
MINUTE 11 OF THE EXPERT PANEL

Request for Information

Mt Welcome, Pukerua Bay, Porirua Project

FTAA-2603-1181

(14 August 2026)

[1] The Expert Panel has identified a number of areas where it seeks further information from the applicant, as follows:

- (a) It is evident from the application documentation that the proposed subdivision is premised on land and assets being vested in Tiaki Wai and Porirua City Council. The subdivision is also premised on the site securing wastewater connections to Tiaki Wai's wastewater network. It appears from the comments received from those organisations that one or both may not agree to accepting the proposed vesting or (in Tiaki Wai's case) the proposed wastewater connection. Is that an option open to them? Assuming it is, and one or both organisations maintains that position, what action(s) would the applicant need to take to address the situation and allow the development to proceed as currently proposed?
- (b) In relation to the Updated Infrastructure Report dated 4 June 2026:
 - (i) Section 10.3 records that the Tiaki Wai wastewater network has limited capacity above the 2018 baseline. This statement prompts the Panel to enquire:
 - (1) How much additional capacity did the network have above that baseline?
 - (2) How much of that capacity has been used up by the population increases detailed in the Economic assessment

between 2018 and 2026?

- (3) How much capacity is there currently taking account of consented and/or permitted development in the catchment?
- (ii) Section 10.10 states that the Mt Welcome development alone, excluding Muri Road Stage 2 can discharge 32 l/s by gravity without causing new overflows downstream, which prompts the following questions:
 - (1) Would it exacerbate existing overflows, and if so, to what extent?
 - (2) What is the status of Muri Road Stage 2?
- (iii) Section 10.10 also states that 8 hours of storage across the proposed pump stations provides the best performance balance. What storage volume does 8 hours equate to and what condition requires that outcome?
- (iv) Section 12.3 references an electricity report. Is a copy available? More generally, does the Scheme Plan provide for ancillary above ground electrical equipment if required?
- (c) In relation to Stantec's 4 June 2026 commentary on District Plan Standard TR-S5, what minimum driveway separation does the author consider appropriate, and why, and what minimum sightlines are appropriate at a vehicle crossing?
- (d) In relation to the comment in the Cultural Values Assessment at page 5 regarding the need to act consistently with Treaty Settlement obligations, what specific obligations does the Panel need to be aware of?
- (e) The NES-F Assessment (Appendix 6) records that 660 lots is not a viable yield. What is a viable yield?
- (f) Section 6.3 of the Flood Risk Report (Appendix 11, Part B) records the expectation that a modelled backflow effect in the upper Kakaho catchment will be resolved as the development proceeds. What condition directs that resolution to occur, and what is the ongoing

effect if that doesn't occur?

- (g) The Wastewater Modelling Report (Appendix 12) notes (e.g. Figure 2) that the model cut off is at the Paremata bridge. Are there any relevant network constraints downstream of that point?
- (h) In relation to the Economic Report (Appendix 13):
 - (i) What parameters noted in Figure 2 are materially different in surrounding developments, so as to produce the price differences predicted in section 2.3? If there are other reasons for the predicted differences, what are they?
 - (ii) How do actual demand figures over the period 2021 to date compare with the predictions in Figure 10?
 - (iii) In relation to section 8, are there other potential reasons for the observed steady population growth?– e.g. the availability of relatively affordable greenfield housing?
 - (iv) Are the estimates of value added in Figures 17-23 Net Present Values? If not, what would the relevant NPVs be, applying discount rates consistent with Treasury Guidelines? If the author considers that alternative discount rates should be preferred, please supply those figures as well, with an explanation of reasons for not applying Treasury Guidelines.
- (i) In relation to the Integrated Traffic Assessment (Appendix 14):
 - (i) Please supply the assessments noted as 'TBC' on page 20
 - (ii) In relation to section 7.1.2, what is the maximum posted speed at which an at grade cycling and pedestrian crossing would be viable?
 - (iii) In relation to section 7.3, is the active mode connection to Pukerua Bay and the Railway Station dependent on the Muri Block development being completed? If so, what is the fallback if that doesn't happen?
 - (iv) On a related point, comment the Panel has received suggest that the railway station carpark is at capacity and there is no scope to enlarge it. Does the author agree, and if so, what are the

implications for development of the site in terms of relevant policy direction around access to public transport. It is noted that the latter could be considered a planning question within Mr McDonnell's sphere.

- (v) In relation to the comments at page 39, please provide a plan showing the location of the over-gradient stretches of road identified, and more specific examples (location and gradient) of the Wellington and Porirua comparators referenced
- (vi) In relation to the discussion at page 40, what does the author consider to be the likely rationale for District Plan Standards INF25.5 and 6?
- (j) In relation to the Hydrology Assessment (Appendix 18)
 - (i) The executive summary notes that the modelling discussed in the report was based on assumptions and limited data, and recommends baseline monitoring continues with modelling compared against the results. Has that occurred, and if so, what was the outcome?
 - (ii) If remodelling available now or in the future indicates materially different outcomes, how would or could those outcomes be addressed?
 - (iii) Page 30 refers to monitoring and mitigation strategies in the Taupō Stream Catchment. Where are those strategies set out, and what trigger points are specified in conditions for their implementation?
 - (iv) Section 8.3.2 references trigger points in the Kakaho West catchment. Where are those trigger points set out?
- (k) In relation to the Water Quality Report (Appendix 19):
 - (i) Section 4.1 notes that limited on site monitoring has occurred. Can the applicant please provide an addendum report detailing any subsequent monitoring, including specifically a discussion of any conclusions that might be drawn from that modelling that would modify the findings presented in the original report;

(ii) The discussion on page 25 records that the operation of the proposed raingardens is critical to achieve removal of copper and zinc from stormwater, but that if they operate as designed, they should be sufficient to ensure no increase in average discharges of those contaminants. This conclusion prompts the following additional questions:

- (1) What ongoing monitoring of heavy metal discharges is proposed?
- (2) What minimum levels of copper and zinc leaving the site should be specified?
- (3) Related, against a regional planning policy framework seeking water quality improvements downstream, is a 'no increase' outcome appropriate or acceptable? Again, the latter might be a question for Mr McDonnell rather than the author.

(l) The applicant is proposing a two step lapse arrangement, with Stage 1 having a five year lapse period and the balance of district consents a 15 year lapse period. What is the legal basis for this arrangement given that a single set of consents governs all stages (i.e. Stage 1 is not proposed to be the subject of separate consents)? Put another way, if the secondary lapse date is triggered, what is the status of Stage 1?

[2] It is acknowledged that the answers to the Panel's questions might already have been provided (and the Panel has not noted that among the large volume of material the applicant has provided). In that case, a simple reference to where the answer can be found is sufficient.

[3] The applicant's response is required by noon on 28 August 2026.

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

Trevor Robinson
Expert Panel Chair