

File ref: FTAA-2502-1009

17 July 2025

CCKV Maitai Dev Co Limited Partnership
C/- Mark Lile
Landmark Lile Limited
By Email: Mark@landmarklile.co.nz

Tēnā koe

Request for information from CCKV Maitai Dev Co Limited Partnership in relation to Maitahi Village under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

The Maitahi Village Expert Panel (the Panel) has directed the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) to request further information from CCKV Maitai Dev Co Limited Partnership (the applicant) under section 67 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (the Act), relating to the Maitahi Village application.

At the direction of the Panel, the EPA is seeking the information detailed in **Appendix 1** of this letter regarding the assessment of wetlands within the Project site.

Supply of Information

In accordance with section 67(2) of the Act CCKV Maitai Dev Co Limited Partnership must:

- a) Provide electronic copies of the information or report requested; or
- b) Advise the EPA, with reasons that you decline to provide the information or report requested.

Please provide the further information to the EPA by **24 July 2025**.

If the information requested is not received, the Panel must proceed as if the request for further information has been declined.

Please note, the information will be provided to the Panel, every person who provided comments on the application, and Nelson City Council. The information will also be made available on the Fast-track website.

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

Nāku noa, nā

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "A Mickleson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Alex Mickleson
Application Lead, Fast-track Applications

Appendix 1 – Information requested by the Panel

Topic	Information Sought
Natural Inland Wetland	<p>The Ecological Impact Assessment (EclA) submitted with the application discusses the identification and location of natural inland wetlands in Section 3.1.3.</p> <p>In Section 3.1.3.1, the EclA states that “<i>potential wetlands in the floodplain area associated with the Lower Kākā Hill Tributary, which has undergone significant modifications in the past, were not considered in this report*</i>”. This indicates reliance on an earlier EclA undertaken by Tonkin and Taylor in 2021 (section 3.1.1.5 of this report provides a brief statement on the two identified wetlands) with regard to the southern area as part of Private Plan Change 28 to the Nelson Resource Management Plan (NRMP).</p> <p>Section 3.1.3.1 then notes that “<i>historical stream realignments and the addition of fill material and access way formation have substantially altered the original floodplain topography, resulting in only small artificial drainage lines and associated depressions (Figure 3.4) that are infrequently inundated during higher flow events. These modifications likely restrict natural drainage of localised areas, creating an environment that could support wetland plant species*</i>”.</p> <p>This section continues on and then states that “<i>although the historical presence of wetlands in the floodplain area cannot be entirely discounted*, such wetland features are typically situated in lower-lying areas more prone to frequent flooding (Courtney et al. 2003). This geographical context reduces the likelihood of historical wetland presence at the relatively higher-lying land associated with the floodplain area</i>”.</p> <p>Under Section 3.1.3.2, the investigations of Wetlands 1 and 2 are discussed. Other than these wetlands, the assessment states that “<i>no additional wetlands are known within the Project Area. There are wet/boggy areas within the pasture, including within floodplain area associated with the Lower Kākā Hill Tributary, which support occasional Juncus species but none of these appeared to reach the density of the NPS-FM definition of natural wetland, based on cursory observations made during site visits*</i>”.</p> <p>*Emphasis added with underline.</p>
Comments received	<p>Comments have been received, for example from G Scott and C Harper, questioning whether the southern part of the site is actually a natural inland wetland and whether the provisions of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPSFM) and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater (NESF) should apply to this area.</p>
Applicant's comments	<p>A response to these comments is provided on Page 112 of the applicant's Table of Comments and Responses. Under the Ecological response heading, the applicant confirmed that “<i>the southern area is not classified as a natural inland wetland (EclA, Section 3.1.3)</i>”.</p>
Request for Information	<p>To assist the Panel in relation to considering the provisions under Schedule X.15 of the NRMP the following information is sought:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Confirmation of whether Robertson Environmental undertook an assessment against the NPSFM definition of ‘natural inland wetland’ across the lower/southern flood plain of the project site, or if such an assessment was limited to Wetlands 1 and 2 with any remaining assessment, being only ‘cursory’ as stated?

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Provide any further evidence or information, where available, to confirm that the lower/southern flood plain area of the site does not fall within the definition of a natural inland wetland under the NPSFM. 3. If this area is to be potentially considered a natural inland wetland, confirm the status of the approval sought, and provide an assessment of the impacts on the values of any wetland including any relevant references to the NPSFM, NESF and NRMP, and any proffered conditions.
--	--