Fast-track

Te Kāwanatanga o Aotearoa
New Zealand Government

MINUTE 5 OF THE EXPERT PANEL
Request for further information

Ōhoka Residential Subdivision Expert Panel [FTAA-2606-1253]

22 October 2026

---

[1] The Panel has reviewed the economic assessments prepared by Market Economics Limited (21 May 2026, "the M.E Report") and Savvy Consulting Limited (June 2026 Final v2, "the Savvy Report"), the economic material provided in s 53 comments, including the Waimakariri District Council/Formative material, the Canterbury Regional Council material (including the evidence of Dr Meade), and the Ōhoka Residents Association material (including the infrastructure cost estimates prepared by Woods), and the Panel's initial independent economic review prepared by Resource Economics Limited dated 21 October 2026.[1]

[2] Pursuant to section 67 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, the applicant is requested to provide the following further information to assist the Panel in assessing the extent of the Project's regional or national benefits under section 81(4), and in undertaking any assessment required under section 85(3).

[3] The Panel seeks a proportionate response that distinguishes gross economic impacts from net monetary economic benefits and identifies material costs or displacement effects. Matters that cannot be quantified may be assessed qualitatively.

---

[1] This report can be found on the Reports and Advice page - https://www.fasttrack.govt.nz/projects/Ohoka-residential-subdivision/reports-and-advice

[4] When responding to the questions included in Appendix 1, please:

(a) express the monetary values (benefits, costs and net benefits) in $2026;
(b) provide the numbers in both annual and net present value (NPV) terms;
(c) when providing the NPV estimates, please use the NZ Treasury's 8% real pretax discount rate or indicate what discount rate is used and why:
(d) differentiate between national and regional values where appropriate.

[5] In accordance with section 67(2) of the Act the Carter Group Limited 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.

[6] Please provide the further information to the EPA at info@fasttrack.govt.nz within 10 working days of the project resuming processing under section 65 of the Act.

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

[8] Please note, the information will be provided to the Panel, the applicant and every person who provided comments on the application. The information will also be made available on the Fast-track website.



Kate Barry-Piceno
Ōhoka Residential Subdivision Expert Panel Chair

Appendix 1 – Information Requested

Regional scope and counterfactual

(a) Identify the geographic area used to assess each claimed regional or national benefit and explain why it is appropriate.

(b) Identify and justify the counterfactual used in the Project reports. Apply it consistently to corresponding benefits and costs. The response should not assume that all housing, construction activity, labour, household expenditure or commercial activity associated with the Project would otherwise be absent from Waimakariri or Greater Christchurch, unless that assumption is supported by evidence.

Housing supply and housing-market benefits

(c) Section 4.1.2 of the M.E Report identifies reduced monopolistic pricing and deadweight loss in the residential land market as a significant economic benefit, and s 4.1.1 identifies avoided costs of supply shortage. Please quantify these effects, or, if quantification is not practicable, provide a switching-value analysis indicating how large these benefits would need to be for the Panel's proportionality assessment to be affected, together with the authors' opinion on whether that threshold is plausibly met.

(d) The report states that the Project would increase medium-term urban residential capacity by approximately 18.7%, including the price-elasticity or other assumptions relied on. Please provide an estimate (or bounded range) of the expected effect of the additional 856 dwellings and 250 retirement units on district house or section prices. Based on this, please:

  (i) Assess the extent to which the revised proposal for 856 residential dwellings and up to 250 retirement-village units is expected to increase net realised housing supply, rather than

displace or bring forward housing that is likely to otherwise be delivered elsewhere. Identify the relevant housing-market catchment and the reasons for using it. Use the most recent assessment of plan-enabled and feasible development capacity, reflecting the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan as it now stands, rather than the WCGM22 assessment, or explain why WCGM22 remains appropriate.

(ii) Identify the expected staging and delivery of the dwellings and the extent of the contribution the Project is expected to make to housing capacity, competition and choice by type, size, price and location relevant to each stage. State the assumed build-out period and annual delivery rate, and the evidence supporting them.

(iii) If reduced land or house prices, avoided supply-shortage costs, reduced monopolistic pricing or reduced deadweight loss continue to be relied on, quantify those benefits where reasonably practicable or otherwise explain their likely materiality and confirm the evidence or provide further evidence supporting them (including sensitivity analysis for key assumptions).

(iv) For all of the above, any resultant benefits must be expressed in terms of either being a national or regional benefit, based on whatever geographic area the Applicant proposes for the latter.

Construction expenditure and employment

(e) Assess the extent to which the construction expenditure, value added and employment identified in the M.E Report are net additional to the relevant identified region, after allowing for displaced or deferred activity assessed, and the opportunity costs of labour, capital and materials.

(f) Address relevant construction-sector labour and other supply-side

constraints over the expected development period. Identify the principal assumptions and provide a proportionate sensitivity assessment.

Commercial centre and retirement village and polo field

(g) Identify separately the material economic benefits and costs attributable to the commercial centre and retirement village and polo field, while also addressing their interaction with the residential development and provide further detail of the effect of staging and typology of retirement village units, services and retail/service typologies that are relied on for those assumptions.

(h) For the commercial centre, distinguish new regional activity from expenditure and employment redistributed from other centres. For the retirement village, identify the evidence of demand and any housing-release benefit relied on. For the commercial centre, assess all retail, commercial, community and health-related activities (not only food, grocery and liquor), at both the 9,000 m² GFA cap in the proposed conditions and the maximum building envelope the proposed standards would enable (approximately 24,600 m² GFA, per the Savvy Report), using the current household yield.

(i) Identify any economic (or other) benefits attributed to the polo field and to whom they accrue, including whether public access is proposed and how it would be secured. Identify any associated costs, including event-related traffic, and explain how its recreational use interacts with its proposed stormwater attenuation function.

Infrastructure and other economic costs

(j) The Savvy Report identifies, but does not quantify, three potential economic disbenefits (s 4.1): under-recovery on existing or planned Council infrastructure in locations from which growth is redirected;

full lifecycle infrastructure costs to Council not recovered through development contributions or rates; and potential unplanned capacity investment at Ōhoka Primary School.

(i) Please provide, for each: an order-of-magnitude estimate or bounded range where practicable; or where quantification is not practicable, the evidential basis for the conclusion that the effect is "less than minor," including any advice obtained from the Council or the Ministry of Education.

(k) The wetland loss is monetised using a 2012-dollar average use value (~$108,150 for 3.5ha), excluding non-use values. Please update this figure to current dollars and to the area of wetland now assessed as being lost (the June 2026 aquatic ecology addendum refers to c. 4.3 ha), comment on the appropriateness of the national average transfer value for the wetlands on this site, and state whether the proposed offsets are expected to produce a net loss, neutrality or net gain in ecosystem service value.

(l) Please confirm whether any economic costs arise from the identified transport mitigation requirements (including the SH1/Tram Road interchange works) that fall on parties other than the applicant, and if so, their treatment in the cost ledger.

(m) Identify any other material infrastructure costs attributable to the Project that are expected to fall on the Council or another party, including any relevant transport, education or lifecycle infrastructure costs not recovered from the applicant or future residents.

(n) Identify and, where reasonably practicable, quantify any other material economic cost or supply-side constraint not already addressed.

(o) For water supply, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure (including any off-site works) required to service the Project, identify the capital and whole-of-life operating costs by stage, who is expected to bear them and by what mechanism, and any existing or planned network or treatment capacity the Project would use. Identify any

material cost risk arising from servicing matters not yet resolved, and confirm that infrastructure costs required to service the Project are not counted as economic benefits. Please respond to the infrastructure cost estimates provided in the s 53 comments.

Updated conclusions

(p) Provide an updated concise statement of the Project's material regional or national economic benefits and disbenefits, distinguishing gross impacts, transfers and benefits considered net additional. Respond to the alternative estimates in the s 53 comments, including those of Formative, Dr Meade and Woods.

(q) Identify the key assumptions on which the conclusion that the Project will deliver significant regional or national economic benefits depends, together with any material qualifications or uncertainty.