
MINUTE 22 OF THE EXPERT PANEL

Requests for Information

Mt Welcome, Pukerua Bay, Porirua Project

FTAA-2603-1181

(14 October 2026)

[1] Following resumption of processing of the application (Refer Minute 21) the Expert Panel is seeking information from the Applicant in three discrete areas.

[2] First, in relation to lizards, the Panel requests that the Applicant (via Mr Payne and Mr McDonnell, as appropriate) provide feedback on a ‘without prejudice’ basis as to the amendments the Panel should consider to the Lizard Management Plan and/or consent conditions if it considers that there is merit in Dr Fea’s recommendation in her 17 September 2026 response that clearance in the areas she identifies as possible copper skink habitat be supervised. We emphasise that we are not requesting that Mr Payne comment on the merits of those recommendations. The Panel will assume that Mr Payne’s views have not changed in that regard unless he advises otherwise.

[3] Mr Payne and/or Mr McDonnell are also requested to identify what amendments would be required to the Lizard Management Plan and/or conditions to provide for the additional potential areas of lizard relocation Mr Payne notes in his 11 September response to Minute 18.

[4] The Panel notes that the potential additional lizard relocation area Mr Payne identifies appears to overlap with the additional potential SNA offset Dr Keesing identified in his 17 September 2026 response to Minute 18. Dr Fea drew our attention to another apparent overlap with a proposed fill area. Can Mr Payne please comment on the implications of these apparent overlaps. In particular, are the different uses of the same land compatible, and how should the overlap be

managed?

[5] If Mr Payne considers that additional amendments to the proposed Lizard Management Plan are required and/ or desirable, he is invited to supply same in conjunction with his responses to our requests above.

[6] Second, the Panel has noted the Applicant's advice in its tabulated response to TRoTR's comments (Issue 4) that " the applicant is continuing to engage with Te Rūnanga on these matters and a site meeting is planned with iwi representatives in the upcoming weeks to discuss opportunities to preserve culturally significant materials associated with the woolshed.". Can the Applicant please provide an update in relation to this issue.

[7] Lastly, the Applicant is asked to expand on and further elucidate its position with respect to recommendations arising from the Urban Design review undertaken on behalf of Porirua City Council.

[8] That Urban Design review was undertaken by Mr Matthew Wenden, and the resulting technical memorandum dated 9 July 2026 was attached to the comments supplied by the City Council, dated 31 July 2026, in response to an invitation under s53 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024.

[9] Mr Wenden's conclusions and recommendations were set out in paragraph 56 to 70 of his memorandum. Those fifteen points were also replicated in the Planning Report prepared on behalf of the City Council by Mr Rory Smeaton, dated 31 July 2026. There, Mr Smeaton added his own planning response to each of Mr Wenden's recommendations ("Table 1' in that report refers).

[10] Mr Brad Dobson, for the Applicant, then replicated both Mr Wenden's and Mr Smeaton's recommendations and comments in a table of his own, in an undated Memorandum in response to the Urban Design review. This Memorandum was attached as 'Appendix H' to the Applicant's response to comments from invited parties (dated 7 August 2026). In his table, Mr Dobson sets out his response with respect to each of Mr Wenden's fifteen recommendations (and Mr Smeaton's associated comments).

[11] The Panel requests that the Applicant expand on and further elucidate its position with respect to Mr Dobson's responses as this will assist the Panel in its deliberations, clarifying the links to relevant consent conditions proffered by the

Applicant and/or appropriate points in future consent processes whereby certain commitments, assurances or considerations will be realised or accommodated. This may necessitate amendments to scheme plans, roading plans or proffered conditions, or the application of certain matters for control or discretion as specified in the Porirua District Plan at consenting stages, for example. We note this may require input from the Applicant's planning, civil engineering and transport experts. We stress that we are asking the Applicant to undertake this exercise on a 'without prejudice' basis, without reference to the overall conclusions we will reach regarding the merits of this application.

[12] To assist and direct the Applicant with respect to this exercise, we have reproduced the table as presented in Mr Dobson's Memorandum in **Appendix 1**, with an additional column setting out our own requests for clarification and/or information.

[13] The Applicant's response to the various requests in this Minute are required by 21 October 2026, at the latest.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'T. Robinson', with a large, stylized loop at the end.

Trevor Robinson
Expert Panel Chair

Appendix 1

Recommendations, Responses and Requests arising from

Porirua City Council's Urban Design Review

Recommendation (from PCC's Urban Design Review)	Proposed Planning Response (from PCC's Planning Report)	Response (from Memo on behalf of the Applicant)	Panel Request
1. The open space and lot layouts at the heads of Roads 10, 11 and 26 be designed to enable future road connections into the Skaiffe Block without requiring the removal of open space or land acquisition, potentially through provision of future road reserve land.	Revision of scheme plan to include road reserve of sufficient width to enable future road connections from Roads 10, 11 and 26 to the southern boundary.	The writer defers to the civil engineers on the Project.	How does the Applicant consider this matter has been resolved, if indeed it can be? What means, including but not limited to changes to the scheme plan, does the Applicant consider are warranted to address this matter? What are the relevant conditions? If no changes are proposed, please provide an explanation.
2. The lot and open space arrangements at the heads of Roads 21 and 25 be designed to preserve the ability to deliver future road connections without reducing open space reserves or requiring land acquisition.	Revision of scheme plan to enable future road connection between Roads 21 and Road 25 of appropriate width and gradient.	The writer defers to the civil engineers on the Project.	How does the Applicant consider this matter has been resolved, if indeed it can be? What means, including but not limited to changes to the scheme plan, does the Applicant consider are warranted to address this matter? What are the relevant conditions? If no changes are proposed, please provide an explanation.
3. The eastern-most track route be shown on the application plans and secured through a consent condition requiring delivery when the wider Muri Block loop track network is developed.	Revision of MLUDS plans. Additional consent condition requiring a consent notice on Lot 5003 for delivery of eastern track through any future development.	The writer defers to the planner on the Project for comment. The writer notes that any future development on Lot 5003 would be subject to the same District Plan and Structure Plan provisions and the Council can rely on those provisions to enable future connections/tracks.	Can the Applicant please point to the relevant proffered condition(s) that <u>specifically</u> address this matter and/or the relevant District Plan and Structure Plan provisions that do so, and explain how these provisions would be brought to bear at the resource consent stage?
4. An additional off-road walking and cycling connection be provided from Upper Terrace to connect with the existing track south of Road 7 and improve active mode links to the Muri Block.	Revision of scheme plan and roading plans.	The proposed connection to Muri Block to the north is technically possible but its not clear to the writer what it would be connected to and what implications this could have on the Muri Block development. The trail network currently provides connectivity via the street network to the Muri Block with off street connections possible via the either stormwater water reserves located east and west on Road 7. Although this requires a short connection on street, it isn't considered to be a long distance and is common on trail networks.	What assurance can the Applicant provide that the connection will be made and what specific mechanism is in place (or needs to be put in place) to effect this (including, but not limited to, any necessary changes to the scheme plan and/or roading plans)? What are the relevant conditions?

Recommendation (from PCC's Urban Design Review)	Proposed Planning Response (from PCC's Planning Report)	Response (from Memo on behalf of the Applicant)	Panel Request
			
5. The subdivision layout be refined in accordance with the recommendations in Appendix 1, including improved street connectivity, collector road extensions, park relocation, walking trail links, future-proofing measures, and support for multi-unit housing near the local centre.	This overarching recommendation is achieved through the other proposed responses.	The writer defers to the civil and transport experts on the Project for comment on most of these matters. In respect of relocating parks, the writer's comments are: Alternative park locations have been considered throughout the development, including amendments made in response to feedback from Porirua City Council and the initial Urban Design Review. The proposed Lucas Block parks are considered appropriate because they provide a balanced distribution of open space within walking distance of surrounding neighbourhoods, while also serving as gateways to the wider valley open space network and future pedestrian connections. Unlike street-defined parks, these parks occupy more prominent locations that provide broader outlooks across the landscape, creating a greater sense of openness and amenity, different to others currently provided within the development. They are also framed by residential development on multiple sides, providing passive surveillance, improving safety, and enhancing the amenity of both the parks and the adjoining homes. While the parks may ultimately be required to accommodate future transport connections identified within the Structure Plan, the Project includes a mechanism (i.e the developer of the land would be required to find land for a park to offset loss of this area) to ensure that an equivalent neighbourhood park is provided in close proximity (if required). This	The Applicant's response refers to a 'mechanism' included in the 'Project' to ensure that an equivalent neighbourhood park is provided in close proximity, in the event that indicative parks are ultimately required to accommodate future transport connections identified within the Structure Plan. Please provide an explanation detailing how this mechanism is intended to work and how it finds expression in proffered conditions, application documentation and/or District Plan or Structure Plan provisions.

Recommendation (from PCC's Urban Design Review)	Proposed Planning Response (from PCC's Planning Report)	Response (from Memo on behalf of the Applicant)	Panel Request
		approach maintains the intended level of open space provision while preserving flexibility for future transport infrastructure if the wider growth area develops.	
6. Services infrastructure be designed with sufficient capacity to support future medium-density residential development within a reasonable walkable catchment of the local centre.	Additional consent conditions for assumptions of the number of dwellings to be provided for by water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure networks.	The writer defers to the planner on the Project.	Can the Applicant please point to the relevant proffered condition(s) that address this matter and/or the relevant District Plan and Structure Plan provisions that do so, and explain how these provisions would be brought to bear at the resource consent stage?
7. The indicative centre design be replaced with a higher-level precinct plan approach to provide stronger direction and control over key structural elements.	Proposed precinct plan to be provided by Applicant. Additionally consent condition to be included requiring a consent notice on Lot 1000 requiring future development to be in accordance with the precinct plan.	The Council's District Plan is relied on for the controls on the centre design. The imagery within the MLUDS is indicative only.	Please identify the specific District Plan controls referred to in the response on behalf of the Applicant and explain how they will operate and provide a suitable level of control and/or discretion over key structural elements associated with the development of the neighbourhood centre.
8. The two Lucas Block parks be relocated to more central and accessible locations to improve usability, visibility, and future road network flexibility.	Revision of scheme plan by Applicant to relocate the two proposed parks within the 'Lucas Block'.	Refer to the response in point 5 above.	The Panel has no further queries.
9. A safe crossing facility be provided to connect with the Ara Harakeke shared path, preferably through a signalised intersection.	Revision of roading plans by Applicant to include active transport connection across SH59.	The writer defers to the transport expert on the Project.	The Panel understands NZTA's position and stated requirement for a roundabout in preference to a signalised intersection and how this practically compromises the ability to provide a surface level connection for the Ara Harakeke shared path. Nonetheless, is there some facility, via identification in the roading plans or otherwise, to provide for a future safe crossing facility (e.g. via an elevated walkway), or least not preclude its future provision, even if the timing, funding and responsibility for its provision remains to be determined?
10. The proposed road type for Road 02 be amended to align with Collector Road Types A–C (with provision of cycle lanes) to better reflect the intent of the Northern Growth Development Area Structure Plan.	Revision of roading plans by Applicant to show all of Road 02 as Collector Road Types A–C.	The writer defers to the transport expert and civil engineers on the Project.	Have the roading plans been revised to show all of Road 02 as Collector Road Types A–C in the manner requested? If so, which roading plans refer? If not, why not, and what alternative approaches have been accommodated? What are the relevant conditions?
11. Roads 12 and 15 be extended to form a connected crescent loop, and Road 04 be connected to Road 01 to	Revision of scheme plan and roading plans by Applicant to provide roading connections.	Roads 12 and 15 have been connected via walkways as the result of a previously adopted recommendation from the Council and the initial Urban Design Review.	Which scheme or roading or other plans have been revised to illustrate these additional connections and how is their provision guaranteed via

Recommendation (from PCC's Urban Design Review)	Proposed Planning Response (from PCC's Planning Report)	Response (from Memo on behalf of the Applicant)	Panel Request
improve network connectivity.		The writer defers to the transport expert on the Project for the connectivity between Roads 04 and 01. A planned walkway connection between Road 04 and the Lower Terrace provides for some connectivity to the west of the Project with the connecting street network.	proffered conditions or other mechanisms?
12. Additional pedestrian or road connections be considered between Roads 02 and 03, and Roads 26 and 28, to improve permeability across large blocks.	Revision of scheme plan to create pedestrian and/or road connections.	The writer considers that the proposed pedestrian connectivity is adequate and notes the connections suggested by the reviewer will not necessarily support the main destinations (i.e. park or centre) but connections between homes instead.	The Panel has no further queries.
13. All referenced design guidelines and controls be provided, and their planning status clearly defined to enable proper assessment. Additionally, a formal implementation mechanism be established to ensure any future design guidelines and controls are applied and enforceable through the consent framework.	Further information to be provided by Applicant's landscape architect on guidelines referenced in the Strategy. Additional consent condition for implementation of design guidelines.	The writer intended that on-lot design guidelines would be prepared to give effect to MLUDS as outlined on the Page 3 of MLDUS. Design guidelines will be voluntary documents prepared by the Applicant to communicate the intended design vision and encourage a high standard of on-lot built form and landscaping outcomes throughout the development. They would provide guidance on matters such as colour palettes, fencing, planting and other elements, but is not intended to impose additional regulatory requirements beyond those already contained within the District Plan, and consent conditions and any applicable consent notices approved through this consent. The matters addressed by a design guide ensure commercial quality controls are in place and the Applicant may choose to implement through private mechanisms. Requiring compliance with a design guide by condition would unnecessarily elevate a non-statutory guidance document into a regulatory instrument and create uncertainty around its interpretation and enforcement. Accordingly, the proposed condition is neither necessary nor appropriate.	Can the Applicant provide an explanation of how 'on-lot' guidelines will be imposed on future lot developers and owners? For example, will this be achieved via covenants or some other mechanism? Additionally, should these mechanisms be a matter for control or discretion in the district plan?
14. Confirmation be provided that consent notices #110 &	Further information to be provided by Applicant's landscape architect.	Consent notices 110 and 111 relate specifically to outcomes	Do the proffered consent notices represent the full extent of the proposed

Recommendation (from PCC's Urban Design Review)	Proposed Planning Response (from PCC's Planning Report)	Response (from Memo on behalf of the Applicant)	Panel Request
111 represents the full extent of the proposed landscape treatments and built form controls referenced in Appendix 22 - Masterplan + Landscape Urban Design Strategy.		of the Landscape Visual Effects Assessment not the MLUDS.	landscape treatments and built form controls in the LVEA? What are the relevant conditions?
15. Further detail be provided on the landscaping measures identified in Consent Notice #110 to ensure the intended outcomes are be achieved.	Amendments to Condition 110 consent notice wording.	As identified in the LVEA, observations from Viewpoint Two (where the houses form part of the skyline, as opposed to Mount Welcome) and to a lesser extent, Viewpoints One and Four (also where the houses form part of the skyline, as opposed to Mount Welcome) and the corresponding visual effects ratings were at a level worth considering further mitigation. Section 7 of the LVEA sets out the recommendation which has been adopted as a consent notice condition. The writer is therefore comfortable with the wording of the consent notice provided.	Noted. What are the relevant conditions?