



Draft Decision and Conditions on the Mt Iron Junction Housing Scheme application, NZTA comments

From Helen Dempster [REDACTED]

Date Tue 15/09/2026 12:41 PM

To Substantive <substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz>

Hello,

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments on the draft conditions. NZTA wish to make the following comments:

1. Condition 50, Part B – Subdivision conditions, addresses the vesting of the two lots (Lot 700 and 701) as road in His Majesty the King. While NZTA are happy with that condition, in the absence of an existing programme of work and funding to upgrade that roundabout, NZTA note that any NZTA fees (e.g. legal, survey, accredited supplier fees) associated with the fulfilment of this condition would need to be borne by the applicant. This matter was previously flagged in paragraph 5.6(c) of the Written Statement of Evidence of Helen Dempster, where a condition was requested that formalised that Lots 700 and 701 are vested to NZTA as Road with any costs of the legalisation process (e.g. legal drafting fees, LINZ fees, survey fees) to be the responsibility of the applicant.
2. The draft documents shared with us do not include the versions of the scheme plan and engineering plans, which, it was indicated during the Hearing, were to be updated to show the correct area of land to be vested in NZTA as road. As such, we haven't been able to check the accuracy of those plans. However, following the Hearing, the applicant shared with NZTA a revised scheme plan ('Revision 9') and revised engineering plans ('Revision 3'), which showed the two parcels (Lot 700 and 701) to vest in NZTA, with the corrected square metre size of Lots 700 and 701 identified. I note that, in the draft conditions, there appears to be a missing 'revision number', and a potentially incorrect 'revision number' cited in the text of the conditions referencing the engineering plans. Specifically:

a. Condition 4, Part A -Land Use Conditions: I think the Engineering Plan should refer to Revision 3, but presently does not:

- b) Mt Iron Junction Ltd – Preliminary Engineering Design – Earthworks – P240103 - Sheet 200 - 202 – Rev 3- Patersons
- c) Mt Iron Junction Ltd – Preliminary Engineering Design – Roading – P240103 - Sheets 300 – 361 – Rev 1 - Patersons
- d) Mt Iron Junction Ltd – Preliminary Engineering Design – Stormwater – P240103 - Sheets 400 - 412– Rev 3 - Patersons

b. Condition 3, Part B – Subdivision Conditions: I think the Engineering Plan should refer to Revision 3, but presently refers to revision 1:

- c) Mt Iron Junction Ltd – Preliminary Engineering Design – Roading – P240103 - Sheets 300 – 361 – Rev 1 - Patersons
- d) Mt Iron Junction Ltd – Preliminary Engineering Design – Stormwater – P240103 - Sheets 400

3. Lastly, it is clear from the draft decision that the Panel intends to require the applicant construct shared use paths along sections of State Highways 6 and 84, where parts of those paths will be located within the state highway road corridor. As noted in paragraph 3.13 of NZTA's Memorandum to the Panel, dated 20 July 2026, NZTA suggests that a condition should be imposed that requires the applicant enter into a developer agreement with NZTA to cover off the roles and responsibilities of the parties for the works within the state highway road corridor. In that memo, NZTA suggested the following condition wording (quoted below), the intent of which is still applicable, except that the 'or' before State Highway 84 should now be removed

and the opening text re-worded to align with the terminology used in the draft condition 9, Part B – Subdivision Conditions, i.e. 'Prior to the commencing of works on the site,'.

"Prior to the issuing of a certificate pursuant to Section 224(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991 of Stage 1 of the proposed development, the Consent Holder shall enter into a development agreement with the New Zealand Transport Agency that addresses the construction of shared use paths along State Highway 6 and/or State Highway 84."

While I note that feedback hasn't been sought on the draft decision, I would like to note that in paragraph 4 of the draft decision the Panel refers to NZTA as "kata Kotahi". The te reo Māori name for NZTA is Waka Kotahi, as such I would request you change 'kata' to 'waka'. Also, in para 153 of the draft decision it is stated that NZTA holds a designation over land needed for expansion of the roundabout. For clarification, the existing designation was to facilitate the previous upgrade of the intersection to the current single-lane roundabout, and not for a future upgrade of the roundabout. Part of that designation was for a temporary construction laydown area, with the intention that the designation would be uplifted from this area. That is to say, the land was not designated with a future upgrade of the present-day single-circulating lane roundabout in mind and it is unclear whether the existing designation would encompass all of the land required to enable a further upgrade to include a partial or full second circulating lane, and associated infrastructure relocations.

Regards
Helen

Helen Dempster

Principal Planner, Environmental Planning/Poutiaki Taiao - Planning & Development
Infrastructure Development & Delivery

DD +64 3 742 1792 / M [REDACTED]

E [REDACTED]

New Zealand Transport Agency **Waka Kotahi**
Dunedin Office / AA Centre, 450 Moray Place,
PO Box 5245, Dunedin 9058, New Zealand



This message, together with any attachments, may contain information that is classified and/or subject to legal privilege. Any classification markings must be adhered to. If you are not the intended recipient, you must not peruse, disclose, disseminate, copy or use the message in any way. If you have received this message in error, please notify us immediately by return email and then destroy the original message. This communication may be accessed or retained by NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi for information assurance purposes.