

Attachment 1: List of attendees at the second convener's conference

Organisation	Person	Email	Provided memo
DOC	Emma Fahey	[REDACTED]	
	Susan Newell	[REDACTED]	Yes
Canterbury Regional Council	Nardia Feehan	[REDACTED]	
	Robyn Fitchett	[REDACTED]	
	Joanne Mitten		
	Sam Prystupa		
Simpson Grierson (Legal Counsel for CRC)	Jade Magrath	[REDACTED]	Yes
Christchurch City Council	Francis White	[REDACTED]	
	Sean Ward	[REDACTED]	
	Paul Lowe	[REDACTED]	
	Brent Pizzey	[REDACTED]	Yes
Chapman Tripp (for Applicant)	Jo Appleyard	[REDACTED]	Yes
	Meg Davidson	[REDACTED]	
Novo Group Ltd (for Applicant)	Jeremy Phillips	[REDACTED]	
	Clare Dale	[REDACTED]	
Carter Group Ltd (Applicant)	Bruce Van Dyne		
	Tim Carter		
Ministry for Environment	Alison McLaughlin	[REDACTED]	

Attachment 2: Summary of issues raised at the second convener's conference

Director-General of Conservation¹

[1] The Director-General has identified an alternative site for relocating the salvaged lizards. Although the site is not owned by the applicant, it is under the applicant's control. In addition to destocking, further steps are required to create a suitable habitat.

[2] The applicant will require expert advice on the timeline for developing the habitat for the salvaged lizards. Tim Carter's proposed four-week timeframe may be unrealistic. Although approval conditions and the management plan have not yet been agreed upon,² the Director-General expects resolution with the applicant within 30 working days.

[3] The Director-General will be provided access to the site from this week.

Canterbury Regional Council³

[4] Together with the City Council, the Regional Council is concerned about the proposed piping of the Paparoa Water Race. After the Regional Council filed its memorandum, the applicant amended the application and now proposes to culvert, rather than pipe, the race water under the road(s). The Regional Council now seeks information regarding the size, design, and construction methods of the proposed culverts.

[5] I note the Regional Council's interest in the topic of suitability of the site

¹ Memorandum dated 24 July 2025

² This includes when site establishment is to occur, the appropriate time of year for translocating lizards, and long-term site maintenance.

³ Memorandum dated 24 July 2025

habitat that the lizards are proposed to be relocated.

[6] The Regional Council disagrees with the methodology used to assess biodiversity within and along the water race and considers further analysis may be required. The proposal having been amended, both Regional and City Council are concerned to receive updated technical evidence responding to this change. The applicant will liaise with them as to the scope of any additional assessment required.

[7] Additionally, the Regional Council has not yet reached agreement on the proposed conditions or relevant management plans. The primary issue appears to be the absence of the usual certifying conditions.

[8] In summary, the Regional Council regards the application as relatively straightforward.

Selwyn District Council

[9] Last week, the District Council was advised of the proposal to culvert the water race. However, there has been no discussion with the Council, and its position on the matter is not known. Bylaws apply to the water race.

CIAL/ Christchurch Airport

[10] Tim Carter met with the neighbouring CIAL (Christchurch Airport) last week. However, the position of the Airport is not known, as it has yet to assess the application. I am advised that issues may arise regarding safety and effects on navigational aids, the detail of which was not discussed.

Christchurch City Council⁴

[11] The City Council provided a memorandum setting out, in broad terms, several issues with the application. Of those matters, the following have the potential to increase the timeframe for decision.

[12] Two issues of mixed fact, policy, and law arise:

- (a) whether the site is within the ‘urban environment’ and subject to that determination, the relevance/application of the NPS-UD; and
- (b) issues arising in relation to the NPS-HPL (noted in an earlier Minute).

The Regional Council has an interest in determining the above.

[13] Transportation network connections remain unresolved. The applicant and the City Council’s traffic engineers have yet to determine whether an upgrade to two intersections (NZTA and CCC assets) is required, what triggers apply to require an upgrade, and how the relevant consent conditions should be drafted.

[14] The standards for infrastructure proposed to vest in the City Council remain at issue. Although it is important that assets vested in the Council are constructed to an appropriate standard, the applicant does not appear to be proposing this. Separately, there may be an issue as to whether a private water supply (i.e., “private pipes”) is proposed to be located within a public road. The City Council has provided the applicant with a Water Supply and Wastewater Servicing Report, which includes suitable conditions. If these conditions are accepted, the issue will be resolved; if not, the process and required reporting will become significantly more complex.

[15] The applicant’s planner has commented that he foresees no issue for the

⁴ Memorandum dated 24 July 2025

panel with respect to the three-water assets ‘going away’.