

APPENDIX 1

19 December 2025

Novo Group Limited
Level 1, 279 Montreal Street
PO Box 365, Christchurch 8140
0 - 03 365 5570
info@novogroup.co.nz

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dean Christie, NTP Development Holdings Limited; and
Jo Appleyard and Tallulah Parker, Anderson Lloyd

FROM: Georgia Brown, Senior Planner, Novo Group Limited

PROJECT REF: Pound Road Industrial Development

FTAA-2505-1057: POUND ROAD INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT APPLICANT SECTION 55 RESPONSE – PLANNING

INTRODUCTION

Qualifications and Experience

1. My full name is Georgia Ellen Brown. I am a Senior Planner at Novo Group a specialist planning, traffic and landscape and urban design consultancy based in Christchurch, Wanaka and Timaru.
2. I hold the qualifications of a Bachelor of Planning (Honours) from the University of Auckland, attained in 2013. I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and have held accreditation as a Hearings Commissioner under the Ministry for the Environment's Making Good Decisions programme since May 2025.
3. I have 12 years of experience as a Resource Management Planner, across the public and private sectors and in both New Zealand and the United Kingdom. I have experience in urban land use development planning in Christchurch, including consenting of industrial land uses.
4. Although this is not an Environment Court proceeding, I confirm that I have read the Environment Court Code of Conduct for expert witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and agree to comply with it. I confirm that the opinions expressed in this statement are within my area of expertise except where I state that I have relied on the evidence of other persons. I have not omitted to consider materials or facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I have expressed.



Scope of Comments

5. I have been asked by NTP Development Holdings Limited (NTP) to provide a response to matters contained in the written comments on the Pound Road Industrial Development application from persons invited by the Expert Panel (Panel) to comment under Section 53 (s53) of the Act. In particular, I address:
 - i. **Transport Effects:** Comments by Christchurch City Council (CCC), Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA), KiwiRail, Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin, Carey Jones, and Warwick and Marianne Wright;
 - ii. **Three Waters Infrastructure:** Comments by CCC, Canterbury Regional Council (CRC), and Warwick and Marianne Wright;
 - iii. **Economics:** Comments by CCC;
 - iv. **Land Contamination:** Comments from CRC;
 - v. **Fresh Water Ecology Effects (Paparua Water Race):** Comments by CCC and the Department of Conservation (DOC);
 - vi. **Landscape and Visual/Rural Amenity Effects:** Comments from CCC, Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin, and John and Philippa Borlase;
 - vii. **Herpetology, Terrestrial and Avifauna Effects:** Comments from CCC and Department of Conservation (DOC);
 - viii. **Reverse Sensitivity:** Comments from the Department of Corrections (Corrections);
 - ix. **Noise:** Comments from CCC, John and Phillipa Borlase, Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin.
 - x. **Highly Productive Soils:** Comments from CCC;
 - xi. **Relevant planning instruments:** Comments from CCC and CRC;
 - xii. **Conditions** proposed by CCC, CRC and DOC; and
 - xiii. **Other Matters:** Comments from Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin.
6. This planning response to comments provides no further reply to the s53 comments on the application made by Whitiora on behalf of Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga. The Applicant has previously discussed the application with Whitiora and a range of matters were requested by Whitiora to be incorporated within the Applicant's condition set. These conditions relate to best practice erosion and sediment control during earthworks, accidental discovery protocol, appropriate ecological management for lizards and fish, implementation of all landscaping as proposed in the application and implementation of best practice methods for stormwater management. While some of the wording in their suggested conditions has been changed to reflect some of the more technical assessments provided by the Councils, the substance of their requests is embedded within the conditions.



7. This planning response is largely a co-ordination of technical inputs from other experts within NTP's team, in response to comments made by the s53 parties, with a particular focus on preparing the Applicant's final set of volunteered conditions. My response to these matters accounts for the following documents and reports, appended to and listed in **Attachment 1** of the s55 response memorandum of Counsel filed on behalf of the Applicant with the Panel. Documents of relevance to my response include:
- i. **Appendix 2:** CCC Land Use and Subdivision Conditions, and DOC Wildlife Conditions;
 - ii. **Appendix 3:** CRC Land Use, Water Permit and Discharge Conditions, and email correspondence confirming agreement of the conditions;
 - iii. **Appendix 4:** Nick Fuller, Novo Group, Transport Memo Response Memo;
 - iv. **Appendix 5:** Todd Inness, Davie Lovell Smith, Civil Engineering Response Memo;
 - v. **Appendix 6:** Natalie Hampson, Savvy Consulting, Economics Response Memo;
 - vi. **Appendix 7:** Laura Drummond, Stantec, Aquatic Ecology Response Memo;
 - vii. **Appendix 8:** Samantha King, Wildlands, Lizard Management Plan and Terrestrial Response;
 - viii. **Appendix 9:** Anne Wilkins, Novo Group, Landscape and Visual Response Memo;
 - ix. **Appendix 10:** Email correspondence with the Department of Corrections;
 - x. **Appendix 11:** Anderson Lloyd Memorandum on the applicability of the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Soils
8. The Applicant's updated proposed sets of conditions in response to comments by CCC, CRC and DOC are attached to the NTP response as tables in **Appendix 2** (CCC land use and subdivision conditions and DOC wildlife approval conditions) and **Appendix 3** (CRC land use, water permit and discharge conditions). With regard **Appendix 2**, noting that CCC did not provide a full set of conditions, the conditions in Column One are those offered by the Applicant and/or updated in response to the s53 comments.
9. For ease of reference and to highlight points of agreement or disagreement between the parties, the tables provided within these documents include a traffic light colour system where:

Green = No (or very minimal) changes are proposed to the administering agency's s53 conditions, and the conditions are agreed between NTP and the Councils.

Orange = Means changes are proposed to the administering agency's s53 conditions by NTP to address comments made by the s53 parties or to improve wording. *Note: any changes to the CRC conditions have subsequently been agreed with them, further detail provided below.*



Red = The administering agency's s53 recommended condition is not agreed to by NTP and is proposed to be deleted, or alternative wording to the administering agency's s53 condition is proposed that is seeking a different outcome.

10. For the orange and red categories, further explanation is provided regarding the changes or reasons for disagreement in column two.
11. The development scheme plans submitted with the s55 response have been updated in response to comments with minor changes being made, reflecting updates to the infrastructure design. The Davie Lovell-Smith (DLS) development plans are attached to the response at **Appendix 5** with a memo from DLS. The landscape plan prepared by Novo Group has also been updated (**Appendix 9**).

TRANSPORT EFFECTS

12. Five parties provided comments on the transport effects of the proposal including CCC, NZTA, Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin (owners of 33 Barters Road), Carey Jones, Warwick and Marianne Wright (owners of 111 Pound Road). A late comment was also received from KiwiRail whilst the application was suspended¹. These are addressed in Mr Fuller's Transport Response Memo, which is attached at **Appendix 4** to the NTP response and is summarised below.

NZTA Comments

13. The NZTA s53 comments raised concerns that the modelling inputs are outdated and insufficient, leaving uncertainty about the true impacts on intersection capacity, safety and heavy vehicle volumes. They noted that the application appeared largely unchanged from earlier pre-application correspondence and that it had not been updated to address their initial concerns raised.
14. NZTA commented that the intersection upgrades lack a detailed design report, and NZTA questioned whether there is sufficient space for the upgrades and whether the design solutions are practical.
15. NZTA provided the following key conclusions:

In summary, while NZTA are not opposed to the Application, NZTA has identified areas where further information is required to understand the effects of the Application. Although NZTA has had discussions with the Applicant to ensure that the assessment supporting the Application is robust, and that all relevant transport matters will be addressed, this information has not been provided.

NZTA is willing to discuss these issues with the Applicant and provide further information to the Panel as it becomes available. As there is a need for further assessment to be undertaken by the Applicant, NZTA has not yet proposed detailed changes to the draft consent conditions but intends to comment on those prepared by the Panel. However, NZTA would seek to have input into a modified

¹ Minutes 6 and 7 issued by the Panel confirm the receipt and acceptance of the late comment.



review condition to ensure that anticipated traffic effects generated by each of the four proposed subdivision stages are mitigated prior to the release of titles for that stage.

In addition, NZTA would seek to ensure that provision for the negotiation of an acceptable side agreement between the Applicant and NZTA covering intersection upgrade contributions where necessary is provided for within the conditions.

16. Noting the request for further engagement, Mr Fuller prepared and provided detailed design solutions for the intersection upgrade to demonstrate that there is sufficient space for the upgrade to occur. NZTA Safety Engineer, Mr James Long, reviewed Mr Fuller's plans and confirmed via email (see Attachment 3a to Mr Fuller's response) that subject to further refinement, there is sufficient space within the existing road corridor to accommodate the upgrade.
17. Following acceptance that the intersection upgrade could be accommodated within the existing road corridor, NZTA provided a further email dated 4 December 2025 (attached as Attachment 4 to Mr Fuller's response), setting out four outstanding concerns. A meeting was subsequently held on 8 December 2025 with NZTA, the Applicant's representative (Mr Christie), and Mr Fuller, Mr Phillips and myself (from Novo Group) to discuss the outstanding issues. The meeting minutes appended within Mr Fuller's response (**Appendix 2**) confirm that the only outstanding issue now for NZTA relates to the funding and timing of the intersection upgrade.
18. At the meeting on 8 December, the parties all acknowledged that the funding and timing of the intersection upgrade is a matter that will be better understood following the completion of the 'Hornby Strategic Case Study' which NZTA have recently commenced and expect to complete within the next 12-18 months. The parties also acknowledged that those timeframes extended well beyond the timeframe for this Fast Track consent application. As such, all parties agreed that funding and timing considerations would require further discussion and work towards a funding agreement and a further meeting with NZTA and CCC will be scheduled to discuss and agree on funding arrangements for the upgrade.
19. For the purposes of this response, and in recognition that funding and delivery decisions by NZTA and the Council will be made in the future (beyond any decision on this application), the Applicant is prepared to enter into a Developer Agreement to confirm their commitment to funding their share of the intersection upgrade. However, the Applicant considers that their contribution should be proportionate to the impact of their development, accounting for the existing environment, the intersection's capacity constraints and the requirement for its future upgrade irrespective of their application.
20. CCC have also made comments about the uncertainty of the required upgrades to Pound Road / SH1 and Pound Road / Waterloo Road intersections being delivered, raising concern about the ability for CCC to incorporate the project in the Long-Term Plan².

² Appendix 6 of CCC s53 Response.



21. To address this, they recommended a condition that *'no further development shall occur after the completion of the first stage of the proposal until the capacity improvements at the SH1/Pound Road and Pound Road/Waterloo Road intersections are under construction, or modelling is updated and demonstrates the intersections can safely accommodate the additional traffic demands associated with the proposal'*.
22. In response to these comments and CCC's recommended condition, Mr Fuller notes:
- i. The traffic modelling undertaken as part of the substantive application indicates the upgrades to the Pound Road intersections will not be required until 2030-2031, which is supported by the proposed condition to defer issuing of Stage 1 Titles until December 2027. Further, it is now proposed to defer issuing of Titles for Stage 2 and beyond until 1 January 2029. It is anticipated that there will be at least a year for the development to be fully established and occupied within Stage 2, leading to the effects from this occurring in 2030, thus consistent with the modelling undertaken. This therefore provides time for the Council, the NZ Transport Agency and KiwiRail to plan and fund the upgrades.
 - ii. Council and the NZTA consider the upgrade arrangements are achievable, so there are no significant obstacles to physically constructing the proposed upgrade.
 - iii. The Applicant is willing to contribute towards some of the intersection upgrade, however, maintains that this contribution should be commensurate to the scale of the effects of the proposal.
 - iv. The intersections are also located within the study area of NZTA's Hornby Strategic Case Study. The Study may determine further / different enhancements to these intersections to further promote the use of Pound Road as a by-pass of Hornby and/or realise other transport objectives by NZTA. Therefore, requiring the Applicant to provide an appropriate contribution (as proposed in the ITA) would provide NZTA with the opportunity to direct that funding to their preferred intersection upgrade, accounting for the outcomes of the completed Hornby Study.
23. Based on the above, including the predicted pace of development, the discussions with NZTA and the Applicant's willingness to enter into a Developer Agreement, the following condition of consent is recommended by Mr Fuller:

The issue of Titles for Stage 1 (Lots 1 – 26-29, 42 -56, 200 and 202) shall not occur before 31 December 2027.

Titles for Stage 2 or beyond shall not be issued until the sooner of:

(a) 01 January 2029; or

(b) a Developer Agreement is entered into with the Council and /or the NZ Transport Agency to facilitate the State Highway 1 / Pound Road intersection and Pound Road/ Waterloo Road intersection upgrades.

The Consent Holder shall provide a contribution toward the construction of the SH1 / Pound Road intersection and Pound Road / Waterloo Road intersection



upgrades (including the rail crossing) on the basis of the traffic generated through these intersections and the costs of the intersection designs included in the ITA for this Consent.

24. In considering the appropriateness of the condition and drawing reference to the overall intent of the FTAA, the following points are emphasised:
- i. The purpose of the FTAA is to **facilitate**³ infrastructure and development which provides significant regional or national benefits. The development has already demonstrated that it will provide significant regional benefits, and therefore the condition assists in facilitating these regional benefits and achieving the purpose of the FTAA.
 - ii. Section 83 of the FTAA states that when exercising discretion to set a condition under this Act, a panel must not set a condition that is more onerous than necessary to address the reason for which it is set in accordance with the provision of this Act that confers the discretion. This means that if the same or similar outcome can be achieved with a less restrictive measure, the more onerous option cannot be imposed.
 - iii. Section 84A of the FTAA (following amendments introduced under the Fast Track Approvals Amendment Act 2025 (FTAAA2025)) prescribes that the Panel may set conditions to ensure that infrastructure in the project area or other infrastructure the project will rely on 'can' be made adequate to support the project. In this situation, the evidence provided in response to comments by NZTA and CCC demonstrates that both parties agree that the necessary infrastructure improvements can physically be accommodated for. The pending Hornby Study however means that the final upgrade design will not be known (or decided) until after a decision on this application is made. The condition gives certainty that this infrastructure can be provided, whilst providing flexibility for the ultimate design.
 - iv. Section 85(1) of the FTAA sets out that the Panel must decline an approval if one or more of s85(1)(a)-(h) apply. None of these sections apply to the application. Section 85(3) states that a Panel may decline an approval, if the panel forms the view that – there are one or more adverse impacts in relation to the approval sought; and those adverse impacts are sufficiently significant to be out of proportion to the project's regional or national benefits that the Panel has considered, even after taking into account any conditions that the Panel may set in relation to those adverse impacts; and any conditions or modifications that the applicant may agree to or propose to avoid, remedy, mitigate or compensate for those adverse impacts.
 - v. There is no evidence to suggest that there are any sufficiently significant adverse impacts of the proposal that are out of proportion to the project's regional benefits. Further, there is a condition that appropriately balances the above points and will manage any potential adverse impacts of the road infrastructure.
 - vi. The alternative (i.e. CCC's recommended condition) to defer Stage 2 onwards until the upgrade has occurred would be counter to the above points and the overall purpose of

³ My emphasis in **bold**.



the FTAA as it leads to the facilitation of the project and whether and when the significant regional benefits materialise in the hands of a third party in a manner the applicant can't control. This approach is not appropriate nor consistent with the FTAA and would introduce a condition "more onerous than necessary" contrary to s 83.

25. In summary, the evidence provided in response to the comments by NZTA and CCC demonstrates that both parties agree that the intersection upgrade can physically be accommodated for, and that timing/funding of the works is the outstanding issue. The proposed condition enables Stage 1 to progress. For Stage 2 and beyond, a 'sunset clause' of 1 January 2029 is included in the condition in order to provide sufficient time for the upgrade to occur, or a Developer Agreement to be entered into and agreed with the relevant parties which provides for a contribution to potentially more significant intersection upgrades that NZTA may establish over a longer time frame. Importantly, this condition provides the Applicant with certainty that the development can progress should the intersection upgrade be delayed, for reasons beyond their control.
26. From a planning perspective and having regard to s84A, I consider the proposed condition to be appropriate for mitigating and managing the potential transport effects of the development while supporting the overall purpose of the FTAA.

CCC Comments

27. The assessment below focuses on the remainder of CCC's proposed transport related mitigation and the conditions recommended by CCC's Transport Planner, Mr Peter Rodgers (Appendix 6 of CCC s53 comments).
28. Aside from the comments on the timing of the SH1 intersection upgrade, CCC's comments relate to the upgrade of all road frontages surrounding the site and the provision of a shared path along Pound Road as part of Stage 2.

Upgrades to road frontages

29. In terms of the upgrading of Barters and Hasketts Road frontages, Mr Fuller notes that the existing carriageways do not currently meet Council standards, and whilst the proposal will increase traffic volumes, it will not increase these to an extent that requires an upgrade. In Mr Fuller's opinion, the Applicant should upgrade the frontage side of the road in accordance with the CCC Infrastructure Design Standards (IDS). However, the opposite side of the road should be upgraded by the Council or be subject to a cost-sharing arrangement between the Council and the Applicant.
30. A cost-sharing arrangement is considered appropriate given that the existing carriageways do not currently meet the Council standards. As set out in Table 1 of Mr Fuller's response, whilst the development will increase daily traffic volumes at 2038 (when the development is expected to be fully developed), this will only be slightly greater than what would otherwise be expected to occur without the development⁴. Based on this marginal increase, the Applicant should not be responsible for fully funding and 'fixing' an existing issue,

⁴ By 2038, the development is expected to increase daily traffic volumes on Barters Road by 500, and Hasketts Road by 800, when compared to the no development model.



particularly when the traffic generated by the application would not alter the standard of upgrade that is required. The requirement for a 2.5 metre shoulder widening along the segment of Pound Road is already necessitated by existing traffic volumes. The proposed site access roundabout will impact approximately 145m of the northern segment, and therefore Mr Fuller considers that the widening in this area can reasonably be considered as part of the associated access works.

31. The remaining 210m of widening would otherwise address an existing deficiency within the road network. It is acknowledged that the proposed development is forecast to increase traffic volumes on this section of Pound Road by approximately 4,800 vehicles per day, resulting in 17,800 vehicles per day along this section of road by 2038 (when the subject site is expected to be fully developed). Accordingly, and given that the existing carriageway is deficient, Mr Fuller is of the opinion that a cost-sharing arrangement between the Council and the Applicant for the southern section of widening is appropriate. This opinion is again based on the fact that the existing carriageway already necessitates an upgrade (to cater for the traffic volumes it currently carries), the development will increase volumes on the road but not to an extent which would require a further upgrade beyond that already deemed necessary.
32. The Applicant accepts Mr Fuller's advice, and updated consent conditions requiring these frontage upgrade works are included in **Appendix 2**.

Pedestrian and cycle access

33. With regards CCC's comments about pedestrian and cycling access, the development plans have been updated to realign the shared path from Stage 1 to the Pound Road / Waterloo Road intersection (refer to the Davie Lovell Smith Plans within **Appendix 5**). The existing crossing at Pound Road / Waterloo Road intersection will also be updated to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists (noting it currently only accommodates cyclists). This matter is now resolved.
34. As part of Stage 2, CCC also seek a separate shared path be provided along Pound Road to reduce the distance some people (pedestrians and cyclists) may have to travel until the subdivision is fully completed. NTP do not agree with the provision of this shared path.
35. In terms of the effects this may have on cyclists, Mr Fuller notes:
 - i. There is an existing 1.8m cycle lane on the Pound Road approach to the Waterloo intersection. Currently Pound Road has a speed limit of 80km/hr. The proposal seeks to reduce the speed limit to 60km/hr and as such this reduced speed will have some improvement on cycle safety beyond the existing situation.
 - ii. The 2m wide shoulders required as part of the Pound Road frontage upgrade can be marked as cycle lanes.
 - iii. Austroads permits a minimum cycle lane width of 1.5m where there is a speed limit of 60km/h, and an acceptable range of 1.2m – 2.5m. Thus, marking the 2m wide shoulders as cycle lanes is considered acceptable, and a separate path is not required.



- iv. Lastly, the cycle path is most likely to be used by confident and experienced riders, rather than 'commuters' or children. This is based on the context of the surrounding environment including the reasonably remote location of the site (rural land to the North and West), with limited connectivity to existing residential development and with no schools or other community facilities in the immediate vicinity which would result in high numbers of 'commuter' type cyclists.
36. With regards the impacts this may have on pedestrians, Mr Fuller comments:
- i. The lack of pedestrian connectivity in the area is acknowledged, however this will be resolved with the construction of Road 3 (Lot 304) in Stage 3 and further improved when Lot 400 is developed and the road extended through that lot.
 - ii. In the interim, pedestrians will experience longer walking distances from the subject site to off-site locations such as Waterloo Road bus stops, varying by lot (e.g., no extra distance for Lot 16, approximately 1.2 km for Lot 7); however, given low public transport usage and the limited number of affected people, this impact is considered minor and temporary.
 - iii. Whilst the preference would be to provide a fully connected / accessible development from the outset, the general pace of the construction and overall staging, which is typical of a large greenfield development, will delay this from occurring. Thus, extending distances for those who wish to walk, for an interim period.
37. Overall, until the site is fully developed the effects of not providing this shared path may be minor on those who choose to cycle or walk to/from the site.

KiwiRail Comments

38. A late comment was received from KiwiRail after the close of s53 comments and whilst the application was suspended at the Applicant's request per s64 of the FTAA.
39. KiwiRail commented that *"the relevant pieces of the proposal have been reviewed by the KiwiRail Engineering Technical Manager - Level Crossings and the Senior Level Crossings Engineer in relation to the level crossings in the vicinity of the project. There is one formed public crossing and one unformed public crossing that potentially could be impacted by the development... The applicant needs to do LCSIA's to all affected level crossings. There are proposed works for roads that will help with some of the future growth"*.
40. To address the potential impacts of the development on level crossings in the vicinity, KiwiRail requested the following condition of consent:

"xx Level Crossing Safety Impact Assessment

Prior to the commencement of Construction Activities, the Consent Holder must have a LCSIA prepared by a SQEP in relation to all level crossings that will be impacted by the proposal. The LCSIA⁵ shall be provided to KiwiRail for review

⁵ Level Crossing Safety Impact Assessment



and sign off, and any and all recommendations set out in the LCSIA must be implemented and will be at the Consent Holders expense. The Consent Holder shall provide to Christchurch City Council that this condition has been met within ten (10) working days of KiwiRail being furnished with the required information.

41. Following receipt of this comment, correspondence with KiwiRail confirmed that they had no records of a LCSIA being undertaken at this intersection. In Mr Fuller's opinion, requiring the Applicant to now undertake this assessment may lead to a requirement to address existing safety concerns that are unrelated to the development proposal. Further, the intersection upgrades will likely supersede any outcomes from a LCSIA.
42. Mr Fuller considers that there is no need for a LCSIA to be undertaken prior to development occurring on the site. However, it is noted that consultation will be required with KiwiRail as part of the NZTA Hornby Strategic Case Study and/or the further detail design of the proposed upgrade. To this extent, any safety concerns directly related to the proposal and the intersection works are better captured through these processes. For completeness, KiwiRail did not comment in objection to the upgrade arrangements proposed.
43. Based on the above, the KiwiRail comments are acknowledged, however the Applicant adopts the advice of Mr Fuller that consideration of the effects on the rail corridor and level crossing can be addressed as part of NZTA's Hornby Study and the detail design of the intersection upgrade.

Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin

44. Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin are landowners of 33 Barbers Road, located to the west of the development site on the opposite side of Barbers Road. Cass and Gemma sought that no accesses will be provided to Barbers Road, and for a range of pedestrian / cycle improvements on Barbers, Pound and Hasketts Road.
45. Mr Fuller considers the proposal provides suitable measures to address their comments, including the shoulder widening on Pound Road, the proposed reduction in speed limits to 60km/hr, and the travel routes to be provided through the site. With regards to traffic generation on Barbers Road, Mr Fuller comments that the majority of traffic is anticipated to use the Pound Road roundabout access, and Barbers Road traffic volumes are only predicted to increase by 500 vehicles per day compared to the 2038 scenario of no development. Mr Fuller considers the walking and cycling facilities requested by this party is not warranted by the development. The Applicant adopts the advice of Mr Fuller.

Carey Jones

46. Carey Jones made a comment in regard traffic effects, noting that it is evident that it will be quite busy including lots of trucks. They specified that the Panel *"looks at the detailed proposed barbers road and barter road Waterloo Road intersection improvements to make sure they are fit for purpose and handle the traffic well"*.
47. Mr Fuller has responded to this comment, noting that the traffic modelling of the intersection predicts it will operate to an acceptable level, and no further assessment is required for this intersection. Mr Fuller's advice is adopted by the Applicant.



Warwick and Marianne Wright

48. Warwick and Marianne Wright own and occupy the property at 111 Pound Road. This property is within the 'application site'. Notwithstanding, they have made several comments in regard traffic safety, including concern regarding the use of Waterloo Road and Kirk Road as an alternative to SH1, and concern about the lack of timeline for undertaking the transport upgrade works.
49. Based on the traffic modelling, Mr Fuller does not consider that there will be any noticeable change in efficiency at Waterloo Road and Kirk Road. With regards the timeline for undertaking the transport upgrade works, this was included in the substantive application and further assessment is provided above in terms of the timing and funding of this work.

Transport Conclusions

50. No party making s53 comments on the application has commissioned transport modelling of the proposed development traffic on the surrounding and strategic road network, that counters that provided by Mr Fuller and QTP. The QTP Cast model is typically the Council and NZTA supported model for applicants to use for such assessments. Following the meeting with NZTA (8 December 2025) it was agreed that there was no issue with the modelling overall, and that there is a solution to resolve the issue at the intersection.
51. The outstanding issue is related to the funding and timing of the intersection upgrades. As set out above, and recognising the funding/timing is still to be resolved, a condition is proposed which will provide a reasonable timeframe for the upgrade works to occur or a developer agreement to confirm their share of funding, should NZTA wish to undertake additional upgrade works over a longer timeframe. This condition appropriately responds to potential road network effects associated with the proposal, whilst also providing certainty that the development can occur in accordance with the purpose of the FTAA.
52. Having considered the s53 comments alongside Mr Fuller's Response Memo, I remain of the view that subject to the volunteered condition of consent, the potential impacts of the project will not be out of proportion to the project's regional benefits.

THREE WATERS INFRASTRUCTURE

53. Since lodging the substantive application and before the s53 comment period began, the Applicant revised the site's wastewater and water servicing proposals. These revisions were outlined in the updated information provided prior to the start of the s53 comment period.
54. CCC have commented on the three waters infrastructure and recommended consent conditions. In regard to stormwater, no further response is provided by NTP noting that the conditions provided by CCC Stormwater Engineer, Mr Brian Norton within Appendix 1 of the CCC s53 comments are agreed to by NTP and included within **Appendix 2**.
55. Mr Inness, Engineer from DLS has prepared a response to the wastewater and water comments received from CCC; his response is attached as **Appendix 5**. In summary, there is capacity to service the development on the proviso that relevant upgrades are made to



the water and wastewater network. With respect to the water supply, the extent of the upgrades will be confirmed following refined hydraulic modelling co-ordinated between the Consent Holder and CCC, to be undertaken at the detailed design phase.

56. The upgraded water supply system will entail works to the existing Council infrastructure up until the point of connection of the development at the corner of Waterloo and Barbers Road. The wastewater network upgrade is defined as the pump station and subsequent rising main and/or duplicate gravity sewer in Waterloo Road to the point of discharge at the intersection of Brixton Street and Waterloo Road. Updates to the respective subdivision conditions requiring the Consent Holder to enter into an Infrastructure Provision Agreement have been made to ensure that the 'upgrade' works are clearly defined.
57. Following further discussion between Mr Inness and Ms McDonald (CCC Team Leader Asset Planning – Water and Wastewater), the location for the odour treatment facility has been agreed, and the condition is updated to reflect this.
58. Based on the above, and as set out by Mr Inness, there is almost full alignment between NTP and CCC on three-waters infrastructure, subject to the minor amendments made to the conditions in **Appendix 2**, and any adverse effects arising from earlier uncertainty associated with three-waters infrastructure have now been resolved.

ECONOMIC EFFECTS

59. The starting point is that the Application appears on Schedule 2 of the FTAA and was confirmed by the Government as meeting the Act's purpose of facilitating infrastructure and development projects that deliver significant regional or national benefits.
60. Extensive feedback on the economic benefits of the proposal was provided from Formative on behalf of CCC. Whilst Formative queried aspects of the Economic Assessment provided by Ms Natalie Hampson of Savvy Consulting (Savvy) as part of the substantive application, there was overall agreement that the development will provide significant regional benefits.
61. Savvy have reviewed the CCC s 53 comments and prepared a response, attached as **Appendix 6**. This response seeks to provide further clarification on any points of disagreement between the economic experts.
62. In terms of the main areas of disagreement, Savvy have responded as follows:
 - i. *Geographic Focus of Demand: The response clarifies that demand for industrial land is not uniform across Christchurch. The Islington–Hornby South area is a focal point for demand, and not all industrial locations are substitutable due to differences in zoning, accessibility, lot size, tenure, and price.*
 - ii. *Vacant Land Take-Up: Recent take-up of vacant industrial land in Islington–Hornby South has been rapid, with 35.4 hectares developed between October 2024 and March 2025—the fastest period since 2016. The average annual take-up from January 2016 to March 2025 is now 15.4 hectares per annum.*



- iii. *Capacity Adjustments: After correcting for minor errors and updating assumptions (e.g., non-developable land ratio), Savvy confirms that current vacant capacity in Islington–Hornby South is estimated at 126.7–158.5 hectares, which is 15% lower than previously reported.*
 - iv. *Demand Scenarios: Updated demand scenarios (excluding the competitiveness margin) are calculated by Savvy as being:*
 - Low: 8.8 ha/year*
 - Medium: 14.7 ha/year*
 - High: 15.4 ha/year*
 - The very high recent rate (35.4 ha/year) is excluded for conservatism.*
 - v. *Sufficiency: Only under the low demand scenario (8.8ha/year) would there be sufficient capacity for the next 10 years. Under medium and high scenarios, shortfalls are expected in the medium term.*
 - vi. *Construction Impact Modelling: The economic impact modelling has been updated to reflect the latest scheme plan (September 2025), reducing the estimated cumulative economic impacts by 17% due to a lower total gross floor area.*
63. The response from Savvy concludes that the proposal will provide critical capacity to meet industrial demand in Greater Christchurch, delivering significant construction and long-term operational economic benefits. The development will support agglomeration benefits and a competitive industrial land market.
64. Overall, and as agreed by CCC, the proposal will align with the purpose of the FTAA, in providing significant regional benefits. Given this agreement, the only economic matters in contention between NTP and CCC are the precise nature and scale of the regional or national benefits provided by the project.

FRESHWATER ECOLOGY EFFECTS

65. There is agreement between NTP and CRC on surface water ecology effects on the Paparua Water Race along Barbers Road. The CRC ecologist is in general agreement with the proposal and proposed conditions.
66. More extensive feedback was obtained via EOS, who provided expert advice on behalf of CCC (Appendix 8 of CCC s53 comments). In summary, the ecologist believes that more information should be provided prior to granting consent, and that amendments are required to the conditions. This is despite the installation of culverts in a network waterway being an exempt activity under the District Plan where a CRC consent exists for the same work (see 6.3.3.h.v.).
67. Ms Drummond, Aquatic Ecologist at Stantec has reviewed the s53 comments provided by CCC and CRC on behalf of NTP and her assessment is attached as **Appendix 7** of the NTP Response.



68. With respect to the request for an assessment of environmental effects to the Paparua Water Race, Ms Drummond comments:

This level of assessment is not considered to be required for this application, the reasons being that the water race flows along the boundary of the site, and no changes to the water race, such as closure, piping or discharges to the watercourse are proposed. It is acknowledged that two culverts will be installed, and the road will be widened by 1m. However, the culvert installation is a permitted activity under the Christchurch District Plan, subject to design (which has been met), and the road widening will be undertaken predominantly outside of the 5m waterway setback (4.8m buffer to be retained, on average). Therefore, no effects assessment is considered necessary (nor is any offset required).

69. CCC support the recommended conditions regarding a 5m landscaping strip along Barters Road, and the provision of an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan. With regard the landscaping strip, CCC recommend this is planted to the true-left edge of the network waterway, that invasive plants are removed/controlled and have made suggested revisions of the plant list within the planting palette. Ms Drummond agrees with these recommendations, and the updates are incorporated within the subdivision conditions at **Appendix 2** and the updated landscape plan included as part of **Appendix 9**.
70. It is noteworthy that EOS has recommended changes to CRC conditions, despite these being outside of the jurisdiction of CCC, and CRC having already expressed full satisfaction with the water permit. EOS recommend that the fish salvage conditions within the CRC water permit consent should be updated to require relocation of freshwater mussels (kakahī) if they are encountered during the salvage efforts. Ms Drummond agrees with this recommendation, and the CRC condition is updated to reflect this. Ms Drummond also agrees with the recommendation that the existing bankside vegetation should be retained, where practicable.
71. Lastly, DOC have also recommended a Fish Management Plan is prepared, and certified by CRC, with a recommended condition update provided. Ms Drummond has reviewed the DOC comments and proposed condition; however, she considers the existing conditions appropriately cover the requirements for fish salvage at this site and does not accept the comments from DOC. She reiterates that CRC agree with the existing (proposed) fish salvage conditions. To this extent, the additional conditions recommended by DOC are considered to be more onerous than necessary and are not accepted by NTP.
72. Overall, Ms Drummond maintains the opinion that there are no adverse impacts of the development that reach the threshold of 'sufficiently significant adverse impact' which require assessment under s85 of the FTAA. The Applicant accepts the advice of Ms Drummond.

HERPETOLOGY, TERRESTRIAL and AVIFAUNA

73. CCC, CRC and DOC have provided independent responses regarding the management of lizard populations at the site. Generally, all parties are supportive of the actions outlined in the Lizard Management Plan (LMP), subject to additional conditions required by DOC in



the s53 Wildlife Approval Report. These require supplementary inclusions in the wildlife approval authorisation.

74. Ms Samantha King, the Applicant's Herpetologist, has provided two memorandums and an updated LMP as part of the NTP's response, this are attached as **Appendix 8**.
75. The conditions submitted by DOC in the s51 Report (Appendix A) are adopted by NTP, with minor amendments suggested by Ms King. These amendments have arisen due to updates made the LMP since the s51 Report was received and are in accordance with the comments received from DOC.
76. The updated LMP and memo prepared by Ms King of Wildlands is also considered to address the outstanding areas of concern identified by CCC in their s53 comments.
77. Lastly, with regard avifauna effects, whilst CCC and NTP are in agreement of the proposed conditions, some minor comments to the conditions have also been made by DOC as part of their s53 response. The amendments from DOC are generally accepted, and are included within the updated conditions in **Appendix 2**.
78. Overall, in consideration of the agreed consent conditions, effects associated with the management of lizards are acceptable.

LAND CONTAMINATION

79. There is agreement between NTP, CRC and CCC on conditions to manage the effects associated with contaminated land, as such no further formal written expert advice from NTP's contamination expert, Ms Fran Hobkirk from Momentum Environmental is provided with this response.
80. On reading the CRC comments and conditions, NTP had some initial concern that the conditions were more onerous than necessary, and thus since receiving the s53 comments NTP has consulted with CRC to address the concern. The wording of these conditions (set out in **Appendix 3**) has now been agreed between NTP and CRC, following email correspondence with CRC's planner (refer to the email attached as part of **Appendix 3**).
81. Finally, the wording of the RAP conditions has been kept the same on the CCC and CRC conditions, so that they are easy for the applicant to administer and both Councils receive the same information at the same time.
82. Given that CCC's s53 comments raised no issues regarding contamination (subject to minor refinements to conditions, which are accepted) and that the final wording of conditions has now been agreed with CRC, there are no contamination matters in contention.

VISUAL AND RURAL CHARACTER / AMENITY EFFECTS

83. Comments relating to visual and rural character / amenity effects were received from CCC, Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin, and John and Phillipa Borlase. These comments are considered below.



CCC Comments

84. CCC provided comments in relation to landscape and visual (rural) amenity matters and requested a number of additional conditions over and above those offered by NTP in the original application dated July 2025 and the September 2025 updates. Ms Wilkins the Applicant's Landscape Architect has reviewed the CCC Landscape and Urban Design Report prepared by Mr William Field (CCC Senior Urban Designer) and recommended conditions, her assessment is attached as **Appendix 9**.
85. In addition, the Barters Road landscaping strip and associated plan has been updated to reflect a slight shift in the location of the strip toward the edge of the waterway, and feedback regarding species proposed within this strip. The latest landscape plan is attached as part of **Appendix 9**.
86. Having reviewed Mr Field's assessment, there are several changes to the proposal or recommended conditions that Ms Wilkins has now recommended as mitigation. NTP now proposes to:
- i. Include Totara trees within the Barters Road landscaping strip, albeit at 10m spacings instead of Mr Field's 5m spacing suggestion.
 - ii. Require a 5m building setback for buildings within allotments adjoining the Templeton Golf Course (previously a 3m setback was proposed), including the planting of Cupressus x leylandii 'Ferndown' at 10m spacings along this boundary
 - iii. Introduce a 15m height restriction on any stacked shipping containers that may be located within 20m of the Barters Road or Hasketts Road boundaries.
 - iv. Restrict any signage on Lots 1-14 and 401 from being oriented toward the Templeton Golf Course.
 - v. Require any fencing along the lots fronting Barters Road to be located internal of the 5m landscaping strip.
 - vi. Require vehicle access to the proposed Lots to be from within the internal roads of the subdivision only, recognising the subdivision has been designed in this way.
87. However, based on Ms Wilkins' assessment there are several conditions that the Applicant does not agree to, or seeks to amend. These are summarised below.
- i. **Building heights:** The Applicant does not accept additional conditions proposed by Mr Field and Mr Ward regarding the height of buildings being restricted to 12m where located within 15m of Barters Road and Hasketts Road, and being limited to a maximum height of 20m overall. Substantial landscape mitigation is already proposed along the Barters Road interface, which will provide meaningful long-term screening, and significantly reduce potential visual effects. Furthermore, given the context of the surrounding environment, visual effects are limited to transient views, rather than from primary living areas.



The interface between the Rural Urban Fringe (RuUF) zone and Industrial General (IG) zone occurs in several locations across the city and the District Plan built form standards for the IG zone do not seek to provide a limitation on building heights opposite Rural zones. Mr Ward (CCC Planner) and Mr Field make reference to the 'enhanced setbacks and a 10-metre landscape strip requirement⁶' at Waterloo Business Park, noting that these are presumably to mitigate potential impact on adjoining rural amenity values. Waterloo Business Park has a 10m – 20m building setback from Pound Road (with the setback required to be landscaped), with no building height restriction. However, this Business Park was established under a materially different planning framework. The FTAA allows approvals of development to enable regionally significant benefits with conditions that are no more onerous than necessary. In the context of the surrounding environment, a condition restricting building height limits is considered to be more onerous than necessary, recognising that the FTAA does not seek to 'eliminate' all effects. The 5m landscaping strip along Barters Road, with the inclusion of Totara trees will provide a sufficient level of mitigation to the potential effects.

In terms of shading effects, the landscape assessment by Ms Wilkins considers that the separation distance provided by the 5m landscaping strip, the road corridor and existing vegetation within the road reserve will mean that any potential shading will be minor and limited in duration.

- ii. **Signs:** The Applicant does not accept additional conditions proposed by CCC in relation to the location, size, height and illumination of signs. In terms of freestanding sign location, it is accepted that numerous signs should not be located within or forward of the 5m wide landscape strip, as this will reduce the effectiveness of the visual mitigation. However, for site/business identification, wayfinding requirements, a single freestanding sign associated with the main vehicle entrances, as per the IG sign rules should be provided for. This type of signage is typical of industrial developments around the city.

As above, the interface between the RuUF and IG zone occurs in several locations across the city, and the District Plan sign rules do not seek to provide limitations for IG sites adjacent Rural zones. Illuminated signs will need to meet the glare and light spill conditions for the zone at the Rural boundary, and thus further limitations on sign illumination are not necessary.

- iii. **Screening of service and outdoor storage:** Additional screening of any outdoor storage and service spaces is not considered necessary by Ms Wilkins. The Applicant does not agree to the CCC recommended condition as a 5m wide landscape strip consisting of a variety of species is already required as a consent condition on the Barters Road frontage. Further, there are no sensitive activities adjacent the site on Hasketts Road that require screening of service and outdoor storage.
- iv. **Tree planting within carparks:** The District Plan IG zone standards do not require landscaping along rural boundaries or within car parking areas. A 5m wide landscaping strip is proposed along the Barters Road frontage which will screen views of parked

⁶ Paragraph 120 of Mr Ward's planning comments



cars. Given the land uses on the adjacent side of Hasketts Road, no additional screening is required here.

- v. **Building Colour:** Ms Wilkin's assessment does not consider that there is any valid reason to require restrictions on the colour of buildings, recognising that no other IG zones (including those adjoining rural or residential zones) contain this restriction. The site is not subject to any special landscape characteristics or features which would otherwise warrant this level of regulation.

- 88. Overall, I maintain that the landscape and visual effects of the proposed industrial subdivision are minor. While the change in land use will result in effects on directly adjacent residents that are more than minor, these effects are not considered significant or unacceptable when assessed in light of Ms Wilkin's landscape response and the context and characteristics of the surrounding environment.

Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin

- 89. Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin made a comment in regard the potential visual and noise disruption associated with the development. Seeking that existing tree hedges on the side of the development bordering residential properties be maintained, that a bund be installed on the development side of the hedge to reduce noise disruption, for the zone to be restricted to general industrial and for a high standard of upkeep to be mandated, similar to what has been achieved at Waterloo Park.
- 90. The existing tree hedges along Barbers Road are proposed to be removed as part of the redevelopment. In their place, a 5m landscaping strip will be established, incorporating a mix of tree and plant species as detailed in Ms. Wilkins' response.
- 91. The acoustic assessment submitted with the substantive application concludes that potential noise effects from the development are acceptable, and therefore a bund is not considered necessary. Industrial activities will be limited to those permitted under the Industrial General Zone of the Christchurch District Plan, with heavy industrial uses excluded. Accordingly, the nature of activities will be comparable to those currently operating at Waterloo Park.

John and Philippa Borlase

- 92. John and Philippa Borlase expressed a desire to preserve the Barbers Road environment, including the ongoing care and maintenance of the pine hedge and trees adjacent to their property. They also requested that mowing of the grass berm continue. Additionally, they raised concerns about increased noise, traffic, and other disruptions that could compromise their quiet, tranquil lifestyle.
- 93. As noted above, the redevelopment proposes removing the existing hedging along the Barbers Road frontage. This will be replaced with a 5m wide landscaped strip featuring a mix of tree and plant species.
- 94. The potential increase in noise and traffic in association with the development is acknowledged, however as per the acoustic assessment and ITA submitted with the substantive application, these effects can be appropriately managed.



REVERSE SENSITIVITY

95. Recognising existing activities in the vicinity of the site (i.e. Ruapuna Motor Park, the Prison) and potential for reverse sensitivity to arise, the substantive application included a condition specifically excluding residential activities, visitor accommodation and education activities from the consent. These types of activities may be sensitive to noise and/or industrial activity and are therefore not provided for as part of the consent.
96. Comments were received from Ara Poutama Aotearoa – The Department of Corrections (Corrections) raising potential reverse sensitivity effects. Corrections occupy 805ha of Crown Land adjacent to the application site on the north-western side of the Hasketts Road/Barters Road/Madisons Road corner. This land is used for farming activity in association with the prison.
97. Corrections commented that their farming operations are lawfully established and hold current resource consents which are being complied with. These resource consents authorise a large-scale pig rearing operation and the spreading of composted bedding material and liquid waste onto land.
98. The Department raised concern that *“within the wide scope of potential future land uses sought in the application, there may be the risk that future land uses establishes of a type that are sensitive to the effects of the lawfully established farming operations on The Department’s land, with odour being a particular concern. For this reason, the Department requests that the Expert Panel take into account the risk of reverse sensitivity when considering the application by NTP Development Holdings Limited, particularly given the wide (and not well defined) scope of future uses that may be enabled”*.
99. The comments conclude that the concern may be resolved by a condition requiring the registration of a ‘no-complaints covenants’ on new titles.
100. Following receipt of these comments, NTP have consulted with Corrections via email. Firstly, it was clarified that the condition restricting ‘sensitive’ activities was now correctly included in the proposed condition set, with the wording refined to clearly preclude sensitive activities. Notwithstanding this condition, Corrections advised that they frequently receive complaints from workers/employees in recently developed industrial / business parks who struggle with odour associated with an operational piggery and their preference is for a no-complaints covenant.
101. The Christchurch District Plan currently requires the establishment of new sensitive activities within a Rural Zone to be set back 200m from any part of a site used for intensive farming. With this framework in mind, NTP volunteer a condition of consent which will require the registration of a ‘no-complaints’ covenant on any new allotment created within 200m of the Crown land at 555 West Coast Road (Sec 4 SO 19454).
102. Corrections confirmed via email on 16 December 2025 that the proposed condition would relieve their concerns with respect to potential reverse sensitivity effects. A copy of this is attached as **Appendix 10**.



103. Based on the above, it is considered that the potential for reverse sensitivity effects will be appropriately managed given future landowners will be made aware of Correction's lawful farming operations.

NOISE EFFECTS

104. An acoustic assessment was prepared by Powell Fenwick and included at Appendix 4 of the substantive application. The assessment concluded that noise generated on site from future industrial activities will likely comply at the closest residential properties, noting that existing environmental noise is higher in this area than usually experienced in rural zones due to high traffic volumes, aircraft noise and occasional noise from Ruapuna. It was noted that noise from additional traffic movements from the development will likely increase noise received at the closest residential properties by 1-2dB however this is unlikely to result in any noticeable difference.
105. Comments regarding noise effects were received from CCC, John and Phillipa Borlase and Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin as part of the s53 comments stage.
106. John and Phillipa Borlase commented in concern about the increase in noise which will take away from their quiet tranquil lifestyle.
107. Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin commented that they opposed the development as it will lead to significant noise to the rural character of the area. They requested a bund be installed on the development side of the hedge to reduce noise disruption before any significant works start.
108. CCC's Environmental Health Officer Ms Agnes van der Erf reviewed the Powell Fenwick assessment and provided comments at Appendix 11 to the CCC response. Ms van der Erf concluded that she agreed with the conclusions and recommended conditions of Powell Fenwick, with some minor amendments as set out in her comments. The conditions have been included as part of **Appendix 2**.
109. Notwithstanding the comments from the two landowners, it is recognised that neither party has provided any acoustic evidence to the contrary of the conclusions made by Powell Fenwick and from CCC's expert. Based on the agreement between NTP and CCC as well as the conditions of consent, any potential noise effects from the industrial development will be acceptable.

HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE SOILS

110. The Council and Applicant disagree on the applicability of the National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL), however CCC conclude that if it applies, the proposal will meet the exemption pathway under Clause 3.10.
111. The Applicant's Legal Counsel have prepared a memorandum on the application of the NPS-HPL to the application, a copy of this is attached as **Appendix 11**. In summary, this concludes that the NPS-HPL does not apply to the Application as:



- i. The Rural Urban Fringe (RuF) zone is not the “nearest equivalent zone” to the General Rural (GR) or Rural Production (RP) zones and does not meet the transitional HPL definition under cl 3.5(7), and cl 1.3 under the NPS-HPL — only the Rural Banks Peninsula Zone (RuBP) and Rural Waimakariri Zone (RuW) genuinely enable and anticipate primary production as anticipated under the HPL.
- ii. The RuF is not managed or intended to function as an 'area used predominantly for primary production activities'; instead, it is fragmented, dominated by lifestyle and peri-urban uses, and constrained in ways that make land-based primary production unviable. Therefore, applying the NPS-HPL to land that is not used predominantly for primary production activities would produce the kind of anomalous and unintended outcomes the NPS-HPL seeks to avoid.

RELEVANT PROVISIONS AND PLANNING INSTRUMENTS

- 112. An assessment against the relevant statutory and non-statutory planning instruments was included the substantive application, and my position remains unchanged.
- 113. While the development involves the ‘urbanisation’ of land that is not identified as urban or a greenfield priority area in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and is currently zoned rural under the Christchurch District Plan, the rural-land ‘avoidance’ policies in the NPSHPL, the CRPS and the District Plan must be read in the context of the FTAA, which expressly provides for urbanisation of rural land via resource consent without prior rezoning.
- 114. Once the current rural zoning is set aside on that basis, the proposal is generally consistent with the relevant RMA planning instruments in an overall sense.
- 115. CRC have commented that they agree with the Applicant, in that the main issues associated with the proposal relate to development outside of an identified Greenfield Priority Area of the CRPS and loss of primary production and versatile soils. Whilst they consider the proposal slightly diverges from the policy direction of the CRPS, the conditions proposed regarding infrastructure will continue to allow for its safe operation. Further, in terms of its out of sequence development. CRC comment that the site borders an industrial zone and thus whilst out of sequence the development may not necessarily be in an inappropriate location.
- 116. Overall, CRC comment that they have considered the proposal through the RMA lens, with focus on Parts 2, 3 and 6. They consider the proposal aligns with the purpose and principles of the RMA. The Applicant and CRC are therefore in general agreement on the consistency with the relevant RMA planning instruments when viewed in an overall sense.

National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD)

- 117. CCC have a commented that there is no full agreement on how to assess the NPS-UD, insofar that:
 - (a) It considers that there are no implementation provisions of the NPS-UD relevant to the processing of a resource consent; and



- (b) It does not consider it necessary to reach a view on whether the entirety of the Greater Christchurch area is the urban environment.

- 118. Notwithstanding, the Council acknowledges that the development, if it proceeds, would be an urban environment and will also interface and affect Christchurch's existing urban environment. The Council also comments that based on its assessment of infrastructure and servicing matters, natural hazards, transport matters, and subdivision and urban design the proposal 'has a design generally suited to its purpose'
- 119. In summary, the Council comments therefore conclude that the proposal is generally consistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) – a conclusion also reached in the assessment accompanying the application
- 120. Accounting for this and that no significant issues or adverse impacts arise that require further evaluation of the NPSUD, no further assessment is necessary in regards this matter.

CONDITIONS

CCC Conditions

- 121. NTP's updated proposed land use and subdivision consent package is attached to the response as **Appendix 2**. As outlined in the preceding assessment, there is still some disagreement (see red conditions in **Appendix 2** table) between the CCC and NTP on conditions relating to:
 - i. Extent of transport upgrades and facilitation of a shared path for pedestrians/cyclists; and
 - ii. Building height limits, signage, and visual amenity.
- 122. NTP consider that these conditions as proposed by CCC are more onerous than necessary and should not be applied to the approval in accordance with s83 of the FTAA. In recognition that NTP and CCC are not going to agree on all the transport and landscape/visual amenity conditions, the fully re-drafted NTP set is in **Appendix 2**.
- 123. However, it is noted that a vast majority of the conditions relating to topics covered in this memo are agreed with CCC. The stormwater, aquatic ecology, environmental health, geotechnical and quality-control (earthworks) conditions are agreed in principle.

CRC Conditions

- 124. NTP's proposed consent conditions for the CRC consents are attached in **Appendix 3** to the response. As outlined above following correspondence with CRC to discuss contamination conditions in particular, the condition package attached is now entirely agreed between NTP and CRC. An email from CRC confirming this is attached at the end of **Appendix 3**.

DOC Conditions



125. As noted above the additional conditions requested by DOC have largely been adopted, with three minor clarification points suggested by the Applicant's ecologist and herpetologist, Ms Samantha King (**Appendix 8**) as part of the final updates to the LMP.
126. The conditions relating to the Wildlife Permit are incorporated into a separate set of conditions for DOC to administer in **Appendix 2**. Other than the points of clarification noted above, the LMP and associated conditions are now agreed between the Applicant and DOC.

OTHER MATTERS

127. Comments received from Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin also raised two other matters, being monetary compensation if their requests could not be met, as well as the lack of consultation undertaken by the Applicant.
128. The FTAA does not offer monetary compensation where persons may consider themselves or their land to be affected by a development proposal. The purpose of the FTAA is to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure and development projects with significant regional or national benefits.
129. With respect to consultation, s11 of the FTAA sets out who an applicant must consult with prior to lodging a referral application; surrounding landowners and occupiers are not a party of whom consultation is required to be undertaken. Instead, the views of adjacent landowners are expressly sought through the separate process in section 53, ensuring that consultation remains focused while still enabling adjacent landowners to provide input at the appropriate statutory stage.

CONCLUSION AND SUMMARY

130. The Applicant has made further progress post s53 comments being received to reach agreement with CRC as detailed above, and partially with CCC. The conditions which are not fully agreed generally relate to transport, landscape and visual amenity effects.
131. As detailed above, and subject to a condition facilitating the issuing of Titles and timing of development, the proposal is assessed as having no more than minor, or more than minor (but not significant) and acceptable actual or potential adverse effects on the environment in relation to the subjects covered in this memo.
132. Importantly, s84A of the FTAA enables the Panel to set conditions to ensure that the infrastructure in the project can be made adequate. As set out above, the necessary infrastructure upgrade works are agreed as being physically possible, and measures are in place to ensure that the work can occur via a Developer Agreement.
133. Accordingly, the cumulative adverse impacts from the Application do not reach the threshold of "sufficiently significant" such that they would be out of proportion to the Projects regional benefits in terms of an assessment under s 85 of the FTAA. In alignment with the purpose of the FTAA, granting the approvals for the Pound Road Industrial Development project will facilitate the delivery of significant regional economic benefits.

