
MINUTE 5 OF THE EXPERT PANEL

Request for Information

Mt Welcome, Pukerua Bay, Porirua Project

FTAA-2603-1181

(20 July 2026)

[1] In Minute 2, the Expert Panel foreshadowed its intention to undertake a mechanical / SMART¹ review of the draft set of conditions contained in Appendix 7 of the application. The Panel further indicated that it would forward the outcome of that review to the applicant and invite the applicant to respond to the mechanical review, in conjunction with the Porirua City Council and Greater Wellington Regional Council, to the extent that the councils wished to be involved.

[2] At that point, the Panel envisaged that this process would follow receipt of comments. The Panel has completed its review and determined that it would be more efficient (and more in keeping with the purpose of the FTAA) to approach the issue sequentially, obtaining the applicant's input first (while other parties are finalising their comments), and then seeking feedback from the councils (while the applicant is preparing its response to comments).

[3] The results of the Panel's review are attached to this Minute in the form of a tracked document showing suggested changes to, and comment boxes for, the draft conditions proposed by the applicant. It should also be noted that this has not been a substantive review, and that the appended document does not include any Panel input in relation to the substance (including for example merit) of the applicant's proposed conditions. A substantive / merits-based review will be undertaken in due course, when all parties' comments (and the applicant's

¹ SMART – conditions that are Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-based.

response thereto) are in hand.

[4] The Panel was well advanced in its review of the draft conditions submitted with the application when the revised conditions attached to the applicant's response to Minute 2 was filed. Rather than transfer its comments and suggested changes into the revised conditions, the Panel transferred the condition amendments the applicant had made into the document it was working on in underline and strikethrough. To assist identification, the Panel has highlighted the changes from the applicant that it has inserted into its version which contains the SMART review. The applicant should check whether that mechanical exercise has been completed correctly as part of its review of the conditions attached.

[5] The Panel wishes to emphasise that the tracked amendments are suggestions only, and do not represent a concluded view. If the applicant considers that revised wording is preferable, it is welcome to suggest same. Similarly, if it considers that its original drafting should be preferred, it should record that view with reasons. Likewise, the marginal comments are observations that the applicant may take issue with.

[6] The applicant's response to the suggestions and comments the Panel has made is requested to be filed by noon on 31 July.

[7] As part of its response, the applicant is requested to insert notes in the set of conditions it has annotated identifying those conditions that reflect the recommendations of the applicant's technical advisors and providing reference to where in the relevant report(s) those recommendations can be found.

[8] Lastly, for the information of the parties, having noted the advice of the parties at the briefing conference that ecological issues are likely to be in contention, the Panel has directed the EPA to take steps to engage Dr Gary Bramley (ecoLogical Solutions) if that is indeed the position following receipt of comments. The Panel's intention is that Dr Bramley would provide a peer review of the competing expert opinions and facilitate expert conferencing (as required).

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'T. Robinson', with a large, stylized loop at the end.

Trevor Robinson
Expert Panel Chair

Appendix One

Panel's SMART review of applicant's draft proposed resource consent conditions