
MINUTE 13 OF THE EXPERT PANEL

Request for further information

Ryans Road Industrial Area [FTAA-2504-1054]

(6 March 2026)

[1] This Minute addresses the following matters:

- (a) The Applicant's response to Minutes 11 and 12;
- (b) Our request for further information from the Applicant regarding a revised set of conditions to form part of the CGL Package;
- (c) Our request for further information from CIAL and Airways in response to the CGL Package;
- (d) Our decision on whether to afford the Applicant an opportunity to reply; and
- (e) Our request for further information and advice regarding various questions raised by the Panel.

The Applicant's response to Minutes 11 and 12

[2] At the procedural conference (the Conference) held on 4 March 2026, the Applicant, Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL) and Airways Corporation of New Zealand (Airways) indicated intentions to provide additional information to the Expert Panel.

[3] The parties acknowledged the limited time now available to prepare the information and for the Panel to consider it ahead of issuing its draft decision which is due on 16 March 2026.

[4] Following the Conference the Panel issued Minutes 11 and 12 containing directions that the Applicant urgently advise whether it intends to request a further suspension of the Application.

[5] Counsel for the Applicant has today responded to the EPA that:

We do not have instructions to suspend the processing of the Application.

As a result of its discussion with the Applicant's technical experts last night, Simon McPherson (Cyrus) has produced the attached statement to assist the Applicant's drafting of proposed conditions relating to the DME issues.

The Applicant is intending to submit an amended proposal incorporating an updated set of proffered conditions that responds to Mr McPherson's suggestion at paragraph 6 and also deals with the issues raised by the Panel relating to a helicopter control area on Monday 9 March 2026.

[6] The Panel records its appreciation to the Applicant for providing this response within a very limited timeframe.

[7] The Panel requests that the EPA circulate the above-mentioned statement from Mr McPherson with this Minute to CIAL and Airways, and also place it on the EPA website.

[8] On the basis of the discussions held at the Conference, and in light of the Applicant's response to Minutes 11 and 12, the Panel now requests the information referred to below and sets timeframes for receipt of that information by the EPA pursuant to section 67 FTAA.

Request for further information from the Applicant regarding a revised set of conditions to form part of the CGL Package

[9] The following further information is to be provided by the Applicant:

(a) The applicant has indicated a willingness to develop revised conditions that could address matters raised by the Panel at the Conference. In that regard, the Panel encourages it to prepare conditions that seek to achieve the following outcomes:

i Avoiding activities that have the potential to limit the efficient and effective operation of Christchurch Airport (including but not limited to communication, navigation and surveillance facilities operated by Airways and the heliport operated by Garden City Helicopters (collectively the Airport), including:

A) potential adverse effects on aircraft safety; and

B) potential externalised costs borne by the Airport to maintain existing levels of aircraft safety (i.e. the cost of all necessary design amendments and mitigations arising from the proposal required to be undertaken to maintain aircraft safety to be borne by the Applicant, or otherwise agreed to in writing by CIAL and Airways).

(b) Supporting explanatory statement to be prepared by the Applicant's planner or relevant expert.

(c) Supporting legal submissions, should the Applicant wish to provide such.

[10] The information requested in Paragraph [9] must be provided to the EPA not later than 4 pm Monday 9 March 2026.

Request for further information from CIAL and Airways in response to the CGL Package

[11] The following further information is to be provided by CIAL and Airways in response to the material filed by the Applicant in accordance with Minute 9 (referred to as the CGL Package) and the further information to be filed by the

Applicant under [9] above, which the Panel considers forms part of the CGL Package:

- (a) Legal submissions addressing matters raised in the Applicant's legal submissions.
- (b) Technical memorandums or statements prepared by suitably qualified and experienced people addressing the effects of the proposal on navigation systems and aircraft safety, economic effects, and planning matters raised in the CGL Package. This should include commentary on the 5 March 2026 memorandum prepared by Mr McPherson of Cyrrus Limited.
- (c) Should these parties choose to, consent conditions that would appropriately address their concerns regarding the potential impacts that the proposal may have on the aircraft safety and operational efficiency of Christchurch International Airport (the Airport). The Panel acknowledges that both parties have indicated that they consider that, at this time, there is insufficient information to develop such conditions. Nonetheless, the opportunity to provide such is left open by the Panel.

[12] The information requested in Paragraph [11] must be provided to the EPA not later than 4 pm Thursday 12 March 2026.

Decision on whether to afford the Applicant an opportunity to reply

[13] During the Conference the Applicant indicated that it wanted an opportunity to reply to any material filed by Airways or the Airport in response to the CGL Package.

[14] Section 67 of the FTAA does not specifically afford the Applicant an opportunity to respond to the information requested in Paragraph [11]. Even so, the Panel may exercise its discretion to allow the Applicant to provide a response.

[15] We have carefully considered the Applicant's request for a reply, the principles of natural justice, and the purpose and the procedural principles of the FTAA.

[16] We would generally consider it appropriate to provide the Applicant with a limited opportunity to respond strictly in reply to any material filed by CIAL and Airways under paragraph [11] above.

[17] The difficulty facing the Panel in this case is that there is insufficient time for the Applicant to provide a final response strictly in reply as would generally occur and for us to consider same before we are required to issue our draft decision on Monday 16 March 2026.

[18] We therefore have decided not to request further information from the Applicant in reply to the material we requested from Airways and CIAL.

Request for further information regarding various questions raised by the Panel

[19] The Panel requests further information regarding the following questions from the parties identified below.

Applicant

[20] Within the southern approach pathway to the GCH heliport TLOF, what is the closest distance between proposed buildings on lots 121 -122, 90-93, and 71 -72 within the subject site and the heliport TLOF?

[21] Within the northern approach pathway to the GCH heliport TLOF, what is the closest distance between existing buildings on other sites and the heliport TLOF?

[22] Please provide an image illustrating the above distances.

Applicant / CIAL (including Garden City Helicopters)

[23] The Navigatus assessment at Section 7.1, page 28 refers to CAA Advisory Circular AC-139-8 (AC-139-8) which provides guidance regarding heliport approach and take-off paths. AC-139-8 is a matter that the Panel may have regard to under section 104 (1)(c) RMA.

[24] How much weight should the Panel give to AC-139-8 in the circumstances of this case?

[25] Please provide an assessment of the proposal against relevant requirements of AC-139-8.

[26] Documents filed by CIAL and the Applicant refer to Australian NASF Guideline H: Protecting Strategically Important Helicopter Landing Sites (Guideline H). Guideline H is a matter that the Panel may have regard to under section 104 (1)(c) RMA.

[27] How much weight should the Panel give to Guideline H in the circumstances of this case?

[28] Under Guideline H, please advise whether you consider the GCH heliport to be a strategically important heliport?

[29] Please provide an assessment of the proposal against relevant requirements of Guideline H. 's suggestion

Note 1: We are mindful that CIAL and the Applicant have already commented on some of the above matters. The Panel does not need that material to be repeated however if these parties would like to elaborate on that material they are welcome to do so.

Note 2: Assertions made in legal submission in response to the above questions should be supported by technical memorandums or statements prepared by an

identified suitably qualified and experienced people familiar with the GCH heliport operations and the above CAA Advisory and Guideline H.

Applicant / Airways / CIAL

[30] The memo received from Mr McPherson dated 5 March 2026 indicates that all aircraft will be under visual control of the pilots in the final 0.5 nautical mile of the approach, including the predicted final 85m of approach through which the modelled interference intercepts with the approach path. The DME would only be used prior to (south of) the DVOR/DME site, following which pilots will fly visually to land without using DME information.

[31] Please confirm that this applies to all aircraft landing at Christchurch airport. If it doesn't, is there any reliance on DME and is that of any concern in terms of aircraft safety?

[32] The further information requested above from the Applicant, Airways and CIAL must be provided to the EPA by 5 pm Thursday 12 March 2026.

Holland Beckett – legal advice

[33] There are conflicting views as between the Applicant, CCC, and CRC and CIAL and Airways regarding assessment of NPS-I policy 10 and policy 11. Please advise on the interpretation and application of these policies in the circumstances of this case.

[34] The further advice requested above must be provided to the EPA by 5 pm Wednesday 11 March 2026.



Chris Fowler
Expert Panel Chair