

Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

MINUTE 4 OF THE EXPERT PANEL

Expert Conferencing
Waitākere District Court – New courthouse project
[FTAA-2508-1096]

17 February 2026

[1] This Minute provides further information about expert conferencing, and addresses the Applicant's response to the most recent request for information, as well as the appointment of a technical advisor.

Applicant's response to request for information

[2] On 5 February 2026, the Panel issued Minute 3, which included a request for further information from the Applicant regarding the National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards.

[3] On 13 February 2026, the Applicant provided a response to the request, which can be viewed on the fast-track website, here: <https://www.fasttrack.govt.nz/projects/waitakere-district-court-new-courthouse-project/reports-and-advice>

Expert conferencing

[4] Minute 3 also included directions from the Panel for expert conferencing regarding flooding and urban design matters to be held.

[5] Conferencing will take place from 9:30am until 1:15pm on Thursday 19

February 2026 and will be held online via Microsoft Teams.

[6] Relevant experts that represent Auckland Council, and the Applicant, are asked to attend.

[7] The matters to be discussed during conferencing are outlined in **Appendix 1** of this Minute.

Appointment of technical advisor

[8] Under clause 10(3) of Schedule 3 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, the Panel may appoint a technical adviser as it thinks appropriate.

[9] The Panel has appointed Dave Serjeant from Merestone Limited to assist with facilitating the expert conferencing, and to provide advice relating to the draft conditions.



Heather Ash

Waitākere District Court – New Courthouse Project Expert Panel Chair

Appendix 1 – Matters to be discussed during expert conferencing

Urban Design

[1] How can the urban design conditions be drafted to give greater certainty that the building will be designed and constructed to address/mitigate the effects of stormwater and extreme rainfall events?

[2] If the Urban Design Guidelines Framework (UDGF) condition addresses the above and all other aspects raised by Auckland Council, including reference to the underlying Auckland Unitary Plan provisions, do we still require the bulk and location condition 7? If no, please provide an agreed wording for condition 6.

Flooding

[1] Given the updated flood modelling, including 10yr, 50yr and permeable grate 100yr rainfall event, does the Applicant and Auckland Council consider that there are upstream effects that are to be addressed due to the potential/proposed development of the NoR site?

a) With reference to ACH Flood Assessment Report addendum filed on 13 February 2026, Section 3.7 & 3.8:

- i) There is an increase in flood footprint in both assessments, however no assessment as to what that means for Takapu Street or the surrounding environment.
- ii) Regarding the Top Water Level (TWL) increase from pre-development:
 - The as-lodged scheme = 10-20mm with 140mm relative to pre-development

- The alternative scheme = 10-120mm with 160mm relative to pre-development

b) what conditions could apply to the NoR to address potential effects in the outline plan of works for flood events?

[2] The ACH assessment has found that the building and landform will be subject to minor consequence during 100yr rainfall event effects. However, the specific velocity associated with the landform and building footprint has not been identified. What is the remaining risk of minor consequences if conditions are included that direct the design of the landform and building?

- a) Is it appropriate to apply conditions to minimise the residual risk, or would a design requirement be more appropriate?
- b) If conditions are appropriate, what conditions can be placed to ensure the residual risk is minimised to the building and landform?

[3] With respect to the hazard risk to occupants, there is a reliance/reference to safe egress. The ACH assessment reports circa 500mm flood depth in the egress route to Edmonton Road via the eastern vehicle ramp. However, the Flood Emergency Management Plan (FEMP) also references that parties within the court should stay in place.

- a) What mechanism is there for the stay in place to be enforced?
- b) Is a NoR condition appropriate for the FEMP to include a stay in place and not recommend egress?

[4] With respect to the site layout, as per Architects as-lodged and alternative layouts, there are areas where car parking and infrastructure is at ground level.

- a) Noting that assessments to date have focused on the safety of affected persons, what assessment has been undertaken for the safety of this car parking and infrastructure during the likelihood of flooding?