

10 October 2026

Panel Convener
Fast-track Applications
Environmental Protection Authority
info@fasttrack.govt.nz

SUBJECT Tahimana Response to Minute 2
File Reference RM260514 (TDC) / FTAA-2608-1290

Kia ora Jane,

Thank you for circulating Minute 2 of the Panel Convener (7 October) in relation to the Convener Conference for the Tahimana FTAA-2608-1290.

Attendees from Tasman District Council will be:

Leif Pigott [REDACTED]
Jenna Wolter [REDACTED]

Tasman District Council provides the following comments as requested in relation to the matters raised in Minute 2 below. These comments are intended to assist the Panel Convener in determining panel composition, process requirements and a timeframe for determination of the application.

7 (a) comment on the extent of engagement by the applicant both before and following lodgment of the application;

Tahimana began as a conventional RMA subdivision application lodged in April 2024, underwent extensive technical review and refinement.

Prior to the resource consent for the development being lodged Council engaged extensively in pre-application discussions with the applicant. These discussions commenced as early as February and March 2023. These meetings considered the initial scope of the proposed subdivision and provided feed back to the applicant on associated infrastructure and information requirements to be addressed when the resource consent was lodged.

Following lodgement on 24 April 2024, Council undertook reviews of the reports prepared by the applicant's technical experts and issued a series of requests for further information on various technical matters. The applicant responded with additional reports and revised

Tasman District Council
Email info@tasman.govt.nz
Website www.tasman.govt.nz
24 hour assistance

Richmond
189 Queen Street
Private Bag 4
Richmond 7050
New Zealand
Phone 03 543 8400
Fax 03 543 9524

Murchison
92 Fairfax Street
Murchison 7007
New Zealand
Phone 03 523 1013
Fax 03 523 1012

Motueka
7 Hickmott Place
PO Box 123
Motueka 7143
New Zealand
Phone 03 528 2022
Fax 03 528 9751

Takaka
14 Junction Street
PO Box 74
Takaka 7142
New Zealand
Phone 03 525 0020
Fax 03 525 9972

designs covering matters such as transport, wastewater, stormwater, ecology, landscape and water supply.

The key issues that further information requests sought to address were largely addressed by the applicant and the requests were deemed to be satisfied (or not) prior to the resource consent application being withdrawn. It was referred to the Fast-track process in March 2026, the substantive FTAA application was lodged in September 2026.

Prior to the development being accepted referred to the Fast Track Process, the applicant engaged in further pre-application discussions with Council and the revised design and updated reports were put to Council for comment (or not) prior to the lodgement of the substantive application.

Engagement and discussions with the applicant on the key issues as well as the conditions of consent are ongoing.

7 (b) the applicant aside, identify in-house experts and external consultants engaged on this project;

We have had technical input from the following people to date. We expect these are the most likely people to provide input going forward.

Person	Task	Organisation
Teresa Walton	Independent Planning Review	Consultant
Leif Pigott	Council Lead / Fast-track Coordination Regional consenting and wastewater	Staff
Jenna Wolter	Consent Processing	Staff
Matt McDowell	Regional Consenting	Staff
Council Transportation Engineers	Transportation Review	Staff
Council engineering staff	Three Waters & Development Engineering	Staff
Chris Milne	Development Engineer	Staff
Matt Moss	Ecology	Staff
Anna MacKenzie	Contaminated land/ HAIL	Staff
Liz Gavin	Landscape Architect peer review	Boffa Miskell

To date we have been unable to find someone to review the Economic and Regional significance associated with this application, although it is acknowledged that the Panel will need to satisfy themselves that the development meets the tests for regional and national benefits .

Council also sees that it is prudent to seek engagement from a suitably qualified urban design and landscape professional to assist with the assessment on the Rural 3 design guides as well as reviewing the adequacy of the mitigation proposed by the applicant's technical landscape and design experts in this regard. Liz Gavin of Boffa Miskell was engaged to review the resource consent application and will likely be engaged to provide comments this application, subject to availability.

Further information may be needed from other technical experts to as well in order for Council to provide accurate Planning assessments of the proposal and comment to the Panel.

7 (c) where there is a difference of opinion between the applicant and any other participant, identify:

(i) the principal issues in contention; and

(ii) those issues capable of resolution through conditions of approval.

Principal Issue	Likelihood of resolution with conditions of approval
Reserves, productive land, urban design and housing outcomes - Council supports the provision of open space and walkway connections, subject to clear conditions covering reserve vesting, classification, development standards, construction responsibilities and financial contributions. Planning matters include the protection of productive land where practicable, consistency with the Coastal Tasman Area Subdivision and Development Design Guide, management of cumulative landscape and rural character effects, and consideration of the affordability and urban form outcomes claimed by the Applicant.	Unknown – Council will need to carry out its own detailed assessment to be satisfied that conditions of approval could sufficiently mitigate the adverse effects of the proposal.
Rural 3 planning assessment - The application provides an assessment of how the proposal responds to the relevant Rural 3 provisions. The key policy issue requiring further evaluation is whether the proposed scale and intensity of the residential clusters is consistent with the Rural 3 Zone's intended character and development outcomes, or whether it represents a form of suburban residential development that exceeds what was anticipated by the Rural 3 planning framework. This is still a significant matter of discussion and Council will likely need to seek independent advice from an urban design and landscape expert on the appropriateness of the proposed mitigation provided to mitigate the effects on the Rural 3 environment.	Unknown – as above
Regional significant and economic assessment The applicant relies on housing, economic and regional benefit claims as part of the justification for approval under the Fast-track process. Given the scale of the proposal and the significance of those claims to the overall assessment, consideration of the assumptions underpinning the economic assessment and whether a cost-benefit analysis is required. Council would like to suggest an	Unknown – as above

independent review for the Panel so that it can satisfy itself that the proposal meets the tests for regional and national benefits.	
Wastewater servicing - remains a key issue. Council's concerns relate mainly to the long-term ownership, operation, maintenance and governance of the proposed privately owned communal wastewater system, rather than the treatment technology itself. If consent is granted, conditions should require a comprehensive Operations and Maintenance Plan, an Asset Management Plan, funded renewal and replacement arrangements, monitoring and reporting against the Wastewater Environmental Performance Standards, and clear governance arrangements before development proceeds. The proposed conditions are being worked through. Council must comply with the Wastewater Environmental Performance Standards if it were ever asked to take over the scheme. This means any future transfer to Council is unlikely to be practical. Council is aware that similar communal wastewater schemes have encountered difficulties where depreciation, renewals and ongoing operational costs were not adequately provided for, leaving future users exposed to unfunded upgrade and maintenance obligations.	Possible/likely
Water supply - Council has discussed potable water supply with the Applicant. An in-principle allocation from the Māpua/Ruby Bay water supply scheme has been reached, subject to agreed conditions and detailed engineering approval. The development should operate as a restricted rural water supply, with appropriate on-site and communal storage, private internal reticulation, and clear requirements for any secondary drinking water supplier obligations.	Possible/likely
Stormwater and ecology - Council considers that stormwater effects can generally be managed through the proposed treatment and attenuation measures, provided detailed design protects wetlands, downstream waterways and receiving environments. Key matters include maintaining wetland hydrology, ensuring post-development peak flows do not exceed pre-development conditions, treating road runoff, managing sediment and contaminant discharges, and securing ecological planting, maintenance and wetland protection through conditions.	Possible
Earthworks and construction discharges - The scale of earthworks required during construction has the potential to	Possible/Likely

generate sediment laden runoff if not carefully managed. Council expects these effects to be addressed through a detailed Erosion and Sediment Control Plan prepared before works begin and implemented throughout construction. This is signaled through the draft land disturbance consent conditions.	
Transport and roading - Transport matters mainly relate to Stagecoach Road upgrades, active transport connections, lighting, and integration with the wider transport network. Council expects these matters to be addressed through detailed engineering design and conditions.	Possible/Likely

7 (d) record processes agreed with the applicant to narrow or reduce any issues relevant to the application and the decision that the panel is required to make;

We have been working through draft conditions that were supplied by the applicant this is ongoing.

The draft versions of the conditions can be supplied to the Panel if requested.

7 (e) identify any changes made, or currently underway, to the application since lodgement, whether as a result of engagement with participants or other work undertaken by the applicant, including any new or supplementary reports and draft conditions;

We have been working on draft conditions of consent prior to lodgment of the substantive application.

The draft versions of the conditions can be supplied to the Panel if requested.

7 (f) describe the complexity of this application;

This is also Council's first application under the Act. The application is not particularly complex in itself. However, it is outside the scope of applications previously approved by Council, and the Fast-track process differs from Council's usual consenting processes. Accordingly, while the application itself is not particularly complex, processing it is moderately complex for Council due to staff resourcing and other competing workload demands. The short timeframes required to respond will also be a source of difficulty for Council as this is Council's first fast track process to provide comment to and the internal systems have not been established to facilitate fast track comments at this stage.

7(g) state whether the drafting of proposed consent conditions (including any draft management plan filed) is accepted; and

We are currently working through conditions of consent supplied by the applicant. The high level consent conditions are what we would expect from an application of this type in this general location.

Final draft conditions and management plans should be circulated for internal review before approval is granted to ensure best alignment with Council's existing compliance and investigations monitoring.

At this stage, no final condition sets or management plans have been approved or accepted by Council.

7 (h) propose efficient processes to enable the panel to understand, resolve or narrow the scope of any likely issues and indicate how these processes may be accounted for under the decision timeframe.

Applicant and Council meet to come to a common understanding (effectively expert conferencing) on the key issues.

It is suggested that a shared digital workspace be set up to keep track of the flow of comments and amendments to conditions between Council and the applicant. Clear tracking of comments and strict version control of condition sets will be vital to co-ordinate quick responses amendments.

Panel membership

Council considers that the Panel would benefit from expertise in Planning with experience with Rural/Rural 3 style subdivisions, onsite servicing in rural environments, discharge consents and urban design experience dealing with developing in smaller rural communities.

Time frames

In considering time frames the panel will need to consider the close down periods and leave around Christmas & New Year then the public holidays at the end of January and early February

Key Staff who have been working on this application have the following leave booked and are unavailable at the following dates

Office closed All Staff 22 December to 6 January

Staff involved with this application currently have leave booked on the following dates

24-29 October

4-9 November

20 November- 2 December

19 December- 6 January

29 January- 9 February

Due to the unavailability of staff during the anticipated process timeframes laid out in Schedule 2 of Minute 2, Council considers that adhering to the timeframe to provide comments from relevant parties (20 November – 18 December 2026) will likely be difficult to achieve.

Please advise if you need any further clarification on any matters raised in this letter.

Ngā mihi

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Leif Pigott', with a stylized, cursive script.

Leif Pigott

Principal Advisor – Environmental Services Tasman District Council