the Panel to understand, as one of the major benefits of the project suggested by the Applicant would be the increased housing supply at an affordable level in the Wanaka Market. However, we have no real understanding of what the Applicant says affordable means and how this would be achieved. We take Ms Hampson's points and accept that the proposal will not be for highly priced 'premium housing'; but we do not see now 'not-premium' means 'affordable'.

[4] In accordance with section 67(2) of the Act the Applicant and relevant parties referred to in individual points above only, must:

- (a) Provide electronic copies of the information requested above; or
- (b) Advise the EPA, with reasons that you decline to provide the information or report requested.

[5] Please provide the further information to the EPA at info@fasttrack.govt.nz by 2.00pm 20 July 2026.

[6] If the information requested is not received, the Panel must proceed as if the request for further information has been declined.

[7] Please note, the information will be provided to the Panel, the applicant and every person who provided comments on the application. The information will also

be made available on the Fast-track website.

[8] Proposed Set of Conditions

We have engaged Mr Blair Devlin to assist us in confirming a set of as-agreed-as-possible conditions that could be used for each of the proposed district and regional consents sought, should the Panel come to a view to grant consent. As part of this process, we have empowered Mr Devlin to proactively work with the parties and we expect parties contacted by Mr Devlin to actively engage with him to achieve this outcome.

[9] Hearing

As we have signaled above, if the issues regarding the interface with the adjacent properties, and transportation and pedestrian / cycle facilities cannot be addressed we are minded to hold a limited and very focused hearing to address these matters. Consequently, and mindful of the time taken to administratively prepare and provide notice of a hearing, if needed this would be held in Wanaka on 6 (and if needed 7) August 2026, beginning at 1.00pm. Should this be required further details will follow. However, we believe it's appropriate to signal the time and date now so the appropriate arrangements can be made.



Dr Lee Beattie

Mt Iron Junction Housing Development Expert Panel Chair