
MINUTE 16 OF THE EXPERT PANEL

Resumption of Processing

Mt Welcome, Pukerua Bay, Porirua Project

FTAA-2603-1181

(28 August 2026)

[1] The applicant has requested that processing resume. Section 65(2) gives the Expert Panel no discretion in relation to such a request. Accordingly, processing has resumed effective midnight on 27 August 2026.

[2] Processing was suspended for 9 working days. That means that the deadline for the Panel's final decision is now 20 November 2026.

[3] There are a number of outstanding actions arising from previous Panel minutes.

[4] In Minute 8, the Panel directed that expert conferencing be undertaken on engineering and ecological issues. A Joint Witness Statement has been filed on engineering issues. That on ecological issues is awaited. The original deadline for the latter was 21 August. Adding the 9 working days during suspension gives a revised deadline of 3 September 2026. However, the Panel requests that, if at all possible, the Joint Witness Statement(s) on ecological matters be provided before then, for reasons that will become apparent shortly.

[5] Minute 11 requested information from the applicant on a variety of topics by 28 August. Interpolating 9 working days gives a revised deadline of 9 September. The Panel requests that the applicant provide whatever information it has to hand in respect of that request by noon on 2 September, with the balance

provided within the revised deadline.

[6] Minutes 13 and 14 forewarned Messrs McDonnell, Banks and Smeaton of the Panel's wish that they conference on conditions, including in relation to the interface between conditions and management plans. The Panel confirms its direction to that effect, with their Joint Witness Statement to be provided by noon on 2 September.

[7] Minute 15 forewarned a number of parties of information that the Panel would seek following resumption of processing. The Panel confirms those requests with comments from Department of Conservation and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga on non-RMA approval conditions required by noon on 4 September, and responses from Greater Wellington Regional Council, Department of Conservation, Porirua City Council and Tiaki Wai on the balance of the requests in Minute 15 by noon on 2 September.

[8] Following expert conferencing on engineering issues, Mr Brittliff has, at the Panel's request, provided a report/evidence on the matters the subject of conferencing. A copy is attached. If any party whose experts participated in conferencing has any comment on Mr Brittliff's report, they may provide same by noon on 2 September.

[9] The Panel has additional requests for information from the applicant, as follows:

- (a) The applicant does not support a requirement for on-lot water retention and re-use, partly on the basis of its cost. What is the approximate cost of such facilities for an average dwelling of the type the applicant seeks to make provision for?
- (b) Table 10 in the Infrastructure Report states that the upper zone reservoir (Muri Site) will have a top water level (TWL) of RL186m. We understand this future reservoir will also service the upper zone in the Muri Block. Section 11.2 of the Infrastructure Report states

that the proposed works will maintain compliance with the Regional Standards for Water Supply (**RSWS**) v3.0. As stated in Section 11.2, the RSWS requires a minimum pressure at each lot of 25m.

The Panel requests that the applicant outline the status of the Muri reservoir site in terms of current design plans and/or planning approvals and indicate the degree of certainty of the likely design top and bottom water levels of the reservoir. We note that PCC LIDAR information indicates the reservoir floor level is likely to be at approximately RL181m, but the reservoir site is on a reasonably restrictive 'dome-shaped' hill and any requirements for visual screening of the reservoir may result in a lower level of the reservoir so that the platform for the reservoir can contain the reservoir, access around the reservoir for maintenance and bunding or planting for visual screening. We request that the applicant comment on these matters so that the Panel can better understand the likely available water pressure at the Mt Welcome development.

It also appears to the Panel that there is likely to be a pipeline length of approximately 450m of water main within the Muri block to the northern boundary of the Mt Welcome block at the road connection to the Lucas block, and a further pipeline length of approximately 800m within the Mt Welcome proposal to service lots 785 – 790 in the Lucas block. The Panel requests that the applicant comment on likely design head losses between the reservoir and the higher sites within the Lucas Block at peak domestic demand periods so that these losses can be considered when assessing available pressure at the development.

We note that Drawing 2130 R1 shows lots 785 – 790 as being formed at a proposed level of RL162. Drawings 2129 & 2130 shows lots 770 – 803 and lots 833 – 836 as being above RL155.

We request that the applicant confirm which lots are likely to not meet the minimum pressure requirements set by the RSWS and advise the likely shortfall in available pressure at peak domestic demand for those lots. In its response to comments, the applicant suggested that consent orders were not required to address this situation. If, having considered the above matters, the applicant maintains that position, the Panel requests that the applicant advise what level of shortfall would justify consent orders.

If the above consideration confirms the minimum pressure of 25m is not going to be achieved at some of the higher lots, the Panel queries if agreement will be required from Taiki Wai as to which lots (if any) will be permitted to have a lower design minimum pressure. If so, that would suggest to the Panel that amendment will be required to conditions (e.g. condition 27 but there may be other conditions affected) to ensure the design is consistent with the conditions.

Similarly, if it is intended to have on-site water storage tanks and associated water pressure pumps to achieve the minimum pressure of 25m at the higher sites, then it would seem that these lots will need to be captured by appropriate conditions relating to water supply. Can Mr McDonnell please comment on whether such amendments are required, and how he would recommend they be framed.

The Panel notes also that lots 315 – 319 are shown on drawing 5106 R1 to be connected to the upper water supply zone. These lots are shown on drawing 2116 R1 to be formed at a level ranging from RL86 to RL94 respectively. Without pressure reducing infrastructure, these lots would appear to have pressure exceeding 90m, which would not meet the RSWS standard for maximum pressure.

The Panel requests that the applicant advise if it is proposed to use

pressure reducing infrastructure to protect these lots from excessive pressure and if so, what consequential amendments to condition 27 are required.

[10] The applicant's response to these requests is required by noon on 2 September.

[11] In Minute 8, the Panel noted its intention to convene conferences to discuss the Joint Witness Statements it was directing be prepared might be discussed. It is obviously not tenable to convene those conferences on 27 and 28 August, as originally planned. However, the Panel has been able to rearrange its other commitments to free up Thursday 3 September for this purpose. It plans to convene the first conference at 9am that day to discuss engineering issues. The experts who contributed to the engineering Joint Witness Statements are required participants. We note that Tiaki Wai's representatives should come prepared to discuss the water supply issues the subject of the Panel's requests in paragraph 9(b) above, and the applicant's response thereto. The inter-relationship between stormwater/ flood management and wetland offsetting on the ground means that the experts who attended the freshwater ecology conferencing will need to attend. We may also have questions of the planning advisors for the respective parties about the planning overlay to the issues under the discussion.

[12] We acknowledge that given the number of people that encompasses, availability may be an issue for some. The Panel will be flexible if experts need to come and go from the conference, but it intends to proceed regardless.

[13] A second conference will be convened at 3pm on 3 September to discuss herpetofauna (first) and then the balance of terrestrial biodiversity issues. The experts who conferenced on these matters are required attendees.

[14] The following day (4 September) is a reserve day in case we are unable to address all issues within the available time on the first day.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a stylized 'T' followed by a series of loops and a horizontal line.

Trevor Robinson
Expert Panel Chair