FTAA-2610-1309

17 November 2026

Hayden Beaton
Summerset Villages (Paraparaumu) Limited
By Email: Hayden.Beaton@summerset.co.nz
Copy to: Torrey McDonnell
By Email: torrey@incite.co.nz

Tēnā koe,

Request for further information in relation to your application under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

You lodged a substantive application, Otaihanga Retirement Village, under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (the Act) on 30 October 2026.

Prior to referring a substantive application to an Expert Panel, the EPA must assess the completeness and scope of the application to ensure it complies with section 46(2) of the Act. To assist with making this assessment, under section 46(2A) of the Act the EPA may seek further information from you.

Request for Further Information

To inform the EPA's assessment of the application for completeness, please provide a response to the following matters.

1. ***Treaty Settlement Provisions***

This matter was raised as part of the EPA's internal completeness check.

The application identifies the Ngāti Toa Rangatira Claims Settlement Act 2014 as the relevant Treaty settlement applying to the project area. It also notes that there are no site-specific provisions applying to the site, but that broader provisions relating to Ngāti Toa's association with the Kāpiti area and participation in resource management processes are relevant. However, the application does not identify the, relevant provisions or provide a summary of any redress provided by those settlements that affects natural and physical resources relevant to the project or project area.

Please provide identification and analysis of the specific, relevant provisions of the settlement legislation for the purposes of Schedule 5, Clause 5(1)(i).

Department of Conservation

These matters were raised as part of the mandatory consultation the EPA undertook with the Department of Conservation (DOC):

2. Lizard Relocation Location and Salvage Success

the following information is not considered to be provided in sufficient detail:

a. Relocation Locations - While lizard relocation 'options' have been noted (in Section 7.5 of the Lizard Management Plan) information about the relocation site/s has not been provided. From the outset (see the Executive Summary), the Lizard Management Plan ('LMP') acknowledges that it is a draft and that the "details on the proposed release site remain to be finalised" (Executive summary – text in bold). Without an identified release site/s, it is not possible to assess the adverse effects on lizards and whether lizards will be adequately protected or determine whether the proposed release site preparation and management will be suitable for the salvaged cohort (or potentially require additional permissions). Further, there is no information on how, or whether, the release site/s will be managed to benefit lizards. The LMP acknowledges that the release site/s is a critical component of the proposed management approach. In this regard, Section 4 states that "protection of lizards is achieved through: • capturing and relocating lizards……; and • preparation of a lizard release site with habitats designed to support lizards, and pest control to suppress predators." Without an identified release site/s and details of its ongoing management, the activity applied for cannot be assessed against the purpose of the Wildlife Act 1953.

b. The LMP does not attempt to define or indicate how the success of the salvage programme will be measured, and does not address residual effects, therefore the potential and actual impacts of the activities proposed are not outlined and again, the activity cannot be meaningfully assessed against the purpose of the Wildlife Act 1953.

Please provide any further information you wish to have considered in response to these comments from DOC for the purposes of the EPA's assessment under section 46(1) of the Act.

Greater Wellington Regional Council

These matters were raised as part of the mandatory consultation the EPA undertook with Greater Wellington Regional Council:

3. Widening and regrading of the existing watercourse

Appendix 16- Infrastructure Design Report (pg. 5) states: "The drain will be regraded and widened as part of the initial stage to provide the required receiving corridor." It is uncertain from the Appendix 4 Resource Consents Assessment whether the regrading and widening of the existing watercourse will require a resource consent under the rules in the Natural Resources Plan for the Wellington Region (NRP), or whether this work can be undertaken as a permitted activity.

To assist the EPA's assessment of whether the information required under Schedule 5 clauses 5(1)(h) and 5(5)(a) has been provided in sufficient detail, please provide:

- confirmation as to whether resource consent is required for that activity, or whether it will be undertaken as a permitted activity; and
- If a resource consent is required for that activity, an assessment of the NRP rules that apply to the widening and regrading of the existing watercourse; or
- If it will be undertaken as a permitted activity, a description that demonstrates that the activity complies with the requirements, conditions, and permissions for the permitted activity.

4. Hydrology as it relates to stormwater

The proposed treatment devices are located at or below recorded groundwater levels, and the groundwater monitoring record covers only two weeks. Therefore, based on the information provided to date, we cannot confirm the devices will function as intended without a hydrogeologist establishing appropriate preliminary design groundwater levels.

Please provide any further information you wish to have considered in response to this comment from GWRC for the purposes of Schedule 5, clauses 6(1)(a) and 6(1)(d) and the EPA's assessment under section 46(1) of the Act.

5. Hydrology as it relates to wetlands

The report relies on surface and groundwater dynamics to make claims about existing wetland hydrology and the wetland creation proposed as part of the development. However, no supporting hydrological assessment has been provided as part of the broader application. The lack of any explicit hydrological technical assessment results in an inability to adequately assess the following components of the Ecological Impact Assessment (EcIA):

- *Claims regarding existing wetland hydrology and connectivity which underpin several subsequent ecological assessments. Without a hydrological assessment, we do not consider that an aggregate wetland ecological value of 'negligible' and the resulting less than minor level of effect has a solid basis.*

- *The feasibility of the proposed new wetland areas to establish and function as wetlands over time.*

- *The proposal to discharge treated stormwater to the created wetlands, whether this runs the risk of becoming the primary water source sustaining them, and how the applicant proposes to balance infiltration from the wetlands into the surrounding sandy soils against maintaining suitable wetland hydrology. No additional water balance model appears to have been provided to demonstrate how these inputs and losses will result in the hydrological conditions required to establish and sustain the proposed wetlands.*

Please provide any further information you wish to have considered in response to this comment from GWRC for the purposes of Schedule 5, clauses 6(1)(a) and 6(1)(d) and the EPA's assessment under section 46(1) of the Act.

6. Stormwater and the receiving environment

While the downstream flow path has been identified (Drain → Mazengarb Stream → Waikanae River), the application does not adequately describe the freshwater receiving environment's values, sensitivities or required outcomes. Therefore, we cannot assess whether the proposed treatment performance is sufficient to protect those values.

Please provide any further information you wish to have considered in response to this comment from GWRC for the purposes of Schedule 5, clauses 6(1)(a) and 6(1)(d) and the EPA's assessment under section 46(1) of the Act.

7. Flooding: blockage scenario

There is a blockage scenario for the western culverts by the solo pond. Though no other culverts have been assessed with a blockage scenario - this is of significant concern with regards to the Western Road crossing, as this is the main outfall from the site.

Please provide any further information you wish to have considered in response to this comment from GWRC for the purposes of Schedule 5, clauses 6(1)(a) and the EPA's assessment under section 46(1) of the Act.

Responding to the Request for Further Information

Under the Act, you have until the end of the 20th working day from the date of this letter to provide a response to the EPA, which is 15 December 2026.

From the date of this letter, the 15 working day timeframe for the EPA to decide on completeness and scope of the substantive application ceases to run. The 15 working day timeframe will recommence once your response is received or after 15 December 2026, whichever is sooner.

If you wish to clarify any matter relating to the request, and the request was generated from the EPA's consultation with an administering agency or local authority, we suggest that you contact that administering agency or local authority directly before providing your response to the EPA.

If you require information from the EPA in relation to the request for further information, you may request that information from the EPA under section 46(2C) of the Act. Please send your request to projects@fasttrack.govt.nz.

The EPA intends to publish the information received from you in full, including your responses in our completeness memorandum, on the Fast-track website.

If you have any questions, please contact Maggie Burns, Application Lead by email at info@fasttrack.govt.nz.

Nāku noa, nā



Ben Bond

Team Leader, Fast-track Applications