

Comments on a substantive application under section 53 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 – Waikanae North Development

Fast-track application no.	FTAA-263-1194
KCDC reference no.	250099FT
Project name	Waikanae North Development
Project address	169-171 Peka Peka Road, Kāpiti
Applicant	Waikanae North Development Limited
Issued to	Sue Simons, Expert Panel Chair substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz
Date	28 July 2026

Prepared by	Monique Leith	Consultant Resource Management Planner	 23 July 2026
Reviewed by	Isaac Cant	Development Facilitation Lead	 23 July 2026
	Amy Camilleri	Resource Consents Lead	 23 July 2026
Approved by	Kris Pervan	Group Manager, Strategy and Growth	 27 July 2026
	Darren Edwards	Chief Executive	 28 July 2026

Table of Contents

1. Overview	3
2. Scope.....	3
3. Pre-lodgement Engagement	5
4. Post-lodgement Engagement.....	5
5. Benefits	5
6. Issues	6
7. Other matters	16
8. Resource Consents Required	16
9. Proposed Conditions.....	16

1. Overview

Kāpiti Coast District Council (“Council” or “KCDC”) appreciates the invitation dated 29 June 2026 to comment on the substantive application made by Waikanae North Development Limited (“WNDL” or “the Applicant”) for the Waikanae North Development project (“the Project”) under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (“the Act”).

This document sets out KCDC’s comments on the substantive application for the Waikanae North Development project under section 53(2) of the Act.

This document is structured as follows:

- **Scope:** this section sets out the scope of KCDC’s comments on the application;
- **Pre-lodgement engagement:** this section records KCDC’s position on the pre-lodgement engagement that occurred with the applicant, up to the point where the Expert Panel (“the Panel”) has invited Council to comment on the application;
- **Post-lodgement engagement:** this section outlines the nature of post-lodgement engagement that has occurred with the applicant and others, since the Panel has invited Council to comment on the application;
- **Benefits:** this section sets out KCDC’s understanding of the benefits of the project, as expressed within the substantive application;
- **Issues:** this section sets out the outstanding issues that KCDC has identified with the substantive application, and sets out responses to these issues for the Panel to consider;
- **Other matters:** this section sets out other matters that KCDC considers the Panel may wish to be aware of when making their decision;
- **Resource consents required:** this section records KCDC’s position on the local authority resource consents required to authorise the project.
- **Proposed conditions:** this section comments on KCDC’s position on progressing any proposed conditions required to support authorising the project.

2. Scope

Within the scope of its functions as a local authority, and with direction from the Panel Convenor, Council and its experts have considered the substantive application within the time available, for the purpose of identifying issues and suggested responses/resolutions for the Panel to consider when deciding on the substantive application. For completeness we note that:

- The comments provided in this response are therefore reflective of the iterative review and feedback process Council has undertaken on the Project to date. Various technical assessments of the Project have been undertaken over an extended period of time, and as a result the key outstanding issues have evolved and progressively reduced. At the direction of the Panel Convenor, and with the view of assisting the Panel with their assessment of the Project, Council has focused its comments on the most critical

outstanding matters requiring further consideration and/or resolution. Accordingly, this report (including the supporting technical assessments) is not intended to provide commentary on every statement, assessment, or piece of supporting information contained within the substantive application. Similarly, the absence of comment on any matter should not be interpreted as an endorsement for that aspect. Rather, the report is intended to assist the Panel by highlighting the key issues that remain relevant to their assessment of the application.

- In accordance with the advisory nature of Council's role under section 53(2) of the Act, these comments do not make judgments on the overall merits of the proposal or its acceptability under relevant statutory planning frameworks, as that responsibility rests with the Expert Panel. Council's comments aim to inform and support the Panel's decision-making, without expressing a view on whether the application should ultimately be granted or declined.
- To confirm, the comments provided in this response relate to the approvals sought by the application that are relevant to KCDC i.e. resource consents necessary to construct, establish, and maintain the Project, which would otherwise be applied for under the Resource Management Act 1991 ("the RMA").
- The scope of Council's comments on the substantive application is within its statutory functions as a local authority. Comments made are relevant to the substantive application and the decision that the Panel is required to make under section 81 of the Act on the approvals sought in the application.

In response to the invitation, Council's in-house and consultant technical advisors prepared memos detailing Council's technical comments on the key issues identified as being outstanding on the date of lodgement for this project. These memos have been progressively updated since the date of lodgement, to reflect post-lodgement engagement as far as practicable within the prescribed timeframe. The purpose of these memos is not to provide a comprehensive assessment of the application but rather to summarise the issues that remain outstanding for consideration by the Panel. The following memos are provided as part of Council's response:

- Ecology / biodiversity (prepared by Dr Sarah Flynn, Boffa Miskell)
- Stormwater, flooding & hydrology (prepared by Charlotte Lockyer, SLR Consulting)
- Reserves and Open Spaces (prepared by Yolanda Morgan, KCDC)
- Transport (prepared by Collin Shields, Tonkin + Taylor and Gary Adams, KCDC)
- Landscape & Visual Amenity (prepared by Emma McRae, Boffa Miskell)
- Urban Design (prepared by Miriam Moore, Boffa Miskell)
- Development Engineering (prepared by Rakshit Vijj, Infill)
- Infrastructure (prepared by Hemraj Kunwar and Ramesh Pillai, KCDC).

Where prepared by external experts or parties, the memos were subject to review and input by Council staff before they were finalised.

We understand that the Panel may request further information from the Council or request attendance of technical advisors at joint conferencing or a potential hearing. We welcome the opportunity for any further engagement that will assist the Panel.

3. Pre-lodgement Engagement

Pre-application consultation between the Applicant and KCDC commenced in October 2024. This is when the Applicant notified KCDC of their intention to progress the Project via the Fast Track Approvals Act 2024. The pre-application consultation between October 2024 and March 2026 was regular and thorough, it included:

- An overview of the project;
- Provision of draft application information including assessments, reports and technical information; and
- Discussion and workshops regarding specific infrastructure and planning requirements.

Throughout the pre-application consultation period, KCDC was able to provide the Applicant with detailed reviews and feedback on the draft information provided. KCDC appreciates the proactive approach taken by the Applicant and considers the pre-lodgement consultation has led to a genuine narrowing of issues that need to be addressed by the Panel.

4. Post-lodgement Engagement

Since the application was lodged, the Council has continued to work with the Applicant to communicate outstanding issues identified and resolve specific technical details. Post-lodgement engagement has included:

- Visiting the site
- Discussion and online meetings regarding key issues and unresolved matters; and
- Sharing of draft assessments and technical information.

Council has also worked in liaison with Greater Wellington Regional Council ("GWRC") on the review of technical information for this project at both pre and post-lodgement stages. The Councils have collaborated as much as possible within the timeframe, with the aim of taking a consistent approach in the feedback provided to the Applicant, and now to the Panel.

Council will continue to work with GWRC in reviewing the draft consent conditions, as well as the ongoing monitoring and compliance of any consents if this application were to be approved by the Panel.

In addition, Council has worked in liaison with Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai on the identification of key issues and potential resolutions. KCDC has obligations to uphold Te Tiriti o Waitangi in exercising its functions (including its functions in relation to the Fast-track approvals process) and acknowledges Te Ātiawa ki Whakarongotai as mana whenua within the rohe where the project is located.

5. Benefits

Council acknowledges that the Project, if approved by the Panel, is likely to result in a range of benefits, including:

- Delivering a greater volume and mix of housing typologies to the market, significantly increasing housing and lifestyle choices in Kāpiti;

- Significantly increasing the number of lots available, reducing the current pressure on the housing market;
- Significant opportunities for the local construction sector and supporting industries; and
- Contributing to wider economic benefits for the district as outlined in the applicant's economic assessment.

These benefits have been expressly recognised in Council's Letter of Support for the Project's alignment with its housing and growth objectives, included within Appendix 40 of the substantive application. For the avoidance of doubt, this strategic-level support does not extend to an endorsement of specific design details proposed within the substantive application such as infrastructure device types, vesting arrangements, or maintenance responsibilities.

6. Issues

This section sets out a summary of the technical memos which form part of this report. It then identifies the most critical outstanding issues that Council has identified with the substantive application along with what it considers to be appropriate responses, for the Panel to consider. For clarity:

- Each of the identified key issues is more fully outlined within the respective technical memos included with this report. These memos should be read in conjunction with this report.
- Technical comments provided are within the advisor's respective areas of expertise, in accordance with the advisory nature of Council's role under section 53(2) of the Act.

Ecology / Biodiversity

All matters identified in the latest pre-lodgement review, that required further actions to ensure anticipated ecological benefits are achieved, were either addressed or taken into account in the substantive application.

Council **does not** support deferral of finalising the mechanism for ensuring the perpetual protection of Te Harakeke Wetland. This is due to:

- The limited number of available options to afford this significant natural resource the appropriate level of protection in perpetuity.
- Council does not support a lesser level of protection being afforded to Te Harakeke.

In addition, a small number of minor corrections and clarifications are required to the proposed Ecological Restoration Management Plan.

Stormwater, Flooding & Hydrogeology

Post-lodgement engagement with the Applicant has resulted in several of the outstanding matters being worked through and a narrowing of issues in contention. A number of matters can now be codified by suitably worded consent conditions. Due to the level of some information available, there remains uncertainty regarding some of the environmental effects.

Noting that a response from the Applicant will not likely be achievable within the timeframes available, these information gaps are identified for completeness, as follows:

- Groundwater and wetland response

While additional background information was provided during discussions with the applicant, there remains uncertainty regarding the hydrogeological response of the site and surrounding area to the proposed development.

The applicant acknowledged that there is limited groundwater data available to inform the assessment. As a result, the conclusions presented in the hydrology assessment are based largely on expected groundwater behaviour rather than site-specific monitoring data or quantitative groundwater modelling.

Consequently, there remains uncertainty regarding how groundwater levels and flow paths may respond to the proposed changes in landform, stormwater management and wetland hydrology.

- Effects on Te Harakeke Wetland and adjacent properties

The applicant advised that seasonal variations in Te Harakeke Wetland water levels are likely to be greater than any changes resulting from additional stormwater inputs associated with the development. The applicant also considers that elevated groundwater levels affecting properties west of the development are primarily attributable to reduced conveyance within Black Drain rather than the proposed development.

While it is accepted that wetland water levels are naturally variable and are strongly influenced by downstream drainage conditions, Council's concern is that the development should not exacerbate an existing problem. The groundwater monitoring period presented by the applicant is relatively short and does not adequately capture the full range of inter-annual groundwater variability, including wetter years.

The applicant has proposed an adaptive management approach whereby additional monitoring data would be collected prior to development of the western zone. This would potentially provide a further 5–6 years of groundwater and wetland monitoring data and allow the proposed design to be reviewed and refined, if necessary, during the subsequent engineering approval process.

While this approach is beneficial and may reduce uncertainty over time, it does not fully resolve the concerns identified above. Accordingly, some residual uncertainty remains regarding the long-term groundwater and wetland response and the potential effects on adjacent properties.

- Minimum building floor levels

Council's preference is for minimum building floor levels to be explicitly defined through the consenting process, rather than through building consent / engineering approval. This provides certainty for both Council and future landowners and helps prevent subsequent earthworks or site modifications that could alter overland flow paths, reduce flood storage, or otherwise increase flood hazard on neighbouring properties. Accordingly, this matter should be addressed through appropriate consent conditions.

In addition, the following matters remain outstanding and are considered capable of being resolved through further review:

- review of the Stormwater Management Plan and proposed consent conditions to ensure the long-term maintenance, operation and renewal obligations for stormwater assets vested in Council are clearly defined, practical and consistent with Council's maintenance approach; and
- review of the applicant's indicative stormwater network concept design to confirm that a feasible solution can be achieved across the site.

Reserves and Open Spaces

Engagement with the Applicant around areas of land to be set aside for reserve or open space has been on-going throughout the period of pre and post-lodgement engagement. As detailed in the corresponding Memo what has been proposed in this regard has changed over time.

Council's consideration of this matter has been two-fold and has resulted in several of the outstanding matters being worked through and a narrowing of issues in contention. Of note:

- Ownership of Te Harakeke Wetland and Walkway

Council is of the strong opinion that to offset the adverse effects of the proposed development on the natural environment that the Te Harakeke Wetland (Lots 5310, 5311 and 5314 should vest to Council as Local Purpose (Ecological) Reserve to ensure its on-going management and perpetual protection. This will also ensure that the development has an appropriate level of publicly accessible open space provided for as a certainty both now and in the future.

Te Harakeke Wetlands are listed as Schedule A3: Wetlands with outstanding indigenous biodiversity values in the Greater Wellington Natural Resources Plan. Wetlands listed in Schedule A3 as having outstanding indigenous ecosystem values meet the following criteria:

1. are highly representative and either
2. have high rarity values; or
3. are highly diverse.

Te Harakeke meets all three criteria. Given there is less than 3% of wetlands remaining in the Wellington region, it is of utmost importance to ensure the protection and proper management of those remaining, especially one as important, large and relatively intact as Te Harakeke. It is Council's view that this important wetland is most appropriately managed by a public organisation with the resources and expertise to ensure that there are not further adverse effects on this important ecosystem.

A new walkaway through the Te Harakeke Wetland is also proposed and this would increase disturbance within the wetlands. While not opposed to the idea of a walkway through the wetland, Council would only accept ownership of it if the entire natural wetland extent was in Council ownership so as the above issues can be managed appropriately, rather than left to a resident's group to provide on-going management of this complex system. Therefore:

- a) Council strongly believes that to offset the adverse environmental effects of development occurring at this site, near this important natural wetland, that Lots 5310 should and 5311 vest to Council.
- b) Council's position is that the current provision of open space within the development is not adequate given the intensity of the development, the proposed number of dwellings and the uncertainty over the future status of the proposed "private open space".
- c) Council does not accept the vesting of Lot 5003 as proposed by the applicant, unless Lots 5310 and 5311 vest to Council as Local Purpose Reserve (Ecological Site).

- Taking of land in lieu of Financial Contributions

Proposed Condition 6 suggests that Council apply a credit to the financial contributions to the value of a number of parcels of land that are to be vested with Council.

Council is only able to accept land in lieu of financial contributions where it is vested for open space and environmental purposes and not for stormwater or other utilities. Only the following lots would be eligible for a financial contribution credit: Lots 5310, 5311, 5314, 5400 and 5402.

For the avoidance of doubt Lot(s) 5000–5006, 5100–5124, 5200–5204 **are not** able to be taken in lieu of financial contributions and **no credit will be applied** for these lots.

Landscape and Visual Amenity

The substantial application addresses a number of the peer review matters and provides additional clarification, especially in relation to viewpoint photograph parameters, additional cross sections, the 5 metre rural interface buffer, planting density and the acceptance of a Landscape Management Plan.

The matters that appear to remain outstanding are as follows:

- The rural interface response remains partly reliant on planting, so conditions should secure the 5m buffer, planting density, species, minimum screening height, timing, maintenance and replacement requirements.
- Further consideration is still required as to whether design-led interface measures, such as setbacks, density reduction or transition lots, are needed at the most sensitive residential/rural lifestyle boundaries.
- Controls for cut faces and batters remain to be incorporated, including maximum steepness, plantability, and a limit on unplanted cut faces, suggested as below 1.5m.
- Retaining wall assumptions should be confirmed through revised conditions, particularly the commitment that retaining structures can be limited to 1 m or less.
- A Landscape Management Plan condition is still required, with clear performance standards, implementation timing, maintenance, monitoring and replacement obligations.
- The relationship between the Landscape Management Plan and the Ecological Restoration Management Plan needs to be clarified to avoid duplication or gaps.
- Updated consent conditions are required to capture the proposed 5m setback for prominent dune-top lots, the 4.5m height restriction, buffer planting requirements, cut face controls and LMP requirement.

Urban Design

In general, the proposal is a substantive application that has adequately addressed key urban design matters. The updated March 2026 Urban Design Assessment and MDR represents an improved revision of the October 2025 assessment, although some matters related to cut/fill and the impact on dune interfaces and retaining remain unresolved.

There remains a concern that the Project as a whole will have limited successful integration into the wider urban environment due to its single point entry and immediate surrounding rural environment. However, multiple primary urban design concerns raised in 2025 have been addressed which will better contribute to an *internal* well-functioning urban environment, including:

- Introducing a second connection into the shared path along SH1 to allow for local active travel,
- Clarifying pedestrian safety treatments at key road-crossing points,
- Providing a small pocket park in the western flats,
- Providing a staging plan that supports active modes,

Further recommendations include:

- That the UDA is updated to clarify the design approach to mitigate the privacy effects of ground floor apartment units adopting the 1.8m/8m² balcony standards, so that there can be confidence this will not result in adverse privacy effects for these units.
- Increasing the lot size of boundary lots (proposed lots 837 to 845 and 846 to 853 along the northern boundary and lots 204-211 in the vicinity of End Farm Road on the southern boundary) to provide a clearer and more appropriate transition between adjacent rural properties and the boundary lots on the Site.

Transport

The technical topic of transport has been the subject of a series of post-lodgement engagements with the Applicant and NZTA. Of note:

- Part of this related to gaining better visibility over the Applicant's modelling undertaken to inform the results which are presented in the application.
- This has been hampered by the Applicant's traffic modeller being away overseas.
- It remains a critical issue that, given this visibility limitation, these impacts are not well understood. To compound this, the results presented in the application (which are not considered to be a worst-case scenario) appear to result in an unacceptable level of service at the Te Moana Road/SH1 interchange.
- This matter must be worked through at the earliest opportunity so these impacts can be understood, assessed, and practicable resolutions devised.

As a summary, the overall outstanding matters with respect to transport are understood to be:

- Contrary to GWRC and KCDC policies, the site does not provide active mode and public transport mode site connectivity. This is a view supported by GWRC. The trip rates used in the ITA are not considered to be worst case.

- Lack of detail and clarity regarding potential future connections to Ngarara Road, Kensington Drive and the potential road links to the south and west of the site.
- Expressway/Te Moana Road SIDRA assessment and methodology is not agreed.
- Further details required of the proposed access to the 7 lots from 107 Paetawa Road.
- Further details required of the proposed internal active mode connections to Paetawa Road.
- Peka Peka Road site access drawing should be updated to take into account the KCDC proposal for cycle lanes on Peka Peka Road.
- Te Moana Road carrying capacity - an explanation of how this has been calculated has been requested, along with details of the traffic flows used.

Infrastructure

Council is not yet able to confirm that the development can be fully serviced by public water and wastewater infrastructure, however, note the applicant has provided several infrastructure servicing options within their application. The following matters remain outstanding and should be resolved before conditions are finalised or any approval enables connection to Council networks.

- Written agreement from the Applicant to Council procuring the required water and wastewater hydraulic modelling at the developer's cost.
- Provision of revised infrastructure reports that address the updated wastewater design flow, peak factor, pump station design basis, storage sizing, rising main design, network clearances, and constructability information.
- Confirmation that wastewater servicing for the development is dependent on the commissioning of the duplicate Waikanae wastewater rising main and associated pump station and rising main upgrades.
- Development of draft consent conditions that prevent premature connection to constrained wastewater infrastructure and require detailed design certification before construction.
- Where staged pump capacity is proposed, require a development agreement or equivalent mechanism to secure the full cost of future pump upgrades, including inflation allowance, before vesting or connection.

Development Engineering

Many of the outstanding development engineering matters are covered within the Transport and Water/Wastewater Infrastructure Memos and need not be duplicated here. There are two residual outstanding Development Engineering-related matters which need to be addressed, in principle, at the consenting stage so as not to defer confirming critical design parameters to the detailed design approval stage. These outstanding matters relate to the provision of earthworks feasibility information, including:

- Representative/ constrained earthworks sections,
- peat management basis,
- conditions for detailed geotechnical assessment,
- engineered fill specification,
- independent peer review and staged completion reporting.

Summary of Outstanding Matters and Resolutions Proposed

To assist the Panel, the following table lists the key outstanding matters identified within each of the technical memos which form part of this report, along with required responses where relevant. For further reasoning and context on each of the listed matters and required responses, please refer to the details contained within the respective technical memo:

Outstanding matter	Required response
Ecology / Biodiversity	
1. Screening vegetation alongside walkways	Provide a 'low ecological impact' design response for walkways, including planting specifications and any other mechanisms that may be suitable to minimise disturbance to birds, such as educational signage along or near the pathways.
2. Mechanism for ensuring perpetual protection of Te Harakeke Wetland	Allotments containing Te Harakeke (Lots 5310 and 5311) to be vested as local purpose (ecological) reserve.
3. Table 5 in ERMP – inadequate approach to achieving the enrichment planting of degraded wetlands (wetland clusters 2, 4 and 5)	Either - update the ERMP to include monitoring of the proposed 'nodes' of indigenous enrichment wetland planting for degraded wetland clusters 2, 4 and 5 and minimum thresholds to be achieved over the monitoring period i.e. the planted nodes progressively increase in extent by a minimum threshold (i.e. 20%) over the monitoring period; Or – update the ERMP to require all exotic-dominated wetlands be revegetated with indigenous plants.
4. Table 18 in ERMP to be re-titled, reviewed and updated	Re-title table to reflect it being a full schedule and timetable of tasks, and review to ensure all components of work are included (e.g. pest monitoring which is not currently listed). A review period should also be scheduled to assess whether adaptive management thresholds are triggered for wetland features, and that all aspects of the ERMP are on track to meet compliance requirements well in advance of compliance certification.
Stormwater / Flooding / Hydrology	
5. Absence of hydrogeological environment assessment by a suitably qualified person	A robust analysis, including development of a groundwater model, is recommended for a development of this scale, to assess the effects.
6. Effects on Te Harakeke Wetland and adjacent properties	Clearly explain what control measures are proposed to prevent Te Harakeke Wetland receiving too much water from stormwater discharges and groundwater inflow, which may then inundate properties to the west.
7. Ownership and maintenance of stormwater assets	Update Stormwater Management Plan to clearly articulate design objectives for assets to be designed as low-maintenance systems with appropriate maintenance access

Outstanding matter	Required response
8. Stormwater network design	Provide an indicative stormwater network layout to demonstrate that a practicable design solution can be achieved across the sit, particularly within the low-lying eastern portions of the development area.
9. Minimum building floor levels	Provide suitably worded consent conditions that stipulate minimum building floor levels.
10. Clarity of SMP	Correct inconsistencies flagged. Outline implementation procedures.
11. Stormwater Impact Assessment report and macro stormwater modelling	Provide Awa report for review.
Reserves & Open Spaces	
12. Ownership of Te Harakeke Wetland	To offset the adverse effects of the proposed development on the natural environment, and to include an adequate provision of public open space within the development, the Te Harakeke Wetland (Lots 5310 and 5311) should vest to Council as Local Purpose (Ecological) Reserve to ensure its on-going management and perpetual protection.
13. Vesting of Walkway through Harakeke Wetlands	Update scheme plans to reflect Council's position that it does not accept the vesting of Lot 5003 to Council, <u>unless</u> Lots 5310 and 5311 vest to Council as Local Purpose (Ecological) Reserve.
14. Taking of land in lieu of Financial Contributions	Update application to reflect Council's policy that it can only accept land in lieu of financial contributions where it is vested for open space and environmental purposes and not for stormwater or other utilities.
Landscape & Visual Amenity	
15. Design-led interface measures	Update application to incorporate design-led interface measures, such as setbacks, density reduction or transition lots, at the most sensitive rural/rural lifestyle boundaries (e.g. at the northeastern edge in the location of proposed lots 837 to 845 and 846 to 853 and the southern edge in the vicinity of End Farm Road (lots 204-211)).
16. Rural interface planting	Provide conditions to secure the 5m interface buffer planting, planting density, species, minimum screening height, timing, maintenance and replacement requirements.
17. Controls for cut faces and barriers	Provide conditions that require controls for cut faces and batters, including maximum steepness, plantability, and a limit on unplanted cut faces, suggested as below 1.5 m.

Outstanding matter	Required response
18. Retaining wall assumptions	Provide conditions that confirm the retaining wall assumptions within the application, particularly the proposed commitment that retaining structures can be limited to 1m or less.
19. Landscape Management Plan	Provide a Landscape Management Plan condition, with clear performance standards, implementation timing, maintenance, monitoring and replacement obligations.
20. Updated proposed consent conditions	Provide conditions that capture the proposed 5m setback for prominent dune-top lots, the 4.5m height restriction, buffer planting requirements, cut face controls and LMP requirement.
Urban Design	
21. Privacy effects of ground floor apartment units	That the UDA is updated to clarify the design approach to mitigate the privacy effects of ground floor apartment units adopting the 1.8m/8m ² balcony standards, so that there can be confidence this will not result in adverse privacy effects for these units.
22. Neighbouring effects at the rural/urban interface	Increasing the lot size of boundary lots (proposed lots 837 to 845 and 846 to 853 along the northern boundary and lots 204-211 in the vicinity of End Farm Road on the southern boundary) to provide a clearer and more appropriate transition between adjacent rural properties and the boundary lots on the Site.
Transport	
23. Trip rates used in ITA	Assumptions used in the ITA require agreement to enable the impacts to be assessed.
24. Future local road network connections	Provide details and clarity regarding potential future connections to Ngarara Road, Kensington Drive and the potential road links to the south and west of the site.
25. Expressway/Te Moana Road SIDRA assessment and methodology	SIDRA assessment and methodology require agreement to enable the impacts on this intersection to be assessed.
26. 107 Paetawa Road lots	Provide further design and layout details of the proposed access to these lots, so the effects can be assessed
27. Proposed internal active mode connection to Paetawa Road.	Provide further details of this proposed internal active mode connection.
28. Peka Peka Road site access drawing	Update drawing to take into account KCDC's proposal for cycle lanes on Peka Peka

Outstanding matter	Required response
29. Te Moana Road carrying capacity	Provide an explanation of how this has been calculated has been requested, along with details of the traffic flows used.
Infrastructure	
30. Water network capacity and design	Complete hydraulic modelling of the internal and external network impacts, including pressure, fire flow, water age, pipe sizing, reservoir assumptions, and staging effects.
31. Wastewater capacity and timing	Complete updated cumulative wastewater modelling for the Waikanae North catchment and confirm the timing and scope of required upgrades before any connection is authorised.
32. Critical wastewater enabling infrastructure	Confirm commissioning requirements for the duplicate rising main from Rauparaha Pump Station to Paraparaumu Wastewater Treatment Plant, Waikanae Pond Pump Station upgrade, Rauparaha Pump Station upgrade, and any rising main upgrade between Waikanae Pond and Rauparaha.
33. Internal wastewater network and pump stations	Provide preliminary design reports for both wastewater pump stations, rising mains, emergency storage, total head, pump duty, staged upgrades, odour control, corrosion protection, access and ownership arrangements.
34. Construction and resilience	Provide detailed design information for trenchless installation, crossing locations, service clearances, geotechnical hazards, high groundwater, liquefaction, flooding, ponding and quality assurance controls.
35. 107 Paetawa Road lots	Provide on-site wastewater disposal design information, confirm Greater Wellington Regional Council consent status, and confirm firefighting compliance for the seven-lot subdivision component.
Development Engineering	
36. Earthworks feasibility	Provide earthworks feasibility information, including representative/ constrained earthworks sections, peat management basis, and conditions for detailed geotechnical assessment, engineered fill specification, independent peer review and staged completion reporting.
37. Geotechnical trenching	Provide a geotechnical trenching assessment and recommendations addressing trench stability, bedding, backfill, temporary support, groundwater control, reinstatement, settlement risk, and works near wetlands, streams, roads and existing services.

7. Other Matters

Council has not undertaken an assessment of the potential adverse effects that the proposal may have on cultural values. This is not to diminish the importance of these effects, but to recognise that it is for mana whenua to determine how a proposal impacts on their cultural values. Council defers to mana whenua on these matters.

8. Resource Consents Required

The Council is satisfied that the application has identified the relevant approvals required under the RMA and have correctly concluded that the overall activity status is a Non-Complying Activity under the District Plan.

The Council notes the application's assessment of the high order planning documents including relevant National Environmental Standards, National Policy Statements, the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement, Greater Wellington Regional Policy Statement – Operative and Change 1 Decisions Version, as well as the Kāpiti Coast District Plan in accordance with Section 104(1)(b)(i) – (vi) of the RMA. The applicant has also addressed Part 2 of the RMA including Sections 5 to 8.

The substantive application is considered to have satisfied the requirement to be comprehensively assessed against the relevant planning provisions of Section 104 of the RMA.

9. Proposed Conditions

A number of critical conditions are required to ensure the proposed works and environmental outcomes are appropriate and codified by conditions.

In accordance with notes [11] and [12] of the Panel's Minute 1, Council will review and provide comments on the updated version of the Applicant's proposed draft conditions when these are circulated.