

FTAA-2605-1227

3 June 2026

Rod Bailey
Bell Road Limited Partnership

C/- Matthew Kerse –

Tēnā koe,

Request for further information in relation to your application under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

You lodged a substantive application, Wairakei South, under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (the Act) on 19 May 2026.

Prior to referring a substantive application to an Expert Panel, the EPA must assess the completeness and scope of the application to ensure it complies with section 46(2) of the Act. To assist with making this assessment, under section 46(2A) of the Act the EPA may seek further information from you.

Request for Further Information

To inform the EPA's assessment of the application for completeness, please provide a response to the following matters:

Scope

Within the schedule 2 listing of the application, the project is described as:

Develop rural land for residential, commercial, and industrial use, including up to approximately 2,000 to 3,000 residential allotments, approximately 60 to 80 hectares of new industrial land, stormwater corridors and management areas, and a State Highway Buffer Reserve.

The State Highway Buffer Reserve is not explicitly mentioned within the application. To assist us in assessing if the application relates solely to a listed project could you please clarify whether and how this element of the scope is met?

Resource Consent

The following requests were raised as part of the mandatory consultation the EPA undertook with the Bay of Plenty Regional Council (BOPRC). BOPRC considered these details were missing from the application:

“While Appendix-AC lists the permitted activity rules, it does not demonstrate how the conditions of these rules will be met. The BOPRC agrees with the Applicant’s identified rule triggers, other than:

The permanent discharge of stormwater from the developed landform:

The Applicant has assessed that resource consent is required under Rules DW R21 and DW R23 – Restricted Discretionary Activity.

It is not clear whether the discharge can meet the conditions of the Restricted Discretionary Activity rules, in particular “The discharge shall not cause nor contribute to flooding or ponding on any land or property owned or occupied by another person.

We consider that consent may be required under Rule DW R8.

The discharge from the site would be consented as a comprehensive catchment discharge consent, as such all of the stormwater discharged from the site requires consent as one activity (rather than components of the discharge being permitted).

The construction, use and maintenance of bridges and culverts has been applied for under Controlled Activity rules. The structure(s) will be in an area that will become an urban area, therefore resource consent is required under BW R36 as a Discretionary Activity for these activities. We expect there will be no material difference in the assessment or conditions for the bridges and culverts whether they are assessed as controlled or discretionary activities, as the matters of control are also the matters which we would use to assess the effects of these activities. Overall, the application is a Discretionary Activity under the RNRP.”

To assist us in assessing if the application complies with s 46(2) of the Act (and in particular the information required for Sch 5, cl 5(5)(a)), please can you provide further information on:

- In relation to the comments identified by BOPRC, how the conditions of the rules will be met.
- Whether discharge can meet the conditions of the Restricted Discretionary Activity rules (rules DW R21 and DW R23). In particular “The discharge shall not cause nor contribute to flooding or ponding on any land or property owned or occupied by another person.”
- Whether consent is or may be required under rule DW R8.
- Whether consent is or may be required under rule BW R36 as a discretionary activity.

BOPRC also noted that there was information missing in relation to Schedule 5, Clause 6 of the FTAA. We invite further comments from you in relation to this issue. In particular:

- (1)(c)(ii) identifying any possible alternative methods or receiving environments for discharges, particularly in the instance of the permanent discharge of stormwater from the developed landform.

In this respect, BOPRC noted:

- The Applicant's proposed method of discharge for permanent stormwater relies on continuous pumping of stormwater from the area. We have not been able to find any assessment within the Application relating to alternative methods.
- There is also a lack of information relating to stormwater treatment alternatives.

We have not located any discussion of alternative methods in relation to these matters. If you wish them to be considered, then they should be provided in response to this letter.

Tauranga City Council identified the following areas that it considered were not adequately addressed in the application:

- An assessment of downstream and cross-boundary effects, including impacts beyond the site and implications on TCC's consented discharge to the Kaituna River from the Wairakei Stream.
- An assessment of any other stormwater interactions across the TCC/WBOPDC boundary – including effects on discharges from the Wairakei urban growth area directly into the Bell Road catchment.
- Assessment of pump and system performance under failure scenarios.
- Evaluation of alternative stormwater management approaches sufficient to demonstrate the chosen approach is appropriate.

To assist us in assessing if the application complies with s 46(2) of the Act, please provide any further information on the above matters identified by TCC.

Wildlife

In relation to Schedule 7, clause 2(1)(n) we have been unable to locate proof of iwi consultation in relation to wildlife and wildlife impacts within the AB Appendixes and the consultation section of the AEE. To assist us in assessing if the application complies with s 46(2) of the Act, please confirm whether consultation with relevant hapū or iwi included the wildlife impacts of the application, and if so provide proof and details.

Other Matters

The following request was raised as part of the mandatory consultation the EPA undertook with the Department of Conservation.

- DOC's assessment found that the Site falls within the area of interest under the following Treaty Settlements:

- Ngāti Pūkenga Claims Settlement Act 2017
- Tapuika Claims Settlement Act 2014
- Waitaha Claims Settlement Act 2013

To assist us in assessing if the application complies with s 46(2) of the Act, please provide any further information in relation to s 13(4)(l) and schedule 5, cl 5(1)(i) of the FTAA in relation to the information DOC has identified.

Responding to the Request for Further Information

Under the Act, you have until the end of the 20th working day from the date of this letter to provide a response to the EPA, which is 2 July 2026.

From the date of this letter, the 15 working day timeframe for the EPA to decide on completeness and scope of the substantive application ceases to run. The 15 working day timeframe will recommence once your response is received or after 2 July 2026, whichever is sooner.

If you wish to clarify any matter relating to the request, and the request was generated from the EPA's consultation with an administering agency or local authority, we suggest that you contact that administering agency or local authority directly before providing your response to the EPA.

If you require information from the EPA in relation to the request for further information, you may request that information from the EPA under section 46(2C) of the Act. Please send your request to projects@fasttrack.govt.nz.

The EPA intends to publish the information received from you in full, including your responses in our completeness memorandum, on the Fast-track website.

If you have any questions, please contact Emma Fahey, Application Lead, by email at info@fasttrack.govt.nz.

Nāku noa, nā



Ben Bond
Team Leader, Fast-track Applications