

APPENDIX 4 – CONSULTATION DOCUMENTS AND RECORDS WITH WAIMAKRIRI DISTRICT COUNCIL

Waimakariri District Council			
Tab	Document	Date	Pages
1.	Pre-Application Meeting for Ohoka Fast Track Application – WDC Meeting Notes	23 January 2025	1-6
2.	Ohoka Fast Track Application Meeting Minutes (WDC	30 May 2025	7-10
3.	File note: Pre-application consultation – Ohoka Residential Subdivision – Meeting with Waimakariri District Council (via Teams) <i>(Note: This is the Applicant's record of the meeting with WDC. No formal minutes were provided by WDC;)</i>	30 April 2026	11-14
4.	Email from Tim Johnston (WDC) to Tim Walsh (Novo Group): RC255196 Carter Group Ohoka Fast Track – WDC High Level Initial Comments	25 May 2026	15-16

Pre-Application Meeting for Ohoka Fast Track Application

Held at the Waimakariri District Council offices – 215 High Street, Rangiora.

23rd January 2025 at 4.00pm

Present:

WDC: Wendy Harris, Matt Bacon, Ian Carstens, Denise Cowan(notes)

Michael Paterson – Inovo
Bruce Van Duyn – Carter Group
Sanna Soederlind – Inovo (via Teams Link)
Tim Carter – Carter Group
Lucy Forrester – Chapman Tripp

Apologies:

Tim Wash – Novo Group
Jeremy Phillips – Novo Group

Agenda

1. Introduction to the application TC
2. General details of the application including summary of supporting documents to be provided. SS/MP
3. Subdivision and Land Use Consent Conditions from WDC WDC
4. Processing procedure outline from WDC WDC
5. Communications plan – pre and post lodgement MP/BVD

The meeting began with attendees introducing themselves and outlining their roles.

Tim C - Tim gave an overview of the development and what the Carter Group do. The Ohoka development is 1 of 3 fast track projects the group have put in. The Fast track system is a fast paced piece of legislation regarding understanding what needs to be done and when it has to be done. The group are working their way through this process.

An application form for the fast track applications is to be put on line and this hasn't been done yet so currently the Group are still unsure of what their application will be, the Group are in the early days of forming their application. The application will be mostly based on what the Council have already seen for Ohoka.

Fast track is about giving approval and getting things going from the Groups perspective. Giving approval is not just the zoning, it is more all the approvals - the design, wildlife approval for lizards – assessments for this will be done, ECAN stormwater approvals to go in along with Subdivision consent approvals. It is an all encompassing approval package.

Timing – unsure of this as yet. There are 2 slightly different paths. There is one where you can apply for priority from early February and you then have to wait to see if the Minister has put you on the priority list. FDA form their panel quicker with this priority list.

The Group are still unsure if they will apply for priority as yet and are still to understand the benefits of doing so. May or may not apply for priority. If you apply for priority, you can't put in a full application until you find out if you are on the priority list.

Tim is keen to make this process as simple as possible for all involved in terms of conditions etc. It would be good to get the standard subdivision consent conditions to put in the application. Keen to get this to be able to build them in to the design at an early stage.

Matt B – Part of the Plan Change included a commercial component. Matt asked, will this be covered in the application including Liquor licences being applied for – Tim outlined they had not thought of liquor licences at this stage. Matt trying to clarify what we looking to approve.

No thoughts have been given to this as yet – it was suggested this may come as part of the building process.

Tim C - Tim outlined they are looking at doing the subdivision stage at this point not building stage. With regard to the liquor licences, this would be covered once they are doing the building stage. Matt's comment regarding the licences and commercial component is relevant as it is unsure what approvals are required at this stage. There are many approvals that would be required – some that have not been thought of or identified as yet.

Tim outlined, the Group will spend the time to get the approvals submitted that are required. There are likely to be more approvals from WDC – If Council have any approvals that would be best to be addressed for efficiency of the application, please let the Group know.

Tim provided a copy of the overview plans to share with the meeting.

Tim C – The plans are very much aligned with the Plan Change and District Plan Review – commercial area is on the same side, it has lots, it has a retirement village and polo field.

Michael P – It has waterways and realigned waterways

Matt asked if there was a school in the plans and Tim advised it will be a school or a retirement village – currently the plans are showing a retirement village. It will be a retirement village unless the Ministry of Education request a school. The plan is to allow both.

Matt B – Matt suggested it would be good to talk through the process for the WDC Planning team as they have not been heavily involved at this stage – eg lot sizes etc

Michael P – Michael outlined that from a Planning point of view it is quite unique as it is currently zoned Rural. There is still the Proposed Plan Change to go through and depending on timing that may be in place and there may be a Urban underlying zone. Currently there is a Rural underlying zone so depending on timing will need to be assessed against one or the other.

Tim C - depending on when the PDP comes out and how it comes out may alleviate the need for a fast track consent. Tim advised he knew that the Council had gone for an extension on the PDP.

Matt B – Matt outlined the Council have sought until the end of June but as yet have not heard back,

Tim C - If the Group get a positive response in the District Plan process they won't need to do the fast track. If they get a negative response then they would need to do the fast track application. If the decisions come out in June the Group are likely to know the outcome of the Plan before they are in a position to go ahead with the fast track. They will do the work in the interim on the assumption they will not get a positive answer from the District Plan review, however the District Plan review may overtake it all.

Michael P – Michael outlined it is complex to make a report at this stage with the underlying Zone. At the moment it would be difficult to assess the rural activities for all of the lots which are urban in design.

Looking at the plans....

Wendy H – Wendy requested to have a brief overview of the plans. Wendy advised she was aware of the project but not totally familiar with it. She confirmed with the team the placement of the retirement village on the plans.

Michael P – Michael outlined it was an indicative bulk form for the retirement village and they would not be seeking consent for the bulk form, it is currently just an illustration to show how it could work.

Wendy clarified the Commercial area on the plans.

Tim C – Tim was unsure of the size of the commercial area but thought it was up to 2 hectares. There is 5000 m² of building footprint. There are 850 residential lots, there is a retirement village and/or school – the retirement village is drawn on the plans but it is to get approval for that or a school. The commercial area to also to provide some area for the Ohoka Market.

The big square is the polo field which is a bit over 5 ha.

Wendy clarified the Storm water ponds on the plan – Michael and Bruce advised there was allowance for the ponds on the plan.

Bruce VD - The 850 lots consist of 600 – 800 m² sized lots and then getting bigger. There are 2 sizes of lots.

Michael P – The plan is a little distorted – he outlined the area that is a lower density. There are generally some larger lots around the outsides and some landscaping buffer areas.

Wendy clarified the access areas. – Bruce advised there are 2 on Bradleys Road and one on Whites Road and one on Mill Road.

Tim C – The major difference from what we have done in the Plan Change to what is being done now would be the stormwater treatment which is more ECAN than WDC. Tim wanted to advise that in the District Plan they couldn't intercept ground water so were building the stormwater treatment ponds and retention ponds using the natural slope of the land. Under the fast track legislation you are allowed to do prohibited activities – will retain bigger stormwater under this proposal than the previous one. This will improve downstream flooding. This is a better solution.

Bruce – Confirmed there are esplanades along water ways, wider green areas. Some are quite wide.

Wendy – asked for clarification on SNA areas or were they reserve areas?

Michael – outlined that there were a combination of both but try to keep the SNA's at the lower end of the catchments.

Wendy – Enquired regarding club rooms with the polo field

Tim C - There will be club rooms with the polo field but not generous ones as we want people to use the facilities in the commercial area also. There will be a restaurant/bar in the Commercial area.

There is only 1 international sized polo field in greater Christchurch. Others are not as large in the area and that is why the Group have teamed up with Polo so it becomes an exhibition field where they can hold charity events and international games. It will stay as a private facility. Due to high maintenance of this facility. Needs to be private due to the H & S involved due to dog walkers etc if it was a public facility.

Bruce VD - This will be staged – there will be a staging plan. The initial plan is to start from the Mill Road corner and working back.

Michael P – It is expected there will be a general suite of conditions be applied for the whole area and would then be reapplied for each stage.

Bruce VD – All the typical assessments – stormwater, water, wastewater – all the infrastructure ones and ecology and urban design ones need to be developed to inform the conditions – for the ECAN or consent conditions.

Wendy – expressed interest in the timeframe – there is no fixed timeframe at the moment due to a lot of work to do yet. Concern it was coming soon with the 7th February mentioned.

Michael P – they are aware of that date due to the legislation starting then.

Tim C - The Group are hoping to see what the application form looks like before the 7 February 2025. There is a bit of a problem if they don't. Want to lodge the application as soon as possible but depends on what the application form says. It will also depend on what approvals the team are going for as to when they lodge.

Michael P – Still need to talk with ECAN and MKL. WDC only have a small part in things, it is probably more ECAN as the main party to see this application.

Tim C – WDC involvement is mainly to come up with the subdivision conditions – spring protection, sediment control and stormwater management. The Group will go for consent for the whole lot, staging included. When the application comes in, it will have the staging diagram – will start at one end, need to focus on this end as once the rest goes for development it won't be the same as it will be over 8-10 years. Focus on one area when assessing. Will start at one end to give effect – rest likely to change as develop the rest within 10-15 years when there are likely to be different planting or access requirements.

Wendy – Creating the conditions are a lot of work – lots of talking before they lodge. The fast track process goes quickly once get in to it. Don't get a lot of time at each step and it is likely there may be a need to vary the conditions to make it work. Will do best to get good set on conditions including bulk and location but likely may need adjustments due to the size of the project. It will go fast, it will move quickly.

Matt B – Waimakariri have 4 fast track consents in the district. North Rangiora, Ravenswood and the Woodend Bypass.

Tim C - Tim enquired if any of the other fast track proposals have been in touch with the Council and Matt advised they have not been in touch yet.

The Group have been in contact with ECAN last week but not on the Ohoka proposal, this was regarding a fast track they have in Christchurch. Most people are waiting for the application form to come out first. Can start to work on the Ohoka proposal if they know what they want to do.

Tim asked if they can get some draft standard subdivision conditions – Wendy advised she can provide a copy of the draft conditions she is currently working on. Wendy is to provide the spreadsheet to Michael.

Tim outlined that any draft condition put in the application won't be perfect to start with. When the conditions are received they can then be add sooner rather than later to the design so when the fast track happens they can try and be prepared.

Bruce VD – This way we can make the conditions site specific and the Planners can go through them and make them fit this development.

Michael – requested to include LUC conditions also – earthworks and roading access. Wendy advised they are all in the spreadsheet.

Matt B – 3 waters infrastructure – part of the Plan Change was to put these in – it is easier consent wise if they are included. Bruce advised they are aware of that and it needs to be addressed – a lot of it is ECAN related.

Michael P – There is a large lot zone and residential zone in the development. It will cover the bulk and location that is suitable for the density. Want a good outcome visually.

Wendy - Iwi consultation – asked the team if they were aware of the change from MKL to Whitiara. Council have been advised that the work MKL currently does in terms of the consultation with the Runanga specific to Tuahiwi is to move to Whitiara. Unsure when this is to happen. We are still doing consultation through MKL – they prefer to deal with council rather than directly with applicants. Wendy requested when the Group are ready to consult with MKL to speak to Council so we can update where the change is up to. May need to consult with both. Whitiara are not resourced up as yet, MKL are set up at present. Tim asked for a contact with Whitiara but Wendy advised they are not set up to communicate with us as yet.

Tim C – may be worth reaching out to them now rather than leave them to the last part of the process. There is an intention to speak to Whitiara – have already reached out to MKL.

Tim advised they have not had any contact with EPA as yet. Unsure of who the contact is there. Need to wait for a draft application form outlining what needs to be in an application but this has not been released on the website yet.

Matt B – advised the EPA have not been in touch with Council as yet.

Wendy – Asked if the Act outlined what needed to be in the application. Tim advised it did contain a lot of information that could be interpreted in different ways. The application form should be more helpful than the information given on the site to date regarding what needs to be in an application.

Michael P – We still need to understand what documents are to be required for the application.

Wendy – Council have found that with the Fast track process you have to go with the process and timeframes given.

Ian C – The timeframes started at 20 days and then reduced as the process went along resulting in shorter times to respond.

Matt B – asked how the Group would like to do the engagement with Council? Engineers, Planning team – how best to engage? Can have a project group or one person doing all the work? Is helpful for us to frame up how it is best to work together.

Wendy - Regular project meetings are helpful eg, once a month. These can be booked out in peoples calendars in advance so time is set aside – engineers, roading etc. All experts may not turn up to each meeting but the Group can advise an agenda and the relevant people can attend.

Tim C – Once the application is lodged, Tim agreed with this approach of regular meetings. He prefers to have a one person contact with the Council. Would like one point of contact who can decide on a meeting or not. From an applicants point of view a number of people can provide different opinions,

Matt B - Council prefers one person contact also.

Tim – one main person from the Carter Group appointed to work with one person from Council initially. Coordinate things via these people.

Wendy - Wet land and spring assessments talked about – lots of this work has already been done as part of the plan change application. Good to see this.

In Summary.....

No timeframe as yet.

Wendy advised Council will charge for pre app advice – Tim is fine with this.

Michael P – clarified these costs will feed back in to the EPA application cost which will recover costs from all involved.

Lucy - Prelodgement - get standard set of conditions to Michael and he can discuss if there are more tailored conditions for a particular site,

Michael P - Novo Group is to lead the application – Michael has been helping with the coordination as this stage - Jeremy Phillips and Tim Walsh will lead but they were unable to make this meeting.

Bruce VD – Clarified that initially communication is to be through Wendy for now. A Relationship Manager will need to be set up.

Lucy – Lucy enquired when the conditions would be available and Wendy advised they need to be sorted by the end of the month for us so they can go to Michael then.

Tim C - asked in relation to the PDP – when is the Council likely to get the Commissioners recommendations?

Matt B - advised the panel gave the Council an indication of 3-6 months from the end of the Hearings. Council is hoping to get recommendations or a Minute in next 2-3 months.

Tim C – enquired if the recommendations, once received, will they become public quickly?

Matt B - advised this is preferable but unsure of the process through this as yet – there is some complexity around this - 2 decisions from 2 different panels.

Tim C – If there is a positive recommendation from the Panel, it would be preferable to hear about this sooner rather than later as working on the development quite hard. Matt advised will keep everyone up to date regarding advice on the extension.

Meeting closed 4.55pm

Ohoka Fast Track Application Meeting Minutes

Meeting Details

Date: 30th May 2025

Location: Waimakariri District Council offices, 215 High Street, Rangiora, Tui Room

Time: 12.45pm

Attendees

Waimakariri District Council

- Wendy Harris – Planning Manager
- Tim Johnston – Senior Planner
- Alicia Klos – Senior Land Development Engineer
- Jennifer McSloy – Development Manager
- Lindy Symonds – Planning Administration (notes)

Crater Group Limited

- Tim Carter (Carter Group) – The Applicant
- Bruce Van Duyn (Carter Group – Assisting Tim)
- Jeremy Philips (Inovo Group) - Planner
- Tim Walsh (Inovo Group) – Technical / Planner (Teams)
- Sanna Soederlind (Inovo Group)- Technical (Teams)
- Jo Appleyard – Lawyer for Carter Group

Apologies

Nil

Agenda

- The Fast Track Process
- When the Proposed District Plan comes into play
- When the Application will be lodged & timeframes
- Proposed Development Plan – Draft Plan Received dated 21.05.25
- Pre-App Meetings

Discussion Summary

- Jo Appleyard is involved in several other Fast Track Applications (4 at the moment). Jo discussed the Fast Track process and the uncertainty regarding the Proposed District Plan dates. Jo mentioned they have two going through the City Council Territorial Authority Domain and the one here in Waimakariri District and are expecting a positive decision out of the District Plan re-zoning process.
- Jeremy Philips mentioned the challenges in advising Carter Group as the panel recommendations are unknown at this stage.
- Wendy Harris asked about the completeness check process and the timeline for lodging the application.
- Jo Appleyard – with Christchurch City Council we have been through what they call ‘complete’ & there are no competing applications – this went public (29th May 2025), We are now off to a panel. When this goes to the EPA there is not a lot of time to do the ‘completeness check’ 5 days.
The Council received it on the Monday, perhaps the next working day after we lodged. The ‘completeness check’ went to ECAN, the City Council, Iwi, MKT & DOC.
When we lodged, we didn’t have a lizard survey, DOC wanted to see this upfront. We didn’t know we had to notify MFE so we were bounced based on completeness (the clock started again).
- Wendy - Covid fast track, a similar process, tight timeframes with Bellgrove (issued with the conditions) we have had changes ever since. Helpful if we can iron the draft conditions now, before you lodge it. Either way that is useful work that can be done as it will all feed into the process either way.
- Jeremy P - One of the challenges is trying to draft conditions. These are generally right at the last minute, you have done your assessment, your subdivision plan, technical assessment & then start to work out what conditions you need & frame those up with reference to the plan provisions.
- Wendy - The bulk & location items will be tricky & I take your point on that. But even servicing the subdivision brings a lot of conditions. These kinds of things can be done in advance regardless of what happens with the plan.
- Bruce - we have had several pre-app meetings. We have a different planning consultant working on the ECAN side of things, Michael Patterson. This follows a lot of the assessments from the engineers, ecologists & the technical team. We have had draft conditions come from them.

- Jo Appleyard - in terms of MFE we won't be making that mistake again. We have now been told to work with Whitiara. We were advised a letter went out to all councils saying we are not to deal MKT anymore.
We have been to Ngaitahu head office & directly to Whitiara & have been told MKT do not speak for Tuahiwi. Everything is to go through Whitiara. We have asked for a hui and are now waiting for a date.
- Wendy - we have had contact earlier this year, it was indicated that we were all going to move to Whitiara over a period of about 6 months. By the middle of the year, we were told it would all be with Whitiara. Wendy will look at this.
- Bruce Van Duyn - presented an updated development plan (DRAFT PLAN), highlighting key features such as residential lots, polo field, retirement village, commercial area, pedestrian crossing, greenspaces, and stormwater management.
 - Retirement Village area – 6 hectares approx. near Ohoka Stream.
 - Commercial area closer to Mill Road & Whites Road corner 1.7-2 hectares approx. with parking & closely connected to the main centre of Ohoka.
 - Waterways & Ohoka Stream will be retaining setbacks from this.
 - Greenspaces are SW management areas, we are finalizing these in terms of attenuation, flood modelling etc.
 - Transpower lines along one edge. We have had correspondence with Transpower.
- Jeremy - Lot size & orientation are still being modelled & reviewed. Don't put any value on the green areas, size & orientation as only draft plan. This has not gone past urban designers yet.
Retirement Village – you have to plan it as a retirement village until the Ministry of Education mark this as a school. We have had discussion with them but they don't engage until things are consented. If there is a school that is where it is going whether there is a school or not depends on the Ministry of Education.
- Wendy – It would be good to review the plan & provide some comments & feedback.
Wendy suggested providing draft documentation to the Council before lodgement for early review.

Wendy

- just to mention the Admin side, for the pre-application meetings we have a charging regime. The way that we operate is we set you up in the system as a dummy application for charging & feed our regular time sheeting into this. There is an application here or you may want to complete the application of online. Once received we lodge this into our system.

Action Items

- Send Jo Appleyard Planning Admin email address (planning.admin@wmk.govt.nz) for lodgement notification.
- Council to review updated plans and provide early feedback.
- Carter Group to prepare for potential lodgement in approximately 3 weeks.

Meeting Closed

Meeting closed at 1.46pm

File note

Client	Carter Group Limited
Matter	Ōhoka Fast Track
Matter no.	174929-0008
Author	M E Davidson
Date	30 April 2026
Time	10.00am
Subject	Pre-application consultation – Ōhoka Residential Subdivision – Meeting with Waimakariri District Council (via Teams)

Attending:

- **Waimakariri District Council (WDC):** Tim Johnston, Jennifer McSloy, Colin Roxburgh,
- **Carter Group Limited (Carter Group):** Tim Carter (Carter Group), Bruce Van Duyn (Carter Group), Jeremy Phillips (Novo Group), Tim Walsh (Novo Group), Meg Davidson (Anderson Lloyd).

Introduction and proposal overview

- 1 **Tim Walsh** outlined that the current proposal remains largely unchanged from the previous meeting, with only minor refinements.
- 2 The proposal includes approximately 875 allotments, a polo field, and a retirement village.
- 3 Carter Group intends to lodge the application on 11 May 2026.
- 4 This meeting was scheduled to finalise feedback and pre-lodgement consultation requirements with WDC.
- 5 Tim Walsh noted that:
 - (a) The project benefits from prior work under PC31 and the plan change process.
 - (b) The FTAA application will contain significantly more detailed information.
 - (c) WDC has already had prior opportunities to provide input and will continue to do so throughout the process.
- 6 Parallel consultation is also occurring with:
 - (a) Environment Canterbury (ECan);
 - (b) Whitiara;
 - (c) Department of Conservation (DOC);
 - (d) Heritage New Zealand; and
 - (e) TransPower.
- 7 Initial feedback has been requested by 6 May 2026 to allow time for incorporation into the lodged application.

File note

Purpose and Approach to Consultation

- 8 **Tim Walsh** explained that the purpose of this pre-lodgement consultation meeting is to:
- (a) Obtain early feedback, particularly on completeness and conditions;
 - (b) Establish ongoing process for communication.
- 9 It was agreed that:
- (a) This stage of consultation is primarily focused on completeness and workability of conditions, not the merits of the proposal.
 - (b) There will be later opportunities (e.g. under s 53) to comment on the merits.
 - (c) The FTAA process allows for refinement of both the application and conditions after lodgement.

FTAA Process

- 10 **Jeremy Phillips** noted the significant level of detail required due to the quasi-rezoning nature of the proposal, particularly within draft conditions. Early feedback on condition detail was emphasised as important.
- 11 It was agreed that a discussion about the Applicant's experience in other FTAA processes (i.e. Ryans Road) and learnings from those processes would be a helpful reference point for discussions going forward
- 12 **Tim Carter** noted the Ryans Road project where:
- (a) Christchurch City Council (**CCC**) provided standard subdivision conditions early, which were incorporated into the application.
 - (b) CCC later commented on the merits at subsequent stages.
 - (c) This approach ensured conditions were practical and implementable from CCC's perspective from the outset.
- 13 **Tim Walsh** confirmed that:
- (a) WDC's previously provided standard condition spreadsheet has been used as a base.

Draft conditions

- 14 Carter Group confirmed that a draft set of conditions is not yet ready for circulation, but:
- (a) Carter Group will provide these as soon as possible.
 - (b) WDC will have an opportunity to review conditions prior to lodgment.

Ongoing Consultation

- 15 **Tim Johnston** queried whether regular informal meetings would be helpful.

File note

- 16 **Jeremy Phillips** supported this saying it would be useful to keep conversations ongoing as the application progressed through FTAA process, noting it worked well with CCC on the Ryans Road project.
- 17 It was agreed that Tim Walsh and Tim Johnston will continue informal discussions on draft conditions as the process progresses (including post-lodgement).

Information yet to be provided

- 18 **Tim Johnston** noted that several technical reports are still outstanding, limiting WDC's ability to provide substantive feedback.
- 19 **Jeremy Phillips** acknowledged the nature of the feedback WDC will be able to provide before lodgement may be necessarily limited however, further engagement will continue alongside the formal process.
- 20 It was agreed that (in addition to the focus on the conditions), the purpose of providing the information to WDC is so that WDC could identify whether there are any gaps in the application. To enable WDC to provide this feedback it was agreed that Carter Group would provide:
- (a) A list of appendices/reports
 - (b) A table of contents for the AEE

Existing Information and Project History

- 21 **Jennifer McCloy** noted:
- (a) WDC reviewed a revised scheme plan last year, and previous feedback is likely still relevant;
 - (b) WDC has not received some of the technical reports (i.e. wastewater). However, unless there are significant changes, WDC's position is unlikely to materially change. It would be useful if Carter Group could highlight any new or changed elements.
- 22 It was acknowledged by also parties that there is extensive prior engagement and background material, which distinguishes this application from typical FTAA proposals.

Standard Conditions

- 23 Discussion covered the basis for draft conditions:
- (a) **Tim Walsh** confirmed use of:
 - (i) WDC's standard condition spreadsheet
 - (ii) Other consents within the district.
- 24 **Bruce Van Duyn** offered to share the working spreadsheet being used so that WDC can confirm it is the most up to date version.
- 25 **Jennifer** highlighted Bellgrove and Cambridge consents as strong examples of workable conditions from WDC's perspective.
- 26 **Tim Walsh** confirmed that he is familiar with the Cambridge conditions.

File note

27 **Jennifer McSloy** emphasised a strong interest in ensuring conditions are practical and workable.

28 *Actions:*

- (a) **Tim Johnston** to provide Bellgrove and Cambridge conditions to the applicant team.

Next Steps:

29 *Actions:*

- (a) **Carter Group** will:
 - (i) Provide draft conditions as soon as practicable;
 - (ii) Provide appendix list and AEE table of contents; and
 - (iii) Share draft expert reports when available.

30 Ongoing:

- (a) Continued informal engagement on conditions; and
- (b) Formal opportunities to comment on merits remain available post-lodgement

Closing remarks

31 **Tim Walsh** invited any specific feedback from WDC ahead of the additional information that is to be provided by the Applicant.

32 **Tim Johnston** confirmed the proposed consultation approach is reasonable and appropriate.

From: [Tim Johnston](#)
To: [Tim Walsh](#)
Subject: RC255196- Carter Group Ohoka Fast Track- WDC High Level Initial Comments
Date: Monday, 25 May 2026 9:51:09 am
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Kia ora Tim,

I have received some initial high-level comments from various teams. Please note the comments provided below are preliminary only and not exhaustive. The technical specialists are still working through their detailed assessments. In addition, we are currently onboarding external consultants to work on some areas.

Further, to assist with the review of the information provided, we request that all supporting models that have been used to generate this evidence be provided to allow a more detailed review, to ensure feedback is as informed as possible.

Please see the current high-level feedback below:

1. Overall, the stormwater servicing concept (wetlands and wet ponds) is considered preferable to the previous proposal of above ground basins. However, there is currently insufficient evidence within the report to demonstrate feasibility within the allocated land, how attenuation offsetting will be achieved, and how effects on surrounding areas have been appropriately mitigated. Specifically, there needs to be further evidence of how the increased runoff volume will impact upon the downstream system. This should consider both the impact of the additional volume and also demonstrate whether the compensatory storage concept is suitable to manage downstream effects. It was understood through previous processes that modelling would be required to adequately demonstrate these impacts.
2. The stormwater design is based on superseded Levels of Service. The system will need to be redesigned to align with current ECOP requirements (i.e. 10-year and 100-year ARI primary and secondary, respectively).
3. It is unclear how many rain gardens are proposed. Given their associated maintenance requirements and uncertain performance in high groundwater, these are not our preferred treatment option. Analysis should be provided to justify their use versus alternative means of treatment given the higher maintenance costs, and uncertainty regarding performance when situated within the water table, which is a concept that we are not aware of being tested.
4. Some urban stormwater catchments are proposed to be treated using swales. These can conflict with other underground services within standard urban road corridors. The applicant should confirm whether swales are appropriate within the available space, and if necessary, increase corridor widths to accommodate all services.
5. We are currently assessing the capacity of the Rangiora WWTP and the transfer main to the Kaiapoi WWTP. This work is ongoing; however, the outcome may influence the discharge strategy for this development. In addition to this restricted capacity within the Rangiora to Kaiapoi pipeline, additional land has been rezoned within the receiving catchment of the Rangiora WWTP, which will place additional loading upon the plant already, without further load that has a viable alternative (to discharge directly to Kaiapoi).
6. As previously noted, we do not support the use of pressure sewer for this development, as it does not align with the criteria set out in Section 5.5 of the WDC Wastewater Policy.
7. The proposal suggests that WDC has capacity in the existing transfer main from Bradleys Road Pump Station to the Rangiora WWTP; however, the justification does not account for projected growth in the Mandeville area. This needs to be included in the assessment.
8. The Pressure Sewer Design does not take into account Inflow and Infiltration from private gravity mains connected to the proposed pump chambers. Council records from the pressure sewer system in Beach Grove in Kaiapoi shows I&I from private pipes adds approximately 150% additional volume in a 5 year event. In a 30 year event it can add up to 200% additional volume. Based on this, it is considered that the resulting flows are likely to be significantly underestimated.
9. The Pressure Sewer Design relies on storage tanks to attenuate flows before discharging into the existing Council main. The Council is not in support of a system reliant upon these storage tanks and pumping during off-peak times for the following reasons:
 - a. The system can become surcharged for weeks on end following large rain events, and in this situation, which makes this concept unviable in these situations.
 - b. Further consideration is needed into how these storage tanks will be cope with spillover from larger rain events to prevent wastewater overflows into the downstream receiving environment.
 - c. The volume of wastewater that will be stored close to a residential area would present an inherent risk, especially if I&I into the system is properly accounted for.
10. Staging needs to occur in a logical sequence, rather than being undertaken opportunistically.
11. There is a lack of detail regarding works outside the development required to ensure the transport network operates safely and effectively. This includes urbanisation of development frontages, upgrades to surrounding roads, and connectivity from the existing network into the proposed development.
12. The provision and use of neighbourhood parks and playgrounds need to be clearly detailed and aligned with the required level of service for the proposed number of residential units. The purpose of each reserve needs to be clearly identified as we would not accept accessway reserve or SMA as substitute for neighbourhood park calculations. It is currently unclear if required levels of service are being met by the proposal, noting that the polo field is to remain a private asset.
13. The application should assess provision for community services (eg but not limited to: medical centres, education facilities, libraries, pools) and the impacts on the existing community services in the wider area.
14. Character and amenity outcomes are identified in the Master Plans; however, it is unclear how these will be secured.
15. Draft conditions are very much a work in progress, we will provide ongoing comments around these through the process once all experts have had detailed look at the reports, plans, and models as the conditions are heavily reliant on the plans.
16. Several design concerns with the proposed road layout (refer to the image below), which need to be reviewed and addressed
17. A road connection should be provided to the boundary of 344 Bradleys Road so any development of that property can be serviced via the application site to avoid accesses near the Mill Road/Bradleys Road intersection, which would become increasingly busy with this development.



The above comments relate to the information that has been provided to Council. But it is noted that Council has not yet received the following information for comment:

- A detailed scheme plan for each stage which shows the areas and dimensions of all lots, stormwater management areas, reserves, roads, right-of-ways etc.
- Economics Assessment.
- Terrestrial Ecology (except Lizard Management).
- Green House Gas Assessment.
- Planning Assessment.
- Land Use Conditions.

Given your intended timeframe for lodging the application, further detailed comments may not be available outside of the formal process. However, I will continue to progress the draft conditions set and share these where possible.

Kind regards,

Tim Johnston | Principal Resource Management Planner
 Plan Implementation Unit

