

OIR: 2526/133

23 October 2025

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

Tēnā koe [REDACTED],

Request for Information under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 (the Act) (the LGOIMA)

Thank you for your email of **26 September 2025** in which you ask about the lessons learned reports/registers and/or emails and correspondence of the development variously known as 4 Kapiti Road, Four Kapiti, Kamahi Place, Houhere Street, and Amohia Steet, the Gibbons Co development. You have requested the following information:

1. Infrastructure: New flood pipes were installed around the site pre-development. Underground unit water storage was reduced to 50,000 L total for the development. Flexibility in water storage rules.

1.1 Given the large pipes that were installed around 4 Kapiti, what advice and improvements downstream in the Wharemauku are you acting on to cope with the extra stormwater especially in times of high rainfall?

The Amohia flood alleviation project is one of a few projects that are scheduled to be delivered in our long term plan in order to reduce the flood risk to properties throughout the Wharemauku catchment.

To clarify:

- The Amohia Stage 1 flood alleviation project has constructed a large flood diversion pipe past the property at 4 Kapiti Road.
- This was stage 1 of a 3 stage project in order to reduce the levels of flooding in parts of the Wharemauku catchment and has no direct connection to the development at 4 Kāpiti Road.
- The flood alleviation project is designed around flood modelling which provided allowances for increased levels and intensities of rainfall over the design life of

Please note that any information provided in response to your request may be published on the Council website, with your personal details removed.

the pipe. The design of this project had to ensure that it was not making the flooding worse in other parts of the catchment.

1.2 What are the conditions to a proposed system referred to in the last sentence at i) below? (note – this refers to OIA response 2425-1345)

Please see attached signed decision and final approved plans for RM200247 and RM200247A that contains the conditions related to the consent.

2. Size of development and cost of individual units: Approximately 80 townhouses - 65% of the units were sold to the private market (over \$800K each) and 35% were sold to Kianga Ora because of difficulty in selling the remaining.

2.1 What advice/report/data/feasibility study did you receive about the size and type of development that buyers in Kapiti would be attracted to in deciding whether to issue consents, other than from developers and real estate companies.

When considering a Resource Consent application, Council do not consider who the property would be marketed to. The Resource Management Act requires that Council considers how the proposed development aligns with the provisions of the District Plan.

I am not aware of any discussions between Council and Kainga Ora about this development in connection to the consenting of the development or subsequent sales of units by the Developer.

2.2 What community consultation data results do you have that support large, dense and expensive developments in Kapiti town centres.

To clarify, in relation to the resource consent application Council received for this development, the consent did not meet the public notification threshold set by the Resource Management Act (RMA), and therefore community wide consultation was not undertaken as part of assessing the application.

2.3 Did the developer get advice from KCDC about the criteria to:

- 2.3.1 "meet the needs of residents [new and existing, I presume] and
- 2.3.2 enables the district to thrive,
- 2.3.3 while retaining the things people value most about living here" as in the Scoop item with the Mayor at ii) below).

As per the Response to Question 2.2, in regards to Council's assessment of the resource consent application, the criteria you note are not part of matters that the Resource Management Act requires Council to consider when making a decision on a resource consent application.

2.4 Did KCDC have prior knowledge that Kianga Ora would be interested in purchasing some of these units if an opportunity arose?

I can confirm that Council did not have discussions with Kainga Ora regarding the purchase of any of the units. Other than the usual interactions that Council has with any ratepayer, Council's involvement with this development ended when it was completed. I suggest that if you have further questions regarding ownership you could write to Kainga Ora with those questions.

Where it has been indicated above that we do not hold that information, those parts of your request are refused under section 17(e) of the Act as the documents alleged to contain the information requested does not exist.

- 3. *There were for sale and for rent signs on these townhouses for months. All of a sudden most of those signs disappeared. I understand that a large number of people on bail/Corrections release are being housed here and that it is colloquially known as 'bracelet city'.***

3.1 *Have you received advice/emails/reports/correspondence from Corrections or Police about people leaving prison or who have community-based sentences and orders as part of community safety.*

This part of your request is refused under section 17(e) of the Act as the documents alleged to contain the information requested do not exist.

3.2 *Do you have any interest in these developments once they are signed off and sold, other than collecting the rates?*

When a development is complete, Council's involvement with the property is the same as it would be for any other property in the district. Council is guided by the legislation we are required to operate under.

- 4. *Finishing costs: \$1.8m gifted by KCDC at their discretion on the basis that Kapiti's housing stock increased. Ratepayers not consulted.***

4.1 *Is this true?*

No, this is not true. For completeness, I can confirm that Council has not resolved to make a gift or a loan to any business (including developers) for \$1.8 million in relation to this site. Information on Council spending is contained in our [annual report](#) which can be found on our website.

4.2 *If so, what discussions were held, what reports and recommendations were provided.*

Please see Response to Question 4.1 above.

5. Social infrastructure.

5.1 Nine homes were on the site beforehand. What formula and advice was used for the increased population requiring more resources like doctors, schools, police, traffic density, etc?

Council is required to consider the application against the provisions of the District Plan. A traffic impact assessment report was provided with the application and we attach the signed planners report that explains how the effect on transport was considered during the consenting process.

The effect of the development on other resources such as doctors, schools and police sits outside the resource consent process and is not a matter that Council can consider when making a decision on the outcome of an application. However, Council does engage with central government departments to share information on planned development to ensure that local social infrastructure demand can be factored into central government decisions on national priorities for funding.

5.2 Did you have a feasibility study on the impacts to the existing population on resources like doctors, schools, police, traffic, etc for either an increased permanent or transient population.

As explained above, Council must consider the application against the provisions of the District Plan. Feasibility studies are not required for resource consent applications and while transport effects are considered as part the Resource Consenting process, the effect on resources like doctors, schools and policy, are not. When a resource consent is granted, the applicant is responsible for the costs associated with installing any infrastructure necessary to service the proposed allotments.

The Council has a [development contributions policy](#) which sets out the funding policy for planned capital expenditure on network infrastructure and community infrastructure within the district. The policy gives the Council a method of assessing and collecting contributions to fund new infrastructure and upgrades to existing infrastructure required as a result of growth.

[Development Impact Fees](#) are a way to ensure developers pay a fair and equitable share of the cost of providing new infrastructure and community facilities needed to support new developments in the district. Development contributions are paid by anyone who proposes new developments (for example, a new house or subdivision). Under legislation, they are calculated for roading, water supply and wastewater treatment facilities and reticulation, stormwater management and community infrastructure.

Unfortunately, this doesn't include fees for building or maintaining hospitals, as this is managed and funded directly by the Ministry for Health and Health New Zealand. Resourcing of schools is managed and funded directly by the Ministry of Education, and the resourcing of Police is managed and funded directly by central government.

6. Re providing more social housing.

6.1 What correspondence/reports/discussions have you had with Kainga Ora concerning the option of rent to buy rather than rental units, as this gives more skin in the game for people to become more involved in their local community.

Please refer to responses provided above – the Resource Management Act requires Council to consider applications against the provisions of the district plan.

For clarity, Council is not involved in setting Kainga Ora's policies or determining options for 'rent to buy' or other similar matters. Kainga Ora is best placed to provide further information on this point.

As we hold no information in relation to your questions 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, and 3.1, I must advise that these parts of your request are refused under section 17(e) of the Act as the documents alleged to contain the information requested do not exist, or despite reasonable efforts to locate them, they cannot be found.

You have the right to request the Ombudsman to review this decision. Complaints can be sent by email to info@ombudsman.parliament.nz, or by post to The Ombudsman, PO Box 10152, Wellington 6143.

Ngā mihi,



Kris Pervan

Group Manager Strategy and Growth
Te Kaihautū Rautaki me te Tupu

If you are interested in the attachments which accompany this response,
please contact us at: informationrequest@kapiticoast.govt.nz