

File ref: FTC000029

6 August 2021

John Duthie
Tattico Ltd
PO Box 91562
Victoria Street
Auckland 1142

Private Bag 63002
Wellington 6140, New Zealand

Level 10, Grant Thornton House
215 Lambton Quay
Wellington 6011, New Zealand

epa.govt.nz
+64 4 916 2426

Dear John

Request for information from Wooing Tree Property Development LP in relation to the Wooing Tree Estate resource consent application under COVID-19 Recovery (Fast-track Consenting) Act 2020

The Wooing Tree Expert Consenting Panel has directed the EPA to request further information from you under clause 25 of Schedule 6 of the COVID-19 Recovery Act 2020 (the Act), relating to the Wooing Tree Estate resource consent application.

The EPA is seeking the information outlined in Appendix 1.

The EPA considers this information to be necessary and relevant to the Wooing Tree Estate resource consent application.

In accordance with clause 25 of Schedule 6 of the Act the applicant 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.

Please provide the further information to the EPA by **Monday 16 August 2021**.

Please note, the information will be provided to the panel, the application and every person who provided comments on the application. The information will also be made available on the EPA website.

If you have any questions or further queries please don't hesitate to contact Gen Hewett, by email gen.hewett@epa.govt.nz or phone (04) 474 5523 or 027 839 3760.

Yours sincerely



Gen Hewett
Senior Advisor

Appendix 1: List of information requested

1. The further information supplied by the Applicant¹ was stated to include “Attachment N – Letter by Veros outlining underpass commitment”. The document titled “RFI response N Underpass commitment” on the EPA website forming part of the RFI response is not a letter from Veros (but rather a duplicate of a comment received from Waka Kotahi). The EPA does not appear to have received the “Letter by Veros outlining underpass commitment”. Please provide the correct Attachment N.
2. The further information supplied by the Applicant also included as Attachment P a section 104D analysis. That analysis refers on p.6 to “a report from Veros at Attachment T to this reply”. On p.10 there is a similar reference to “Attachment T and the analysis by Veros”. The 5 July cover letter includes a list of attachments which does not include an Attachment T, and no Attachment T document was supplied. The Applicant’s subsequent response to comments received from third parties² does include a corporate report by Sean Haynes of Veros as Attachment B. Please:
 - a. Provide Attachment T, or
 - b. Confirm if Attachment T is not being supplied and references to it should be ignored, or
 - c. Advise if Attachment B to the response to comments received is the Veros report which is referenced in the s104D analysis, or
 - d. Otherwise clarify the position.
3. The Applicant’s response to comments received from third parties includes as Attachment J Updated suggested conditions of consent. The Panel request the Applicant review those suggested conditions with particular reference to amendments made to the application and associated plans and provide a complete package of further amended/updated plans and suggested conditions that address all changes made. This request results from a review of Attachment J and referenced plans which suggests there may be errors or omissions. For example:
 - a. Clarification is needed as to the limits on development prior to the roundabout with SH8B and underpass under SH8B being constructed. Compare Attachment J suggested conditions 8 and 20, and the comment in paragraph 4.35 of Simpson Grierson’s Legal Submissions (Attachment A).
 - b. Suggested condition 28 refers to superlots 600-602, which presumably should be a reference to lots 601-602.
 - c. Suggested condition 37 refers to lots 600-602, which presumably should be a reference to lots 601-602.
 - d. Suggested condition 62:
 - i. Refers to lots 600-602, which presumably should be a reference to lots 601-602;
 - ii. References plans by FDA numbered 1347 A- 101A -104A and 105-110 and 401A-402A and 403-406, the bulk of which are now shown as deleted in the table in suggested condition 2.

¹ Under cover of a letter from Tattico dated 5 July 2021

² Under cover of a letter from Tattico dated 27 July 2021

- e. Suggested conditions 62 and 63 thus appear to suggest consent would be granted to “the hospitality centre” and “the building” without any link to detailed and dimensioned plans (for example elevations).
- f. Suggested condition 65 references plans by FDA numbered 1347 A-104A, 107, and 110 dated 19/03/21. These plans are shown as deleted in the table in suggested condition 2.
- g. Suggested condition 67:
 - i. Refers to plans by Adapt (for example those dated 14 April 2021 plan numbers 2002 rev G) which have been overtaken.
 - ii. Refers to boundary set back plans which are outdated (for example lots 399 and 400 have changed orientation and size, and it appears that the business zone may encompass some of lots 566 - 571).
- h. Suggested condition 81 has an outdated plan overlaying the area of reverse sensitivity.