

Before the panel convener appointed under
the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

FTAA-2607-1260

Under	the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024
In the matter	of Bangor Village
By	HUGHES DEVELOPMENTS LTD

**RESPONSE OF CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL TO MINUTE 2 OF THE
PANEL CONVENER**

17 SEPTEMBER 2026

MAY IT PLEASE THE PANEL CONVENER

1. This memorandum is provided on behalf of Canterbury Regional Council (**CRC**) in response to Minute 2 of the Panel Convener dated 10 September 2026 (**Minute 2**), regarding the Hughes Developments Ltd application for approvals for Bangor Village.

MINUTE 2, SCHEDULE 1 - PARTICIPANT'S ESTIMATED TIMEFRAME

2. CRC proposes the timeline in Appendix 1 which totals 65 working days. Reasons for the timeframe is included in the CRC comments/reasoning column, however a brief consideration is given below.
3. As advised in the s46 letter, CRC considered the application to be complete and does not generally consider that further information is required to decide the application. Attachment 3 of the s46 letter included a summary of technical advice for this proposal. To further assist the Panel Convener in understanding where progress has been made in addressing any outstanding matter, this table is now included to this response as Appendix 3, with an additional column included to provide a commentary of such progress. The key technical discussions have related to storm water and contaminated land.
4. As per CRC's letter to the applicant dated 21 August 2026, the aspects which CRC considered incomplete in the s46 response were addressed and consequently CRC anticipate there to be fewer technical matters to be resolved during this process.
5. CRC also acknowledges that the timeframe for this application may need to reflect the availability of the panel members, applicant and participants over the summer period, resulting in a longer timeframe than the complexity or contentiousness would otherwise require.
6. CRC is happy to discuss timeframes further at the Panel Convener Conference.

MINUTE 2, SCHEDULE 2 – MATTERS TO CONSIDER WHEN PREPARING FOR CONFERENCE

(a) comment on the extent of engagement by the applicant both before and following lodgement of the application;

7. CRC notes that the applicant has engaged with CRC on matters raised in CRC's section 46 completeness response. Further modelling of pre- and post-development flood levels has been provided to CRC.
8. Following lodgement of the Substantive Application, CRC and the applicant have continued to engage on matters raised by CRC, including issues relating to contaminated land and stormwater. The majority of these matters have since been resolved, with Hughes Group submitting an amendment to the application to the EPA following agreement with CRC.

(b) the applicant aside, identify in-house experts and external consultants engaged on the project;

9. The following technical experts have been engaged for the project, where external this has been identified:
 - a. Edward Cromwell - Contaminated Land - Internal

- b. Maiya Sadler - Contaminated Land - Internal
- c. Carl Hanson - Groundwater Resources - Internal
- d. Jaz Morris - Land Ecology - Internal
- e. Julie Gillespie - Land Resources - Internal
- f. Nick Griffiths - Natural Hazards - Internal
- g. Isolina O'Brien - Planning - Internal
- h. Peter Christensen - Stormwater Engineering (Storm Environmental)
- i. Michele Stevenson - Surface Water Ecology & Quality - Internal
- j. Richard Meade - Economics - External (Cognitus)
- k. Reuben Herz-Edinger - Consents Planning – Internal
- l. Joanne Mitten - Consents Planning – Internal
- m. Amy Wells - Consents Planning – Internal

(c) record processes agreed with the applicant to narrow or reduce any issues relevant to the application and the decision that the panel is required to make;

- 10. CRC considers there are no agreed processes but acknowledges the applicant has been prompt at responding to concerns raised by CRC's experts via email.

(d) where there is a difference in opinion between the applicant and any other participant, identify the principal environmental effects at issue;

- 11. The principal issue in contention from CRC's perspective is stormwater. CRC's technical expert agrees with the applicant that the potential effects from a 2-hour 200-year Average Recurrence Interval (ARI) event on a small area at the rear of the 1, 3 and 5 Piako Drive properties can be resolved during detailed design. However, the effects of longer critical duration events (such as a 12-hour event) should be demonstrated through additional modelling.
- 12. Pre-treatment of all road runoff should occur via swales to reduce contaminants discharging to ground from trafficked areas. Currently, only some of the discharge is treated via swales and the expert considers there should be sufficient space for this to occur on all roads. However, given the depth to groundwater and the low traffic volume, this is identified as a low risk item.
- 13. The applicant has not provided CRC with calculations to demonstrate that the sizing of the stormwater infrastructure is adequate. However, CRC's stormwater expert has stated that the proposed conditions are considered sufficient to address this.

(e) describe the complexity of the application;

- 14. This is discussed further in Appendix 3, Consideration of Complexity. In summary, CRC considers the application to be of low to medium complexity.

(f) state whether the drafting of proposed conditions (including any draft management plan filed) is accepted; and

- 15. CRC is engaging, and will continue to engage, with the applicant to refine the proposed consent conditions and will engage with other relevant parties where appropriate.

(g) propose efficient processes to enable the panel to understand, resolve, or narrow the scope of any likely and indicate how these processes may be accounted for under the decision timeframe.

16. CRC considers that constructive engagement through expert conferencing is an efficient way to progress and resolve any technical or conditions drafting matters that may arise.

17. CRC is willing to engage directly with the Panel as necessary. As noted above, CRC is willing to discuss any matters that arise with the applicant and other relevant parties.

CONFIRMATION OF PANEL ATTENDANCE

18. The following CRC staff will attend the panel conveners conference on 23 September 2026, at 10am:

(a) Joanne Mitten - CRC Principal Consents Planner

(b) Amy Wells - CRC Consents Planner

Dated: 17 September 2026

Ngā mihi



Joanne Mitten

Principal Consents Planner

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Schedule 1 – Participants' Estimated Timeframe

Appendix 2: Consideration of Complexity

Appendix 3: CRC Technical Advice Summary – progress documented

APPENDIX 1: SCHEDULE 1 - PARTICIPANTS' ESTIMATED TIMEFRAME

Task	Working days	Date	CRC comments/reasoning
Panel commencement date	-	12 October 2026 (nominal)	Nominal date provided by Minute 2 of the Panel Convener.
Invite comment from relevant parties	10 W/D later	27 October 2026	CRC notes the timeframe is specified within the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA).
Comments close (s 53 & s 54)	20 W/D later	24 November 2026	CRC notes the timeframe is specified within the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA). CRC will provide comment under section 53 of the FTAA as a relevant local authority. CRC will be able to provide comments within 20 working days noting all technical experts have been engaged and are considering the application. CRC notes that section 54 does not pertain to CRC.
Comments close for applicants (s 55)	5 W/D later	1 December 2026	CRC notes the timeframe is specified within the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA).
Any other procedural steps, evaluation and decision writing	25 W/D later	25 Jan 2027	CRC consider 25 working days is reasonable to resolve matters resulting from section 53 comments. CRC notes the RMA clock over Christmas/New Years is likely to be followed. CRC do not anticipate any delays resulting from CRC expert availability. CRC anticipates this stage to be relatively straightforward as there are no significant outstanding issues but is aware that panel/applicant availability may require this timeframe to be increased. CRC does not anticipate any need for a hearing on issues related to the regional councils functions. Should the panel have any specific questions for CRC experts, we suggest these could be addressed through a minute.
Draft decision is to approve			
Draft decision and conditions to Ministers (s 72)	5 W/D later	29 January 2027	

Response from Ministers. (s 72)	10 W/D later	12 February 2027	CRC notes the timeframe is specified within the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA) s72(2).
Applicant response to Ministers comments (if any)	5 W/D later	18 February 2027	CRC notes the timeframe is specified within the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA) s70(4).
Draft conditions and decision to participants (s 70(1))	5 W/D later	29 January 2027	CRC notes this step can occur simultaneously with s72. CRC has suggested aligning these timeframes.
Participant comments on draft conditions (s 70(2))	10 W/D later	12 February 2027	CRC considers this step can take place at the same time as the response from ministers under s72.
Applicant response to participants on conditions (s 70(4))	5 W/D later	18 February 2027	CRC considers the applicant is best to advise on this, but suggest this can take place at the same time as the Applicant's response to Ministers comments.
If not agreed, procedural step in relation to draft conditions.	10 W/D later	3 March 2027	CRC do not anticipate there to be issues however have still included this time to enable CRC's experts to review the applicant's response to the participants on conditions CRC considers an extra 10 working days would likely to be sufficient to resolve conditions through expert caucusing or other method.
Evaluate and finalise decision	5 W/D later	9 March 2027	CRC notes this is a brief period of time should comment on draft conditions be substantive and require rework by the Panel.
Decision release	5 W/D later	16 March 2027	CRC notes a decision may be released sooner than 5 working days.

APPENDIX 2: MATTERS TO CONSIDER WHEN PREPARING FOR CONFERENCE

APPROVALS

1. Hughes Developments Ltd, in their application, seeks three approvals from CRC for activities described in the RMA.
2. One approval is required under each of section 9, 13 and 14, and two under section 15 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**), as follows:
 - Section 9 - The use of land to excavate material
 - Section 13 - The damming of water in the bed of a river and the constructing, using, altering, maintaining and operating of dam structures within the bed of a river, including any damming of water outside of the bed of a river or natural lake
 - Section 14 - The non-consumptive taking and use of water from a lake, river or artificial watercourse and discharge of the same water to the same lake, river or artificial watercourse
 - Section 15 - The discharge of construction-phase stormwater, other than into or from a reticulated stormwater system, into a surface waterbody, or onto or into land in circumstances where a contaminant may enter groundwater or surface water
 - Section 15 - The discharge of stormwater or construction-phase stormwater from a reticulated stormwater system onto or into land or into or onto land in circumstances where a contaminant may enter water, or into groundwater or a surface waterbody

COMPLEXITY

Table 1: Consideration of complexity		
Level of complexity	Specific provision	CRC comment
(a) Legal Complexity: novel or difficult legal issues	(i) involve untested law or interpretation of statute;	CRC considers that the proposal does not involve untested law or interpretation of statute.
	(ii) involve application for multiple approvals;	The applicant has applied for 5 approvals from CRC involving sections 9, 13, 14 and 15 of the RMA. The applicant has also applied for approvals from the Selwyn District Council involving section 9 of the RMA and a wildlife approval from the Department of Conservation. Resource consent is also required under the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2011 The scale of effects associated with these approvals vary significantly.
	(iii) interface with two or more statutes; and	Setting aside the FTAA, the RMA is the primary statute for this proposal. Within the RMA framework the following legislative documents apply to this proposal: 1. Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing

		and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011; 2. Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Freshwater) Regulations 2020; 3. Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Sources of Human Drinking Water) Regulations 2007; 4. National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD); 5. National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 (NPS-IB); 6. National Policy Statement for Infrastructure 2025 (NPS-I). The applicable regional plan for classifying the proposed activities is the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP). The activities, if bundled, would have a non-complying activity status under the LWRP.
	(iv) engage constitutional law and public law.	CRC considers that there are no complexities associated with constitutional and public law.
(b) Evidentiary Complexity: stemming from the volume, type, or technical nature of evidence	(i) include challenges like managing expert reports or dealing with conflicting factual or opinion evidence; and	CRC science experts have reviewed the information supplied with the application and, there is general agreement that the assessments provided are appropriate with further modelling sought for stormwater. The applicant has provided assessments and records of consultation with relevant parties, and CRC experts generally consider it appropriate to adopt the recommendations in the technical assessments provided by the applicant. Areas where further information could assist in the assessment of the proposal include: 1. Modelling of the change in flooding for a longer critical duration rainfall event (e.g. the 12-hour event)
	(ii) often involve technical or scientific analysis	The applicant submitted several technical assessments and information documents as appendices with the application. The technical assessments relevant to the approvals relevant to CRC are: 1. Substantive Project Assessment 2. Attachment 001 – Subdivision plan 3. Attachment 004 – Infrastructure Assessment 4. Attachment 005 – Engineering plans 5. Attachment 006 – Proposed Selwyn District Council Conditions 6. Attachment 007 – Proposed Environment Canterbury Conditions

		7. Attachment 008 – Draft Erosion and Sediment Control Plan 8. Attachment 090 - RMA Rules Assessment 9. Attachment 010 – Geotechnical and natural hazard assessment 10. Attachment 011 – Aquatic Ecology Assessment 11. Attachment 012 – Terrestrial Ecology Impact Assessment 12. Attachment 015 - Economic Assessment Update 13. Attachment 017 - Updated Response to Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited recommendations and feedback from Whitiara Centre Limited 14. Attachment 018 RMA Objectives and Policies Assessment 15. Attachment 019 – Draft stormwater management plan 16. Attachment 021 – Lizard Management Plan 17. Attachment 022 – Proposed Wildlife Approval Conditions 18. Attachment 023 – Detailed site investigation 19. Attachment 025 - Permitted Activity Analysis CRC science staff have undertaken a detailed review of these documents and are generally satisfied with the content of these assessments. Discussions are underway with the applicant regarding aspects relating to stormwater and contaminated land, but the significance of these issues is not high.
(c) Factual Complexity: arises from the volume and nature of evidence -	(i) requires careful management of extensive information or reports, including expert opinion in specialised fields; and (ii) necessitates analysis if technical, scientific, or highly specialised subject matter are involved.	As noted above, there are many technical reports, which have in turn been reviewed by CRC technical experts. CRC's technical experts are generally in agreement with the applicant's assessments. I note that the economic review in April did not agree with the applicant's findings. CRC does not consider that any highly specialised subject matter expertise is required.

ISSUES

In addition to the matters noted in the Minute, describe:

- ***the issues that have arisen during pre-lodgement and post-lodgement consultation and engagement.***
3. The vast majority of issues that have arisen during pre-lodgement and post-lodgement consultation and engagement have been resolved

4. CRC notes that the condition wording regarding contaminated land is under discussion
5. No calculations have been provided to demonstrate that the sizing of the stormwater infrastructure is adequate.
6. Currently, there is a medium risk issue of longer critical duration events resulting in adverse effects on neighbouring properties. CRC's expert anticipates that the applicant will be able to demonstrate through modelling that this stormwater and overland flow can be managed.
7. Only some of the road runoff is pre-treated through swales. Pre-treatment via swales is recommended to reduce contaminants discharging to ground from trafficked areas.
- ***if the application concerns an activity the same or similar to one previously lodged with a consent authority, state how requests for information pursuant to section 92 of the RMA have been addressed in this application.***
8. This development is a new proposal and the same or similar activity has not previously been lodged with CRC for this site.
- ***any statutory process that coincides with the 30-working day period (if proposed).***
9. CRC is not aware of any statutory process that coincides with the 30-working day period

PANEL MEMBERSHIP

Consider:

- ***the knowledge, skills and expertise required to decide the application under clause 7(1) of Schedule 3***
 - ***whether there are factors that warrant the appointment of more than four panel members, such as:***
 - ***the circumstances unique to a particular district or region; or***
 - ***the number of applications that have to be considered in that particular district or region; or***
 - ***the nature and scale of the application under consideration; or***
 - ***matters unique to any relevant iwi participation legislation.***
10. Please refer to SDC's memo in due course regarding panel nominations. CRC note that there are no significant concerns at this point relating to the matters under CRC's discretion that would require specialist knowledge, skills or expertise.
 11. CRC do not consider that there are factors which warrant the appointment of more than four panel members. However, CRC do note that there are multiple applications located in other parts of the Selwyn District which are awaiting the Minister's referral decision. There is the potential for b.i. to be relevant. CRC consider that the cumulative effects primarily relate to matters within the discretion of SDC, who are better placed to comment on this matter.

PROCEDURAL REQUIREMENTS

Consider and prepare to indicate:

- *willingness to engage directly with the panel as necessary to advance progress of the application efficiently (briefings, meetings, conferencing);*
 - *the timing of expert conferencing or wānanga;*
 - *the referral of two or more participants or topics to mediation;*
 - *the requirement for any form of hearing process including:*
 - *disputed facts or opinions;*
 - *proposed conditions; or*
 - *legal issues.*
12. CRC is willing to engage directly with the Panel as necessary. As noted above, CRC is happy to discuss specific matters with Hughes in more detail and intends to continue ongoing discussions with Hughes and other relevant parties.
13. CRC does not currently expect that any expert conferencing or mediation will be required.

ANYTHING ELSE?

Is there any other information needed to decide time frames or panel composition?

14. CRC does not consider there to be any other information pertinent to deciding time frames or panel composition.

APPENDIX 3: CRC TECHNICAL ADVICE SUMMARY

Technical Team	Technical expert considers all expected technical reports are provided	Technical expert has identified gaps in the provided technical reports	Technical expert considers the conditions are appropriate	Progression since S46 Comments
Contaminated Land	Yes	No	No (see below)	The applicant has continued to include CRC's feedback into the conditions
Groundwater Resources	Yes	No		Not required
Land Resources	Yes	No	Yes	Not required
Natural Hazards	Yes	No		Not required
Surface water quality and ecology	Yes	No		Not required
Economics	CRC has not sought further review from an economist. CRC can undertake this if it is likely to be of benefit to the panel.			
Stormwater	Yes	Yes. Modelling of longer duration critical events is required. Pretreatment via swales of all road runoff.	Yes	Provided updated modelling
Planning	Yes	No gaps in the policy assessment have been identified by CRC's expert.	N/A	Not required
Consent Conditions	Yes	Conditions have been provided and will need to continue to be worked through with the Applicant moving forward.	Some amendments are likely required to the conditions set and will be worked through moving forward.	Additional conversations regarding contaminated land conditions- as set out below this table.

Regarding the contaminated land conditions:

- The conditions should also require further investigation beneath buildings, stockpiles, the presumed UST area, and other currently untested locations.

- As a result, some key controls, including RAP implementation, SVR approval, OSMP requirements, and infiltration-related validation sampling, won't extend to contamination identified through further investigation, delineation, remediation, validation works, or contamination discovery during construction.
- CRC's expert recommends considering amendments to ensure these requirements apply to any area where contamination exceeding relevant residential land use criteria is identified during the course of the project, rather than only to the currently defined Affected Areas. This would provide greater certainty that any contamination discovered through the additional investigations required by the conditions is captured by the contaminated land management framework.
- In addition, for SDC conditions, consideration could be given to linking any required OSMP to a defined subdivision milestone (e.g. prior to s224(c) certification for affected lots) to ensure long-term management measures are formally established before titles are issued.