

# PLANNING OVERVIEW RESPONSE REPORT

*Arataki Project*

*CDL Land New Zealand Limited*

**86, 108 & 122 Arataki Road, Havelock North**



**Substantive Application  
Fast-Track Approvals Act 2024  
20 November 2025**

## Document Control

---

Project Number	P24-244
Project Name	Arataki Project
Client	CDL Land New Zealand Limited ( <b>CDL</b> )
Date	20/11/2025
Version	V1
Issue Status	Final
Originator	Karin Lepoutre – Senior Planning Consultant Emma Howie – General Manager, Planning & Urban Design
Reviewer	Jo Sunde – Senior Associate Planner
Approval	Emma Howie – General Manager, Planning & Urban Design
Consultant details	Wood & Partners Consultants Limited ( <b>Woods</b> ) PO Box 6752 Victoria St West, Auckland 1142 woods.co.nz
Copyright and Limitations	<p>The concepts and information contained in this document are the property of Woods (Wood &amp; Partners Consultants Ltd). Use or copying of this document in whole or in part without the written permission of Woods will constitute an infringement of copyright.</p> <p>This report has been prepared on behalf of and for the exclusive use of Woods client, and is subject to and issued relating to the provisions of the agreement between Woods and its Client. Woods accepts no liability or responsibility whatsoever for or in respect of any use of or reliance upon this document by any third party.</p>

## Table of Contents

---

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Update to the Proposal</b>	<b>6</b>
2.1.	Description of the Changes	7
2.2.	Updates to Application Documentation & Expert Reporting	10
2.3.	Reasons for Consent	11
2.4.	Amendments to Conditions of Consent	12
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Comments Received from Invited Parties</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1.	Feedback from Neighbouring Residents	13
3.2.	Feedback from Mana Whenua	22
3.3.	Feedback from Government Agencies	22
3.4.	Feedback from Ministers	22
3.5.	Feedback from Hastings District Council	23
3.6.	Feedback from Hawkes Bay Regional Council	34
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>43</b>

## List of Appendices

---

<b>Appendix 1</b>	Conditions Suite V2 (Mark up) (Woods)
<b>Appendix 2</b>	RDF Background Documentation (Woods)
<b>Appendix 3</b>	Revised Landscape Concept Report (Boffa Miskell)
<b>Appendix 4</b>	Revised Landscape Management Plan (Boffa Miskell)
<b>Appendix 5</b>	Revised Civil Drawings (Woods)
<b>Appendix 6</b>	Transportation Memo (Flow)
<b>Appendix 7</b>	Revised Stormwater Management Plan (Woods)
<b>Appendix 8</b>	Conditions Suite V2 (Clean) (Woods)
<b>Appendix 9</b>	Alternative Masterplan (Urban Acumen)
<b>Appendix 10</b>	CDL & Shaggy Range Post-Lodgement Correspondence Redacted (CDL)

## 1.0 Introduction

This Report provides a consolidated Planning Overview Response Report following lodgement of the Arataki Substantive Application with the Environmental Protection Authority (**EPA**) under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (**FTAA**). It outlines key changes to the proposal, updates to the assessment of effects, and summarises post-lodgement engagement. This document addresses:

- Overview of updates to the proposal, including
  - Design changes
  - Updated documentation
  - Additional reasons for consent
  - Amendments to conditions of consent
- Response to comments received under section 53(2) of the FTAA.

Updated Application Drawings and Expert Response Memorandums have been appended to this Report. Revised conditions of consent have been included as **Appendix 1** (mark-up) and **Appendix 8** (clean).



## 2.0 Update to the Proposal

Following lodgement of the Substantive Application, several discrete updates have been made to the Proposal. These updates are in response to feedback received from key stakeholders including Hastings District Council (**HDC**) and Hawkes Bay Regional Council (**HBRC**), neighbours, and further refinements by the project team to best align with the overall project objectives.

The changes to the Proposal are addressed in the following sections and include the following:

- Replace the Residential Design Framework (**RDF**) with the application of the Hastings District Plan (**HDP**) Havelock North General Residential Zone (**HNGRZ**) and Medium Density Residential Zone (**MDRZ**) provisions through a consent notice approach. Apply bespoke consent notices where the provisions of the applied zoning do not achieve the intended design outcomes (change made in response to HDC's comments).
- Replace the buffer interface no build, landscaping and fencing covenants with consent notices and consequential update to the scheme plan (change made in response to HDC's and McKenzies (Olive Grove) comments).
- Amend buffer interface screening tree species from Mexican Alder to Layland Cypress / Cupressus Owensii to address spray drift feedback (change made in response to McKenzies (Olive Grove) comments).
- Undertake minor corrections to the fencing notations within the landscaping plan drawings and reference this as a consent notice (consequential amendment).
- Update the Stormwater Management Plan (**SMP**) to provide mitigation options for circumstances where the maximum 60% impervious area threshold is exceeded and manage this through a consent notice (change made in response to HDC's comments).
- Updates to the consent conditions suite to reflect feedback received and local council drafting preferences (change made in response to HDC and HBRC's comments).
- Update to the consent conditions suite to enable an alternative concept plan to be approved if CDL and the owner of 104 Arataki Road (Shaggy Range) reach an agreement on relocating the Shaggy Range driveway (change made in response to Johnston Partnership (Shaggy Range)'s comments).

The changes made to the Proposal do not alter the scale, intensity or nature of the Arataki development as assessed in the Planning Report lodged with the Substantive Application. Accordingly, the overall assessment of effects, the assessment against the relevant statutory documents, and the assessment against the relevant sections of the FTAA remains unchanged, and the conclusions reached in the Substantive Application continue to apply.

## 2.1. Description of the Changes

The sections below provides detail of the changes to the proposal.

### 2.1.1. Replacement of the RDF with Consent Notices

#### *Change made in response to HDC comments*

A key change post-lodgement has been the shift from the bespoke RDF framework to a consent notice approach, as requested by HDC. Following lodgement, the applicant and HDC discussed the adequacy of the RDF provisions and the risk that certain rules may have been unintentionally omitted, potentially creating challenges for future house builders. The RDF was based largely on the existing HNGRZ standards for Lot Type 1 and MDRZ standards for Lot Type 2, supplemented by bespoke design standards to achieve a cohesive built form.

HDC recommended adopting the underlying HNGRZ and MDRZ provisions directly and implementing them through consent notices, with District-wide provisions applying as they normally would under those zones. The use of consent notices allows activities otherwise permitted in the HNGRZ and MDRZ to be enabled for future lot owners, providing certainty that typical residential development can proceed without the need for additional resource consents.

In response, the applicant compared the RDF provisions against the relevant HDP provisions to determine where direct transposition was appropriate (**Appendix 2**). This exercise identified rules that aligned well with the underlying zones and could be adopted without change. It also identified provisions where the underlying rules were sufficiently similar that bespoke controls were no longer necessary. A limited number of HDP provisions did not translate appropriately and bespoke consent notices are therefore proposed to retain specific design outcomes. These are summarised below:

#### **Lot Type 1 (Condition 68B):**

- Landscaping requirements for the front yard setback (Condition 68C).
- Bespoke garage and accessory building setbacks to achieve the anticipated built form (Condition 68D).

#### **Lot Type 2 (Condition 68E):**

- Building height restricted to 8m +1m (roof), rather than 11m allowed by the MDRZ (Condition 68F).
- Bespoke garage and accessory building setbacks to achieve the anticipated built form (Condition 68G).
- Minimum 10% glazing and street connection requirement rather than 20% to avoid poor design outcomes (Condition 68H).

#### **Other:**

- Site-wide stormwater management control to set impervious areas at 60% as HDP stormwater standards do not effectively translate to the Arataki development (Condition 65A).
- Site-Wide Fencing requirements to achieve a bespoke urban design response to address passive surveillance, Arataki Road visibility and privacy (Condition 65B).
- Council Reserve boundary fencing requires 1.8m high permeable fencing (Condition 66).

- Onsite vehicle manoeuvring for rear sites to enable forward-facing exit patterns (Condition 68).
- Arataki Corner Lots allowed a reduced distance of vehicle access from access roads (Condition 68A).

It is considered that the use of consent notices instead of the RDF will achieve the same design outcome through a clearer and more flexible framework for future development. It avoids the risk of omission inherent in a bespoke ruleset and strengthens the certainty and enforceability of the planning framework, which HDC has confirmed as its preferred approach.

Further, it is noted that while the proposed planning framework has changed since lodgement, the reasons for consent are unchanged from the lodged substantive application.

The proposed new consent notices are proposed in the Conditions Suite V2 (mark-up) (**Appendix 1**) and the List of Application Reports and Drawings (Schedule 1) has been updated accordingly to remove the RDF.

## 2.1.2. Replacement of Buffer Interface Covenants with Consent Notices

### *Change made in response to HDC and McKenzies (Olive Grove) comments*

HDC stated its preference for the Buffer Interface to be secured through consent notices rather than covenants. Feedback from the neighbouring Olive Grove owners (McKenzies) also queried the robustness of covenants in ensuring long-term maintenance of the buffer interface treatments.

In response, the applicant proposes to replace the Buffer Interface covenants with consent notices. This approach enables Council to monitor compliance and undertake enforcement if required, providing neighbouring rural landowners with a clear pathway to raise concerns should maintenance issues arise in the future. Three bespoke consent notices (Conditions 65C – 65E) are now proposed to address the no-build area, landscaping, and fencing outcomes along the buffer interface. The scheme plan (Revised Civil Drawings **Appendix 5**) has been updated accordingly.

The existing “no-complaints covenant” will remain as a covenant (Condition 27).

## 2.1.3. Amended Buffer Interface Screening Tree Species

### *Change made in response to McKenzies (Olive Grove) comments*

The Olive Grove raised concerns that the originally proposed buffer screening tree species (Mexican Alder) adjacent to the southern boundary is not consistent with best practice under NZS 8049:2021 Management of Agrichemicals. In response, the applicant sought advice from their agricultural experts Fruition and identified suitable ‘needle leaf’ species capable of achieving the recommended 1-metre wide spray-drift buffer.

A shortlist of compliant and locally available species was provided to the Olive Grove for their input. The Leyland Cypress (*Cupressus ovensii*) was subsequently selected from that list, reflecting their stated preference, and this has now been incorporated into the updated Landscape Concept Report (**Appendix 3**) and proposal. The Olive Grove have confirmed that, notwithstanding this update, they continue to oppose the proposed 10 metre buffer interface and maintain their preference for a 30-metre setback.



#### 2.1.4. Amended Fencing Plan

##### ***Consequential amendment***

The RDF fencing outcomes differ from the fencing standards provided for in the HDP, as it has been tailored to achieve specific urban design outcomes for the Arataki development, including passive surveillance, appropriate vehicle visibility along Arataki Road, and privacy where required. Accordingly, a bespoke consent notice is proposed to secure the fencing outcomes previously contained within the RDF.

With the shift to the consent notice framework, it is necessary to reference a specific and approved fencing plan to ensure that the intended design outcomes are implemented by future lot owners.

To distinguish between fencing constructed by the applicant at the subdivision stage and fencing to be constructed by future owners, the consent notices now reference the Boffa Miskell Fencing Plans included in the Landscape Concept Report (**Appendix 3**). The Fencing Plan has been split into two separate sheets (Drawings L200 and L201) for clarity and to align with the two relevant conditions (Conditions 65B and 65E). Minor amendments have also been made to the Fencing Plan legend to clarify fence types and ensure consistency with the original RDF provisions.

#### 2.1.5. Updated Stormwater Management Plan

##### ***Change made in response to HDC's comments***

The HDP stormwater rules do not provide for the overall outcomes for the development as they do not account for the additional storage capacity provided within the subdivision's retention ponds or the integrated stormwater solution implemented for the wider site.

Therefore, a consent notice (Condition 65A) is proposed to manage stormwater for the development, in lieu of applying the underlying HDP provisions. The subdivision has been designed for a 60% impervious area threshold, and sites that exceed this limit will be required to provide on-lot mitigation such as detention tanks or, where preferred by the lot owner, water-reuse systems to offset additional runoff.

The SMP has been updated (**Appendix 7**) to include a clear flow diagram illustrating the required mitigation pathway for sites exceeding the threshold to assist future lot owners with their stormwater management design and Council engineers to assess each proposal exceeding 60%. HDC requested for the flow diagram to be included within the SMP.

#### 2.1.6. Alternative Masterplan Option

##### ***Change made in response to Shaggy Range's comments***

CDL and the owners of 104 Arataki Road (Johnston Partnership / Shaggy Range) have held discussions regarding the location of the existing driveway that currently bisects the Site. CDL has continued this engagement both prior to and following lodgement of the Substantive Application, including several post-lodgement attempts to arrange a meeting to continue conversations regarding the potential land swap and relocation of the driveway. A copy of the post-lodgement correspondence with Shaggy Range is included in **Appendix 10**.

The Arataki masterplan has been intentionally prepared to accommodate an alternative scheme should agreement be reached to relocate the Shaggy Range Driveway to the south of the site. The Alternative Arataki Masterplan is included in **Appendix 9**.

The Alternative Arataki Masterplan layout retains the development yield of 171 residential lots and maintains the feasibility of the engineering design and stormwater management approach. Minor consequential adjustments occur, including small changes to lot sizes, additional JOALs, and a slight modification to one intersection.

Under the Alternative Masterplan, the existing 6-metre-wide Shaggy Range access strip would be relocated to the southern boundary of the Arataki development as a like-for-like arrangement, including an equivalent land parcel and a gravel driveway with grassed and landscaped berms. Locating the driveway along the southern boundary supports a more efficient site layout and further contributes to a separation buffer between the Site and the adjoining Olive Grove to the south.

Overall, the alternative scheme would deliver a more cohesive development that is no longer bisected by an existing driveway. The currently lodged scheme nonetheless achieves positive urban design outcomes.

To provide a clear and transparent pathway for implementation of the Alternative Masterplan, a new subdivision condition (Condition 14A) has been included on an Augier basis. This condition outlines the process for the relevant authorities to consider an updated scheme plan and associated drawings, and confirming the requirement for CDL to lodge a Section 127 change to conditions under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) should the alternative layout be pursued by CDL.

## 2.2. Updates to Application Documentation & Expert Reporting

**Table 1** provides a summary of the appendices that have been updated and are submitted in full as part of this response.

**Table 1: Format of Expert Responses to Feedback**

Apdx	Area / Expert	Response Format	Document Name
1	Planning / Woods Planning	Conditions Suite V2 (mark-up)	Conditions Suite V2 (mark-up), Arataki Project, Project No. P24-244, v2, prepared by Woods, and dated 20/11/2025
2	Planning / Woods Planning	RDF Background Documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RDF / HDP Comparison Table</li> <li>• Post-lodgement correspondence with HDC</li> <li>• Consent Notices</li> </ul>	RDF Background Documentation, prepared by Woods, and dated 20/11/2025
3	Landscape Architecture / Boffa Miskell	Landscape Concept Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updated Fencing Plans               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Fencing Plan 1 – External Boundary Fencing Provided by the Development</li> <li>○ Fencing Plan 2 – Site Wide Fencing Requirements Provided by the Lot Owner</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Updated Buffer Interface tree species</li> </ul>	Landscape Concept Report (ref: BM240623_Arataki_landscape_concept_report), v2, prepared by Boffa Miskell and dated 20/11/2025

Apdx	Area / Expert	Response Format	Document Name
4	Landscape Architecture / Boffa Miskell	Landscape Maintenance Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updated Buffer Interface tree species on southern boundary adjoining Olive Grove</li> </ul>	Landscape Management Plan (ref: BM19058_Landscape_Management_Plan_Final.doc), v2, prepared by Boffa Miskell and dated 20/11/2025
5	Survey / Woods Survey	Civil Drawing Set <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Updated scheme plans</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scheme Plan, DWG No. P24-244-00-0001-SC, Rev 3, prepared by Woods, dated 20/11/2025.</li> <li>Scheme Plan, DWG No. P24-244-00-0002-SC, Rev 3, prepared by Woods, dated 20/11/2025.</li> <li>Scheme Plan, DWG No. P24-244-00-0003-SC, Rev 3, prepared by Woods, dated 20/11/2025.</li> </ul>
6	Transport / Flow	Transportation Memo	Arataki Project Fast-Track Substantive Application: Response to Hastings District Council Comments, prepared by Flow Transportation Specialists, dated 17/11/2025
7	Stormwater / Woods 3 Waters	Revised Stormwater Management Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Includes updated flow diagram for 60% impervious area exceedance and supporting technical assessment</li> </ul>	Stormwater Management Plan, Arataki Project, Project No. P24-244, V2, prepared by Woods, and dated 20/11/2025
8	Planning / Woods Planning	Conditions Suite V2 (Clean)	Conditions Suite V2 (clean), Arataki Project, Project No. P24-244, V2, prepared by Woods, and dated 20/11/2025
9	Masterplan / CDL & Urban Acumen	Alternative Masterplan	Arataki Fast Track – Alternative masterplan, Project No: 23-059, prepared by Urban Acumen and dated 19 Nov 2025
10	CDL	CDL / Shaggy Range Correspondence	Email correspondence

## 2.3. Reasons for Consent

In the comments on the substantive application, HDC confirmed that the reasons for consent were correctly identified within the application.

Similarly, HBRC noted that the reasons for consent had generally been identified, however, noted that in some instances the rule references were not correct. Namely:

- The rules assessment (Appendix 8) omitted to state that rule TANK 15 is applicable as the activity includes taking and using impounded water. This is however, included in the planning report (section 8.2.2).*
- In the planning report (section 8.2.3), it is stated that resource consent for removal of native vegetation within 10 m of a stream is required under TANK 8. The activity is correct, however the reference to “TANK 8” is incorrect. For correctness, the activity does not comply with RRMP Rule 7 as amended.*

HBRC questioned whether flocculants would be used following the construction of the subdivision. CDL confirms that its use is limited to the construction period and for construction of the stormwater management pond and therefore does not trigger any additional resource consents.

Overall, the feedback from HDC and HBRC confirms that the reasons for consent have been appropriately identified and addressed within the planning assessment.

## 2.4. Amendments to Conditions of Consent

Amendments to conditions have been made in response to comments received from HDC, HBRC, invited parties, and to align with refinements to the proposal. The feedback memos from HDC and HBRC included specific commentary on the proposed conditions of consent.

The most significant change to the conditions has been the replacement of the RDF with a consent notice approach resulting in a number of new conditions. This represents a change in mechanism and implementation rather than a change to the development outcomes.

The Applicant's response to these recommended changes and other matters raised in neighbour submissions is provided in Section 3.0 below. To assist the Panel, two versions of the revised conditions have been appended to this Planning Overview Response Report:

- **Appendix 1 - Conditions Suite V2 (mark-up)**

A marked-up version of the conditions identifying the changes made in response to comments received.

- **Appendix 8 - Conditions Suite V2 (clean)**

A clean version of the updated conditions with all track changes accepted.

## 3.0 Comments Received from Invited Parties

In accordance with section 53(2) of the FTAA, the Expert Panel appointed to the Application must invite comments from persons listed in sections 53(2) (a) to (n), where relevant. Comments on the Application closed on 13 November 2025.

The sections below provide CDL's comments on the feedback that has been received following the closure of comments period. For ease of reference, feedback has been categorised into feedback from:

- Neighbouring residents;
- Mana whenua;
- Government agencies;
- Ministers;
- HDC; and
- HBRC.

### 3.1. Feedback from Neighbouring Residents

Feedback was received from several neighbouring residents through the invitation for comment process, and this was generally consistent with the matters raised during pre-lodgement consultation. The Applicant anticipated these themes given the early engagement undertaken.

With the exception of the feedback from the Olive Grove and Shaggy Range properties, no further changes to the proposal or conditions have been required in response to comments from other residents, as the issues raised have already been comprehensively addressed within the lodged Substantive Application material and the associated Consultation Report.

A summary of the additional comments received is provided in **Table 2** below, together with the Applicant's responses, to clarify how these matters have been considered.

**Table 2: Feedback from Residents**

Party	Address	Key Issues Raised	CDL Feedback
Susan Doughty	[REDACTED] [REDACTED]	<p>Believes the development will be detrimental to existing Arataki Road residents.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned road widths are inadequate for emergency and service vehicles.</li> <li>Notes an apparent increase in dwelling numbers and limited capacity in local schools and medical services.</li> <li>Raises compatibility issues with nearby dog kennels, machinery workshop and mushroom farm (noise/odour).</li> <li>Requests fewer houses, larger sections with garden space, and homes consistent with the existing standard on Arataki Road.</li> </ul>	<p>Effects relating to neighbourhood character and site density are addressed in section 13.4 of the planning report.</p> <p>Traffic and transport effects are addressed in section 13.9 of the planning report and in the Integrated Transport Assessment prepared by Flow (Appendix 18).</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity effects are addressed in section 13.3 of the planning report and include issues relating to noise and odour and the rural interface.</p> <p>Social effects are addressed in section 13.6 of the planning report. As is stated in that report, discussions with the Ministry of Education confirmed that local schools have sufficient capacity to accommodate the expected growth.</p> <p>CDL confirms that there is no change to the number of lots which remains at 171.</p> <p>Overall, it is considered that the issues raised by the party are adequately addressed above and within the substantive application.</p>
Arataki Honey (Rhys Flack)	66 Arataki Road, Havelock North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Long-established beekeeping and honey-packing operation; notes inherent incompatibility between commercial beekeeping and nearby residential development.</li> <li>Requests a 30-metre planted buffer or walkway to separate new housing from rural activities.</li> </ul> <p>Emphasises need to retain full road width and avoid traffic-calming devices, due to frequent large-truck and seasonal night-time hive movements.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes hive-burning produces smoke and flame which could have adverse effects.</li> <li>Seeks design measures that avoid creating conflict between the business and new homes.</li> </ul>	<p>Reverse sensitivity effects are addressed in section 13.3 of the planning report, including matters relating to noise, odour, seasonal operational requirements and the interface between productive rural activities and residential development. Section 13.3 concludes that the combination of landform, fencing and planting will appropriately mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>Traffic and transport effects are addressed in section 13.9 of the planning report and in the Integrated Transport Assessment prepared by Flow (Appendix 18). These assessments confirm that the road network can safely accommodate expected traffic volumes and that road widths and layouts have been designed to maintain safe vehicle movements, including for heavy vehicles.</p> <p>Smoke, odour and intermittent effects associated with hive-burning and other beekeeping operations fall within the assessment of rural</p>



Party	Address	Key Issues Raised	CDL Feedback
			<p>land use and reverse sensitivity effects at sections 13.2 and 13.3 of the planning report. These effects are not expected to give rise to unreasonable constraints on Arataki Honey's operations.</p> <p>Overall, the issues raised are addressed in the sections identified above and within the substantive application.</p>
Bay Planning on behalf of C&M McKenzie	70 Arataki Road Havelock North (Olive Grove)	<p>Reverse sensitivity effects on olive grove operations including spray drift, noise, bird-scarers, and long-term ability to operate productively. Proposed 7.5 m to 10 m buffer is inadequate. Repeated request for a minimum 30 m vegetated buffer.</p> <p>Seek clarification on whether the species planted align with the buffer recommendations in NZ8049:2021. Notes that current shelter belt on their property is not effective for spray drift mitigation.</p> <p>Question the effectiveness of multi-title covenants for vegetation maintenance. Prefers buffer to be held in a single title.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagrees with CDL's interpretation of HDC and HBRC objectives and policies and that proposal does not align with</li> </ul> <p>Questions ability to enforce or maintain covenants long term. Wants clear recognition of constraints on productive use if residential lots are placed close to boundary.</p> <p>Does not consider that the proposal aligns with the relevant objectives and policies and consider that not all relevant Objectives and Policies have been assessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific relief sought includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A minimum 30 m vegetated buffer strip along the boundary.</li> <li>Buffer to be in a single title and managed uniformly.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Reverse sensitivity effects are addressed in section 13.2 and 13.3 of the planning report. This includes consideration of the interface with the olive grove and other productive rural activities.</p> <p>CDL notes the request for a 30m buffer; however, based on the effects assessment in sections 13.2 and 13.3, CDL considers that the buffer proposed is adequate to avoid unreasonable reverse sensitivity constraints while balancing the requirement for efficient land use outcomes.</p> <p>Rural land use effects, including consideration of buffer requirements and recognised rural activities, are addressed in section 13.2 of the planning report. CDL notes that buffer requirements have been developed in response to the landform, existing vegetation and the effects-based assessments contained in the application.</p> <p>The recommendation for needled trees (as per NZ8049:2021) to provide a 1m wide buffer to reduce spray drift have been discussed with Bay Planning and are now incorporated into the landscape plan (<b>Appendix 3</b>). A Layland Cypress / Cupressus Owensii is now proposed as the primary screening tree to the southern (Olive Grove) boundary.</p> <p>All relevant objectives and policies (including those specifically referenced within this feedback) are assessed in the planning report and Appendix 8 to that report. It is noted that the referenced objectives and policies relate to managing potential reverse sensitivity effects and built form outcomes. These matters are all addressed with</p>

Party	Address	Key Issues Raised	CDL Feedback
			<p>the planning assessment and overall, it is considered that the proposal is consistent with the outcomes of the relevant objectives and policies.</p> <p>CDL has considered that multi-title covenant approach to maintaining the required landscaping and acknowledges that a consent-notice approach provides for a more efficient and effective management tool (refer to section 2.1.2 above). Unlike private covenants, consent-notice provides Council with the ability to take enforcement action under the RMA if required.</p> <p>Overall, the issues raised are addressed in the sections identified above and within the substantive application.</p>
Darell and June Hall	██████████ ██████████	<p>Seeks inclusion of larger lots (<math>\geq 700 \text{ m}^2</math>), noting current <math>350\text{--}550 \text{ m}^2</math> lots do not reflect Havelock North's character or provide sufficient amenity or tree canopy and biodiversity.</p> <p>Concerned about shading effects from Zone 2 typology, especially winter shading onto neighbouring homes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned about privacy and overlooking and elevated outdoor areas on smaller lots; requests stronger design controls (screening, glazing, setbacks).</li> </ul> <p>Believes lack of controls may lead to neighbour disputes and undermine neighbourhood character.</p>	<p>Neighbourhood character effects are addressed in section 13.4 of the planning report. That assessment confirms that the lot sizes, built form controls and design framework will maintain an appropriate residential character and transition to the adjoining environment.</p> <p>Visual and shading effects are addressed in section 13.7. That assessment concludes that the scale and form of development enabled by the typologies will not result in unreasonable shading or dominance effects at neighbouring properties.</p> <p>Privacy and overlooking effects are addressed through the Residential Development Framework and in the neighbourhood character and visual assessments in sections 13.4 and 13.7. These confirm that controls on building height, setbacks, and fencing will appropriately manage potential effects.</p> <p>Social effects related to neighbourhood cohesion and amenity are addressed in section 13.6 and do not raise concerns that would alter the overall conclusions of the planning assessment.</p> <p>Overall, the issues raised are addressed in the sections identified above and within the substantive application.</p>
Barry Keane	██████████ ██████	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strong objection to any stormwater overflow or discharge from the Arataki development being directed through his property at 163 Brookvale Road.</li> </ul>	<p>Stormwater and flooding effects are addressed in section 13.8 of the planning report and in the supporting Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix 12). The assessments confirm that the stormwater system</p>

Party	Address	Key Issues Raised	CDL Feedback
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Notes significant historic flooding on his property during Cyclone Gabrielle, resulting in major damage and repairs.</li> </ul> <p>States that HBRC and HDC have increased flood-related rates but have not maintained or upgraded drains, channels, or stopbanks along Brookvale Road, which remain in poor condition.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Will not agree to the proposed stormwater overflow unless existing upstream and local drainage issues are properly addressed.</li> </ul>	<p>has been designed to avoid increasing flood risk on downstream properties, including 163 Brookvale Road.</p> <p>Section 13.8 concludes that the discharge regime, treatment approach and attenuation will not exacerbate existing drainage issues within the Brookvale catchment.</p> <p>As noted in the consultation material submitted with the application, the applicant has met with Mr Keane to discuss the project and flooding within the wider catchment. The expert assessments confirm that the development will not increase flooding or exacerbate existing overland flow patterns. Notwithstanding this, Mr Keane's concerns are understood and respected, particularly given his experience during Cyclone Gabrielle and the wider community impacts observed at that time.</p>
Forest and Bird	104 Arataki Road, Havelock North	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Forest &amp; Bird considers that the Arataki development will not directly affect the operation of its Hastings–Havelock North nursery at 104 Arataki Road.</li> <li>Notes it has provided a separate letter to the owners of 104 Arataki Road supporting good environmental outcomes for the project.</li> </ul> <p>Encourages native planting to enhance connectivity between Arataki Reserve and Te Mata Peak and to achieve good biodiversity outcomes generally.</p>	<p>It is noted that feedback was received from Forest and Bird on 14 July and CDL acknowledges the earlier feedback in addition to the feedback provided to the Panel which included more details relating to biodiversity outcomes.</p> <p>Ecological effects are addressed in section 13.12 of the planning report, which concludes that the proposed planting and stormwater treatment will result in a positive ecological outcome.</p> <p>The general support by Forest &amp; Bird is noted.</p>
Christine and Clive Brown	██████████ ██████████	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant concern about existing traffic congestion and safety issues on Arataki Road, which already carries heavy vehicles, Arataki Honey trucks, and cruise-ship buses - believe the subdivision will worsen these issues.</li> </ul> <p>Consider the proposed small lot sizes inconsistent with the established character and semi-rural feel of the Arataki area.</p> <p>Concern that small lots will result in high levels of on-street parking - request that all new subdivision roads be wide enough to allow legal parking on both sides while still accommodating safe two-way vehicle movement, including emergency vehicles.</p>	<p>Traffic and transport effects are addressed in section 13.9 of the planning report and the Integrated Transport Assessment (Appendix 18). The assessment confirms that Arataki Road can safely accommodate expected increases in traffic and that the subdivision road network is designed to support safe movement and parking.</p> <p>Neighbourhood character effects and the appropriateness of proposed lot sizes are addressed in section 13.4. The assessment concludes that the development pattern is consistent with a residential environment and represents an appropriate transition from the existing urban area.</p>

Party	Address	Key Issues Raised	CDL Feedback
			Potential on-street parking effects are addressed in section 13.9, which confirms that the road widths and design standards adopted can accommodate visitor parking while maintaining safe movement, including for emergency vehicles.
G & P Kidd	██████████ ██████████	<p>Concerned about loss of open space outlook and that this visual amenity will be lost.</p> <p>Oppose high-density, two-storey housing and small compact sections in this location, considering it inappropriate for the character of Arataki Road.</p> <p>Concerned about loss of wildlife habitat, including hawks, tūi and small mammals, as a result of development.</p> <p>Expects noise, dirt and construction traffic, noting similar issues at Brookvale Road and slow section sales in the Iona subdivision.</p>	<p>Neighbourhood character effects and the change in outlook from rural to residential are addressed in section 13.4 of the planning report. The assessment confirms that the development will form an appropriate edge to the existing urban area.</p> <p>Visual and landscape effects, including changes to open space views, are addressed in section 13.7. The assessment concludes that while outlook will change, effects are not unreasonable.</p> <p>Ecological effects are addressed in section 13.12 of the planning report, which confirms that the development will not result in significant adverse ecological effects and will result in a net ecological gain through new planting.</p> <p>Construction effects are addressed in section 13.17 and will be appropriately managed through the Construction Environmental Management Plan and related controls.</p>
Hayden Senior		<p>Note that the feedback provided is a duplicate of the concerns previously submitted to CDL before lodgement with the added request for notification of, and participation in, any hearing and wants the opportunity to comment on draft conditions before the Panel finalises its decision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Writes on behalf of Arataki residents, who strongly oppose the development.</li> </ul>	<p>Traffic and transport effects are addressed in section 13.9 of the planning report and in the Integrated Transport Assessment prepared by Flow (Appendix 18). The assessment addresses issues raised relating to road widths, carparking on general traffic effects.</p> <p>Neighbourhood character effects and the appropriateness of proposed lot sizes are addressed in section 13.4. The assessment concludes that</p>

Party	Address	Key Issues Raised	CDL Feedback
		<p>Considers the proposal an overdevelopment that will worsen existing traffic congestion, create noise and safety issues, and negatively affect community wellbeing.</p> <p>Opposes medium-density housing and any inclusion of Kāinga Ora/social housing, citing effects on neighbourhood character and potential antisocial behaviour.</p> <p>States that section sizes are too small and should be 500–1,400 m<sup>2</sup> to retain the semi-rural character of the area.</p> <p>Requests roads wide enough to allow legal parking on both sides while maintaining access for emergency vehicles.</p>	<p>the development pattern is consistent with a residential environment and represents an appropriate transition from the existing urban area.</p> <p>Social effects are addressed in section 13.6 of the planning report. Overall, the Arataki Project is anticipated to have positive social effects by contributing to a well-functioning, inclusive, and resilient community. The design supports strong social outcomes and addresses potential adverse effects through thoughtful design and effective mitigation.</p>
Jeremy & Lyn White		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider that the proposal is considerably more intensive than the established pattern of development in the surrounding area. Appear to be based on an Auckland highly intensified model.</li> <li>States that the application provides for one to two storied dwellings – this is not in keeping with the existing character (noting that two storey dwellings were not permitted to be built.</li> <li>Traffic concerns relating to increased vehicle movements, cumulative congestion in Havelock North, lack of parking within the development, and the potential for overflow parking along Arataki Road. Consider that the transport assessment takes a too narrow a view of wider network pressures.</li> <li>Concern about lack of water capacity (noting that there is already a request from Council to conserve water).</li> <li>Consider terrace-style housing to be contrary to the village atmosphere in Havelock North.</li> <li>Note that the site is identified as highly productive land and question whether rezoning or reclassification would be required before approval.</li> <li>State that the application includes overhead images of the Brookvale Road mushroom facilities in a way that could give the false impression that the Arataki Road environment includes commercial or industrial character. Emphasise that their neighbourhood is prime residential and that the mushroom facilities are not visible from the site.</li> </ul>	<p>Neighbourhood character and density effects are addressed in section 13.4 of the planning report. That assessment confirms that while the lot sizes differ from those on Arataki Road, the proposed typologies and built form controls will maintain an appropriate suburban character and provide a suitable transition to the existing environment.</p> <p>Building height and two-storey development are addressed in sections 13.4 and 13.7. These assessments confirm that height limits, setbacks and fencing will appropriately manage dominance, privacy and shading effects.</p> <p>Traffic and transport effects are addressed in section 13.9 and the Integrated Transport Assessment (Appendix 18). The assessments confirm that expected vehicle movements can be safely accommodated and that road widths and parking provisions are sufficient to avoid reliance on overflow parking on Arataki Road.</p> <p>Water supply and servicing are addressed in section 13.10. The development can be serviced without adverse effects on the wider water network.</p> <p>Highly productive land and rural land classification matters are addressed in section 13.2. The proposal aligns with the relevant policy framework, and the effects of residential use have been assessed in full.</p> <p>The images included in the application are for context.</p>



Party	Address	Key Issues Raised	CDL Feedback
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concerned that the development will detract from residential amenity and negatively affect the value and saleability of their property.</li> <li>Do not support Fast-track consenting for this project.</li> </ul>	<p>Amenity-related effects have been comprehensively assessed in detail and are considered to be acceptable.</p> <p>Overall, the issues raised are addressed in the sections identified above and within the substantive application.</p>
Shaggy Range Ltd / JW & SL Johnston Partnership	104 Arataki Road (Shaggy Range)	<p>Concern about rural–urban interface effects, including noise, dust, odour, spray drift and the potential for dog-barking issues arising from the proximity of new dwellings to the Shaggy Range dog-daycare operation. Preference for a 30-metre buffer instead of the applicant’s proposed 10-metre setback to avoid reverse-sensitivity conflicts and maintain operational flexibility for their rural activities.</p> <p>Discusses three options provided by CDL to address the location of the Shaggy Range driveway being in the middle of the development. This included relocating their driveway along Olive Grove boundary. Considered that options were not well intentioned from CDL.</p> <p>Loss of freedom to operate for Shaggy Range due to new neighbours’ sections being too close to our boundary. An increase in barking from dogs we care for because of neighbouring activities. Annoyance to new and existing neighbours and complaints about barking, dust and noise from cars entering and leaving Shaggy Range.</p> <p>Animals from the new subdivision wandering onto our property because of inadequate fencing that results in disturbance of the dogs at Shaggy Range, and/or worry our stock. These animals may also bark at the cars going past their boundary fence along our driveway.</p> <p>A restriction on our ability to introduce new farming practices in the future for example keeping pigs.</p> <p>A loss of opportunity to consider how the new subdivision can be planted to encourage nature, and work with native species known to grow well in dry conditions to ensure the subdivision is sustainable from a water use perspective. The local Forest &amp; Bird branch have expressed these views in a letter already submitted but also attached.</p> <p>Notes errors in the application documentation relating to their address, doggy daycare activity description and RMA reference.</p>	<p>The applicant acknowledges the feedback provided by the Shaggy Range owners and appreciates the time they have taken to engage with the process. Throughout the past year and half, the applicant has met with the owners on several occasions, explored multiple driveway relocation options, and sought to work constructively through boundary treatments, planting design and interface management. Post-lodgement correspondence with Shaggy Range is included in <b>Appendix 10</b> to this report.</p> <p>The applicant’s preferred development option is to relocate the Shaggy Range driveway to the southern boundary which aligns with the sentiments of the Johnston’s feedback. While we were not able to reach agreement on moving forward with this option to align with the timeframes required by CDL for their Overseas Investment Office obligations, the proposal has been master planned to allow for a future driveway relocation should agreement be reached. The design can pivot to this response and still maintain the integrity of the overall masterplan design.</p> <p>The applicant remains open to reaching a resolution on this matter with the Johnston’s. A solution could be the implementation of an “either or” condition of consent (Condition 14A) which would enable the development to proceed either down the current design route or pivot to a design option that enables the driveway to move to the southern boundary. This has been addressed in Section 2.1.6 above.</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity effects have been discussed comprehensively in the AEE. In response to some of the more specific comments made in the Johnston’s feedback, the following applies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A 30-metre setback has not been requested in any prior engagement with the applicant. The 10-metre buffer, planting design, and fencing have been developed in direct response to</li> </ul>



Party	Address	Key Issues Raised	CDL Feedback
		Seeks greater emphasis on ecological planting, nature-based outcomes and long-term neighbourly compatibility.	<p>earlier discussions and in any case, as set out in the AEE, the design approach provides a suitable level of separation and mitigation at this interface.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Three driveway options were explored in good faith with the owners over an extended period. The applicant's preferred solution was relocation to the southern boundary, but the owners were not able to confirm support. The subdivision has been designed to keep this future option open, and an "either/or" condition is proposed to enable relocation should a commercial agreement later be reached.</li> <li>• The proposed rural-interface fencing will prevent wandering animals and reduce interactions between household pets and the dog-daycare operation. Final fencing specifications have been discussed previously and reflect those conversations. Fencing at the interface with this neighbour will be installed by the applicant as required by consent conditions.</li> <li>• The Plains Production zone continues to provide for permitted rural activities. The proposed interface treatments are intended to minimise potential reverse-sensitivity effects while not constraining lawful rural activities undertaken in accordance with the HDP. Further, no-complaints covenants are proposed on adjoining properties.</li> <li>• The applicant acknowledges the clerical errors (address, activity description, and RMA reference). We accept that the Shaggy Range operation should have referenced a doggy daycare rather than kennel facility.</li> </ul>

### 3.2. Feedback from Mana Whenua

Post lodgement, the Applicant contacted Tamatea Pōkai Whenua to provide an update on Panel timeframes and to confirm whether any further feedback would be forthcoming. No feedback has been received from Mana Whenua as part of the Panel's invitation for comment.

### 3.3. Feedback from Government Agencies

The Ministry for the Environment has confirmed that it does not wish to comment on the application. No further feedback was received from any other Government agency.

### 3.4. Feedback from Ministers

**Table 3** below provide a summary of the feedback received from government agencies along with response from the Applicant.

**Table 3: Feedback from Ministers**

Item	Comment	CDL Feedback
3.1	Minister for Infrastructure	
3.1.1	Infrastructure is important for growth and prosperity. Our view is our planning system has not been enabling of growth, hence the establishment of the FTAA.  I wish to take this opportunity to express my broad support for projects which deliver positive outcomes for New Zealand, including the Arataki project. Please take this letter of support as a reflection of the Government's economic growth and infrastructure priorities.	Noted
3.2	Associated Minister of Transport	
3.2.1	My view is that this project aligns with the Government's strategic priorities of housing development and economic growth. The Government Policy Statement on land transport 2024 seeks to unlock access to greenfield land for housing development and to support greater intensification, which this project would accomplish.  I would like to take this opportunity to note my support for the Arataki application to receive the substantive approvals it requires.	Noted
3.2.2	My support does not cover an assessment of impacts on the local transport network. I understand that the Hawke's Bay Regional Council and Hastings District Council have also been invited and can provide comments on this.	Please refer to Sections 3.5 and 3.6 of this report for transport related comments from HDC and HBRC.
3.3	Minister for Māori Development	
3.3.1	I support the application subject to reasonable consideration being given to the comments provided by relevant Māori groups, as identified in the Expert Panel's Minute 2.	Noted
3.3.2	I also encourage the Expert Panel to give due regard to the statutory acknowledgements over the Karamū Stream, as provided for in the Heretaunga Tamatea Claims Settlement Act 2018 and Hawke's Bay Regional Planning Committee Act 2015.	The applicant acknowledges the statutory acknowledgements over the Karamū Stream. The proposal incorporates best practice stormwater management and post-

		development water quality monitoring to protect the mauri and health of the stream, reflecting outcomes sought through engagement with local marae Ruahāpia.
--	--	--

### 3.5. Feedback from Hastings District Council

#### 3.5.1. Overview of Post-Lodgement Engagement

Post-lodgement engagement with HDC has been focused primarily on resolving the implementation of the RDF and responding to HDC's preference for a consent notice planning framework. Engagement has been constructive, iterative, and undertaken with both planning and engineering specialists to ensure that the development's planning framework is robust, enforceable, and aligned with HDC's expectations for the site.

The following outlines the post-lodgement engagement with HDC:

##### **Engagement on RDF and Planning Framework**

On 16 September 2025, the applicant met with Nellie Aroa (HDC Consents Planner) and Anna Summerfield (HDC Senior Policy Planner) to discuss the RDF and HDC's concerns regarding its adequacy and long-term usability. HDC advised that the RDF risked unintentionally omitting rules and recommended adopting the underlying HNGRZ and MDRZ provisions through consent notices instead for the proposed two lot types.

Prior to this meeting, and in response to HDC's planning feedback to the RDF dated 18 July 2025 (**Appendix 2**), the applicant had prepared and issued a detailed RDF - HDP comparison document to HDC on 29 August 2025 (**Appendix 2**). Following the 16 September meeting, this comparative assessment was revisited and refined further (**Appendix 2**). The applicant then provided HDC with a set of draft consent notices (**Appendix 2**) on 23 October 2025, completely replacing the RDF framework in favour of the application of the direct HDP zoning provisions, while retaining only a small number of bespoke design controls via specific consent notices to allow for particular design outcomes in the development sought by the RDF document and detailed in **Appendix 2** and **Table 4** below. This updated consent notice package reflected the agreed shift in planning framework approach and responded directly to the matters raised in the 18 July email at the 16 September meeting.

##### **Stormwater Management and Engineering Engagement**

On 6 November 2025, the applicant met with André Magdich (HDC Development Engineer) and Nellie Aroa (HDC Planner) to confirm an appropriate site-wide stormwater management approach. This discussion addressed the need for a bespoke consent notice rather than reliance on HDP standards, due to the oversized storage within the development's retention system and the 60% impervious area design threshold catered for within the development.

The applicant's engineer prepared a proposed mitigation flow diagram outlining the mitigation pathway for sites exceeding the threshold, including detention tanks and water-reuse options. This diagram has been refined following HDC feedback to ensure it would be readily interpretable by monitoring officers and engineering staff. The updated SMP with the inclusion of the mitigation diagram and supporting assessment is attached as **Appendix 7**.

### Ongoing Communication and Document Sharing

Since lodgement, the applicant has maintained open dialogue with HDC, providing timing updates, process guidance, and draft material on an informal basis. This included templates shared with HDC on 25 September 2025 to streamline the Panel review process, and regular email communication to clarify matters around timing and expectations. Where appropriate, updated versions of the consent notices and stormwater documents were shared informally with HDC prior to their formal submission to the EPA through this Comments Response process.

### Conclusion

This engagement has resulted in an altered planning framework for the development, centred on consent notices that clearly implement the residential urban zone provisions while capturing necessary bespoke design controls as lot specific consent notices. The revised approach provides greater clarity and enforceability for HDC, and greater certainty for future lot owners, ensuring that residential activities and development can proceed without unnecessary resource-consent triggers. These refinements are now fully reflected in the updated conditions suite (**Appendix 1**) and supporting documentation included with this response.

#### 3.5.2. Hastings District Council – Information Gaps / Key Issues

The HDC Memo has included a response to key issues and information gaps. The Applicant's response to these key issues and / or information gaps is provided in **Table 4** below.

#### 3.5.3. Hastings District Council – Additional Reasons for Consent

No additional reasons for consents have been identified.

**Table 4: HDC Information Gaps / Key Issues Table**

Item	Council Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Council Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
4.1	Planning Matters			
4.1.1	Reasons for Consent	We agree with the reasons for consent that have been outlined in the Application.	N/A	Noted
4.1.2	Assessment against the Statutory Planning Framework	We agree with the assessment that has been made in the Application.	N/A	Noted
4.1.3	Conditions	The Council was also provided with the opportunity to review the draft conditions prior to lodgement. Preliminary feedback was provided at that stage	HDC Feedback Attachment B sets out the Council's current views on the draft conditions, including areas where changes are requested and where additional conditions are considered necessary.	Refer to <b>Appendix 1</b> Conditions Suite V2 (20 November 2025) which includes all HDC feedback on conditions and CDL responses.
4.1.4	Overall comments	Overall, the proposal is considered to align and be consistent with the relevant rules, objectives and policies of the Hastings District Plan. It is considered that any adverse effects that may arise can be suitably avoided, remedied or mitigated subject to conditions of consent, should the Panel approve the application.	N/A	Noted
4.1.5	Expert Panel Minute 2, Item 4  Residential Design Framework	We have been working with Woods to address the concerns previously raised regarding the proposed Residential Design Framework (RDF), particularly the risk that any non-compliance with the RDF would trigger a consent notice variation. As noted earlier, this process can be both onerous and costly for Council and future homeowners.	N/A	<b>Accept:</b> As discussed in section 2.1.1 above, the Applicant has accepted the shift in planning framework from RDF to consent notices.  The new approach is to apply the HNGRZ provisions to Lot Type 1 (Condition 68B) and MDRZ provisions to Lot Type 2 (Condition 68E). Bespoke controls have been adopted as consent notices for the two Lot Types where the underlying zoning provisions do not achieve

Item	Council Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Council Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
		<p>The applicants have since provided a revised approach, which removes the RDF and instead proposes a draft consent notice applying the relevant provisions of the Hastings District Plan residential zones, as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lot Type 1: Havelock North General Residential Zone provisions</li> <li>• Lot Type 2: Medium Density Residential Zone provisions</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the applicants have included a small suite of bespoke design controls secured through consent notice conditions. These are tailored to the Arataki layout and development objectives and cover matters such as fencing, landscaping, and stormwater management.</p> <p>Having reviewed the draft consent notice conditions, I am satisfied that the removal of the RDF and its replacement with the proposed consent notice approach will achieve the applicants' intended development outcomes, while also providing clearer and more efficient implementation for Council. The lots will align more closely with existing residential zone standards, ensuring consistency in the built outcomes achieved for the respective zones and ease of assessment.</p> <p>Under this approach, where any future development does not meet the relevant performance standards of the applicable residential zone, a resource consent can be sought to address that specific non-compliance—without the need for a variation to the consent notice (except where bespoke design controls apply).</p> <p>Overall, this method represents a more streamlined and practical mechanism that reduces the likelihood and number of future consent notice variations, while</p>		the intended design outcome previously sought through the RDF document.




Item	Council Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Council Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
		maintaining an appropriate level of design control and alignment with the District Plan framework.		
4.1.5	Expert Panel Minute 2, Item 5  Density	<p>We believe the exclusive use of the national medium density residential standards would not be appropriate for these sites and this is not supported on the basis that some of these provisions allow a significant development envelope particularly in respect of height that is not consistent with the provincial context of Hastings.</p> <p>However, given the size of the proposed type 2 lots (400m<sup>2</sup> or less) and that all the sites are internal to the subdivision, we would support, applying the Hastings Medium Density Residential Zone provisions to these lots, as discussed above in matter 4. These provisions include some of the MDRS provisions but have also been tailored to the Hastings context and tested and developed through a schedule 1 process with the local community. These provisions currently apply to the Medium Density Residential Zone and to applications for comprehensive residential development of greenfield land in the Howard Street, Hastings and Brookvale, Havelock North new urban development areas.</p> <p>Applying these standards to the Lot 2 types will therefore be consistent with the existing direction and policy of the District Plan. It will also help enable a more efficient use of this greenfield land resource, and it is noted that this site in particular is within the vicinity of three schools (primary, intermediate and high school), bus route, and recreation areas.</p> <p>Allowing for medium density development within greenfield locations provides greater housing diversity and a range of typologies that can better meet the needs of different households, lifestyles and price points / budgets.</p>	N/A	<p><b>Accept:</b> For the Panel's benefit, and as discussed in section 2.1.1 above, the applicant undertook an exercise to ensure that the MDRZ provisions that are now proposed to apply to the site align with the original intention of Lot Type 2 of the RDF (<b>Appendix 2</b>).</p> <p>In this regard, while the majority of the MDRZ zone provisions are able to apply to Lot Type 2, several bespoke controls are proposed to achieve the intended design outcomes for the development, including restricting the height of buildings to 8m +1m (rather than 11m) to achieve a smaller scale built form to reflect the character of the area. In addition, further subdivision and / or comprehensive residential development is not able to be applied on the Lot Type 2 sites given the small site sizes.</p>

Item	Council Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Council Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
		<p>This approach aligns with the planned urban built form anticipated for Havelock North and the wider district, which seeks to support more compact, well-designed residential areas while maintaining a high level of amenity.</p> <p>Overall, the proposed design standards are considered appropriate to deliver the intended built form outcomes and contribute positively towards achieving a more efficient, diverse, and resilient urban environment.</p>		
4.2	Engineering Matters			
4.2.1	<p>Expert Panel Minute 2, Item 2</p> <p>Wastewater capacity</p>	<p>The wastewater capacity augmentation project is programmed for delivery in the 2025/2026 financial year. Upon completion, this project will provide adequate system capacity to accommodate the proposed development, ensuring no adverse impacts on the performance or operation of the existing wastewater network.</p>	N/A	Noted
4.2.2	<p>Expert Panel Minute 2, Item 3</p> <p>Source Protection Zone</p>	<p>When assessing applications for a new take or discharge in or near a Source Protection Zone (SPZ), Hawkes Bay Regional Council (HBRC) will generally consider contamination pathways, risk of degrading source water quality, mobility of contaminants and the cumulative effects of the proposed land/water use activity. As the Registered Drinking Water Supplier for the Hastings district, Hastings District Council (HDC) is notified of any consents where proposed land/water use activity is located within an identified SPZ for an opportunity to comment.</p> <p>With regard to collaboration and opportunity for positive engagement and input, HDC is satisfied with the applicants' efforts to meet with both HBRC and HDC to</p>	N/A	Noted

Item	Council Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Council Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
		<p>discuss the overall stormwater philosophy and approach to the proposals management of stormwater from both a quality and quantity perspective as evident in sec 5.0 Stakeholder engagement and consultation - Table 3 of the SMP.</p> <p>The Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) developed by Wood &amp; Partners Consultants Limited makes it clear that approximately 80% of the site falls within this zone, requiring measures to prevent potential contamination of drinking water sources as per Hawke's Bay Regional Council (HBRC) guidelines.</p> <p>With regard to compliance with each TA's requirements, the purpose of the SMP states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Demonstration that the proposed stormwater management meets the requirements of HDC and HBRC ensuring compliance with the HDC's Code of Practice (2020) and HBRC's Hawke's Bay Waterway Guidelines (2009).</li> <li>2. Provide appropriate treatment for the receiving environment via stormwater quality treatment guidelines</li> </ul> <p>A description of measures to prevent or minimise adverse effects on the quality of the source water and receiving environment are as follows, as stipulated in the SMP:</p> <p>Sub-catchment A:</p> <p>Although HDC guidelines do not mandate water quality treatment for stormwater discharged to its network from the roading network, four raingardens are proposed along Arataki Road to treat stormwater runoff. The raingardens are designed to treat the first flush of low storm events, reducing pollutants such as Total Suspended Solids (TSS) and hydrocarbons.</p>		

Item	Council Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Council Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
		<p>Sub-catchment B:</p> <p>A treatment train approach is adopted, combining a proprietary device (Atlan BaffleBox or similar) and a communal dry basin. The treatment devices are designed to achieve a total suspended solids (TSS) removal rate of 84%, exceeding the HBRC guideline of 75%.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The dry basin also addresses temperature management, ensuring stormwater discharge does not increase the natural temperature of receiving water by more than 3°C.</li> <li>• The project includes water quality monitoring both upstream and downstream of the development to ensure the effectiveness of treatment devices and to address mana whenua concerns and monitoring will include baseline testing and post-development testing (up to year 3) for parameters such as TSS, petroleum hydrocarbons, heavy metals, nitrogen, phosphorus, hardness, and E. coli.</li> </ul> <p>It is noted that a minimum vertical separation between the base of a dry (or wet) stormwater basin and the seasonal high groundwater table is normally required to not create or exacerbate contamination pathways to groundwater or aquifers and avoid or mitigate adverse effects on source water quality. As per sec 3.3 Geotechnical / soil conditions of the SMP, groundwater was not encountered within any of the investigations completed to date across the site and is expected to be at depths greater than 8m below the site.</p> <p>It is noted that a further assessment will be carried out in due course when considering applications to discharge stormwater to ground to ensure that the design minimises risks of contamination to the SPZ.</p>		

Item	Council Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Council Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
		For the above reasons, HDC is comfortable with the appropriateness of what is being proposed and is confident in the applicants' desires, approach, and mitigation measures to ensure there are no adverse outcomes from this development proposal with regard to source protection.		
4.3	Transportation			
4.3.1	Expert Panel Minute 2, Item 1 Traffic generation	<p>Bruce would agree that the Integrated Transport Assessment does not provide comment on the use of Meissner Road or the potential impacts of the development on Meissner Road. In the context of the access to the schools, there is certainly easy pedestrian and cycle access in the area from the development via Meissner Road, and via a walkway at the end of the Te Heipora Place to the schools.</p> <p>It could be expected that there would be an increase in traffic using Meissner Road at school times with the development. Given the AADT on Meissner Road and the extent of the development, the potential increase in traffic using Meissner Road is unlikely to create any issues on both Meissner Road and at the Meissner Road / Russell Robertson Drive roundabout. The challenge is to determine the potential traffic volumes where the purpose is school related.</p>	It may be appropriate that the applicant be asked to provide an assessment of the question raised by the panel with that provided as an addendum to their ITA.	<p>Refer to the Transportation Memo prepared by Flow Transportation Specialists (dated 17 November 2025) at <b>Appendix 6</b>.</p> <p>The additional assessment confirms that any school-related traffic using Meissner Road will be limited and comfortably accommodated within the road's intended function. The Arataki Project benefits from strong walking and cycling connections to nearby schools, and the projected vehicle movements remain well within the capacity of an Access Road. On this basis, no further transport mitigation is required, and the proposal continues to present an appropriate and efficient transport outcome.</p>
4.4	Public Spaces and Reserves Matters			
4.4.1	Overall comment	Overall, the Public Spaces and Reserves team consider the proposal is generally consistent with the Hastings District Council Reserves requirements.	N/A	Noted

Item	Council Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Council Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
4.4.2	Lot 3 on the fencing plan is shown with a green fence	Lot 3 (as below) currently shows a green fence reference instead of blue (indicating it adjoins reserve). This should be update this to blue (1.8m high, open-style galvanised pool fencing), that would be great.	Recommend changing the fencing along this boundary to be 1.8m visually permeable fence: 	<b>Reject:</b> The applicant does not accept the request to apply a 1.8-metre pool-style fence along the full length of the southern boundary of Lot 3 adjoining the reserve walkway.  The proposed bespoke fencing approach, which enables the future lot owner to construct up to 50 per cent of this boundary fence at 1.8 metres (with the remainder at 1.2 metres), provides an appropriate balance between privacy for the resident and passive surveillance of the reserve.  In addition, the opposite Lot 4 & 5 reserve fronting boundaries will have open pool-style fencing, ensuring further passive surveillance over the reserve walkway. It would be difficult for the owner of Lot 3 to provide for appropriate onsite privacy if pool style fencing was applied to both the east and south boundaries.
4.5	Consent Notices			
4.5.1	Stormwater consent notice	Please ensure the SMP includes the flow diagram from our meeting 6/11/2025 and some clear instructions/way to determine the appropriate sized detention tanks should a design be over 60% impervious and require mitigation.	Please ensure the SMP includes the flow diagram from our meeting 6/11/2025 and some clear instructions/way to determine the appropriate sized detention tanks should a design be over 60% impervious and require mitigation	<b>Accept:</b> For the Panel's benefit, a bespoke consent notice is required (rather than application of underlying HDP stormwater rules) as the stormwater management system for the development has been oversized and the current HDP rule does not reflect this approach, placing undue impervious area limitations on the proposed lots.  Following discussion with HDC, the SMP ( <b>Appendix 7</b> ) has been updated to include a flow diagram and supporting assessment to clearly demonstrate how mitigation should be achieved for sites that exceed the 60% impervious area threshold. Further, this report



Item	Council Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Council Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
				now forms part of the listed Schedule 1 Reports and Drawings ( <b>Appendix 1</b> ).
4.5.2	Fencing consent notice	The public spaces and reserves team have stated that the lot 3 side boundary should also have a 1.8m high, open style pool fence (currently shown as a corner fence) Please amend to include.	1.8m high, open style pool fence (currently shown as a corner fence) Please amend to include.	<p><b>Reject:</b> The applicant does not accept the request to apply a 1.8-metre pool-style fence along the full length of the southern boundary of Lot 3 adjoining the reserve walkway.</p> <p>The proposed bespoke fencing approach, which enables the future lot owner to construct up to 50 per cent of this boundary fence at 1.8 metres (with the remainder at 1.2 metres), provides an appropriate balance between privacy for the resident and passive surveillance of the reserve.</p> <p>In addition, the opposite Lot 4 &amp; 5 reserve fronting boundaries will have open pool-style fencing, ensuring further passive surveillance over the reserve walkway. It would be difficult for the owner of Lot 3 to provide for appropriate onsite privacy if pool style fencing was applied to both the east and south boundaries.</p>

## 3.6. Feedback from Hawkes Bay Regional Council

### 3.6.1. Overview of Post-Lodgement Engagement

Post-lodgement engagement with HBRC has focused on confirming the robustness of the technical documentation supporting the Substantive Application and ensuring that the proposed regional consent conditions align with HBRC's standard approach. HBRC have been proactive in sharing their completeness check findings, internal reviews, and peer review material, which has supported a clear pathway to confirming that the technical reporting is sound.

The following outlines the post-lodgement engagement with HBRC:

#### **Site Visit and Initial Engagement**

On 5 September 2025, a site visit was undertaken with HBRC representatives and the applicant team. This provided an opportunity for HBRC to walk the site, understand the proposed discharge location, and gain clarity around the rural interface and downstream catchment characteristics. This visit enabled a technical discussion on the engineering approach for the development and narrowing the focus of subsequent technical queries.

#### **Technical Peer Reviews and Specialist Feedback**

HBRC provided an ecological peer review memo on 6 October 2025 (submitted with HBRC's invitation for comment response), which identified a difference in professional opinion between HBRC's ecologist (low ecological value) and the applicant's ecologist (very low value). Both experts agreed that the distinction does not alter the overall conclusions or required mitigation for the project. The applicant queried whether a terrestrial ecology review would also be provided and HBRC confirmed that any terrestrial review would fall under HDC's jurisdiction.

A memo from HBRC's civil engineer was received on 13 October 2025 (submitted with HBRC's invitation for comment response), confirming general agreement with the engineering assessments supporting the application. Minor amendments to the regional conditions were discussed and agreed. HBRC also confirmed that PDP would be engaged to independently peer review the application which was provided with HBRC's formal feedback comments.

#### **Ongoing Communication and Document Sharing**

Since lodgement, the applicant has maintained open communication with HBRC, providing updates on timing, anticipated panel processes, and draft material to support the efficiency of HBRC's internal reviews. This included the provision of response templates to streamline the comment process and regular email correspondence to clarify expectations and respond to technical questions as they emerged.

#### **Conclusion**

Overall, the applicant's post-lodgement engagement with HBRC has ensured that the technical foundations of the Substantive Application are robust and that the regional consent conditions reflect HBRC's established standards and review findings. HBRC's feedback has been incorporated into the updated conditions (**Appendix 1**) and supporting documentation provided with this response.

### 3.6.2. Hawkes Bay Regional Council – Information Gaps / Key Issues

The HBRC Memo has included a response to key issues and information gaps. The Applicant's response to these key issues and / or information gaps is provided in **Table 5** below.

### 3.6.3. Hawkes Bay Regional Council – Additional Reasons for Consent

No additional reasons for consents have been identified.

**Table 5: HBRC Key Issues / Information Gaps Table**

Item	Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
5.1	Planning Matters			
5.1.1	Rules assessment TANK 15 and TANK 8	<p>The applicant has generally identified the relevant rules under the relevant plan and plan change for the activity. In some instances, the references to the relevant rule names are incorrect, however this does not change the outcome as the relevant rule content has been considered as follows:</p> <p>The rules assessment (Appendix 8) has omitted to state that rule TANK 15 is applicable as the activity includes taking and using impounded water. This is however, included in the planning report (section 8.2.2).</p> <p>In the planning report (section 8.2.3), it is stated that resource consent for removal of native vegetation within 10 m of a stream is required under TANK 8. The activity is correct, however the reference to "TANK 8" is incorrect. For correctness, the activity does not comply with RRMP Rule 7 as amended by TANK Plan Change 9 and consent is therefore required under RRMP Rule 8.</p>		<p>Noted.</p> <p>HBRC have advised that the reasons for consent were generally identified correctly but noted two minor rule-reference corrections. Rule TANK 15 has not been listed in Appendix 8 of the substantive application for the take and use of impounded water but consent has been correctly identified in the Planning Report (section 8.2.2).</p> <p>HBRC also clarified that removal of native vegetation within 10 m of a stream is a non-compliance with RRMP Rule 7 (already applied for) rather than "TANK 8."</p> <p>No changes to the proposal are required as the corrections have been noted for accuracy.</p>
5.1.2	Rules assessment – flocculants	<p>Of note, Appendix 19 – Ecology Report mentions the use of flocculants during construction.</p> <p>It is understood that flocculants are to be used only during construction of the stormwater management pond (which will later become the attenuation basin) and the sediment retention ponds (SRPs) to manage sediment within the confines of the site owned by the applicant. Resource consent has not been sought to discharge flocculants as a part of this application</p>	Therefore, the applicant may need to obtain additional resource consent for this matter at a later date if flocculants are intended to be used.	<p><b>Not applicable:</b> HBRC questioned whether flocculants would be used following the construction of the subdivision. CDL confirms that its use is limited to the construction period and for construction of the stormwater management pond and therefore does not trigger any additional resource consents.</p>

Item	Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
		but an authorisation to do so potentially may be required (i.e. if flocculants were discharged to the stormwater management pond to manage sediment laden water and a rainfall event were to cause the stormwater management pond to overflow/wash flocculants out of the pond).		
5.1.3		Overall, the proposal is generally consistent with common practice for stormwater management in Hawke's Bay. To date, the applicant has actively and openly discussed matters of the proposal with HBRC representatives which has been constructive for satisfying a number of HBRC's initial concerns, and as a result, HBRC has a small number of comments about the proposal at this time.	Subject to the few amendments detailed in Appendix B (of the HBRC Memo), the proposed mitigation measures and conditions of consent are appropriate for the scale and nature of the activities.	<b>Accept:</b> The Applicant accepts the proposed amendments to conditions sought by HBRC. Changes reflect HBRC condition preferences and support the overall implementation of the proposal. These have been incorporated into the Conditions Suite V2 included in <b>Appendix 1</b> .
5.1.4	No other information gap, although some smaller issues with consent conditions are identified.	Corrections and amendments to the draft conditions of consent are suggested to ensure the conditions achieve their intent and are effective.	See amendments in Appendix B (of the HBRC Memo) for recommended actions and comments.	<b>Accept:</b> The Applicant accepts the proposed amendments to conditions sought by HBRC. Changes reflect HBRC condition preferences and support the overall implementation of the proposal. These changes have been incorporated into the Conditions Suite V2 included in <b>Appendix 1</b> .
5.2	Engineering Matters			
5.2.1	No information gap or key issues identified.  Overall, the proposal is generally consistent with best practice design for stormwater management.	Overall, the proposal is generally consistent with best practice design for stormwater management. Additional time is needed for Council to consider information/plans submitted for certification as required by the draft conditions of consent.	Recommend amendment to conditions to review days allocated to council.	<b>Accept:</b> The Applicant accepts the proposed amendments to conditions sought by HBRC. Changes reflect HBRC condition preferences and support the overall implementation of the proposal. These changes have been incorporated into the Conditions Suite V2 included in <b>Appendix 1</b> .

Item	Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
	Additional time is needed for Council to consider information /plans submitted for certification as required by the draft conditions of consent.			
5.2.2	Engineering design & conditions	<p>Based on the information provided, presented and the site visit meeting the HBRC Engineering team were able to adequately understand the proposed development and were able to undertake an assessment of the potential environmental impact of the activity.</p> <p>Based on this assessment the HBRC Engineering team have made the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed approach for the management, treatment and discharge of stormwater from the development is fit for purpose and follows best practice in NZ.</li> <li>• The stormwater devices and measures proposed for the stormwater system follow the HBRC Waterway Guidelines – Stormwater Management2.</li> <li>• The proposed stormwater devices and measures are consistent with low impact design.</li> <li>• The proposed development would have less than minor effects on the environment.</li> <li>• The proposed conditions that were provided as part of the Condition Suite document especially Conditions 118 – 136 relating to in stream works and 137 – 176 relating to the stormwater discharge are adequate and appropriate.</li> </ul>	Recommend amendment to conditions to review days allocated to council.	<b>Accept:</b> The Applicant accepts the proposed amendments to conditions sought by HBRC. Changes reflect HBRC condition preferences and support the overall implementation of the proposal. These changes have been incorporated into the Conditions Suite V2 included in <b>Appendix 1</b> .



Item	Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
		<p>The only amendment to these conditions is associated with the number of days that documents that are proposed to be supplied for HBRC review and approval/acceptance is short. However, the HBRC review process is managed by HBRC Compliance team.</p> <p>Based on the information provided, we consider that the proposal would be acceptable.</p>		
5.3	Ecology Matters			
5.3.1	<p>Issue – Disagreement on overall freshwater ecology value.</p> <p>Overall comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Adequacy: The ecological assessment was limited but adequate. No significant freshwater ecological issues are likely.</li> <li>• Effects: Effects are best described as low (rather than very low) but are not considered significant, provided the proposed conditions and monitoring are implemented.</li> <li>• Conditions: The proposed suite is strong, and Condition 170 addresses this, but it could be made clearer by referencing Condition 142(c) &amp; (d) to strengthen ecological</li> </ul>	<p><b>Methodology and Good Practice</b></p> <p>From a freshwater quality and ecological perspective, the methodology is fit-for-purpose and follows good/best practice for ecological assessment and stormwater design relevant to water quality outcomes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The ecological survey used standard NZ protocols for fish and macroinvertebrates and reported MCI-sb values appropriately.</li> <li>• Stormwater design was assessed against HBRC best practice guidelines in relation to water quality and ecological outcomes, with treatment trains incorporating raingardens, baffle boxes, and an attenuation basin. Claimed TSS removal rates (~84%) are within accepted performance ranges for such systems.</li> <li>• The proposed conditions (WQMS, SMMP, sediment control, monitoring) align well with good practice for construction and post-construction stormwater management in New</li> </ul>	<p><b>Recommendation - Adaptive Management Trigger</b></p> <p>Linking water quality monitoring results to adaptive management (e.g., requiring review of stormwater systems or maintenance if analyte limits are exceeded or ecological monitoring shows decline) is recommended. Condition 142(h) currently requires the Water Quality Monitoring Strategy (WQMS) to be reviewed every two years to assess whether the monitoring remains fit for purpose and reflects best practice. Condition 170 addresses this, but it could be made clearer by referencing Condition 142(c) &amp; (d).</p> <p>See amendment in Appendix B (in the HBRC Memo) for recommended change to condition 170.</p>	<p><b>Accept:</b> The Applicant accepts the proposed amendments to conditions sought by HBRC. These changes have been incorporated into the Conditions Suite V2 included in <b>Appendix 1</b>.</p> <p>Note: The HBRC Ecology Memo has identified a difference in professional opinion on the status of the stream between HBRC's ecologist (low ecological value) and the applicant's ecologist (very low value). Both experts agreed that the distinction does not alter the overall conclusions or required mitigation for the project.</p>

Item	Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
	monitoring and adaptive management.	<p>Zealand as they relate to maintaining water quality and ecological values.</p> <p><b>Assessment of Effects and Conclusions</b></p> <p>The applicant concludes that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Effects on ecological values from stormwater quality and quantity will be “very low”.</li> <li>• The receiving environment is already degraded and tolerant of additional stressors.</li> </ul> <p>No significant ecological effects are anticipated. However, characterisation of effects as “very low” is considered to be slightly optimistic, given that the stream continues to support taonga species (longfin eel, īnanga, kōura) that remain vulnerable to cumulative stressors such as sedimentation, low dissolved oxygen, high instream temperatures, and potential contaminant loading.</p> <p>The effects could be framed as low (rather than very low) but note that this distinction does not change the overall conclusion: no significant ecological issues have been identified, provided that the proposed monitoring and management conditions are implemented.</p> <p><b>Conditions and Monitoring Requirements</b></p> <p>From a freshwater quality and ecological perspective, the proposed suite of conditions (118–176) is comprehensive, with particular strengths in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Sediment and erosion control during construction.</li> </ul>		

Item	Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stormwater treatment design as it relates to water quality and ecological outcomes.</li> <li>Detailed water quality monitoring requirements (including nutrients, metals, hydrocarbons, E. coli, and TSS).</li> </ul>		
5.4	Regional Public Transport Matters			
5.4.1	<p>No information gap or key issues identified.</p> <p>Supportive of provision for additional bus stops, if in the future should they be needed. Though to be clear, the consent holder is not expected to construct the bus stops as they are not currently needed at this time.</p>	<p>Although an additional public transport bus stop on the eastern side of Arataki Road is not required at this time (and not proposed as part of the application), Council is supportive of the conceptual plan Figure 34 of Appendix 18 - Integrated Traffic Assessment which has provision for additional bus stops.</p> <p>Council is supportive of this provision as it may assist in enabling opportunity to alternative or additional bus routes in the future, should they be necessary.</p>	No changes to conditions necessary.	Noted.
5.5	Heretaunga Plains Confined Aquifer Bore Water Risk Matters			
5.5.1	<p>Expert Panel Minute 2, Item 3:</p> <p>Council is requested to comment on the appropriateness of the proposed permanent stormwater treatment design, and temporary construction sediment control methodology, with respect to the Source Protection Zone</p>	<p><b>Review Conclusion</b></p> <p>The following conclusions regarding the risk of the proposed stormwater discharge containing the Heretaunga Plains Confined Aquifer and public water supply bores are based on this review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As the location of the discharge is outside of the 1-year Source Water Risk Management Area of the Brookvale Road water bore, the risk of contamination is expected to be low.</li> </ul>	Recommend amendment to conditions 121 and 141.	<b>Accept:</b> The Applicant accepts the proposed amendments to conditions sought by HBRC. Changes reflect HBRC condition preferences and support the overall implementation of the proposal. These changes have been incorporated into the Conditions Suite V2 included in <b>Appendix 1</b> .

Item	Information Gap / Key Issue	Council's Comment	Recommended Action / Next Step	CDL Response
	<p>and Heretaunga Plains Confined Aquifer.</p> <p>Overall, the risk of contamination from the proposal on both public water supply bores and other bores is expected to be low.</p>	<p>There is also expected to be a low risk of contamination to the Hastings Urban Supply bores, given the nature of the discharge and that they are located some distance upgradient of the discharge location. They also draw water from below the low permeability confining strata layers of the Heretaunga Plains Confined Aquifer, further reducing the risk of contamination.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considering expected background contaminant concentrations in the stream and in the stormwater, the risk of contaminating other bores in the Heretaunga Plains Confined Aquifer from any losses from the stream to groundwater below the point of discharge is expected to be low.</li> </ul> <p>The spill risk during the construction phase must be adequately managed in accordance with the SMP for the site. This should be reviewed to help ensure that the risk of hydrocarbon contamination is managed appropriately.</p> <p>Based on the review, the proposed permanent stormwater treatment design, and temporary construction sediment control methodology, is considered appropriate with respect to risks to public supply bores and other bores in the Heretaunga Plains Confined Aquifer.</p>		

## 4.0 Conclusion

This Planning Overview Response Report has been prepared to support the Expert Panel's consideration of the Arataki Substantive Application under the FTAA. It responds to feedback received from HDC, HBRC, and other invited parties, provides clarification on the consent requirements, and documents refinements made to the proposal and conditions of consent since lodgement of the Substantive Application.

Overall, it is concluded that the proposal continues to result in effects that are acceptable and appropriately managed through the updated conditions of consent. No material change to the conclusions of the lodged Assessment of Environmental Effects is required. This information is provided to assist the Panel in its decision-making under the FTAA.