Attachment M: Section 53 Comments Register and Tabulated Responses - Waikanae North Development (FTAA-2603-1194)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
1	Sally & John Killick, [redacted]	Opposed / Concerns	1.1	Reverse sensitivity / rural amenity: 7 residential lots (5 squeezed between their block and the swamp) proposed immediately adjacent to their 5-acre rural lifestyle block. Concern that new residents will demand curtailment of normal rural activities (firearm use on rabbits/possums, 5–6 bonfires p.a., dog breeding & barking, chainsawing). Consider proposed buffer inadequate.	Planning; Urban Design	Attachment I - Landscape (L3); Covering Report (P5); Attachment H - Urban Design (U2, U9)
			1.2	Groundwater / water table: rely on sand traps (shallow bores) for garden irrigation and stock water; concern that large-scale earthworks and ground restructuring will lower or disrupt the water table.	Hydrology; Geotechnical; Earthworks	Attachment C - Hydrology (H1); Attachment D - Geotechnical (G1)
			1.3	Wetland water levels & flooding of their land: concern that raising Te Harakeke swamp levels for ecological restoration could re-flood their horse arena ($15k spend in 2019) and pond ($8k). Seek assurance on flood mitigation for rear of property.	Hydrology; Ecology; Hazards (Flooding)	Attachment B - Flooding (F4); Attachment C - Hydrology (H4)
			1.4	Roading capacity & safety: Peka Peka Rd and Paetawa Rd already carry increased traffic plus cyclists, horses, walkers, runners. No mention of roading upgrades by KCDC/NZTA. Query motorway on/off link at Peka Peka; expect rat-running via Paetawa Rd to Waikanae Beach interchange if absent.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s4.1)
			1.5	Public transport: query whether bus services will be provided through Peka Peka.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s4.4)
			1.6	Active transport: query provision of cycleways/walkways along Peka Peka Rd and enhancements to Paetawa Rd.	Transport; Urban Design	Attachment G - Transport (s4.5)
			1.7	Construction noise, dust & screening: concern about earthmoving machinery generating dust, sand and noise adjacent to their boundary; seek minimisation and new rear fencing/screening.	Noise; Earthworks; Landscape	Attachment E - Earthworks (E3); Attachment I - Landscape (L4)
			1.8	Relief sought: request the panel decline the 5–7 residential lots at the eastern (rear) end of their and neighbours' properties — states these destroy rural character/outlook, risk restrictions on rural activities, and leave their block sandwiched between two residential areas.	Planning; Urban Design	Attachment I - Landscape (L3); Covering Report (P3, P5); Attachment H - Urban Design (U2, U9)
2	Hon Simon Watts, Minister of Climate Change	Supportive	2.1	Broad support: expresses support for projects delivering positive climate-adaptation outcomes, including the Waikanae North Development; letter reflects the Government's climate priorities.	Planning; Climate / Sustainability	Covering Report (P1)
			2.2	Requests securing of measures: encourages the panel to ensure stormwater, flood risk, wetland, stream and dune restoration measures are secured through conditions and long-term management, so adaptation outcomes are maintained/improved and climate risk not increased.	Conditions; Infrastructure (Stormwater); Hydrology; Ecology; Hazards (Flooding)	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I4)
3	Jo & Adam Southwick [redacted]	Supportive	3.1	Support: immediate neighbour supportive of the scheme layout and the proposed boundary activities, including earthworks and landscaping.	Urban Design; Earthworks; Landscape	Covering Report (P1)
4	Lyndon & Patrice Thomas, [redacted]	Supportive	4.1	Support: immediate neighbour supportive of the scheme layout and the proposed boundary activities, including earthworks and landscaping.	Urban Design; Earthworks; Landscape	Covering Report (P1)
5	Nicholas Brown, [redacted]	Opposed / Concerns	5.1	Off-site flood risk to Paetawa Road not assessed (major gap): application (Stormwater App.16, Hydrology App.17, Flood App.20) assesses off-site effects to the NE/E/S but gives no analysis of flooding impacts on Paetawa Rd properties to the NW. All 17 groundwater piezometers were on-site, none in the Paetawa Rd area. Cites strong hydrogeological connectivity between Te Harakeke Swamp and Paetawa Rd groundwater, evidenced by the 2021/22 flooding (~50 properties).	Hydrology; Hazards (Flooding); Infrastructure (Stormwater)	Attachment B - Flooding (F1); Attachment C - Hydrology (H2, H8); Covering Report (P4)
			5.2	Out-of-date flood mapping relied upon: Fig 51 (application) and Fig 2 (App.20) use old KCDC Flood Hazard Planning Maps that show no Paetawa Rd flood risk only because the area was never modelled. KCDC's 2025 modelling shows many of these properties at risk; revised draft map due imminently. Panel urged to obtain the 2025 draft map.	Hazards (Flooding); Planning	Attachment B - Flooding (F2)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			5.3	Development likely to raise Te Harakeke Swamp groundwater: stormwater from parts of the development is released to the swamp; ~475,000 m3 of peat removed (reducing storage) and replaced with compacted fill; extensive hard surfacing increases run-off. Risk of re-creating the 2021/22 flood conditions.	Hydrology; Ecology; Earthworks; Infrastructure (Stormwater)	Attachment C - Hydrology (H3, H8); Attachment E - Earthworks (E2); Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I4)
			5.4	Reliance on Ngarara Stream maintenance: stormwater approach depends on the future free-flowing Ngarara Stream on private land downstream. Recommends a binding maintenance agreement and KCDC 'global' resource consent (developer / KCDC / GWRC / landowners) to prevent future blockages (the 2021/22 cause).	Infrastructure (Stormwater); Conditions; Planning	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I5)
			5.5	Relief sought (hydrology): recommends conditions — regular monitoring & publication of Te Harakeke Swamp levels; a capped water level (e.g. 2.6m NZVD 2016 along NW edge) with remedial action; a supplementary flood report using 2025 KCDC modelling; developer to meet residents & KCDC Flood Defence Team and share raw data; time for independent expert review before decision. Raises s.85(3) FTAA refusal test and a tort / statutory-authority concern that Paetawa Rd owners may have no redress.	Conditions; Hazards (Flooding); Planning	Attachment B - Flooding (F5); Attachment C - Hydrology (H5); Covering Report (P3, P4)
			5.6	Transport effects understated: disputes ITA conclusion that traffic disperses with no mitigation. Population rises ~730 to ~4,000 (x5.4), generating ~9,000–10,000 vpd; contends significant safety, capacity, air, noise & vibration effects — Paetawa Rd traffic ~x4 (410%) and Waikanae Town Centre +60%. Cites cumulative growth (Te Tupu Pai) and DP Policies TR-P1/TR-P2.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s4.1, s4.2)
			5.7	Relief sought (transport): requests that construction of south-facing on/off ramps at the SH1 Peka Peka interchange be made a condition of consent — funded by the developer, or the development delayed until a co-funding agreement (developer / NZTA / future developers) is reached. Notes ~95% of generated traffic heads south and the ramp land appears already NZTA-designated (ITA Fig 3.1).	Transport; Conditions; Planning	Attachment G - Transport (s4.3)
6	End Farm Developments Ltd, (Kim Schwass & Matt Hodgkinson)	Supportive	6.1	Support: immediate neighbour (End Farm Road) supportive of the scheme layout and the proposed boundary activities, including earthworks and landscaping; sees no issue with the proposal.	Urban Design; Earthworks; Landscape	Covering Report (P1)
7	Tuatahi First Fibre, (Matt Sheehy)	Supportive	7.1	Support (telecommunications / fibre): open-access UFB fibre provider supportive of the project meeting the Fast-Track intent (delivering needed housing supply) and, specifically, of the application's telecommunications provisions — a world-class open-access fibre network embedded in the master plan giving every lot high-capacity broadband. Notes the applicant proactively engaged with Tuatahi so fibre design integrates with the scheme plan for coordinated utility installation (best practice / resource efficiency).	Infrastructure (Telecommunications / Utilities); Planning	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I7); Covering Report (P1)
8	Paul Westbury, [redacted]	Opposed / Concerns	8.1	Endorses Nicholas Brown's submission: holds the same hydrology and traffic-flow concerns set out by Mr Brown (comment 5) and formally endorses that submission. Considers the Panel should either include Mr Brown's recommended conditions or decline the development in accordance with Schedule 5, clause 17(5) of the FTAA.	Hydrology; Hazards (Flooding); Transport; Conditions; Planning	Attachment B - Flooding (F1, F5); Attachment C - Hydrology (H2); Covering Report (P3, P4)
			8.2	Scope of consultation / natural justice: concerned the Committee's determination on 'Additional land invited to comment' excludes a considerable number of properties at risk from the hydrology issues and adverse traffic effects. Submits the Panel should invite comment from all affected owners — all Paetawa Road property owners — under s.53(3) of the FTAA.	Planning; Consultation / Engagement	Covering Report (P9)
9	Hon Chris Bishop, Minister for Infrastructure	Supportive	9.1	Broad support: writing as Minister for Infrastructure, expresses broad support for projects delivering positive outcomes for New Zealand, including the Waikanae North Development. States the planning system has not been enabling of growth (hence the FTAA); asks that the letter be taken as a reflection of the Government's economic growth and infrastructure priorities.	Planning; Economics; Infrastructure (General)	Covering Report (P1)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
10	Hon Tama Potaka, Minister for Māori Development	Supportive	10.1	Support (conditional on Māori input): supports the application subject to any comments received from the relevant Māori groups identified in the MfE section 18 report and in the Expert Panel's Minute. Encourages the Panel to have regard to matters raised by Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai.	Planning; Cultural / Tangata Whenua	Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C1); Covering Report (P1, P2)
11	Kevin & Karen Baker, [redacted]	Opposed / Concerns	11.1	Lot sizes / densification disproportionate: ~1,200 lots at avg ~490m² (some <300m²) is an urban densification level inconsistent with the surrounding rural/lifestyle area. Submit minimum lot sizes should be ~1,000m² if approved.	Urban Design; Planning	Attachment I - Landscape (L3); Covering Report (P6); Attachment H - Urban Design (U1, U9)
			11.2	Earthworks breach Rural Dunes Precinct / Special Amenity Landscape (SAL): earthworks cover ~90% of non-wetland site (93 ha / 67%) destroying lower/mid dunes and retaining only ridgelines, contrary to KCDC DP intent (retain sensitive landscape, very low density, openness) and RMA SAL protection. Volumes: topsoil 139,000m³, cut 1,210,000m³, fill 1,145,000m³, peat 475,000m³. Says dune destruction is to source on-site fill / maximise lots; seek a dune-protection condition and imported fill instead.	Earthworks; Landscape; Planning	Attachment E - Earthworks (E1, E5); Attachment I - Landscape (L1, L3); Covering Report (P6, P7)
			11.3	Visual impacts understated: SA assesses low–moderate, but replacing grassland/pasture/dunes with roads, lighting, fences and dwellings is a significant adverse change both during the 10–15yr build and once complete. Seek reduced density, retention of western dunes, more open space, and early mature native planting.	Landscape; Urban Design	Attachment I - Landscape (L2, L3)
			11.4	Fresh water & wastewater capacity: relies on an uncertain future KCDC reservoir; Pekapeka neighbours are on trickle supply / self-service; WNDP adds ~5% to KCDC sewerage (higher share at Waikanae WWTP). Formative notes WNDP not contemplated in KCDC plans, so additive to Waikanae River demand. Seek a condition requiring WNDP to self-service water/wastewater like its neighbours.	Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater); Economics; Planning	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I1, I2, I3, I9); Covering Report (Ee4)
			11.5	Stormwater & flooding: site is flood-prone for 2–100yr events (SA Fig 51 shows majority of build area flood-prone). Converting free-draining sand to impervious surfaces will increase flood risk on-site and to neighbours; caution urged on densification, worsened by climate change.	Hazards (Flooding); Hydrology; Infrastructure (Stormwater)	Attachment B - Flooding (F3); Attachment C - Hydrology (H3); Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I4)
			11.6	Carbon footprint: significant construction & operational carbon with few mitigations; greenfield emissions multiples worse than infill given distance from centres. Seek carbon-neutral conditions — more green/open space & native planting for offsets, solar rooftops, and a ban on non-clean-energy heating.	Climate / Sustainability; Planning	Covering Report (P11)
			11.7	Traffic effects & speculative mitigations: ITA ~10,000 vpd vs current 1,000–2,000 (~x5 on the two local roads). The 35% Paetawa/Te Moana split 'defies logic' (shorter route via Rutherford/Te Moana). Metlink PT extension is speculative. Seek a condition that WND negotiate & build the NZTA Peka Peka south exit / north entry ramps.	Transport; Conditions	Attachment G - Transport (s4.1-s4.4)
			11.8	Economic benefits & housing supply/affordability overstated: UE report vs KCDC's Formative peer review conflict; Formative calls the sufficiency analysis 'critically flawed' (excludes <50-dwelling greenfield and unconsented planned developments). GDP $261m + $58m and 1,600 jobs equate to only ~$26m p.a. / 133 jobs p.a. (~0.05% GWRC, <1% KCDC GDP; ~0.6% jobs). 70% of dwellings ~$930k (20% above KCDC avg; 7–11x local income vs 3–5x norm). Bal Mathieson opinion (App.39) is partisan.	Economics; Planning	Covering Report (P12, Ee1, Ee2, Ee3)
			11.9	Relief sought: the SA should be declined, or significant additional conditions imposed before acceptance (reduced density, dune protection, self-serviced three-waters, carbon-neutral measures, NZTA ramps, greater native planting).	Planning; Conditions	Covering Report (P3)
12	Bryan & Debbie Edwards, [redacted]	Partial / Conditional	12.1	Property not accurately represented on plans: their 1-bed/1-bath dwelling at [redacted] does not appear accurately on the master plan (e.g. Plan 175) or consistently across other plans.	Urban Design; Planning	Attachment H - Urban Design (U3); Covering Report

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			12.2	Two-storey home height, visual & privacy effects: four 8m-high dwellings (lots 955–958) proposed directly behind their 2.14ha rural lifestyle property would affect outlook, privacy and rural character (open pasture to higher-density urban) and potentially resale value. Request the two-storey homes adjacent to [redacted] be replaced with single-level dwellings. Note they plan to build a larger home on the elevated portion near the boundary.	Urban Design; Landscape; Planning	Attachment H - Urban Design (U3, U9); Attachment I - Landscape (L3)
			12.3	Compensation for loss of rural outlook / value: asks whether any compensation has been considered for neighbouring rural-lifestyle owners experiencing loss of outlook and potential property-value impacts.	Planning	Covering Report (P10)
			12.4	Construction impacts & mitigation: property ~100m from construction; asks whether a house-washing service will be provided for dust/earthworks-affected properties, and what compensation/mitigation is proposed for directly impacted neighbours.	Earthworks; Noise; Planning	Attachment E - Earthworks (E3)
			12.5	Land Parcel 5124 & boundary setbacks: queries the purpose of Parcel 5124 and whether structures are proposed there; and seeks confirmation of the setback distance between the rear boundary and new dwellings (understood to be ~6–10m in the rural residential zone).	Urban Design; Planning	Attachment H - Urban Design (U4); Attachment I - Landscape (L3)
			12.6	Challenge to 'character will change' assumption: disputes the planning statement that the rural-lifestyle character [redacted] cluster) will transition to a more residential nature over time, considering it an unproven assumption. Seeks the evidence / analysis / planning rationale that supports it.	Planning; Urban Design	Attachment H - Urban Design (U5, U9); Attachment I - Landscape (L3); Covering Report (P8)
			12.7	Wetland wildlife & pest control: asks what plans protect wetland wildlife from an increase in domestic pets; and requests rear boundary fencing include rabbit mesh (property has been rabbit-free ~5 years) to keep rabbits and stoats out.	Ecology; Landscape	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec3, Ec4, Ec31); Attachment I - Landscape (L4)
13	Kensington Farm Park Ltd, (Blair McCardle) — [redacted]	Partial / Conditional	13.1	Transport capacity: Peka Peka Road appears to be the only access and would be unable to cope with the traffic volume generated.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s4.1)
			13.2	Construction & topography: land is primarily peat and sand requiring major, invasive works to create building platforms — changing the nature of the land, with dominant sand dunes used to replace peat.	Geotechnical; Earthworks	Attachment D - Geotechnical (G2); Attachment E - Earthworks (E2)
			13.3	Disruption / loss of amenity: the scale means years — if not decades — of lost quiet enjoyment for existing residents unless mitigation (noise abatement, visual screening) is put in place.	Noise; Landscape; Urban Design	Attachment I - Landscape (L4, L5)
			13.4	Hydrology / ecological sensitivity: a very ecologically sensitive area; changes to watercourses and ponding effects caused by the Expressway construction have already been noted.	Hydrology; Ecology	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec9); Attachment C - Hydrology (H4, H6)
			13.5	Public Works Act offer-back / affected land: past owner of the farm to the north at 343 SH1, taken under the Public Works Act for the M2PP RONS (2013), with offer-back rights once declared surplus; states the WND has a material effect on that parcel.	Planning; Property / Legal	Covering Report (P13)
14	Jo Gilpin & John Urquhart, [redacted]	Partial / Conditional	14.1	Construction traffic & CTMP: several years of heavy-vehicle movements along the private road bordering their property. Seek clarification of daily truck movements per stage, duration, operating hours, weekend/evening restrictions, dust mitigation and maintained resident access; and request a Construction Traffic Management Plan prepared in consultation with directly affected neighbours.	Transport; Earthworks; Conditions	Attachment G - Transport (s4.8)
			14.2	Suitability & safety of existing private road as main access: seek confirmation the existing road can safely carry future volumes — width, independent road-safety audit, width for footpaths/cycle facilities, drainage, street lighting, and intersection design/safety — given it becomes the primary access to ~1,000 dwellings.	Transport; Conditions	Attachment G - Transport (s4.6)
			14.3	Permanent amenity effects of the new public road: property changes from adjoining a lightly-used private access to bordering the principal public road. Application should address traffic noise, intersection-works closures/disruption, headlight glare, street lighting, loss of privacy, visual effects, road runoff/stormwater and long-term maintenance.	Transport; Noise; Urban Design; Infrastructure (Stormwater)	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I4); Attachment H - Urban Design (U6)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			14.4	Boundary fencing & landscape screening: request conditions for new boundary fencing between the public road and adjoining private properties, designed in consultation with owners of [redacted]; early landscape planting; evergreen screening for privacy; replacement of failed planting — all installed before the road becomes operational.	Landscape; Urban Design; Conditions	Attachment H - Urban Design (U6); Attachment I - Landscape (L4)
			14.5	Road designation & future property rights: seek clarity on whether the new public road creates restrictions on future use of their property (fencing, landscaping, utilities, easements, vehicle access); whether land is required from adjoining properties for the road reserve (cycle lanes/footpaths may need more room than available); effect on legal boundary/easements/development potential; and maintenance responsibilities at the road/private interface.	Planning; Transport	Covering Report (P14)
			14.6	Utility protection & connection opportunity: their electricity connection sits within the proposed road corridor — seek protection during construction, any relocation at no cost, advance outage notice, preserved maintenance access, and accurate identification/protection of underground services. Also ask whether adjoining properties can connect to new reticulated water, wastewater, fibre and electricity upgrades.	Infrastructure (Utilities / Water / Wastewater / Telecoms); Conditions; Planning	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I6)
			14.7	Future SH1 access & cumulative effects: ask whether NZTA has considered a long-term southbound SH1 on-ramp / northbound off-ramp for growth; whether cumulative traffic from other developments (e.g. Old SH1 Waikanae) is in the modelling; and whether the proposed road layout could constrain future transport improvements.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s4.3)
			14.8	Consultation scope: concerned the owner of [redacted] did not receive an invitation to comment (they forwarded it), and that wider Peka Peka / Paetawa residents affected by traffic/construction were not directly consulted. Request confirmation that all parties entitled to comment have been identified and invited, and what wider engagement is proposed.	Planning; Consultation / Engagement	Covering Report (P9)
			14.9	Requested consent conditions: pre- and post-construction condition surveys of neighbouring properties; developer-funded repair of construction damage; CTMP; dust suppression / road cleaning; noise & vibration monitoring; advance notification of major works; consulted boundary fencing; landscape screening before road opening; protection of utility supply; a clear process for neighbours to enquire about future infrastructure connections; and a dedicated community liaison contact.	Conditions; Planning	Attachment G - Transport (s4.8); Covering Report
15	Wellington Conservation Board, (Asher Wilson-Goldman, Co-Chair)	Supportive	15.1	Support for ecological improvements: supports the proposed restoration planting of stream/wetland margins, improved floodplain-wetland hydrology & ecology, net gain in wetland extent (≥1.74ha), re-naturalisation of Ngarara Stream, lizard-habitat replacement/enhancement, and net gain in indigenous vegetation & connectivity along the dune–wetland corridor.	Ecology	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec1); Covering Report (P1)
			15.2	Pest plant & animal control (key ask): concern that an expanded road network increases invasive-predator movement. Supports the proposed control programme but asks for additional pest-animal control along roads and trails, a sustained commitment, and a recommended 20-year minimum for all pest plant & animal control; plus detail on managing domestic cats/dogs and community education.	Ecology; Conditions	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec2, Ec3, Ec31)
			15.3	Planting, wetlands & sediment control: supports the 20m wetland planting buffer and is comfortable that the net gain more than offsets the loss of 1.69ha of extant wetland. Stresses erosion & sediment control must be allowed for throughout the development's life and beyond (critical given sediment impact on wetlands), and asks how plant/seedling supply will be managed given market shortages.	Ecology; Earthworks; Conditions	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec5); Attachment E - Earthworks (E4, E7)
			15.4	Ecological connectivity beyond the site: encourages ecological corridors linking the site to Hemi Matenga Scenic Reserve, Ngā Manu Nature Reserve, and surrounding wetlands, dunes, waterways and coastal ecosystems — not planning in isolation.	Ecology	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec6)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			15.5	Fish passage & Ngarara Stream restoration: asks the applicant to work with Mana Whenua to restore mahinga kai, the mauri of the stream and traditional relationships; to extend stream restoration beyond the footprint with neighbouring landowners; and to incorporate enhanced fish passage (improved culvert design, rock ramps, natural fish pathways, wetland–stream connectivity), drawing on Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Trust examples.	Ecology; Cultural / Tangata Whenua	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec7); Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C2)
			15.6	Public/recreational access: notes 'Private Open Space' areas in addition to the two KCDC reserves. Considers reliance on the areas' private nature insufficient and expects any trail network to explicitly provide for public access.	Planning; Urban Design; Recreation	Covering Report (P15)
			15.7	Cultural impact (key ask): notes apparently positive engagement with Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai Charitable Trust and supports the applicant addressing in full the outstanding matters identified in the Interim Cultural Impact Assessment.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Planning	Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C1, C10)
			15.8	Retail / commercial activity effects: recommends conditions ensuring future commercial uses do not cause adverse effects via waste, contaminants, lighting or vehicle movements, or impacts on wetlands/waterways/indigenous species; and that long-term conditions of use keep future activities compatible with ecological objectives.	Planning; Conditions; Ecology	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec8)
16	Glynn & Jennifer Cowley, [redacted]	Opposed / Concerns	16.1	Character & landscape: consider the design more an intensified residential-urban model than something aspirational for this unique semi-rural area, imposing significant negative impacts on the sand-dune character. Cite the Building Block planning report 3.4.1.2.1 (Rural Dunes Precinct) — retain sensitive landscape/ecological character, avoid highly visible development / dune-landform change, very low density to retain openness.	Landscape; Urban Design; Planning	Attachment I - Landscape (L1, L3); Covering Report (P6, P7); Attachment H - Urban Design (U9)
			16.2	Scale of earthworks: excluding wetlands, earthworks encompass ~90% of the site — huge, disruptive, and at odds with the Rural Dunes Precinct intent; must have a negative effect on surrounding properties during construction.	Earthworks; Landscape	Attachment E - Earthworks (E1, E3); Attachment I - Landscape (L5)
			16.3	Visual impacts significant (not low/moderate): particularly where development is proposed on sand dunes on the western boundary adjacent Te Harakeke wetland — building on higher levels will have a significant adverse visual effect.	Landscape; Urban Design	Attachment I - Landscape (L2)
			16.4	Three-waters capacity & unanticipated cost: existing Waikanae/Kapiti fresh water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure lacks capacity; surrounding properties self-service (septic, stormwater, fire-fighting/potable storage). Cite the Formative report that WND is not anticipated in KCDC's infrastructure strategy and is an unanticipated development with additional unanticipated cost.	Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, Stormwater); Economics; Planning	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I1, I2, I9); Covering Report (Ee4)
			16.5	Stormwater / flood management: some properties already flood in heavy rain; significant groundworks plus increased hard surfaces in an already flood-risk zone would pose additional risk to surrounding (especially lower-lying) properties — or create a problem ratepayers must fund to resolve.	Hazards (Flooding); Hydrology; Infrastructure (Stormwater)	Attachment B - Flooding (F3); Attachment C - Hydrology (H3); Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I4)
			16.6	Economic case contestable: questions the robustness of the economic/housing case — differing opinions in the Formative and UE reports cast doubt on basic assumptions; Formative states the sufficiency analysis is critically flawed. Affordability not assured (developer sells land packages, no control over house cost/quality; more sections ≠ lower build costs). Bal Mathieson legal opinion was commissioned in support of WND and other interpretations are possible.	Economics; Planning	Covering Report (P12, Ee1, Ee3)
			16.7	Transport effects: Traffic assessment indicates up to ~8,000 vpd across Paetawa & Peka Peka Rds, almost all via the Peka Peka Rd access; impacts on Rutherford Drive–Te Moana Rd and the southbound Te Moana expressway access must be considered. No footpaths on Peka Peka Rd; both roads heavily used by cyclists and horses; a wetland walking access to the beach adds foot traffic (likely many children). Net adverse visual, noise and safety effects.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s4.1-s4.3)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			16.8	Relief & conditions sought: the substantive application must be declined as currently proposed; at the very least substantial additional conditions are required — as a minimum, condition WND to negotiate with NZTA to build a north entry / south exit at Peka Peka Rd, extend Ngarara Road to give Waikanae township access, and provide public transport.	Transport; Conditions; Planning	Attachment I - Landscape (L3); Covering Report (P3); Attachment H - Urban Design (U11)
17	Dean & Miriam Lewin, [redacted]	Opposed / Concerns	17.1	Loss of rural character & outlook (adjoining owner): property directly adjoins the site; ~1,200 sections would fundamentally transform the western outlook from open countryside to a residential subdivision with roads, houses, vehicles, lighting, noise and continual activity — a permanent, irreversible loss of the rural character and amenity that attracted them.	Landscape; Urban Design; Planning	Attachment I - Landscape (L3); Attachment H - Urban Design (U2, U9)
			17.2	Traffic effects on western boundary: currently effectively no residential traffic alongside the property; ~1,200 homes will introduce substantial daily vehicle movements bringing traffic noise, headlights, dust, vibration and disturbance through day and evening, significantly reducing peaceful enjoyment.	Transport; Noise	Attachment G - Transport (s4.6)
			17.3	Reverse sensitivity & cumulative urbanisation: proposal creates reverse-sensitivity issues between existing rural land uses and new residential development, placing ongoing pressure on neighbouring landowners and irreversibly changing the established character of the area.	Planning; Urban Design	Covering Report (P5); Attachment H - Urban Design (U2, U9)
			17.4	Privacy & visual dominance: close proximity of residential housing overlooking an open rural landscape, together with street lighting and residential activity, diminishes privacy and materially affects enjoyment of the property.	Urban Design; Landscape	Attachment I - Landscape (L3)
			17.5	Property value: consider the rural setting, outlook, privacy and tranquillity integral to market appeal, and that their loss through adjacent large-scale urban development is likely to significantly reduce property value.	Planning; Economics	Covering Report (P10)
			17.6	Construction-period effects: ask the Panel to consider cumulative impacts over the lengthy construction period, including construction traffic, dust, noise and disruption.	Earthworks; Noise; Transport	Attachment I - Landscape (L7)
			17.7	Relief sought: oppose the application in its current form as it does not adequately recognise or address effects on immediately adjoining landowners. If approval is granted, request substantially stronger conditions — wider landscape buffers, increased setbacks, effective acoustic mitigation, restrictions on lighting spill, and measures to minimise traffic and construction effects.	Conditions; Planning	Attachment E - Earthworks (E3); Attachment I - Landscape (L3, L5)
18	Ron & Jane Woodrow, [redacted]	Partial / Conditional	18.1	Amenity / departure from permitted baseline: do not oppose the development, but note the permitted baseline for the rural-zoned site would allow only low-level development adjoining their boundary, potentially unnoticed. Multiple residential dwellings along their northern boundary is a significant departure from that baseline and from the seclusion, privacy and rural values that drew them to the property — which they consider unmitigated effects on amenity, privacy and quiet enjoyment.	Planning; Urban Design	Attachment I - Landscape (L7); Attachment H - Urban Design (U9)
			18.2	No edge treatment & removal of existing vegetation: the landscape plan set (App.11 Pt 1) proposes no edge treatment between their property and the development, and (App.11 Pt 2, Existing Vegetation Plan) proposes to remove planted vegetation along the shared boundary which, if retained, would have helped mitigate effects. Seek mature mass native planting along the shared boundary, secured by a condition of consent.	Landscape; Conditions	Attachment I - Landscape (L3)
			18.3	QEII-covenanted wetland intrinsically linked to the site's wetland: their property contains a natural inland wetland protected by an Open Space Covenant under s22 QEII National Trust Act 1977. Both their wetland and the applicant's form part of Te Harakeke Swamp, a protected ecological area under the KCDC District Plan (Ecological Site K066), and their wetland's healthy functioning relies on the adjoining system remaining natural and healthy.	Ecology; Planning	Attachment I - Landscape (L3)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			18.4	Significant ecological values & species: cite DP significance of K066 (kahikatea, pukatea, toe toe, cabbage trees, manuka; second-largest harakeke flaxland and raupo reedland in the district; nationally rare wetland habitat, <8% indigenous cover in Foxton ED; Australasian bittern (Threatened–Nationally Endangered); At Risk–Declining long-fin eel, inanga, Wellington green gecko), and the contiguous K236 / Pharazyn Reserve SNA values (26 indigenous bird species, seven indigenous fish species). K236 provides open water habitat and K066 breeding, nesting and foraging land.	Ecology	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec15, Ec23)
			18.5	Edge / fringe effects on wetland ecosystem: although the applicant does not propose to reclaim the wetland, they are concerned that development close to and along its boundary will disturb the ecosystem, and that any effect on the applicant's wetland will in turn affect theirs.	Ecology; Urban Design	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec23)
			18.6	Stormwater quality effects on wetland: the level of development could adversely affect wetland water health and quality through stormwater runoff during and after construction; seek a high quality of stormwater treatment so no adverse effects arise from increased discharges.	Infrastructure (Stormwater); Ecology	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec23)
			18.7	Further ecological offset / mitigation sought: currently only wetland buffer planting is proposed (App.26 ERMP, Fig 15) in the wetland system bordering their property. Given the scale of development they consider the applicant should go further — wetland rehabilitation planting to enhance the complex — so no significant residual ecological effects remain. Conclude the proposal can be acceptable if this mitigation and offsetting is secured via appropriate conditions.	Ecology; Conditions	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec23)
19	Gail Inglis & Watutsi Trust, [redacted]	Opposed / Concerns	19.1	Rural-to-urban change & traffic environment: the development will have significant adverse effects on the Peka Peka environment, changing it from rural to urban with a substantial change to the traffic environment on both Peka Peka and Paetawa Roads.	Planning; Transport; Urban Design	Attachment I - Landscape (L1); Attachment H - Urban Design (U9)
			19.2	Ngarara Road link should be formed as part of the development (primary ask): the plan includes two unformed road links to be vested in Council, one offering a link to the unformed end of Ngarara Road. Submits that forming this link as part of the development — rather than merely enabling it later at someone else's cost — would distribute traffic effects wider across the network, which is highly desirable and should be built into the initial development.	Transport; Conditions	Attachment G - Transport (s3.1 (1.2)); Attachment H - Urban Design (U11)
			19.3	Public transport & trip generation assumptions challenged: considers the suggestion of PT servicing the development, and of lower-than-standard trip generation in this peri-urban location, 'fanciful' — especially with a single access to Peka Peka Road. The site is poorly connected to shops and services and will generate substantial trips despite the Transport Assessment.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s4.2, s4.4)
			19.4	Intersection & road widening effects on rural character: the proposed T intersection with Peka Peka Road, with right-turn lanes, will require significant localised road widening and, with increased traffic, permanently change the character of Peka Peka. Notes Peka Peka Road is a rural road frequently used by horses, pedestrians with dogs and cyclists travelling between the beach and Harrisons cafe.	Transport; Landscape; Urban Design	Attachment H - Urban Design (U9)
			19.5	Relief sought: urge minimising disruption to the Peka Peka community by distributing traffic effects and building the proposed future Ngarara Road link as part of the initial development. Alternatively, as a Government-supported fast-track proposal, relief could be provided via south-bound ramps to the Kapiti Expressway at Peka Peka — noting the quickest southbound access (dominant at peak for work and schools) is currently via Paetawa Road to the Waikanae Beach interchange.	Transport; Conditions; Planning	Attachment G - Transport (s4.1, s4.3)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
20	Hon Chris Penk, Minister for Building and Construction	Supportive	20.1	Support (housing supply & construction sector): commenting as Minister for Building and Construction, notes the proposal delivers 1,181–1,201 dwellings — a substantial increase in Kapiti Coast housing supply that would help meet demand and place downward pressure on land prices and housing costs over time. Notes the applicant's estimated average dwelling price of ~$935,000, said to be 20–30% below comparable nearby developments, which if achieved could improve access to home ownership and support affordability. Notes ~$261m contribution to construction-sector GDP and ~1,600 FTE jobs, sustaining employment and retaining critical skills. Concludes these outcomes are generally consistent with Government objectives.	Planning; Economics	Covering Report (P1, Ee4)
21	Kāpiti Coast District Council, (s53(2)(a) local authority)	Conditional / Advisory	21.1	Screening vegetation alongside walkways: provide a 'low ecological impact' design response for walkways, including planting specifications and other mechanisms to minimise disturbance to birds (e.g. educational signage along or near pathways).	Ecology	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec14); Attachment I - Landscape (L12)
			21.2	Perpetual protection of Te Harakeke Wetland: KCDC does not support deferring the protection mechanism. Allotments containing Te Harakeke (Lots 5310 and 5311) to be vested as Local Purpose (Ecological) Reserve. KCDC does not support a lesser level of protection.	Ecology; Planning; Conditions	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec15)
			21.3	ERMP Table 5 — enrichment planting of degraded wetlands (clusters 2, 4 and 5) inadequate: either update the ERMP to include monitoring of the proposed 'nodes' of indigenous enrichment planting with minimum thresholds over the monitoring period (e.g. nodes progressively increase in extent by ≥20%), or require all exotic-dominated wetlands to be revegetated with indigenous plants.	Ecology	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec16)
			21.4	ERMP Table 18 to be re-titled, reviewed and updated: re-title as a full schedule/timetable of tasks and review for completeness (e.g. pest monitoring not currently listed). Schedule a review period to assess whether adaptive management thresholds are triggered for wetland features and that all ERMP aspects are on track well ahead of compliance certification.	Ecology	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec17)
			21.5	Absence of hydrogeological assessment by a suitably qualified person: limited groundwater data means conclusions rest largely on expected groundwater behaviour rather than site-specific monitoring or quantitative modelling. A robust analysis, including development of a groundwater model, is recommended for a development of this scale.	Hydrology; Hazards (Flooding)	Attachment C - Hydrology (H7)
			21.6	Effects on Te Harakeke Wetland and adjacent properties: KCDC accepts wetland levels are naturally variable and influenced by downstream drainage (Black Drain conveyance), but is concerned the development should not exacerbate an existing problem. The monitoring period is short and does not capture inter-annual variability including wetter years. The applicant's adaptive management approach (a further 5–6 years of monitoring before western zone development) is beneficial but does not fully resolve the concern — residual uncertainty remains. Clearly explain what control measures prevent Te Harakeke receiving too much water from stormwater discharges and groundwater inflow, which may then inundate properties to the west.	Hydrology; Hazards (Flooding); Ecology; Infrastructure (Stormwater)	Attachment C - Hydrology (H8)
			21.7	Ownership and maintenance of stormwater assets: update the Stormwater Management Plan to clearly articulate design objectives for assets to be designed as low-maintenance systems with appropriate maintenance access, and ensure long-term maintenance, operation and renewal obligations for assets vesting in Council are clearly defined, practical and consistent with Council's maintenance approach.	Infrastructure (Stormwater); Conditions	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I12)
			21.8	Stormwater network design feasibility: provide an indicative stormwater network layout demonstrating a practicable design solution can be achieved across the site, particularly within the low-lying eastern portions of the development area.	Infrastructure (Stormwater)	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I13)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			21.9	Minimum building floor levels: KCDC's preference is that minimum floor levels be explicitly defined through the consenting process rather than at building consent / engineering approval — providing certainty and preventing later earthworks that could alter overland flow paths, reduce flood storage or increase flood hazard on neighbouring properties. Provide suitably worded consent conditions.	Hazards (Flooding); Conditions	Attachment B - Flooding (F10)
			21.10	Clarity of the Stormwater Management Plan: correct the inconsistencies flagged and outline implementation procedures.	Infrastructure (Stormwater)	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I12)
			21.11	Stormwater Impact Assessment report and macro stormwater modelling: provide the Awa report for review.	Infrastructure (Stormwater); Hydrology	Attachment B - Flooding (F11)
			21.12	Ownership of Te Harakeke Wetland: to offset adverse effects on the natural environment and provide adequate public open space, the Te Harakeke Wetland (Lots 5310 and 5311) should vest to Council as Local Purpose (Ecological) Reserve for on-going management and perpetual protection. Te Harakeke is a Schedule A3 wetland (outstanding indigenous biodiversity values) in the GWRC Natural Resources Plan, meeting all three criteria; with <3% of wetlands remaining regionally, KCDC considers it must be managed by a public organisation rather than a residents' group.	Ecology; Recreation / Public Access; Planning	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec15); Covering Report (P19)
			21.13	Vesting of the walkway through Te Harakeke Wetland: a new walkway would increase disturbance within the wetland. KCDC is not opposed to the idea but would only accept ownership if the entire natural wetland extent is in Council ownership. Update scheme plans to reflect that Council does not accept vesting of Lot 5003 unless Lots 5310 and 5311 vest as Local Purpose (Ecological) Reserve. KCDC also considers current open space provision inadequate given the development's intensity and uncertainty over the future status of 'private open space'.	Recreation / Public Access; Ecology; Planning	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec15); Covering Report (P19)
			21.14	Taking of land in lieu of financial contributions: proposed Condition 6 suggests a credit against financial contributions for parcels vesting in Council. KCDC can only accept land in lieu where vested for open space and environmental purposes — not stormwater or other utilities. Only Lots 5310, 5311, 5314, 5400 and 5402 would be eligible; Lots 5000–5006, 5100–5124 and 5200–5204 are not, and no credit will apply.	Planning; Conditions; Economics	Covering Report (P19)
			21.15	Design-led interface measures: further consideration required as to whether setbacks, density reduction or transition lots are needed at the most sensitive rural/rural-lifestyle boundaries — e.g. the northeastern edge (proposed lots 837–845 and 846–853) and the southern edge near End Farm Road (lots 204–211).	Landscape; Urban Design; Planning	Attachment I - Landscape (L7); Attachment H - Urban Design (U8, U9)
			21.16	Rural interface planting: the rural interface response remains partly reliant on planting, so conditions should secure the 5m interface buffer, planting density, species, minimum screening height, timing, maintenance and replacement requirements.	Landscape; Conditions	Attachment I - Landscape (L6)
			21.17	Controls for cut faces and batters: conditions required covering maximum steepness, plantability, and a limit on unplanted cut faces (suggested below 1.5m).	Landscape; Earthworks; Conditions	Attachment I - Landscape (L8)
			21.18	Retaining wall assumptions: confirm through revised conditions the commitment that retaining structures can be limited to 1m or less.	Landscape; Earthworks; Conditions	Attachment I - Landscape (L9)
			21.19	Landscape Management Plan: an LMP condition is still required with clear performance standards, implementation timing, maintenance, monitoring and replacement obligations. The relationship between the LMP and the Ecological Restoration Management Plan needs clarifying to avoid duplication or gaps.	Landscape; Ecology; Conditions	Attachment I - Landscape (L10)
			21.20	Updated proposed consent conditions (landscape): conditions required to capture the proposed 5m setback for prominent dune-top lots, the 4.5m height restriction, buffer planting requirements, cut face controls and the LMP requirement.	Landscape; Conditions	Attachment I - Landscape (L10)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			21.21	Privacy effects of ground floor apartment units: update the Urban Design Assessment to clarify the design approach mitigating privacy effects of ground floor apartment units adopting the 1.8m / 8m² balcony standards, so there can be confidence this will not result in adverse privacy effects for those units.	Urban Design	Attachment H - Urban Design (U7)
			21.22	Neighbouring effects at the rural/urban interface: increase the lot size of boundary lots (proposed lots 837–845 and 846–853 along the northern boundary, and lots 204–211 near End Farm Road on the southern boundary) to provide a clearer and more appropriate transition between adjacent rural properties and the boundary lots on the site.	Urban Design; Planning	Attachment I - Landscape (L7); Attachment H - Urban Design (U8, U9)
			21.23	Trip rates used in the ITA are not worst case: contrary to GWRC and KCDC policies the site does not provide active mode and public transport connectivity (a view GWRC supports); the nearest bus stop is ~870m (10.5 min walk) from where the connection meets the expressway shared path, with the furthest part of the development ~2.9km (35 min) away, and the town centre ~4km. Assumptions used in the ITA require agreement to enable impacts to be assessed.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s3.1 (1.1))
			21.24	Future local road network connections: lack of detail and clarity regarding potential future connections to Ngarara Road, Kensington Drive, and the potential road links to the south and west of the site.	Transport; Conditions	Attachment G - Transport (s3.1 (1.2)); Attachment H - Urban Design (U11)
			21.25	Expressway / Te Moana Road SIDRA assessment and methodology not agreed: visibility over the applicant's modelling has been hampered (traffic modeller overseas). The results presented — which are not considered worst case — appear to result in an unacceptable level of service at the Te Moana Road / SH1 interchange. This must be worked through at the earliest opportunity so impacts can be understood, assessed and practicable resolutions devised.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s3.1 (1.3))
			21.26	Access to the 7 lots from 107 Paetawa Road: further design and layout details required so the effects can be assessed.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s3.1 (1.4))
			21.27	Proposed internal active mode connection to Paetawa Road: further details required.	Transport; Urban Design	Attachment G - Transport (s3.1 (1.5))
			21.28	Peka Peka Road site access drawing: update the drawing to take into account KCDC's proposal for cycle lanes on Peka Peka Road (KCDC is about to construct cycling safety improvements involving seal and lane widening at the site access point under its LTP).	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s3.1 (1.6))
			21.29	Te Moana Road carrying capacity: an explanation of how this has been calculated has been requested, along with details of the traffic flows used.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s3.1 (1.7))
			21.30	Water network capacity and design: complete hydraulic modelling of internal and external network impacts including pressure, fire flow, water age, pipe sizing, reservoir assumptions and staging effects. KCDC also seeks written agreement from the applicant to Council procuring the required water and wastewater hydraulic modelling at the developer's cost.	Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, Stormwater)	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I8)
			21.31	Wastewater capacity and timing: complete updated cumulative wastewater modelling for the Waikanae North catchment and confirm the timing and scope of required upgrades before any connection is authorised. Provide revised infrastructure reports addressing updated wastewater design flow, peak factor, pump station design basis, storage sizing, rising main design, network clearances and constructability.	Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, Stormwater)	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I9)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			21.32	Critical wastewater enabling infrastructure: confirm commissioning requirements for the duplicate rising main from Rauparaha Pump Station to Paraparaumu WWTP, the Waikanae Pond Pump Station upgrade, the Rauparaha Pump Station upgrade, and any rising main upgrade between Waikanae Pond and Rauparaha. KCDC seeks draft conditions preventing premature connection to constrained wastewater infrastructure and requiring detailed design certification before construction.	Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, Stormwater); Conditions	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I9)
			21.33	Internal wastewater network and pump stations: provide preliminary design reports for both wastewater pump stations, rising mains, emergency storage, total head, pump duty, staged upgrades, odour control, corrosion protection, access and ownership arrangements. Where staged pump capacity is proposed, KCDC requires a development agreement or equivalent to secure the full cost of future pump upgrades (including inflation allowance) before vesting or connection.	Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, Stormwater); Conditions	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I10)
			21.34	Construction and resilience: provide detailed design information for trenchless installation, crossing locations, service clearances, geotechnical hazards, high groundwater, liquefaction, flooding, ponding and quality assurance controls.	Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, Stormwater); Geotechnical	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I10)
			21.35	107 Paetawa Road lots (servicing): provide on-site wastewater disposal design information, confirm GWRC consent status, and confirm firefighting compliance for the seven-lot subdivision component.	Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, Stormwater)	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I11)
			21.36	Earthworks feasibility: provide earthworks feasibility information including representative/constrained earthworks sections, peat management basis, and conditions for detailed geotechnical assessment, engineered fill specification, independent peer review and staged completion reporting — to be addressed in principle at consenting stage rather than deferred to detailed design.	Earthworks; Geotechnical; Conditions	Attachment E - Earthworks (E6)
			21.37	Geotechnical trenching: provide a geotechnical trenching assessment and recommendations addressing trench stability, bedding, backfill, temporary support, groundwater control, reinstatement, settlement risk, and works near wetlands, streams, roads and existing services.	Geotechnical; Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, Stormwater)	Attachment D - Geotechnical (G3)
22	Bradley & Lucas families, [redacted]	Supportive	22.1	Support: owners of 55 End Farm Road (Lot 6 DP 87994). As an immediate neighbour, supportive of the scheme layout and the proposed boundary activities including earthworks and landscaping.	Urban Design; Earthworks; Landscape	Covering Report (P1)
23	QEII National Trust, (Daniel Bradfield)	Conditional / Concerns	23.1	Sedimentation into the QEII-owned portion of Te Harakeke Swamp: QEII understands a phase-specific ESCP will be certified by Council before each earthworks phase. Asks that, in certifying any ESCP, Council ensures sedimentation levels in the QEII-owned portion of the swamp are not detrimental to wetland health and are not diminishing its open space values, and that each ESCP's objectives are being met as the project progresses.	Earthworks; Ecology; Conditions	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec24)
			23.2	Water levels and dewatering: activities will temporarily change groundwater levels, and dewatering associated with peat removal may affect groundwater near wetlands. QEII encourages the Panel to consider whether the duration of any water level change is short enough not to have a detrimental effect on Te Harakeke Swamp.	Hydrology; Ecology	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec24)
			23.3	Stormwater discharge sufficiency: notes the SMP treats to the water quality volume equivalent to one third of a 50% AEP event (ARC TP10 / GWRC WSD best practice) with further measures for >10-year ARI events. Encourages the Panel to consider whether these measures are sufficient given expected increases in weather event severity. Direct discharges into Te Harakeke can poison freshwater life, smother plant life with sediment, increase turbidity affecting fauna feeding, disrupt water chemistry and temperature, and destroy habitats; sustained high water levels can cause die-back of species not suited to inundation. Also flags the indirect effect that if high water levels put neighbouring properties at risk, subsequent actions to lower levels can cause equally catastrophic long-term ecological damage.	Infrastructure (Stormwater); Ecology; Hazards (Flooding)	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec24)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			23.4	Buffer planting must be eco-sourced and appropriate: notes the cross-reference to AEE section 4.2.2.8 appears not to exist (ERMP section 5.4 sets out wetland restoration; no enhancement planting is proposed within Te Harakeke as it is already native-dominated, with buffer planting and pest plant control most critical). Accepting this, QEII asks the Panel to ensure planting in buffer areas surrounding Te Harakeke uses eco-sourced species appropriate to the wetland and wider ecological district, since those species will spread into the QEII-owned part of the swamp.	Ecology; Landscape	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec24)
			23.5	Pest plant and animal control insufficiently specific: ERMP language is general and leaves wide discretion to contractors, with no objective measures to later determine whether the required level of control has been achieved. Mustelid control is not addressed (presence only monitored). Weed control references relate only to the revegetation programme, yet environmental weeds elsewhere on site will persist and spread to neighbours — existing wetland areas are heavily infested with pampas grass (Cortaderia selloana), which produces millions of seeds per plant and needs repeated control to eradicate.	Ecology; Conditions	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec25)
			23.6	Lizard release area pest control duration: understands pest animal control will run 10 years across the 5.8ha lizard release area per the Lizard Management Plan. Given the slow breeding ecology of New Zealand lizards, QEII encourages the Panel to consider whether 10 years is sufficient and suggests 35 years would be more appropriate.	Ecology; Conditions	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec25)
			23.7	Domestic cat and dog management: supports securing cat/dog control by conditions enforced through subdivision covenants, provided they are fit for purpose. Of the three cat management options in the ERMP, QEII prefers a blend securing the highest level of protection. Considers the proposed pet control boundary fence unlikely to be fully effective given its incomplete perimeter (subdivision–wetland interface only) and the wide hunting ranges of unneutered tom cats and feral cats; suggests the high installation and maintenance cost would be better invested in comprehensive enduring pest animal control plus subdivision covenants precluding outdoor domestic cats.	Ecology; Conditions	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec25, Ec31)
			23.8	Long-term protection / future ownership of Te Harakeke: notes the applicant proposes to retain ownership with future options being vesting in Council, ownership by Iwi, or a Residents Association. QEII encourages the Panel to consider which option delivers the best long-term ecological outcomes and states its preference for vesting in the Council or ownership by Iwi.	Ecology; Planning; Recreation / Public Access	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec26)
24	Greater Wellington Regional Council, (s53(2)(a) local authority)	Conditional / Advisory	24.1	Wetland loss and offsetting — not like-for-like: four wetlands (W3, W5, W9, W10) and parts of others associated with the Ngarara Stream (W6, W2.1, W16, W17, W18) totalling 16,852m² are proposed to be reclaimed. GWRC accepts the offsetting package is sufficient to achieve a net gain, but considers it is not like-for-like: Wetlands 3 and 5 are dune-impounded fens whereas the proposed offset wetlands on the Ngarara floodplain are swamp wetlands, so they constitute compensation rather than offset. Hydrologically the reclaimed wetlands are largely rainfall/groundwater fed while the offsets are riverine — again not like-for-like. Under NRP Policy P31 compensation should only be provided where offsetting is not possible. GWRC also notes wetland reclamation is a prohibited activity under Provision 53 of the NES-F, for which the NRP/RPS framework does not anticipate consent being granted.	Ecology; Planning	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec18)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			24.2	Functional need & effects management hierarchy for stream reclamation: the application seeks consent under NES-F Provision 57 to reclaim part of the Ngarara Stream bed but does not consider whether there is a functional need for the reclamation in that location, nor clearly demonstrate how the effects management hierarchy has been applied. Reg 57(2) NES-F permits consent only if the authority is satisfied on both counts; NPS-FM Policy 7 and NRP Policy P110 also apply.	Ecology; Planning	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec19)
			24.3	Classification of watercourses — disagreement: GWRC considers the ~3km network of watercourses/tributaries connected to the Ngarara Stream, though highly modified, meets the RMA definition of 'river' (per GWRC's Watercourse Types Guidance Note May 2021 — watercourses constructed to drain historic wetlands are the modified form of those waterbodies; also mapped as highly modified streams in GWRC's 2013 exercise for NRP Rules R134–R136). The applicant, on legal and ecological advice, considers they are not rivers, does not treat their loss as reclamation, does not seek consent, and offers no mitigation package beyond fauna relocation. GWRC considers consent is required under NES-F Reg 57 and NRP Rule R142.	Ecology; Planning; Property / Legal	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec20)
			24.4	Stream Ecological Value (SEV) — post-development calculation not supplied: an SEV defines the current value of the Ngarara Stream and its two largest tributaries, but no post-development SEV has been provided to determine expected restoration/offsetting outcomes. GWRC agrees a net gain in stream area and habitat quality can be achieved, but considers a post-development SEV would provide a clear restoration target. GWRC also considers an SEV assessment should be carried out across the disputed watercourses (issue 22.3) to determine residual effects.	Ecology	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec21)
			24.5	Hydrology — information gaps for a development of this scale: the assessment provides useful context (~10 months of groundwater monitoring, hydrogeological cross-sections) but is missing: (a) transient (daily/7-day timestep) hydrological or hydrogeological models; (b) local climate change simulations; (c) Ngarara Stream level monitoring correlated with rainfall events and seasonal inundation frequency; and (d) resolution of remaining uncertainty on groundwater levels and wetland hydrology. GWRC considers this likely manageable via conditions requiring extensive monitoring (continuous pressure transducers rather than monthly readings, before/during/after development) integrated into a sound adaptive management framework with hydrological triggers. Further detail also sought on outcomes if the Ngarara streambed level rises over time from sediment deposition and the flatter gradient behind the proposed weir.	Hydrology; Ecology	Attachment C - Hydrology (H7, H9)
			24.6	Stormwater discharge — consistency with NRP Policy P83(e) not demonstrated: the receiving environment is a wetland system. Treatment devices must sit at an appropriate height above a design seasonally high groundwater level, but GWRC understands the hydrology assessments to date are insufficient to establish that level. The approach is generally consistent with P83(a)–(c), but without the hydrological information it is uncertain whether it is consistent with P83(e) (managing localised effects appropriate to the receiving environment). Key uncertainties: balance of surface vs subsurface flow to maintain wetland soil moisture; flow rates/durations needed to maintain post-development wetland hydrology; and response triggers if restored wetlands do not achieve the required hydrological state.	Infrastructure (Stormwater); Hydrology; Ecology	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I14)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			24.7	Vesting of stormwater infrastructure — KCDC in-principle approval not confirmed: the applicant proposes to vest on-site stormwater with a third party and has discussed this with KCDC, but the application does not confirm KCDC in-principle acceptance of the proposed treatment methodologies and devices. KCDC prefers passive non-proprietary devices whereas the proposal includes proprietary systems where groundwater constrains locations; discharge to kerb has also not been accepted. GWRC does not regard pre-application discussions as formal acceptance and warns a 15-year staged development risks consenting an approach the eventual asset owner cannot operate or maintain.	Infrastructure (Stormwater); Planning; Conditions	Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I15)
			24.8	Erosion and sediment control: ~1.2M m³ cut and 1.1M m³ fill over 93ha. The Draft CEMP and ESCP provide overarching principles but not the level of detail required to demonstrate effects will be suitably managed; GWRC nonetheless sees no apparent reason controls could not be designed, installed and maintained to its regional guide, and considers effects can be managed by conditions.	Earthworks; Infrastructure (Stormwater); Conditions	Attachment E - Earthworks (E7)
			24.9	Flooding effects: egress from several properties is affected in smaller, more frequent events as well as the 1% AEP event; flood depths >0.5m may prevent emergency vehicles reaching parts of the development, and further assessment is needed on whether people could safely walk or drive through inundated areas. The double-barrel culvert at the downstream end of the Lower Ngarara Wetland Cluster (modelled with 50% blockage for sediment) needs further consideration at detailed design, testing both sediment and debris accumulation. It is unclear which climate scenarios and emissions pathway Awa's modelling used — Awa projects to a 2130 horizon whereas Landlink's stormwater assessment extends only to 2090. Sensitivity testing is sought for culvert/outlet blockage, hydraulic roughness and elevated groundwater coinciding with rainfall. Maintenance requirements (incl. design life) for the proposed flood protection infrastructure are not provided.	Hazards (Flooding); Infrastructure (Stormwater)	Attachment B - Flooding (F6, F7, F8, F9)
			24.10	Regional and public transport: the site is not served by existing amenities or bus services and is well beyond a walkable catchment for the existing low-frequency routes serving Peka Peka. The development will generate substantial additional traffic on local roads and increase pressure on park-and-ride capacity at Waikanae Station. GWRC is concerned the application creates an expectation the development may be serviced by a bus service in the absence of adequate infrastructure or funding for one.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s3.3)
			24.11	Other matter — on-going protection for ecological offset sites: GWRC's priority is that areas identified as ecological offsets are protected for that purpose in perpetuity. Consistent with NRP Policy P31 and Schedule G2, it seeks demonstration that management, legal (e.g. covenants) and financial (e.g. bonds) arrangements are in place so positive effects endure as long as the residual adverse effects, and preferably in perpetuity.	Ecology; Conditions; Property / Legal	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec22)
			24.12	Other matter — Te Harakeke Swamp vesting: GWRC's priority is that the ecological and hydrological characteristics of Te Harakeke wetland are protected in perpetuity, and considers vesting Lots 5310, 5311 and 5314 to KCDC as Local Purpose (Ecological) Reserve achieves this and secures an appropriate level of publicly accessible open space.	Ecology; Recreation / Public Access; Planning	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec15)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			24.13	Other matter — proposed consent conditions feedback (provided to the applicant 18 June 2026): condition set should state the environmental outcomes sought for streams and wetlands; use a front-page table mapping conditions to the specific consents they relate to (e.g. wetland reclamation, earthworks); confirm whether mana whenua have given feedback on the Tīmatanga ceremony, Kaitiaki Monitoring Strategy and other conditions requiring their input; introduce conditions placing an upper limit on allowable wetland and stream reclamation (GWRC has had significant compliance issues on other wetland consents lacking this); and note conditions cannot be placed on third parties such as KCDC — once consents transfer, all conditions become the new holder's responsibility. A tracked-changes version of Appendix 33 is provided as GWRC Appendix 1.	Conditions; Planning; Cultural / Tangata Whenua	Covering Report (s8, Table 2)
25	Hon James Meager, Associate Minister of Transport	Supportive	25.1	Support: commenting as Associate Minister of Transport. Expressly states he has not considered the impact of the proposal on the local transport network, but is pleased the applicant is working with NZTA and the local and regional councils to ensure those matters are properly considered, noting those organisations have also been invited to comment. Notes his support for the project to receive the substantive approvals it requires.	Planning; Transport	Covering Report (P1)
26	Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai, Charitable Trust (mana whenua)	Unable to support as presented	26.1	Overall position — unable to support at this time: the Trust has worked with WNDL for more than four years and acknowledges the applicant's willingness to discuss concerns and the significant efforts of both parties. However, the Trust remains concerned that the cultural impacts raised during engagement are not well understood and remain unresolved, and is therefore unable to support the application as presented. Further engagement is considered necessary. The Trust has sighted advance copies of the KCDC and GWRC comments and agrees with their preliminary views.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Planning	Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C4, C14, C16)
			26.2	CIA effect 1 — mauri of waterways and stormwater: potential impacts of the land use change on the mauri of waterways in the area, and the need to protect taonga through appropriate stormwater management. The use of constructed wetlands is strongly supported, provided they are designed to the necessary specifications to manage the stormwater volume and that this use does not conflict with other ecological and abundance goals.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Infrastructure (Stormwater); Ecology	Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (s3); Attachment C - Hydrology; Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater
			26.3	CIA effect 2 — relationship with the whenua: the development could further alienate whānau from their cultural landscape, which has been under significant stress for generations. An important foundation is finding opportunities to strengthen connections to the whenua and restore systems so that cultural practices can also be restored.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua	Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C12, C13, C15)
			26.4	CIA effect 3 — cultural landscape and collective memory: impacts on the cultural landscape from large-scale urbanisation. It is critical that collective memory endures through publicly visible acknowledgement in the landscape of the long-standing history and connection of Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai to the area.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Urban Design; Landscape	Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C15)
			26.5	CIA effect 4 — kaitiaki role: urban development has deteriorated food webs and ecosystem function. It is vital to ensure an ongoing role for the Trust as kaitiaki, exercising customary practices including manaakitanga, working toward a landscape where abundance is recovered within the rohe.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Ecology; Conditions	Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C6)
			26.6	CIA effect 5 — wāhi taonga and wairua: potential for disturbance of taonga or tūpuna during the 10+ year construction phase and beyond as the community develops and interacts with the landscape. It is critically important that the frameworks for site development (largely via management plans) and oversight of public spaces and significant natural areas are codified to provide the highest level of certainty for whānau.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Archaeology; Conditions	Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C15); Covering Report (A2)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			26.7	Title transfer of ecologically/culturally sensitive open space (primary ask): the Trust's priority is securing perpetual protection of the wetlands and open space. It sees two overarching elements as critical. The first is recognition of the mana held for the whenua, delivered in part through transfer of title of areas of open space with sensitive ecological and cultural values — title should be with Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai. The Trust states this does not marginalise the stakeholder community, whose interests (along with council and future resident interests) can be addressed through appropriate governance arrangements. Neither issue is presently addressed.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Planning; Property / Legal; Ecology	Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C5, C12)
			26.8	Meaningful kaitiaki role in restoration and management (second overarching element): ensure a meaningful kaitiaki role in the restoration and future management of public open spaces and sites of significance, alongside key stakeholder agencies and community representatives. The Trust recognises the ambitious effects management package for wetland restoration, open space and sites of ecological and cultural significance, and supports the programme for maintaining and enhancing those values, while noting the Panel must satisfy itself these values are provided for long term. Structures and institutional arrangements will change through time, but Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai will remain.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Ecology; Conditions	Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C6)
			26.9	Process requests to the Panel: (a) seek the Panel's support for KCDC and GWRC to participate in discussions on the matters raised in the CIA; (b) respectfully request the Panel's support and direction to facilitate engagement and conclude a satisfactory set of conditions reflecting Te Ātiawa values; and (c) request the Panel consider facilitated conferencing and/or an opportunity for the Trust to present directly to the Panel on unresolved matters when setting directions. The Trust also sees significant value in both councils participating in caucusing on the CIA values.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Planning	Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C7)
			26.10	Wider context concern: the Trust's position is consistent with its view that medium and high density housing development on the Kapiti Coast presents significant risks to the community and taiao. The form and intensity is often at odds with the character and capacity of the taiao to absorb impacts, and important issues are tending to be left to future decision processes (e.g. capacity to manage wastewater across the Kapiti Coast). The Trust considers the current application and those following it have a high degree of 'ad-hockery'; if the challenges are not addressed in the decision, compounding impacts will follow that will be increasingly unable to be mitigated.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Planning; Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, Stormwater)	Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C8)
27	Heritage New Zealand, Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT)	Conditional / Advisory	27.1	Archaeological authority required regardless of consent outcome: no archaeological authority application is included in the substantive application and there are no listed heritage places in the project area; the applicant acknowledges (s5.9) the authority will be sought outside the Fast-track process. HNZPT re-iterates the archaeologist's key finding that there are 21 recorded archaeological sites within the development area, the majority of which will be impacted by the proposed cut and fill earthworks, with a high likelihood of unrecorded sites below ground in the sand dune landscape. HNZPT confirms an archaeological authority must be applied for and granted before any works commence, regardless of whether the resource consents are granted.	Archaeology; Planning	Covering Report (A1)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			27.2	Recommends removal of draft conditions 11 and 12: HNZPT has reviewed the GWRC conditions in Appendix 33 and considers conditions 11 and 12 (Discovery of Artefacts / accidental discovery protocol and resumption of works) duplicate conditions that will be imposed as part of the archaeological authority — both as specific conditions and via the requirement to act in accordance with the approved Archaeological Management Plan for the authority's duration. The authority, if granted, will include conditions ensuring works are culturally appropriate, mitigate adverse effects on archaeological values, allow information to be recorded and accessible, and can be monitored for compliance, including kōiwi and taonga discovery protocols.	Archaeology; Conditions	Covering Report (A2)
28	NZ Transport Agency, Waka Kotahi (NZTA)	Conditional / Information sought	28.1	Modelling information required before the Panel determines the application: NZTA is not yet able to confirm that transport effects on the Te Moana Road / SH1 interchange have been adequately assessed or can be appropriately managed. It requests the following be obtained and made available to NZTA for review: confirmation the base SIDRA model has been appropriately calibrated and validated; confirmation of the adopted trip-generation rate based on 85th percentile rates for the surveyed Upper Hutt locations; the electronic SIDRA model files (or equivalent enabling independent reproduction and testing); the basis for saturation-flow, cycle-time and phase-sequence assumptions with sensitivity testing; the land-use yield, staging and road-connection assumptions for Ngārara represented in KTM4 including the position assumed by 2036; a cumulative scenario applying consistent land-use, trip-generation and route-assignment assumptions across Waikanae North, Proposed Private Plan Change 5, Ngārara and other consented/committed growth; an explanation of the counterintuitive changes in traffic demand and queues when Waikanae North is added; and identification of any feasible interchange mitigation and appropriate development triggers.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s3.2 (2.1-2.8))
			28.2	Conditions sought if a condition-based pathway is appropriate: NZTA recognises the limited opportunities for input under the fast-track process and supports clear, measurable and enforceable conditions where effects are sufficiently understood. If updated modelling confirms a condition-based pathway, NZTA requests conditions providing for: baseline and ongoing monitoring of interchange performance; updated cumulative modelling at defined development stages; objective performance thresholds and development triggers; implementation of any required mitigation (or an enforceable mechanism securing it) before development proceeds beyond the applicable trigger; and a workable mechanism securing the consent holder's proportionate responsibility where an interchange improvement responds to the cumulative effects of more than one development.	Transport; Conditions	Attachment G - Transport (s3.2); Covering Report (s8)
			28.3	Stormwater neutrality and flooding on State Highway assets — addressed in principle: the applicant has confirmed stormwater neutrality will be achieved and the development will not cause flooding effects on State Highway assets. NZTA considers these matters addressed in principle, subject to conditions requiring hydraulic neutrality for each relevant stage and final design verification that the development will not increase flood levels or adversely affect the capacity, function, operation or maintenance of NZTA drainage assets or NZTA's consented discharges.	Infrastructure (Stormwater); Hazards (Flooding); Conditions	Attachment B - Flooding; Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater
			28.4	Covenants for reverse sensitivity and dwelling-number limitations: the applicant has confirmed existing covenants benefiting NZTA will be carried forward to the relevant new titles, and that covenants and/or consent notices addressing reverse sensitivity and dwelling-number limitations will be registered against the relevant new titles. NZTA seeks conditions requiring those instruments to be approved and registered before s224(c) certification for each relevant stage, and to provide equivalent and enduring protection.	Planning; Conditions; Property / Legal	Covering Report

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			28.5	Boundary fencing to the State Highway corridor: the applicant has confirmed all properties adjoining the corridor will be fenced. NZTA seeks conditions requiring a continuous boundary fence installed before s224(c) certification for each relevant stage, with no unauthorised gates or access to the corridor, maintained from private land at the consent holder's or landowners' cost.	Transport; Conditions	Attachment G - Transport (s3.2)
			28.6	Separate NZTA approvals required outside the consent: any State Highway effects mitigation affecting or changing assets within the SH1 designation requires NZTA's separate written approval under s176(1)(b) RMA — including the proposed connections to the shared walking and cycling path and any infrastructure crossings beneath or otherwise affecting the Expressway designation. Detailed design must be approved to NZTA standards before the relevant works commence (though not necessarily completed at the time consents are granted), as new or altered State Highway assets will ultimately vest in NZTA. Where mitigation alters or establishes access to/from SH1 as a limited access road, approval under s93 of the Government Roading Powers Act 1989 is also required — without it, legal access may not exist. All mitigation works within the corridor must be delivered under a legal development agreement and the applicable Corridor Access Request, Works Access Permit and temporary traffic management approval processes, managed by an NZTA project manager.	Transport; Planning; Property / Legal	Attachment G - Transport (s3.2); Covering Report
29	Transpower New Zealand Ltd, (Andy Eccleshall)	Conditional / Information sought	29.1	Effects on National Grid not adequately identified or assessed: the Bunnythorpe–Haywards A and B (BPE-HAY-A / BPE-HAY-B) 220kV National Grid transmission lines traverse the eastern portion of the site, supported by towers BPE-HAY-A0244–A0246 and B0230–B0231. The lines are not designated; Transpower relies on NPS-EN Policies 11 and 12 for protection. Despite pre-lodgement advice (from late 2024 through 2025–26), Transpower considers several matters remain unresolved and the application does not adequately identify or assess potential effects on National Grid assets.	Infrastructure (Telecommunications / Utilities); Planning	Attachment J - National Grid (s4)
			29.2	Flooding effects on National Grid support structures — consent should not be granted without this: Transpower's key concern is the absence of any assessment of flooding effects on the integrity and stability of the tower foundations. Converting the site from rural to urbanised will increase impervious surfaces, modify runoff, realign streams and establish wetlands and stormwater areas within the National Grid Yard corridor, potentially altering floodwater depths, ponding duration and surface flow near the towers. From Appendix 20 Transpower cannot determine the predicted change in flood levels at the structures (the towers are not shown on the Existing/Design Situation Peak Depth figures, and the assessment does not address National Grid infrastructure), nor the effect on depth, duration and frequency of ponding. Increased ponding may affect foundation performance through hydraulic loading, prolonged saturation or accelerated corrosion — potentially requiring enhanced corrosion protection, foundation strengthening or raised plinth levels.	Hazards (Flooding); Infrastructure (Telecommunications / Utilities); Geotechnical	Attachment J - National Grid (s4); Attachment B - Flooding
			29.3	Ground-to-conductor clearance non-compliance (unresolved from pre-lodgement): changes to ground level (roads, reserve earthworks, wetlands, stormwater basins) may reduce conductor-to-ground separation below the NZECP34:2001 requirement of 7.5m plus Transpower's 0.5m tolerance (8m total). Transpower's pre-lodgement clearance assessment found the road south of the dog park (proposed Lot 4049) will not comply and requested it be lowered by at least 0.4m; this does not appear to have been addressed in the substantive application and remains outstanding. Transpower requests new land use Condition 14a. No fill may be stockpiled or deposited so as to infringe clearances, and Transpower does not support stockpiling or equipment storage beneath the lines or within 12m of any support structure (requested Condition 14b), plus Condition 14c for the 8m clearance.	Infrastructure (Telecommunications / Utilities); Earthworks; Transport	Attachment J - National Grid (s2-s4)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			29.4	Land disturbance and earthworks near support structures: NZECP34:2001 s2.2.3 restricts excavation within 12m of the outer edge of tower foundations — no excavation deeper than 300mm within 6m, no deeper than 3m between 6m and 12m, and no unstable batter. The application seeks consent under KCDC Rule INF-MENU-R36 for non-compliance with Rule INF-MENU-R34 (earthworks within 12m of a National Grid support structure). Transpower warns that even with resource consent, a separate dispensation from Transpower is required if the excavation cannot comply with NZECP34:2001 — there is no guarantee it will be given, particularly for a greenfield development, and redesign may be required. Earthworks must also avoid damming or ponding water around tower foundations, and drainage changes must not adversely affect foundations.	Earthworks; Geotechnical; Infrastructure (Telecommunications / Utilities)	Attachment J - National Grid (s4)
			29.5	Vegetation and landscape planting near the National Grid: new vegetation within the National Grid Yard should be less than 2m at full maturity, and trees outside the NGY must be set back so they cannot fall within 4m of the line (Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003). Planting near support structures must be set back at least 12m for operation and maintenance access. Transpower requests landscape plans be updated to show the BPE-HAY-A and BPE-HAY-B lines and structures — a review of the plant palettes (Appendix 11) shows species such as kahikatea, kōwhai and tōtara, which exceed 2m at maturity, could be planted within the NGY. Requests plans reference the height restrictions and that Transpower receive the final landscape plans for review (Conditions 18, 18a, 18b).	Landscape; Infrastructure (Telecommunications / Utilities); Conditions	Attachment I - Landscape (L11); Attachment J - National Grid (s4)
			29.6	Access, walkways and public safety near structures: Transpower recommends walkways/shared paths be set back from support structures as far as practicable to minimise impacts on access for operation and maintenance, noting that directing people near structures increases the risk of climbing or unintended use and creates safety risks. The dog park plan (LA4.03, Appendix 11 Part 1) shows bench seats frequently along the pathway through the park — Transpower requests all bench seats be located outside the National Grid Yard corridor for health and safety reasons and the plan updated accordingly. Access to the structures for operation, maintenance, upgrading and development must be provided.	Urban Design; Recreation / Public Access; Landscape	Attachment I - Landscape (L11); Attachment J - National Grid (s4)
			29.7	Fencing, Construction Management Plan and Earth Potential Rise: Transpower does not support long lengths of conductive fencing parallel to the lines — fencing should be non-conductive (PVC/timber) or well earthed with timber section breaks, and no conductive fencing within 5m of a support structure. A Construction Management Plan is required before any construction or earthworks within 50m of the BPE-HAY assets, demonstrating compliance with NZECP34:2001 minimum approach distances (including the 4m conductor clearance for mobile plant, i.e. plant within 23m of the lines limited to 4.1m maximum reach height). Transpower has requested amendments to the applicant's proposed Condition 15 to reflect its standard CEMP wording and that the CEMP be provided to Transpower before going to the consent authority for certification. An Earth Potential Rise assessment will be required for all buildings and structures within 50m of support structures (applicant's proposed Condition 19).	Infrastructure (Telecommunications / Utilities); Earthworks; Conditions	Attachment J - National Grid (s4)
30	Michael Pearson, [redacted]	Concerns / questions	30.1	Traffic volumes and construction duration (general questions): asks what traffic volumes will be on his road at full build-out compared with today; how long construction will last and how many truck movements are expected each day; how many additional vehicle movements per day will be generated at full development; and what assumptions have been used regarding car ownership and commuting patterns.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s4.1, s4.6)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			30.2	Local road network effects and levels of service: asks what impact the development will have on Paetawa Road, Peka Peka Road, Greenhill Road and End Farm Road; whether any intersections will fail acceptable Levels of Service during peak periods; what road upgrades will be completed before occupancy; whether construction traffic will use the same roads as residents; what measures will prevent heavy vehicles using unsuitable local roads; whether school traffic and pedestrian safety will be adversely affected; and whether future growth beyond this subdivision has been considered.	Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s4.1); Attachment H - Urban Design (U10)
			30.3	Right of way upgrade and roundabout sought (specific requests): requests that the right of way used by [redacted] be fully upgraded before any construction occurs — it is already pot-hole ridden and further activity will significantly increase damage, potential vehicle repair costs and dust. Secondly, requests a roundabout be installed prior to construction given the projected traffic increase, noting Peka Peka Road is already under pressure as a feeder to Transmission Gully for Te Horo south, and that the SH1 roundabout under construction is illustrative of the need.	Transport; Conditions	Attachment G - Transport (s4.6)
			30.4	Visual, privacy and amenity effects at [redacted]: asks what will be seen from his home once complete; whether visual simulations have been prepared; whether three-storey buildings are proposed; what screening vegetation is proposed and what species for the land bordering his property; how long landscaping will take to mature; what building heights are proposed adjacent to existing homes; what setbacks apply along existing boundaries; what landscape buffers will be provided; how privacy will be maintained; whether outdoor lighting will affect neighbouring properties; and what restrictions will apply to future residents regarding noise and lighting.	Urban Design; Landscape; Noise	Attachment I - Landscape (L3)
			30.5	Flood risk, dust, noise and infrastructure sequencing: asks whether any existing property will experience increased flood risk as a result of urbanisation; what noise limits will apply during construction and operation; how dust will be monitored and managed; what infrastructure upgrades will be completed before residents move in; and how properties immediately adjacent will be affected during construction.	Hazards (Flooding); Noise; Earthworks; Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, Stormwater)	Attachment B - Flooding; Attachment E - Earthworks (E3); Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater
			30.6	Cumulative effects, property values and enforceability: asks how cumulative effects of future development in Waikanae North have been assessed; what assurance can be given that neighbouring property values and amenity will not be adversely affected (and whether any assessment of property value impacts has been undertaken); and what legally enforceable conditions will ensure current residents are protected if predicted impacts are exceeded.	Planning; Conditions; Economics	Covering Report (P10, Ee1-Ee4)
31	Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki Inc., (Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga — mana whenua)	Opposed - seeks decline	31.1	Overall position — oppose and seek decline: NHoŌ is the mandated representative body of the five Ngāti Raukawa ki te Tonga hapū holding mana whenua in the Ōtaki rohe (Ngāti Pare, Ngāti Korokī, Ngāti Kapu, Ngāti Maiōtaki, Ngāti Huia ki Katihiku), commenting under s53(3). While acknowledging the importance of increasing housing supply, NHoŌ identifies significant concerns regarding permanent modification of the ancestral landscape, impacts on wetlands, waterways and other taonga, risks to wāhi tapu and archaeological material, and the extent to which the proposal provides for kaitiakitanga, rangatiratanga and ūkaipōtanga. NHoŌ opposes the Proposed Activity and requests the Panel decline the application. If granted, NHoŌ requests the CIA recommendations be adopted as consent conditions.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Planning	Attachment L - Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (s5); Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C14)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			31.2	Insufficient opportunity to assess (rangatiratanga): NHoŌ acknowledges the applicant made genuine efforts to engage over a number of years, but due to limited capacity and resources it could not meaningfully participate or prepare a CIA during proposal development. NHoŌ was not provided with the complete substantive application, AEE or full suite of technical reports during development, and earlier discussions related to a materially different proposal — an earlier concept of approximately 500 residential lots. The first opportunity to assess the final form came after s53(3) notification, leaving 20 working days to review an application supported by 44 technical appendices. Participation has been undertaken without dedicated funding.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Consultation / Engagement; Planning	Attachment L - Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (s2-s3)
			31.3	Ponding and flooding (kaitiakitanga): NHoŌ is concerned about urban development in areas naturally prone to ponding or flooding. Engineering solutions may reduce flood risk but rely on permanently modifying natural hydrological processes, diminishing natural functioning, reducing ecosystem services and creating ongoing reliance on engineered infrastructure — exposing communities to residual risk and burdening future generations. From a te ao Māori perspective flooding is a natural process rather than a problem to be engineered away. Notes the application concludes overall improvement to flood levels but acknowledges isolated less-than-minor increases in flood depth in areas already subject to flooding. Recommends development avoid, wherever practicable, locating residential development in areas naturally susceptible to ponding or flooding.	Hazards (Flooding); Hydrology; Cultural / Tangata Whenua	Attachment L - Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (s4); Attachment B - Flooding; Attachment E - Earthworks (E7)
			31.4	Stormwater discharge to Te Harakeke (kaitiakitanga): wai is a taonga with mauri, fundamental to tikanga including tohi, pure and whakawātea. NHoŌ notes treated stormwater is to be intentionally discharged from selected catchments into Te Harakeke Wetland (Schedule A3 NRP — outstanding indigenous biodiversity values) to support restoration, and remains concerned that the scale and intensity of urban development will substantially alter the wetland's function and characteristics, placing pressure on ecological integrity and mauri over time. Seeks a precautionary approach. Recommends: stormwater to be treated to maintain or enhance water quality, mauri and ecological health; discharges only where it can be demonstrated they maintain or enhance the receiving environment long term; and a comprehensive monitoring programme (including baseline) for water quality, hydrology and ecological health developed in partnership with NHoŌ and ĀKWCT.	Infrastructure (Stormwater); Ecology; Cultural / Tangata Whenua	Attachment L - Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (s4); Attachment F - Infrastructure & Stormwater (I4)
			31.5	Earthworks — wāhi tapu, kōiwi and archaeological risk: extensive earthworks create significant risk that wāhi tapu, taonga tuku iho, kōiwi and other archaeological material may be inadvertently disturbed or destroyed; may reduce water quality through sediment, peat and contaminant mobilisation affecting taonga freshwater species and mahinga kai. Recommends: a NHoŌ Kaitiaki Monitor on site to observe earthworks with at least 5 working days' notice before earthworks commence and NHoŌ resourced for all kaitiaki monitoring; NHoŌ Accidental Discovery Protocols included as a consent condition; decisions on treatment, reinterment or long-term management of archaeological material or kōiwi to be determined by mana whenua in accordance with tikanga following engagement between NHoŌ and ĀKWCT; and strict erosion and sediment control protocols throughout all phases.	Archaeology; Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Earthworks; Conditions	Attachment L - Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (s4); Covering Report (A2)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			31.6	Permanent modification of the natural and cultural landscape: the proposal transforms a predominantly rural landscape of wetlands, streams, indigenous and exotic vegetation and dune systems into a large-scale urban development — removal of 475,000m³ of peat, loss of 1.69ha of wetland, removal of 993m of stream length (2,965m² of un-culverted bed), modification and culverting of sections of Ngārara Stream, and clearance of indigenous dune vegetation. Earthworks will permanently modify landforms and natural character including the dune landscape and wetland margins that contribute to cultural significance; removal and reconstruction of natural landforms, particularly the dune system, diminishes the integrity of the ancestral landscape. While the whakapapa relationship cannot be extinguished, the ability to experience, exercise and express that relationship through the landscape may be diminished.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Landscape; Earthworks; Ecology	Attachment L - Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (s4-s5); Attachment I - Landscape
			31.7	Dog exercise area location questioned: NHoŌ questions the appropriateness of locating a dog exercise area within an ancestral landscape known to contain archaeological sites and associated with settlement, occupation and wāhi tapu values. While recognising the need for recreational facilities, the location has potential to diminish the site's cultural sensitivity. NHoŌ considers the area would be more appropriately used as a space recognising the cultural history of the whenua through interpretation and education and — where agreed by both NHoŌ and ĀKWCT — may provide an appropriate location for respectful reinterment of archaeological material discovered during construction.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Urban Design; Recreation / Public Access; Archaeology	Attachment L - Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (s4)
			31.8	Restoration, mahinga kai and mana whenua participation: recommends that NHoŌ and ĀKWCT undertake fish salvage and relocation; the applicant endeavour to purchase plants from the NHoŌ nursery for restoration; the applicant endeavour to employ NHoŌ kaimahi for restoration activities; ecological restoration and enhancement plans be prepared, implemented and monitored in partnership with NHoŌ and ĀKWCT with cultural oversight throughout implementation; the applicant work collaboratively with both iwi to develop an interpretation area recognising the history, occupation and cultural significance of the site through cultural narratives and interpretive signage; and explore opportunities for mahinga kai within the site and harvesting of traditional resources such as harakeke and rongoā.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Ecology; Landscape; Conditions	Attachment L - Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (s4); Attachment K - Cultural (Te Ātiawa) (C15)
			31.9	Ūkaipōtanga — housing outcomes for mana whenua: NHoŌ's concerns extend to long-term social and cultural implications. While the proposal delivers substantial new homes, there is little evidence these will meaningfully contribute to the housing aspirations of NHoŌ uri or improve their ability to remain within, or return to, their tūrangawaewae; the development may fundamentally change the social and cultural character of the area without corresponding benefits for mana whenua. Recommends (if approved): collaborative work with both iwi to reimagine the design to reflect mana whenua aspirations for ūkaipōtanga (per WRM and Te Rautaki Whakakāinga); recognition of NHoŌ mana and identity; support for uri to establish and maintain connections with the whenua; mechanisms improving uri access to housing including affordable housing initiatives, shared equity models or similar; and enabling NHoŌ and ĀKWCT to provide names and cultural narratives for places, spaces and features so the whakapapa of the whenua remains visible.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Urban Design; Economics; Planning	Attachment L - Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (s5)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			31.10	Ongoing resourcing and recognition: recommends the applicant appropriately resource NHoŌ's ongoing participation throughout all subsequent stages — including the FTAA process, preparation and review of management plans, cultural monitoring, kaitiaki monitoring, fish salvage, ecological restoration and any future engagement required by consent conditions. If approved, the applicant and all consent holders should continue to recognise and provide for NHoŌ's role as mana whenua and rangatira through ongoing engagement, shared decision-making where appropriate, and opportunities to exercise kaitiakitanga throughout detailed design, construction, restoration and long-term management.	Cultural / Tangata Whenua; Conditions	Attachment L - Ngā Hapū o Ōtaki (s5); Covering Report
32	Department of Conservation, (s53 comment — Director-General)	Concerns	32.1	Overall position: the Director-General has been invited to comment under ss53(2)(k), 53(2)(m)(i) and 53(2)(m)(iv). The project does not involve any public conservation land. DOC has concerns regarding effects on avifauna, terrestrial vegetation and wetlands, plus suggestions to improve outcomes for aquatic ecology. Concerns relating to lizards were largely addressed in the s51 report and are not repeated. DOC concludes that if the concerns relating to avifauna, terrestrial vegetation and wetlands are addressed, the effects of the proposed activity can be appropriately managed. Advice informed by Dr Aidan Mora-Teddy (Freshwater), Ms Tayla Hooker (Terrestrial Ecology) and Ms Tertia Thurley (Avifauna).	Ecology; Planning	Covering Report (P18); Attachment A - Ecology
			32.2	Complex freshwater fisheries approval is triggered — disagreement with the applicant: DOC considers the proposal triggers the requirement for a permit under Regulation 43 of the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations 1983. The 993m Ngārara Stream diversion into a new constructed channel (with added substrate, woody debris, sizing, depth, gradients and planted banks) meets the definition of a diversion structure, and the box culvert weir — intended to temporarily confine and control flood waters — meets the definition of a dam (which expressly includes weirs). Reg 43, unlike Reg 42, applies to all dam or diversion structures, not only those impeding fish passage. DOC also notes that if fish are relocated to waters administered by DOC, that triggers a further complex freshwater fisheries approval under s42(4)(j)(iv) FTAA. The applicant does not consider the approval is required and says it can apply outside the FTAA process if wrong.	Ecology; Planning; Property / Legal	Covering Report (P18); Attachment A - Ecology (Ec32)
			32.3	Aquatic ecology — offsetting calculations and fish salvage: species present include inanga, longfin eel, banded kōkopu and kōura (all At Risk), with brown mudfish (At Risk–Declining) in Te Harakeke and the wider wetland complex — very rare locally with only two other known sites in the district. DOC broadly agrees with the aquatic values assessment but is concerned the applicant's conclusion of no net loss / net improvement from stream works is not supported by any offsetting calculations, and seeks the existing SEV scores be combined to calculate environmental compensation using the Environmental Compensation Ratio (ECR). Recommends the works area be de-fished before work begins with a suitably qualified ecologist on site during works (as a condition), and that fish relocation occur within the same catchment — not across multiple catchments as the original fish salvage plan suggests — using multiple sites to avoid overpopulating any one.	Ecology; Conditions	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec18, Ec32)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			32.4	Wetland valuation methodology challenged (WEV/ECR vs BOAM): DOC queries the appropriateness of the Wetland Ecological Valuation tool used to value on-site wetlands, given its acknowledged limited use in practice, and notes the tool was developed by the same consultancy (RMA Ecology) that supplied the AEE. There is not enough data to determine whether the offset calculations equate to no net loss, and the justification for using this method over best-practice models has not been demonstrated. DOC recommends offsets be calculated using DOC's guidelines and the Biodiversity Offsets Accounting Model (BOAM) as best practice, with a comparative assessment against the ECR:WEV outputs for transparency.	Ecology	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec29); Dune Wetland Memo (App. to Attachment A)
			32.5	Avifauna — domestic cats and 'ecological traps': the site holds Nationally Critical Australasian bittern plus brown teal and NZ dabchick; Te Harakeke and Peka Peka Road Swamps provide high quality habitat for spotless crake, marsh crake, bittern, fernbird and brown teal. The AEE itself acknowledges that without appropriate management of domestic cats and dogs the effects are likely to be moderate at a regional scale, resulting in a high potential level of adverse effect. DOC queries the feasibility of controlling an estimated up to 800 domestic cats, and is concerned the gain from restoring wetlands will be undermined by creating ecological traps whereby attracted birds are vulnerable to predation. None of the three ERMP options provides protection in perpetuity — all propose only limited durations of trapping and fence maintenance — and the Option C covenanted exclusion area appears concentrated on Te Harakeke, failing to address Peka Peka Road Swamp and other wetlands. Offering a choice of options post-approval does not provide certainty.	Ecology; Conditions	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec31)
			32.6	Wetland classification and delineation questioned: DOC queries the classification of wetlands W3 and W4 (Wetland Cluster 4) as not constituting dune slack wetlands — the absence of threatened flora pertaining to dune swale habitats should not disqualify an area from being identified as a dune swale. DOC considers these areas should be treated as naturally uncommon ecosystems with a threat status of Nationally Endangered and assessed on that basis; currently the application does not identify or remedy significant impacts on dune swale ecosystems. Given their rarity, like-for-like offsetting is not an option — the only real options are to avoid or compensate, and as threatened and naturally uncommon ecosystems they should be fully avoided. DOC also has concerns with the methods used to delineate natural wetlands generally, noting areas that should have been identified as natural wetlands may not have been, so the full impacts may not be identified.	Ecology	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec27); Dune Wetland Memo (App. to Attachment A)
			32.7	Stable dune ecosystem not adequately offset: DOC considers the impact on the stable dune area should be assessed as a landform comprising approximately 42 hectares of the site, rather than the small isolated indigenous remnants of approximately 0.54ha. Current mitigation (retaining a remnant of the dune mounds, planting indigenous vegetation and developing around it) will render the area unrecognisable as a stable dune and is better described as amenity planting within the subdivision. Stable dunes are characterised by landform features, ecological setting and associated functions — restricting the assessment to isolated patches fails to recognise these. As a naturally uncommon, Nationally Endangered ecosystem they cannot be recreated elsewhere, so the area to be enhanced should be guided by compensation guidelines rather than biodiversity offset principles. DOC suggests more meaningful mitigation would retain ecosystem connectivity between the stable dunes, dune swales and Te Harakeke rather than isolating them.	Ecology; Landscape; Earthworks	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec28)

No.	Commenter	Position	Issue #	Issue raised	Topic area(s)	Where addressed
			32.8	EIANZ significance application and wetland buffers: DOC raises concerns with the application of EIANZ significance criteria across the wetland clusters and indigenous dune vegetation but not against the entire site, and identifies an internal inconsistency — all wetlands are correctly ranked high for Rarity and Distinctiveness, yet several are assessed as only moderate ecological value. DOC's position is that a rare ecosystem is a rare ecosystem and its value should not be drawn down by other assessment factors; these areas should be assessed as high, which would lead to a larger offset requirement than currently provided. DOC also recommends wider buffers for wetland clusters given the significant area of wetland being reclaimed, noting research that comparable microclimate conditions may not be achieved in buffers of less than 40 metres — so a 40M buffer is likely required for long-term resilience of Te Harakeke, one of the largest wetlands left in the Foxton Ecological District.	Ecology; Urban Design; Landscape	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec29, Ec30)
			32.9	Te Harakeke perpetual protection and mudfish monitoring: the application states the high values of Te Harakeke will be protected in perpetuity, but DOC seeks clarification as to how the applicant specifically intends to achieve this, and how all offset areas including wetlands and stable dune planting areas will be managed in perpetuity (noting many riparian areas will not have an adequate buffer to be self-sustaining). DOC also identifies that proposed stormwater runoff management could increase water levels in some wetland areas, potentially increasing predatory fish populations detrimental to mudfish — the most threatened species in this system, whose habitat has been significantly reduced in the district. DOC recommends conditions requiring monitoring of both mudfish and Te Harakeke water levels post-works, with the ERMP updated to reflect this and to include adaptive management should a correlation between water levels and mudfish decline be detected.	Ecology; Infrastructure (Stormwater); Conditions	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec15, Ec32); Covering Report
			32.10	Management plan amendments and draft conditions: DOC considers a number of clarifications and amendments are needed to the proposed management plans. While the weed control guidelines in the Ecological Restoration Management Plan appear robust, further measures are required — clarification of how all offset areas (wetlands and stable dune planting) will be managed in perpetuity, and recognition that many riparian areas lack an adequate buffer to be self-sustaining. DOC also recommends reconsideration of the suitability of the species to be planted. DOC's suggested tracked changes to the draft conditions are provided at its Appendix E.	Ecology; Conditions	Attachment A - Ecology (Ec33)
33	Brett Johnson, [redacted]	Supports / Concerns	33.1	Fully supports the proposed development, but as the owner of a property at the entrance to the development raises serious concerns he asks be taken into consideration. He is one of only two properties with direct access off the existing gravel road.	Planning; Transport	Attachment G - Transport (s4.6); Covering Report (P1)
			33.2	Gravel road to be widened and sealed before works start: the current gravel road is not wide enough for two cars to pass without driving onto the grass — never a problem historically as only two property owners used it. He asks that before works start developing the farm the gravel road be widened and sealed to the main farm gate. He is already putting up with a number of pot holes caused by extra traffic to and from the farm.	Transport; Conditions	Attachment G - Transport (s4.6, s4.8); Covering Report (P9)
			33.3	Endorses the Gilpin & Urquhart submission: has discussed the proposed development and their concerns as directly affected owners with his neighbours at [redacted], and shares all the same concerns expressed in their submission (comment 14) — construction traffic and CTMP, road safety, permanent effects of the new public road, boundary fencing and landscaping, road designation and property rights, utility protection, infrastructure connection, future SH1 access and consultation scope. Requests to be kept up to date with progress.	Transport; Landscape; Urban Design; Infrastructure (Water, Wastewater, Stormwater); Conditions	Attachment G - Transport (s4.6, s4.8)