



**SALLY GEPP KC**  
BARRISTER

Fast Track Referrals

For: Jess Hollis

By email: [referral@fasttrack.govt.nz](mailto:referral@fasttrack.govt.nz)

16 January 2026

Dear Jess,

**FTAA-2512-1162 Tahimana - Information required to support Section 14 compliance check  
CRM:0419000010**

Thank you for your email of 12 January 2026 requesting information to support the s 14 compliance check. This letter sets out the applicant's responses.

**Section 13(4)(a)**

1. You asked whether the following draft project description adequately describes the project and the activities it involves for s 13(4)(a):

*The project is to subdivide and develop land for the purpose of establishing a residential and rural lifestyle development on approximately 70 hectares of land off Stagecoach Road, Tasman. The project will include works within the Stagecoach Road and Williams Road reserves.*

*The project will include:*

- *subdivision to create approximately 145 allotments and enable construction of approximately 141 residential units across a range of densities (which may be constructed by a person or persons other than the applicant)*
  - *development of an open space network including a public reserve and walkways, and construction of and upgrades to shared pathways*
  - *landscape planting, and restoration and enhancement of waterways and wetlands*
  - *associated infrastructure, including for three waters services and transport (including external site access works).*
2. The project description is generally adequate except there appears to be a very small area of Dicker Road within the proposed shared access upgrade corridor. In addition the description could give a more complete picture of the project benefits. The applicant suggests the following project description:

*The project is to subdivide and develop land for the purpose of establishing a residential and rural lifestyle development on approximately 70 hectares of land off Stagecoach Road, Tasman. The project will include works within the Stagecoach Road, Dicker Road and Williams Road reserves.*

*The project will include:*

- subdivision to create approximately 145 allotments (4 for reserve, roading and services) and enable construction of approximately 141 residential units across a range of densities (majority of dwellings to be erected as part of a design/build package by the applicant and related entities; some dwellings may be constructed by a person or persons other than the applicant)*
- development of an open space network including a public reserve and walkways, and construction of and upgrades to shared pathways*
- landscape planting, and restoration and enhancement of 13 waterways and 51 wetlands*
- associated infrastructure, including for three waters services and transport (including external road upgrade works).*

3. You requested an additional site plan clearly showing the full extent of the project area, including the length of Stagecoach Road proposed to be upgraded. This plan is **enclosed**.

#### **Section 13(4)(d)**

4. With reference to the statement in the referral application that “to the extent that any part of the communal wastewater system is located on or under any land held by the Council or in private ownership, private wastewater easements or a license to occupy will be sought and registered on the relevant titles”, you asked whether any additional private landholdings are required for the project.
5. The project does not involve any additional private landholdings. This statement is referring to the potential for wastewater pipes to pass through private allotments within the site.

#### **Section 13(4)(e)**

6. You asked for the construction activities completion date for the project as a whole. The anticipated construction activities completion date is 2034.

#### **Section 13(4)(k)**

7. You have advised that initial project consultation in 2022 is not considered sufficient to satisfy the s 11 requirement to consult on the referral application. You have requested additional evidence to satisfy the Section 11(b) consultation requirements with respect to relevant iwi authorities, hapū, and Treaty settlement entities.
8. The applicant will provide a response to this matter separately.

## Section 13(4)(t)

9. You refer to the interests registered on Record of Title 573241 and request an analysis of those interests, to confirm they will not impact on project delivery and/or necessitate additional approvals for the project to proceed. In response:
- a. Appurtenant to Lot 1 DP 450728 part formerly Lot 7 DP 20366 is a right of way created by Transfer 243846.1. This right of way is an historic appurtenant ROW that is effectively redundant and will be extinguished. It relates to land not within the project site, that was contiguous to the site's parent title. It does not impact on project delivery or necessitate additional approvals.
  - b. CT 573241 is subject to a covenant under s 240 RMA. This is an amalgamation covenant dating from 2000. The original reason for the covenant was that the then-owner wished to effectively amalgamate the two parcels, but could not due to the parcels having different survey status (in this case historic title NL 13C/309 Ltd was limited as to title, whereas historic title NL 13C/305 was a guaranteed title). Since that subdivision there have been several subsequent subdivisions including in 2011, which resulted in the current title. The covenant is redundant and can be removed from the title by LINZ. It does not impact on project delivery or necessitate additional approvals.
  - c. CT 573241 is subject to two easements in gross. The first is in favour of Carter Holt Harvey and allowed Carter Holt Harvey to emit noise, dust and spray (chemical or otherwise) over part of the site. It dates from 1999, when Carter Holt Harvey had forestry interests next to the site (which is no longer the case). The second is in favour of Tasman Pine Forests Limited and allowed Tasman Pine Forest to discharge noise, dust, smoke and light over part of the site. It dates from 2007, when Tasman Pine Forests had forestry next to the site (which is no longer the case). To the extent that these easements have any continuing relevance, they do not impact on project delivery or necessitate additional approvals.

Yours sincerely



Sally Gepp KC  
Barrister