

Before the Expert Panel

**FTAA-2504-1054**

---

Under	<b>Fast-track Approvals Act 2024</b>
In the matter of	an application for approvals in relation to the Ryans Road Industrial Development
By	<b>Carter Group Limited</b> Applicant

---

**Memorandum of counsel for Carter Group Limited**

28 November 2025

---

**Submitter's solicitors:**

J M Appleyard | M E Davidson  
Anderson Lloyd  
Floor 2, The Regent Building, 33 Cathedral Square, Christchurch 8011  
PO Box 13831, Armagh, Christchurch 8141  
DX Box WX10009  
p + 64 3 379 0037  
jo.appleyard@al.nz | meg.davidson@al.nz

**anderson  
lloyd.**

**May it please the Panel:**

- 1 This memorandum is filed on behalf of Carter Group Limited (**Carter Group** or **Applicant**), the applicant for the Ryans Road Industrial Development (**Project**). It addresses comments received from persons invited to comment on the application under section 53 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (**FTAA** or **Act**).

**INTRODUCTION**

- 2 Comments on the Project were received from the following persons:<sup>1</sup>
  - (a) Canterbury Regional Council (**CRC**);
  - (b) Christchurch City Council (**CCC**);
  - (c) Department of Conservation (**DOC**);
  - (d) Selwyn District Council (**SDC**);
  - (e) Minister for the South Island;
  - (f) Minister for Regional Development;
  - (g) Christchurch International Airport Limited (**CIAL**);
  - (h) Airways New Zealand (**Airways**);
  - (i) New Zealand Transport Agency | Waka Kotahi (**NZTA**);
  - (j) Whitiora Centre Limited (**Whitiora**) on behalf of Ngāi Tūāhuriri;
  - (k) Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited (**MKT**) on behalf of Te Taumutu Rūnanga;
  - (l) Orion New Zealand Limited (**Orion**);
  - (m) Adjacent landowners including:
    - (i) NZ Arable;

---

<sup>1</sup> Noting that the Minister for the Environment, New Zealand Game Animal Council and 'Adjacent landowner 1' each confirmed they wish not to provide comment on the Application.

- (ii) Martin Leslie O'Neill and Shane Colin O'Neill (members of PRG Limited (**PRG**)); and
  - (iii) TWT Holdings Limited (**TWT**).
- 3 This memorandum provides a summary of the Applicant's response to comments received from parties invited under section 53, followed by an outline of the legal framework under the Fast-track Approvals Act (FTAA) in light of those comments.
- 4 A more detailed planning response is provided in:
  - (a) **Appendix 1:** Memorandum prepared by Ms Clare Dale (Novo Group) which addresses:
    - (i) Transport effects – addressing comments by CCC, NZTA and PRG;
    - (ii) Three waters infrastructure – addressing comments by CCC and CRC;
    - (iii) Water Quality Effects – addressing comments by CRC;
    - (iv) Land Contamination – addressing comments by CRC;
    - (v) Birdstrike Hazards – addressing to comments by CIAL;
    - (vi) Freshwater Ecology Effects (Paparua Water Race) – addressing comments by CCC, CRC and SDC;
    - (vii) Indigenous Vegetation Effects – addressing comments from CRC;
    - (viii) Herpetology / Wildlife Act Approval – addressing comments from DOC;
    - (ix) Landscape and Visual Amenity Effects – addressing comments from CCC; and
    - (x) Conditions proposed by CCC, CRC and CIAL and DOC.
  - (b) **Appendix 2:** Memorandum prepared by Mr Jeremy Phillips (Novo Group) which addresses:
    - (i) Aviation safety matters – which addresses comments from Airways and CIAL;

- (ii) Economic benefits – addressing comments by CCC; and
  - (iii) The National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (**NPS-HPL**) addressing comments by CCC; and
  - (iv) The National Policy Statement on Urban Development (**NPS-UD**) addressing comments by CCC.
- 5 A full list of the reports prepared by Carter Group's expert consultants is provided as **Attachment 1** to this memorandum.

#### **CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL**

- 6 Carter Group acknowledges the comments received from CRC.
- 7 CRC's review of the application did not identify any material matters of contention. CRC concluded that:

*any adverse environmental effects that may arise from the proposal can be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated subject to conditions of consent, should the Panel approve the application.*

- 8 CRC identified a few outstanding matters to be addressed in consent conditions. Since receiving these comments, Carter Group has worked collaboratively with CRC to resolve those issues. With respect to the regional council consent conditions, the conditions package is now fully agreed between CRC and the Applicant. CRC confirmed agreement via an email on 24 November 2025.

#### **CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL**

- 9 Carter Group acknowledges the comments received from CCC.
- 10 CCC provided a range of technical reports and recommended conditions that it considers appropriate to manage potential adverse environmental effects.
- 11 The report concludes that:

*316. After considering the actual and potential effects on the environment of the proposal, it is my view that:*

*a. While the net regional benefits of the proposal are not well quantified, I accept that they will be significant, and granting the approval sought would facilitate the delivery of a development project with regional benefits;*

*b. Conditions proposed by the Council are no more onerous than necessary, are recommended in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Act;*

*c. Subject to the implementation of conditions recommended by Council specialists, the adverse effects of the proposal can be appropriately managed.*

*317. Accordingly, it is my conclusion that, subject to conditions recommended, adverse impacts relating to the approval sought will not be sufficiently significant so as to be out of proportion to the benefits.*

*318. If the conditions recommended by Council specialists are not included, I consider that additional economic assessment to determine the net economic benefit will be required to consider the significance of the adverse impacts of the proposal in relation to the benefits*

- 12 As outlined in the memorandum of **Ms Dale (Appendix 1)**, the Applicant has prepared an updated set of conditions incorporating many of the measures proposed by CCC to mitigate potential adverse effects. However, not all of CCC's recommended conditions are accepted by the Applicant.
- 13 The conditions that the Applicant does not agree with relate to:
  - (a) transport upgrades and staging;
  - (b) landscape and visual effects; and
  - (c) the necessity for water race conditions, given its artificial status.
- 14 While each matter is addressed briefly below, a more detailed summary of these issues is provided in Ms Dale's memorandum (**Appendix 1**). A further explanation of the conditions that have not been agreed to is set out in **Appendix 3** (CCC land use and subdivision conditions).
- 15 **Mr Greg Akehurst** has also prepared a response to CCC's comments regarding the benefits of the Project (**Appendix 20**). This is discussed in detail at paragraphs 129-137 below.

#### *Transport upgrades and staging*

- 16 The updated condition package accepts several of the CCC's recommended transport conditions relating to the speed environment, engineering approvals, vesting of roads, and frontage upgrades. However, Carter Group does not agree to conditions relating to staging, internal road design, and frontage treatments. The traffic response of **Mr Nick Fuller**

addresses areas of disagreement and provides supporting modelling and analysis (**Appendix 7**).

#### *Landscape and visual effects*

- 17 CCC provided comments on landscape and visual amenity matters and sought additional conditions beyond those proposed by Carter Group.
- 18 **Ms Hannah Bruere** has prepared an assessment of CCC's Landscape and Urban Design Report. That report is attached as **Appendix 15**. Updated landscape plans (**Appendix 16**) include detailed planting specifications (shelterbelt and indigenous species), stormwater changes, species advice, and CCC/CIAL requests. The landscape plans also form part of the updated Capture Land Development package (**Appendix 5**).
- 19 There are several changes that Carter Group accepts as mitigation for landscape and visual effects including:
  - (a) a 3m-wide landscaped strip along Ryans and Grays Roads with maintenance obligations;
  - (b) plant larger approved tree species opposite properties containing residential units; and
  - (c) a building height restriction on Lots 68–70 to mitigate visual bulk and shading.
- 20 However, Carter Group considers that a number of the conditions proposed by CCC are not necessary and are therefore onerous in the context of the FTAA. The proposed conditions that the Applicant does not agree to include those relating to restrictions on sign size, height, and illumination, noting compliance with the IG zone and airport lighting rules. Conditions relating to screening of service areas, shipping containers, car park landscaping, building colour, and vehicle crossings are not accepted or have been amended due to redundancy, practicality, or inconsistency with IG zone standards and wildlife hazard management principles.

#### *Water race conditions*

- 21 Feedback on potential effects to the SDC Paparua water race (**Water Race**) was received from CRC and CCC ecologists.
- 22 CRC generally supports the proposal and recommended additional measures, including fish salvage, limiting the duration of culvert works, and provision of detailed culvert design drawings. These requirements have been incorporated into the proposed agreed conditions (**Appendix 4**).

- 23 CCC sought further information and additional conditions in relation to the water race despite culvert installation being an exempt activity under the District Plan where the regional consent applies. The ecology response of **Mr Jarred Arthur (Appendix 13)** supports fish salvage and ecologist oversight for instream culvert works but considers CCC's broader requirements, such as monitoring all works within 5 metres of the waterway and prior approval of riparian planting are unnecessary and onerous in the context of a fast-track application given the water race's artificial status. Accordingly, the Applicant does not accept those conditions identified as unnecessary by Mr Arthur.

*National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL)*

- 24 For completeness it is noted that Carter Group disagrees with the Buddle Findlay opinion (Appendix 15, CCC section 53 comment) to the extent that it relates to the "nearest equivalent zone."
- 25 The Applicant maintains the land is not zoned General Rural or Rural Production for the purposes of the NPS-HPL and therefore the NPS-HPL is not relevant to the application under the current definition of highly productive land.
- 26 However, this issue is not addressed in any further detail as it does not need to be resolved for the purposes of this application. The Applicant agrees with the Buddle Findlay opinion that, even if the Panel concludes the project is inconsistent with or contrary to the NPS-HPL and therefore constitutes an "adverse impact," this alone cannot justify declining approval unless that adverse impact (together with any others identified) is sufficiently significant to outweigh the project's regional or national benefits.
- 27 For completeness, it is also noted that while clause 17(1) of Schedule 5 requires decision-makers to "take into account" provisions of the Resource Management Act (**RMA**) that guide resource consent decisions, RMA plans and policies remain relevant and mandatory considerations under the FTAA. However, under the FTAA there is no obligation to "give effect to" higher-order instruments such as the NPS-HPL. By way of comparison, the FTAA:
- (a) has a distinct purpose from the RMA, focusing on the facilitation of developments that deliver national and regional benefits;
  - (b) applies a different threshold requiring decision-makers only to "take into account" as opposed to "give effect to" under the RMA; and

- (c) grants Panels broad discretion to depart from policies that would otherwise bind them under the RMA.

- 28 **Mr Mthamo's** report (Appendix 26 to the March application) concludes that the effects on versatile soils and rural production will be minor and acceptable. CCC commissioned a peer review of Mr Mthamo's report, with particular regard to clause 3.10 of the NPS-HPL. Based on this advice, CCC Planner, Mr White, accepts that the site is subject to permanent or long-term constraints, and subdivision, use, or development is permitted under clause 3.10.
- 29 Accordingly, the Applicant considers that any loss of highly productive land or inconsistency with the NPS-HPL does not amount to an adverse impact of sufficient significance to justify declining the approvals sought.

#### *National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD)*

- 30 As noted in the memo by **Mr Phillips (Appendix 2)**, CCC and the Applicant differ on the relevance of the NPS-UD to consent processing. CCC considers there are no implementation provisions applicable and does not consider it necessary to determine whether Greater Christchurch constitutes the entire urban environment. CCC acknowledges, however, that the proposal would form part of and interface with Christchurch's urban environment. Based on assessments of infrastructure, hazards, transport, subdivision, and design, the Council concludes the development is generally fit for purpose and consistent with the NPS-UD.
- 31 Therefore, no significant issues in relation to the NPS-UD arise warranting further evaluation.

#### **THE DIRECTOR GENERAL OF CONSERVATION**

- 32 Carter Group acknowledges the comments and the section 51 wildlife approval report (**Section 51 Report**) received from DOC.
- 33 The Section 51 Report confirms that:

*subject to recommended conditions, the proposed activities are broadly consistent with the purpose of the Wildlife Act. The lizard management plan (LMP) includes appropriate methodologies for salvage and relocation, identifies a suitable release site, and proposes habitat enhancement measures.*
- 34 The additional conditions requested by DOC have been adopted, with three minor clarification points suggested by the Applicant's ecologist and



herpetologist, **Mr Lachie Davidge**. An updated Lizard Management Plan (**LMP**) including DOC's section 51 conditions is attached as **Appendix 14**.

- 35 At the request of DOC, the conditions relating to lizard management are now incorporated into a separate set of conditions for DOC to administer. Other than the points of clarification noted above, the LMP and associated conditions are now agreed between the Applicant and DOC.

## **RELEVANT IWI AUTHORITIES AND TREATY SETTLEMENT ENTITIES**

### **Whitiora (on behalf of Ngāi Tūāhuriri) and MKT (on behalf of Te Taumutu Rūnanga)**

- 36 Carter Group acknowledges the comments received from Whitiora (on behalf of Ngāi Tūāhuriri) and MKT (on behalf of Te Taumutu Rūnanga).
- 37 Prior to lodging the substantive application, Carter Group engaged in discussions with the Whitiora and MKT. As a result of that process, conditions requested were incorporated into the Applicant's proposed condition set.
- 38 Whitiora has confirmed that it "has no additional feedback."
- 39 MKT has also provided recommendations aimed at moderating the effects of the proposed activity.
- 40 The memorandum of **Ms Dale (Appendix 1)** confirms that, while some wording in the suggested conditions has been refined to align with the technical assessments from CRC, CCC and DOC, the substance and intent of the recommendations are retained within the Applicant's condition set.

## **MINISTERS OF THE CROWN**

### **Minister for the South Island**

- 41 Carter Group acknowledges the comments received from the Minister for the South Island. The Minister considered the application and its alignment with the Minister's priorities the South Island portfolio being, to double South Island exports, increase the region's gross domestic product contribution, and invest in reliable, resilient infrastructure.
- 42 The Minister states that:

*The project strengthens long-term economic capacity and supply chain resilience by enabling export-facing businesses near Christchurch Airport,*

*contributing significantly to regional GDP, and addressing a critical shortage of industrial land.*

*Given the scale of the projected economic benefits, including job creation and regional investment, the project will deliver significant regional economic benefit and does not require further economic analysis at this stage.*

- 43 This comment supports the benefits of the project as set out by Carter Group within the Application.

#### **Minister for Regional Development**

- 44 Carter Group acknowledges the comments received from the Minister for Regional Development that:

*Given the scale of the projected economic benefits as set out in the application's economic assessment, the project could deliver significant regional economic benefit.*

- 45 This comment supports the benefits of the project as set out by Carter Group within the application.

#### **ADJACENT LANDOWNERS**

##### **PRG Limited**

- 46 Carter Group acknowledges the comments received from Martin Leslie O'Neill and Shane Colin O'Neill (as members of PRG), an adjacent landowner to the site.

- 47 The comment supports the benefits of the Project as advanced by Carter Group within the application. In particular, the comment notes the significant shortage of freehold industrial land within Christchurch, stating:

*We support the Ryans Road application to the extent that we agree that there is shortage of freehold industrial land in the City; and that the West Christchurch area, in the Pounds Road vicinity, including 211 Ryans Road and the wider PRG Site, is an ideal location for industrial development to meet that shortage.*

- 48 It is also acknowledged that the commenter raised a number of concerns regarding the Project. The concerns relate to:

- (a) Potential adverse effects on the use and enjoyment of 211 Ryans Road and future development opportunities for the PRG site;
- (b) Inadequate identification and/or mitigation of development effects.

- (c) Traffic impacts, including upgrades to the Pounds Road/Ryans Road intersection and wider transport effects.
  - (d) Lack of proposed upgrades to the Pounds/Yaldhurst/School Road/Old West Coast Road intersection despite existing capacity issues.
  - (e) Insufficient future-proofing of infrastructure to enable efficient industrial development of surrounding land.
  - (f) Inconsistency with FTAA referral criteria and the overall appropriateness of the proposal for approval under the FTAA.
- 49 Carter Group does not agree that the Project inadequately identifies or mitigates development effects. These matters have been comprehensively addressed through the application and supporting technical assessments, including the Integrated Traffic Assessment prepared by **Mr Fuller (Appendix 7)**, as well as detailed infrastructure and planning reports submitted with the application and in response to section 53 comments.

#### **TWT Holdings Limited (TWT)**

- 50 Carter Group acknowledges the comments received from TWT, an adjacent landowner to the site.
- 51 TWT is a member of PRG, and their comments mirror that above.
- 52 TWT's comment supports the benefits of the Project as advanced by Carter Group within the application. In particular, TWT notes the significant shortage of freehold industrial land within Christchurch, stating:

*TWT supports the Ryans Road application to the extent that it agrees that there is shortage of freehold industrial land in the City and the West Christchurch area, in the Pounds Road vicinity, including the TWT and wider PRG Site, is an ideal location for industrial development to meet that shortage.*

- 53 TWT also raises concerns consistent with those identified by PRG. Carter Group's response to these matters is set out at paragraph 49 above.

#### **NZ Arable**

- 54 Carter Group acknowledges the comments received from NZ Arable, an adjacent landowner to the site.
- 55 NZ Arable is concerned to ensure that:

*With any future business development of the Ryans Rd Industrial Development please ensure that the current helicopter flight path is maintained - especially with in coming flights.*

- 56 For a response on matters relating to aerodrome operations and flight paths, refer to paragraphs 61-72 below (CIAL and Airways comments).

## **OTHER PERSONS INVITED TO COMMENT**

### **New Zealand Transport Agency**

- 57 Carter Group acknowledges the comments received from NZTA.
- 58 The NZTA's comment contains the following conclusion:

*The development represents both economic opportunity and infrastructure risk. The scale of traffic generation (8,804 daily movements) onto an acknowledged failing network creates potential for significant adverse effects on state highway performance. However, these risks can be managed through appropriate conditions and independent verification. NZTA considers a suite of conditions would be required to resolve these impacts, and would welcome further engagement with the applicant to develop these.*

- 59 **Mr Fuller (Appendix 7)** has addressed the effects-based issues raised and considers that the Integrated Traffic Assessment submitted with the application provides sufficient information to identify potential effects and outline mitigation measures, including those relating to the Pound Road / SH73 intersection.
- 60 A summary of engagement with NZTA is provided by **Ms Dale (Appendix 1)**. Ms Dale clarifies that the Applicant has not proposed any additional conditions in response to NZTA's section 53 comments, as NZTA has not clearly identified the specific conditions it seeks.

### **Airways / Christchurch International Airport Limited**

- 61 Carter Group acknowledges the comments received from Airways and CIAL.
- 62 In their respective comments, Airways and CIAL raised a number of issues which are summarised in more detail in the memorandum of **Mr Phillips (Appendix 2)**. This memorandum does not exhaustively address those matters.

- 63 Among the issues raised, Airways and CIAL requested that the Applicant provide a comprehensive aeronautical safeguarding study prepared by suitably qualified professionals. They have each asked that the study assess potential effects on navigation and surveillance systems and that all recommendations be implemented to avoid any adverse impacts on aviation safety.
- 64 The Applicant recognises the importance of these matters and, in response, has commissioned the following expert reports:
- (a) **Technical Safeguarding Assessment of Air Navigation Equipment Report (Appendix 18)**, prepared by Cyrrus, a UK specialist who was recommended by Airways, to prepare a technical safeguarding study assessment of air navigation equipment (**ANE (Cyrrus Report)**).
  - (b) **Aviation Safeguarding Assessment (Appendix 19)**, prepared by Navigatus, a New Zealand specialist also recommended by Airways, to provide New Zealand based aviation advice on and expert review of the Cyrrus Report, and address other aviation safety matters raised by Airways and CIAL (**Navigatus Report**): and
  - (c) **Christchurch International Airport Safeguarding Assessment (Appendix 17)**, prepared by L&R Airport Consulting (**L&R Report**).<sup>2</sup>
- 65 It is noted that aeronautical safeguarding reports require highly specialised expertise and considerable time to prepare. There is only one known professional in New Zealand, and only a limited number internationally, qualified to undertake this work. Cyrrus and Navigatus were engaged by the Applicant at the recommendation of Airways. Given the scarcity of expertise and the comprehensive peer review already undertaken, Carter Group considers that further independent review is neither practical nor necessary.
- 66 The Cyrrus Report and Navigatus Report conclude that, subject to the recommended safeguards (which can be incorporated as conditions), the proposal will have acceptable (and not significant) impacts on navigation or surveillance systems at Christchurch aerodrome. Overall:
- (a) The Cyrrus Report (**Appendix 18**) concludes that *"the effects on air navigation equipment from development of the Ryans Road land are*

---

<sup>2</sup> L&R Report updates the Airport Safeguarding Assessment submitted by the Applicant on 15 August 2025.

*manageable to an acceptable standard"* and that the development *"will not adversely affect the safe operation of the ANE"*<sup>3</sup>

(b) The Navigatus Report concludes that:<sup>4</sup>

All identified aviation safety risks can be managed to an acceptable level through design controls, operational procedures, and regulatory compliance.

...

The recommended consent conditions and advice notes that address aviation aspects provide robust and practical safeguards, ensuring ongoing compliance and protection of the safety of the aviation-system.

In summary, provided the development proceeds in accordance with the modelled parameters and recommended conditions, the effects on aviation safety are acceptable. The assessment provides confidence that aviation safety risks are identified, managed, and mitigated.

(c) The L&R Report concludes that *"adverse impacts of the development on airport safeguarding matters, will be adequately managed to an acceptable level through the mitigating measures proposed."*<sup>5</sup>

67 The Applicant accepts all recommendations from Cyrrus and Navigatus to safeguard and avoid adverse effects on navigation and surveillance aids at Christchurch aerodrome. These recommendations have been incorporated into the proposed conditions of consent. The Applicant has also confirmed that it will make the aeronautical study publicly available and provide it to future lot owners and occupiers as recommended by Airways.

68 **Mr Phillips** memorandum (**Appendix 2**) also provides a comprehensive summary of the Applicant's response to other potential issues raised by CIAL and Airways. **Mr Dale's** memorandum (**Appendix 1**) addresses bird strike risk.

---

<sup>3</sup> Cyrrus *Technical Safeguarding Assessment of Air Navigation Equipment* (18 November 2025) at pages 5 and 70 respectively (**Appendix 18**).

<sup>4</sup> Navigatus Consulting Aviation Safeguarding Assessment (28 November 2025) at page 61.

<sup>5</sup> L&R Airport Consulting Christchurch International Airport Safeguarding Assessment (28 November 2025) at page 15 (**Appendix 17**).

### Conditions

- 69 The potential adverse effects identified by Airways and CIAL have been appropriately addressed through the draft conditions. These effects are avoided or mitigated through updated consent conditions that incorporate the recommendations of the Applicant's expert advisers.
- 70 Technical modelling undertaken by Cyrrus is both highly complex and time-intensive. As a result, the process necessarily prioritised ensuring the robustness of the assessment before any further engagement with CIAL and Airways could occur. This has meant that further consultation with Airways and CIAL on the proposed conditions has not been feasible.
- 71 Notwithstanding the above, the proposed conditions (which adopt the recommendations of the experts recommended to the Applicant by Airways) are considered sufficient to address the concerns raised. Carter Group considers that further independent review of the aeronautical study is neither practical nor necessary. Airways and CIAL will have a further opportunity to review and comment on the proposed wording of conditions under section 70 of the Act.
- 72 With these updated conditions in place, the Panel can be satisfied that the proposal will not adversely affect aerodrome operations, aviation safety, or the efficient functioning of Christchurch Airport.

### Selwyn District Council

- 73 Carter Group acknowledges the comments received from SDC.
- 74 SDC's comments relate to the Water Race that the Applicant now proposes as an open channel, incorporating culverts where vehicle access or roads are required. SDC's comments focus on:
- (a) ecological values associated with the Water Race;
  - (b) Maintenance of flow capacity; and
  - (c) Access for ongoing maintenance.
- 75 SDC's comments confirm that:

*"The minimum culvert sizing of 900mm diameter for road and vehicle crossings proposed in the amended application is considered to be sufficient to provide for flood flow capacity."*

*"The proposed placement of the culvert below the channel invert is also supported as a mechanism for ensuring fish passage past the culverts is maintained."*

*"The management and discharge of stormwater from the site via infiltration basins is supported."*

*"SDC remains open to further consultation with the applicant and is confident that a mutually beneficial outcome can be reached for this development."*

- 76 The Applicant's assessment of ecological values associated with the Water Race is addressed at paragraphs 21-23 above and in more detail in **Appendix 1** and **Appendix 13** (ecology response). For completeness, it is noted that the Applicant has confirmed that access for maintenance of the Water Race will be maintained. The Applicant will also later need to seek approval from SDC of the detailed design under the Selwyn District Council Water Race Bylaw 2008.

#### **Orion New Zealand Limited**

- 77 Carter Group acknowledges the comments received from Orion.
- 78 The comments confirm that Orion:
- (a) has capacity in the network to accommodate the initial requirement of 2MW to meet the needs of Stage 1 of the proposed development;
  - (b) is currently undertaking planned network reinforcement works that will enable Orion to support the remaining anticipated load uptake of the development; and
  - (c) will "be pleased to receive the connection applications".
- 79 Orion's comments do not raise any matters requiring further response.

#### **CONDITIONS PROPOSED BY THE APPLICANT**

- 80 In response to the comments received, the Applicant has provided an updated set of proposed conditions, comprising:
- (a) **Appendix 3:** CCC land use and subdivision conditions, and DOC wildlife approval conditions; and
  - (b) **Appendix 4:** Conditions to be administered by CRC.
- 81 As outlined in the memorandum of **Ms Dale (Appendix 1)**, the conditions have been colour-coded to indicate the level of agreement between the



Applicant and the section 53 parties. Conditions shown in **green** reflect those where no or only minimal changes have been made to the Council's section 53 conditions, and these are agreed between Carter Group and the Councils.

- 82 Conditions marked **orange** indicate changes proposed by Carter Group to address comments from section 53 parties (including CIAL and Airways). For clarity, it is noted that any changes to CRC conditions have subsequently been agreed between CRC and the Applicant.
- 83 Conditions in **red** represent recommended provisions that Carter Group does not agree to, where deletion is not sought, an alternative wording has been proposed.
- 84 For conditions marked orange and red, further explanation is provided in the tables and in the expert reports attached to this response.

## **STATUTORY TESTS UNDER THE FTAA**

- 85 The purpose of the next section is to assist the Panel in making its determination under the FTAA in light of the comments received.

### **Overarching principles and legal framework**

- 86 The starting point for assessing any application under the FTAA is its overarching purpose:<sup>6</sup>

*... to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure and development projects with significant regional or national benefits.*

- 87 For substantive applications, the relevant provisions of the FTAA are sections 81 to 85.

- 88 Section 81(2) sets out the following requirements:

*(2) For the purpose of making the decision, the panel-*

*(a) must consider the substantive application and any advice, report, comment, or other information received by the panel under section 51, 52, 53, 55, 58, 67, 68, 69, 70, 72, or 90:*

---

<sup>6</sup> Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, section 3.

*(b) must apply the applicable clauses set out in subsection (3) (see those clauses in relation to the weight to be given to the purpose of this Act when making the decision):*

*(c) must comply with section 82, if applicable:*

*(d) must comply with section 83 in setting conditions:*

*(e) may impose conditions under section 84:*

*(f) may decline the approval only in accordance with section 85.*

- 89 Under section 81(2)(a) the Panel is required to consider a range of information, including advice and reports from parties invited to comment under section 53 and the Applicant's response provided under section 55.
- 90 In terms of subsection (2)(b), “applicable clauses” are discussed in detail under the headings below.
- 91 Subclause (2)(d) confirms that the Panel must also comply with section 83 when setting conditions. Condition setting under the FTAA is discussed in more detail at paragraphs 110-113 below.
- 92 Importantly, subsection (2)(f) provides that the Panel “*may decline the approval only in accordance with section 85.*” After discussing the applicable clauses, this memorandum applies the test under section 85.
- 93 For completeness it is also noted that subsections (2)(c) or (2)(f) are not applicable in this case.

### **Criteria and Assessment for the approvals sought**

- 94 The substantive application seeks approvals for:
- (a) various resource consents under the RMA; and
  - (b) a wildlife approval under the Wildlife Act 1953 (**Wildlife Act**).
- 95 We address each in turn.

### *Criteria and assessment of resource consent approvals*

- 96 Section 81(3)(a) identifies the applicable clauses for a Panel's decision-making on approvals for resource consents as clauses 17 to 22 of Schedule

5.<sup>7</sup> Clause 17 of Schedule 5 sets out the criteria and other matters for assessment of a consent application. It provides:

***17 Criteria and other matters for assessment of consent application***

*(1) For the purposes of section 81, when considering a consent application, including conditions in accordance with clauses 18 and 19, **the panel must take into account, giving the greatest weight to paragraph (a),—***

***(a) the purpose of this Act;** and*

*(b) the provisions of Parts 2, 3, 6, and 8 to 10 of the Resource Management Act 1991 that direct decision making on an application for a resource consent (but excluding section 104D of that Act); and*

*(c) the relevant provisions of any other legislation that directs decision making under the Resource Management Act 1991.*

***[our emphasis]***

- 97 As noted at paragraphs 25-27 above, clause 17(1) of Schedule 5 requires decision-makers to “take into account” provisions of the RMA that guide resource consent decisions. Accordingly, RMA plans and policies remain relevant and mandatory considerations under the FTAA. However, under the FTAA there is no obligation to “give effect to” these provisions or to apply policies and plans in the same way as would ordinarily be required under the RMA. This framework provides Panels with broad discretion to depart from policies that would otherwise constrain decision-making under the RMA, enabling decisions to be made in accordance with the FTAA’s purpose: to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure and development projects with significant regional or national benefits.

***Criteria and assessment of wildlife permit approvals***

- 98 Section 82(3)(i) identifies the applicable clauses for Panel’s decision-making criteria for wildlife approvals as clauses 5 and 6 of Schedule 7. Clause 5 provides that:

---

<sup>7</sup> It is noted that clauses 19 to 22 do not apply here, as they relate to other types of resource consents not sought by the Applicant.

## 5 Criteria for assessment of application for wildlife approval

For the purposes of section 81, when considering an application for a wildlife approval, including conditions under clause 6, **the panel must take into account, giving the greatest weight to paragraph (a),—**

**(a) the purpose of this Act;** and

(b) the purpose of the Wildlife Act 1953 and the effects of the project on the protected wildlife that is to be covered by the approval; and

(c) information and requirements relating to the protected wildlife that is to be covered by the approval (including, as the case may be, in the New Zealand Threat Classification System or any relevant international conservation agreement).

**[our emphasis]**

### Panel must give the greatest weight to the purpose of the FTAA

99 Both clause 17(1)(a) of Schedule 5 (resource consents) and clause 5(1)(a) of Schedule 7 (wildlife approvals) require the Panel to give the greatest weight to the purpose of the FTAA. It is critical to note that this purpose is fundamentally different from that of the RMA or the Wildlife Act.

100 Parliament's intention for decision making by expert panel was stated in the Legislative Statement accompanying the Bill:<sup>8</sup>

*The purpose and provisions of the Bill will take primacy over other legislation in decision making. This means that approvals can be granted despite other legislation not allowing them, such as, projects that are prohibited activities or those which are inconsistent with RMA National Direction. This approach is intended to ensure key infrastructure and other development projects with significant benefits for communities are not declined where the benefit of approving the project outweighs any issue identified.*

101 In this context, the Act prioritises enabling projects that deliver substantial regional or national benefits, even where other considerations might ordinarily weigh against approval. The statutory purpose must therefore inform and shape the interpretation of all provisions within the FTAA.

---

<sup>8</sup> Legislative Statement for Fast-Track Approvals Bill (7 March 2024) at [17].

## SECTION 85 – WHEN A PANEL MAY DECLINE APPROVAL

102 For ease of reference, the following section references summary tables that have been prepared to assist the Panel in its assessment under section 85. These tables are provided in **Attachment 2** and include:

- (a) **Table 1** – *Summary of potential adverse impacts identified by the Applicant and parties invited to comment under section 53 (before conditions or modifications);*
- (b) **Table 2** – *Summary of proposed conditions and modifications intended to address those impacts; and*
- (c) **Table 3** – *Comparison of potential impacts (after mitigation) against the projects regional benefits.*

103 As noted above, section 81(2)(f) provides that a Panel “may decline the approval only in accordance with section 85”.<sup>9</sup>

104 The circumstances in which an approval must be declined are set out in subsections 85(1) and (2). None of these mandatory grounds apply here.

105 Beyond these mandatory grounds, section 85(3) provides that an approval may be declined if, after complying with section 81(2), the panel forms the view that:<sup>10</sup>

- (a) *there are 1 or more adverse impacts in relation to the approval sought; and*
- (b) *those adverse impacts are sufficiently significant to be out of proportion to the project’s regional or national benefits that the panel has considered under section 81(4), even after taking into account—*
  - (i) *any conditions that the panel may set in relation to those adverse impacts; and*
  - (ii) *any conditions or modifications that the applicant may agree to or propose to avoid, remedy, mitigate, offset, or compensate for those adverse impacts.*

---

<sup>9</sup> Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, s 85(2)(f).

<sup>10</sup> Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, s 85(3).

- 106 The term “adverse impact” is defined broadly in section 85(5) “as any matter considered by the panel in complying with section 81(2) that weighs against granting the approval.”<sup>11</sup>
- 107 **Table 1** of Attachment A provides a summary of the potential adverse impacts identified by the Applicant and by parties invited to comment under section 53 of the Act. These impacts are presented in their unmitigated form, that is, prior to considering any conditions or modifications intended to avoid, remedy, mitigate, offset, or compensate for those impacts, and before accounting for the project’s benefits.
- 108 Carter Group’s response to matters raised in written comments under section 53 includes a range of proposed conditions and modifications intended to avoid, remedy, mitigate, offset, or compensate for adverse impacts identified in those comments.
- 109 **Table 2** summarises the proposed conditions and modifications proposed by the Applicant to address the potential adverse impacts identified in Table 1. It also shows the overall potential impact after the mitigation measures are applied, showing where effects are neutralised or result in a no more than minor impact. In addition, Table 2 identifies whether the Applicant has obtained express agreement from the relevant parties (including those invited to comment) on the proposed conditions or modifications. It is noted that the section 53 parties will be provided a further opportunity to comment on conditions when Panel seeks comment on draft conditions prior to granting approval under section 70.

### **Condition setting under the FTAA**

- 110 When setting conditions, the Panel must ensure that conditions comply with section 83 of the FTAA.<sup>12</sup> For ease of reference, section 83 is set out below:

#### ***83 Conditions must be no more onerous than necessary***

*When exercising a discretion to set a condition under this Act, the 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.*

- 111 The Applicant considers that the conditions proposed in **Appendix 3** and **Appendix 4** comply with section 83. These conditions have been carefully

---

<sup>11</sup> Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, s 85(5).

<sup>12</sup> Section 81(2)(d)

drafted to address the relevant effects identified by the section 53 parties, without imposing obligations that exceed what is reasonably required under the Act.

- 112 In the Applicant's view, the conditions recommended by CCC that are not agreed (identified in red) go further than is reasonably necessary to manage the adverse effects they seek to address. As a result, they impose obligations that are more onerous than required and do not comply with section 83.
- 113 It is also noted that section 70 provides a further opportunity for parties to comment on draft conditions before any approval is granted. Specifically, before deciding whether to grant an approval, the Panel must direct the EPA to provide a copy of its draft conditions and invite comment from the Applicant, all persons or groups that submitted comments under section 35 or 53, and any local authority or other body with statutory responsibility for enforcing or monitoring compliance with the conditions.

## **BENEFITS OF THE RYANS ROAD INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPEMNT**

### *Schedule 2 Listing*

- 114 The Project was chosen to be listed in Schedule 2 of the FTAA. The listing confirms that the Project has already been identified by Parliament as delivering significant regional or national benefits.
- 115 The Fast-Track Projects Advisory Group (**Advisory Group**) was established to provide independent advice to Ministers on projects to be included in Schedule 2 of the Bill. The Advisory Group was tasked to:<sup>13</sup>
- (a) determine if projects meet the purpose of the Bill (as introduced);
  - (b) confirm eligibility under process under Clause 17; and
  - (c) recommend projects for inclusion in Schedule 2, Part A and Part B.
- 116 In its initial eligibility assessment, the Ministry for the Environment reported to the Advisory Group that the Ryans Road Industrial Development Project would provide significant regional benefits.<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Ministry for the Environment and Ministry for Business Innovation and Employment [Briefing: Fast-Track Approvals \(Listed Projects\) – Options for Ministers](#) (24 July 2024) at [5].

<sup>14</sup> Ministry for the Environment [FTA#331: Application for listed project under the Fast-track Approvals Bill - Ryans Road Industrial Development Project for Schedule 2A](#) (5 July 2024).

- 117 In its report to Ministers, the Advisory Group ranked all Part 2A projects by sector (priority levels 1–5). The Ryans Road Industrial Development was placed in Priority Group two by the advisory group.<sup>15</sup>
- 118 On 6 October 2024, the Ministers publicly announced the listing of the Ryans Road Industrial Development Project within Schedule 2, confirming that the Project was one of 149 projects selected by Government to have significant regional or national benefits
- 119 Accordingly, in becoming a listed project, the Government had to be (and was) satisfied the Ryans Road Industrial Development Project could deliver significant regional benefits.
- 120 The listing itself is compelling evidence of the significant regional benefits. It would be difficult to reconcile a finding on a substantive application that the Project lacks the requisite benefits when it has already passed the “significant benefits” test for listing.

#### *Supporting comments*

- 121 The regional significance of the Project is further confirmed by **Mr Akehurst** who prepared an Economic Assessment in support of the Application (**Appendix 20** to the application).<sup>16</sup>
- 122 The significance of the Project appears to be broadly accepted by parties invited to comment under section 53, including the Minister for the South Island and Minister for Regional Development. The comments of the Ministers further confirm that “the project will deliver significant regional economic benefit.”<sup>17</sup>
- 123 CCC also accept that the net regional benefits “will be significant, and granting the approval sought would facilitate the delivery of a development project with regional benefits.”<sup>18</sup> However, CCC notes that these net economic benefits “*are not well-quantified*” in the absence of a formal cost–benefit analysis.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> Fast-track Projects Advisory Group [Report to Ministers](#) (2 August 2024).

<sup>16</sup> Greg Akehurst Economic Assessment – 104 Ryans Rd Industrial Development (11 March 2025).

<sup>17</sup> Minister for the South Island *Section 53 comment on the Ryans Road Industrial Development* (9 September 2025).

<sup>18</sup> Christchurch City Council *Section 53 comment on the Ryans Road Industrial Development* (15 September 2025) at [316].

<sup>19</sup> Christchurch City Council *Section 53 comment on the Ryans Road Industrial Development* (15 September 2025) at [46] and [316].



*Mr Akehurst's response*

- 124 In response to CCC's observations regarding economic benefits, **Mr Akehurst** prepared an additional memorandum submitted with this response to section 53 comment (**Appendix 20**) (**Mr Akehurst's Memorandum**) addressing these concerns.<sup>20</sup> Mr Akehurst's Memorandum responds to Formative Limited's peer review and CCC's Growth Model, clarifies terminology, revisits the Business Development Capacity Assessment 2023 results, and compares these with CCC's latest demand projections.
- 125 On transfer effects, Mr Akehurst confirms that while some relocation may occur, developer-funded infrastructure, development contributions, and future rates revenue will cover capital and servicing costs. From a cost-benefit perspective, infrastructure provision is fiscally neutral meaning costs are internalised and not imposed on ratepayers. Net economic benefits from Ryans Road therefore represent a genuine gain to the regional economy.
- 126 Mr Akehurst's Memorandum confirms that the Ryans Road Industrial Development will deliver "*substantial economic benefits for both the Christchurch and Canterbury economies*". At its core, the proposal addresses a critical shortage of freehold, serviced industrial land in the Airport submarket, which is currently dominated by leasehold tenure and constrained by zoning limitations. This shortage has been confirmed by updated CCC projections. By providing 55.5 hectares of strategically located land adjacent to Christchurch International Airport and State Highway 1, the development will "enhances flexibility, ownership certainty, and competition, supporting a more efficient and responsive industrial land market in line with the NPS-UD objective of maintaining a well-functioning urban environment."<sup>21</sup>
- 127 Mr Akehurst confirms that economic benefits of the proposal are significant. In particular:<sup>22</sup>

*The construction-phase benefits reflect a significant short-term stimulus, with an estimated \$348 million in total output supporting around 2,070 FTE jobs and contributing approximately \$263 million in value added to the*

---

<sup>20</sup> Greg Akehurst, Ryans Road Industrial Development - Reply to CCC (21 October 2025) (**Appendix 20**).

<sup>21</sup> Greg Akehurst, Ryans Road Industrial Development - Reply to CCC (21 October 2025) (**Appendix 20**) at page 22.

<sup>22</sup> Mr Akehurst, Ryans Road Industrial Development - Reply to CCC (21 October 2025) (**Appendix 20**) at page 22.

*Christchurch economy during the build period. Once operational, the development will sustain around 3,200 FTEs annually and contribute roughly \$321 million per year to regional GDP, reflecting the ongoing productivity and employment benefits generated by the site.*

- 128 Beyond these quantified impacts, Mr Akehurst confirms that the proposal delivers important qualitative benefits. For example, the project enhances land market efficiency by introducing freehold, serviced lots into a submarket where such options are scarce, improving competition, choice, and ownership certainty. Its strategic location reduces freight distances and vehicle kilometres travelled, lowering transport-related emissions and logistics costs while leveraging existing infrastructure to avoid major public investment. The development also strengthens regional resilience and economic diversification by providing modern, flexible industrial land for logistics, manufacturing, and export-oriented firms.

#### **COMPARISON OF ADVERSE IMPACTS (AFTER MITIGATION) AGAINST THE PROJECT'S REGIONAL OR NATIONAL BENEFITS**

- 129 **Table 3** compares the remaining adverse impacts after taking into account conditions or modifications that the Applicant proposes to avoid, remedy, mitigate, offset or compensate for those adverse impacts against the projects regional or national benefits.
- 130 The right-hand column includes a summary of the benefits of the Project as set out in the reply of **Mr Akehurst (Appendix 20)**.
- 131 The left-hand column of **Table 3** identifies the remaining adverse effects (i.e., excluding those listed in Table 2 as neutral or no more than minor). The Applicant considers that any other adverse effects not included in Table 3 are appropriately managed through the updated conditions in **Appendix 3** (CCC land use and subdivision conditions and DOC wildlife approval conditions) and **Appendix 4** (CRC conditions). Accordingly, these effects should not weigh against granting the proposal under section 85.
- 132 Pedestrian and cyclist safety and convenience (arising from limited pedestrian options within the development area and restricted cyclist access to the site) has been identified as a remaining adverse effect. However, this effect is assessed as minor. Traffic safety and capacity effects have otherwise been addressed through design modifications and the proposed consent conditions.
- 133 With regards to aircraft safety, all adverse impacts can be managed to an acceptable (and not significant) level through design modifications and the proposed consent conditions.

134 The remaining adverse impacts that cannot be fully avoided, remedied, mitigated, offset, or compensated through modifications or consent conditions relate to the loss of HPL and rural amenity (rural and landscape effects). These impacts are assessed in **Mr Akehurst's** Response which includes a cost-benefit analysis of the Project:<sup>23</sup>

- (a) The loss of rural amenity is considered "*small relative to Canterbury's overall agricultural base*"; and
- (b) In relation to the loss of HPL, Mr Akehurst concludes that "*the measurable economic benefits of the proposal vastly outweigh the direct economic costs.*" The forgone value added is estimated at between \$0.16 million and \$0.42 million per year, which Mr Akehurst considers a "*negligible amount when compared with the scale of regional industrial benefits.*"

135 Overall, Mr Akehurst concludes that:<sup>24</sup>

*While the site's Class 1 and 2 soils are highly productive, the overall scale of agricultural loss is minor in the regional context, representing only a small fraction of Canterbury's total agricultural output. The transition of this land from farming to industrial use is appropriate in light of its strategic urban fringe location and proximity to major infrastructure. When considered against the enduring employment, productivity, and market-efficiency benefits generated by the development, the economic opportunity cost of maintaining the site in agricultural use is minimal.*

**Taken together, the Ryans Road development delivers large, sustained, and well-distributed benefits, both quantified and qualitative. The limited adverse effects are not out of proportion to these gains.**

**In accordance with section 85(3)(b) of the FTAA, the overall cost-benefit balance clearly demonstrates that the proposal will make a net positive contribution to Christchurch's economy, infrastructure efficiency, and environmental performance.**

**[our emphasis]**

---

<sup>23</sup> Mr Akehurst, Ryans Road Industrial Development - Reply to CCC (21 October 2025) (**Appendix 20**) at page 22.

<sup>24</sup> Mr Akehurst, Ryans Road Industrial Development - Reply to CCC (21 October 2025) (**Appendix 20**) at pages 23-23.

136 Accordingly, the Applicant considers that there is no realistic basis for the Panel to conclude that any remaining effects could be regarded as “*sufficiently out of all proportion to the regional or national benefits*” of the Project.


137 The Project’s regional and national benefits decisively outweigh any potential adverse impacts. On that basis, the Panel should grant the approvals sought.

### **Conclusion**

138 The Applicant acknowledges the comments received made by section 53 parties and has carefully considered all matters raised.

139 A comprehensive and detailed response to each matter raised is provided in the reports attached to this memorandum (see **Attachment 1** for the full list).

Dated 28 November 2025

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jo Appleyard', written over a horizontal line.

Jo Appleyard / Meg Davidson  
Counsel for the Applicant

## **ATTACHMENT 1 - Ryans Road Industrial Development - section 55 response**

### **Appendices list**

- i. **Appendix 1:** Clare Dale, Novo Group, Planning Memo Response (Transport, Three Water Infrastructure, Water Quality, Bird strike, Ecology (freshwater and vegetation), Herpetology, Landscape and Visual Amenity and CCC/ DOC/ CRC conditions).
- ii. **Appendix 2:** Jeremy Phillips, Novo Group, Planning Memo Response (Aviation Safety, NPS-UD, NPS-HPL and Economic Benefits).
- iii. **Appendix 3:** Applicant proposed CCC (Land use and Subdivision) and DOC (Wildlife Approval) Conditions
- iv. **Appendix 4:** Applicant proposed CRC Conditions (and email from CRC agreeing conditions).
- v. **Appendix 5:** Capture Land Development and DCM Urban, Updated Plan Set for Approval
- vi. **Appendix 6:** Tom Lemon, Capture Land Development, Civil Engineering Memo
- vii. **Appendix 7:** Nick Fuller, Novo Group, Transport Memo Response
- viii. **Appendix 8:** Tom Lemon, Capture Land Development, Construction Management Plan
- ix. **Appendix 9:** Eoghan O'Neill, PDP, Stormwater Memo Response
- x. **Appendix 10:** Tom Garden, PDP, Water Quality Response Memo
- xi. **Appendix 11:** Lizzie Civil, PDP, Bird Strike Memo Response
- xii. **Appendix 12:** Lizzie Civil, PDP, Draft Wildlife Hazard Management Plan
- xiii. **Appendix 13:** Jarred Arthur, PDP, Ecology Memo Response
- xiv. **Appendix 14:** Lachie Davidge, PDP, Lizard Management Plan
- xv. **Appendix 15:** Hannah Bruere, DCM, Landscape and Visual Response Memo
- xvi. **Appendix 16:** Hannah Bruere, DCM, Landscape and Visual Graphic Supplement
- xvii. **Appendix 17:** L+R Airport Consulting, Christchurch International Airport Safeguarding Assessment
- xviii. **Appendix 18:** Cyrrus Limited, Technical Safeguarding Assessment of Air Navigation Equipment, Ryans Road Industrial Development, Christchurch.

- xix. **Appendix 19:** Navigatus, Ryans Road Industrial Development Aviation Safeguarding Assessment
- xx. **Appendix 20:** Market Economics Limited, Reply to CCC Comments on Economic Matters.

## ATTACHMENT 2: Summary for section 85(3) evaluation

Table 1. Potential adverse impacts (before conditions or modifications proposed in the application or the s55 response )	
1.	<b>Loss of agricultural production / Highly Productive Land (LUC 2):</b> Reduction in the area of productive rural land around Christchurch International Airport due to the conversion of 55.5 ha of LUC 2 land to industrial use displaces agricultural activity generating ~\$0.16–0.42 million p.a. in value added.
2.	<b>Loss of rural amenity (Landscape and visual amenity effects):</b> Effects on the landscape character and rural values of the area due to the change in land use.
3.	<b>Aviation Safety:</b> Impact on the provision and navigational and surveillance equipment and services used by aircraft. Effects on Christchurch Airport including impacts relating to CO2/20 Approach Lighting system, Helicopter flight paths, protection surfaces, runway end protection area, lighting, building generated windshear and turbulence (BGWT) and reverse sensitivity.
4.	<b>Bird Strike risk:</b> Potential for increased bird strike risk due to the development.
5.	<b>Loss of lizard values associated with the site:</b> Removal of habitats and site works (e.g., earthworks) may cause adverse effects on native lizards in the area.
6.	<b>Transport:</b> Potential adverse impacts due to the operation of the site prior to the upgrade of the Pound Road / Ryans Road intersection and the reduction of speed limits along the Ryans Road and Grays Road frontages, and the provision of footpaths and shared paths.
7.	<b>Three Waters Infrastructure:</b> Adverse impacts due uncertainty in proposal (i.e. stormwater design).
8.	<b>Water quality:</b> Potential adverse impacts due to distance to groundwater beneath the proposed soak pits.
9.	<b>Contamination:</b> Potential adverse impacts relating to contaminated land due to potential HAIL activities occurring at site and the presence of contaminants above background concentrations.
10.	<b>Freshwater Ecology:</b> Potential effects of the development on the ecological values of Paparua Water Race.
11.	<b>Indigenous Vegetation effects:</b> Potential effects on Geranium retrorsum.

**Table 2. Summary of proposed conditions or modifications to address potential adverse effects**

Impact		Conditions or modifications that the Applicant proposes avoid, remedy, mitigate, offset, or compensate for those adverse impacts	*Potential Impact			Reference	Agreed between the Applicant and relevant s 53 parties?
			+	O	-		
<b>Loss of agricultural production / HPL</b>	<b>1.</b>	N/A			-	<b>Appendix 20</b> – Market Economic Limited, reply to CCC comments	CCC and Applicant agree that site is subject to permanent or long-term constraints, and subdivision, use, or development is permitted under clause 3.10 of the NPS-HPL.
<b>Loss in rural amenity (Landscape and visual effects)</b>	<b>2.</b>	<p>The landscape and visual effects of the proposed industrial subdivision are assessed to be low-moderate (minor), with moderate effects on residents directly adjacent to the site (more than minor, but not significant).</p> <p>Several conditions are proposed to mitigate landscape and visual effects.</p>			-	<p><b>Appendix 20</b> – Market Economics Limited, reply to CCC comments</p> <p><b>Appendix 15</b> - Landscape and Visual Response (Hannah Bruere (DCM))</p> <p><b>Appendix 16</b> - Landscape and Visual Graphic Supplement (Hannah Bruere (DCM))</p> <p>Landscape and Visual Assessment (7 March</p>	While some conditions proposed by CCC have been accepted, there is not full agreement between the Applicant and the Council on the conditions relating to landscape and visual effects



						2025) Appendix 11 to the Application	
<b>Aviation Safety</b>	<b>3.</b>	<p>Potential adverse impacts <b>mitigated and will be minor (at most) and acceptable</b> through modifications and updated consent conditions.</p> <p>Aeronautical safeguarding study prepared at Airways / CIAL request, recommendations implemented through modifications and consent conditions to avoid impacts on navigation and surveillance systems.</p>			-	<p><b>Appendix 18</b> Cyrrus – Technical Safeguarding Assessment of Air Navigation Equipment</p> <p><b>Appendix 19</b> Navigatus Consulting Aviation Safeguarding Assessment</p> <p><b>Appendix 17</b> L&amp;R Airport Consulting, Christchurch International Airport Safeguarding Assessment</p> <p><b>Appendix 2</b> – Memorandum of Mr Jeremy Phillips</p>	Airways and CIAL yet to confirm agreement with updated conditions. <sup>1</sup>
<b>Bird Strike risk</b>	<b>4.</b>	<p>Potential adverse effects <b>mitigated and managed</b> through updated consent conditions and draft Wildlife Hazard Management Plan and mitigation measures including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Stormwater design and drainage;</li> <li>▪ Landscape planting and Vegetation Management;</li> <li>▪ Construction and Earthworks Management</li> </ul>			O	<p><b>Appendix 11</b> - Wildlife Hazard Management Plan response (Lizzie Civil (PDP))</p> <p><b>Appendix 12</b> - draft Wildlife Hazard Management Plan</p> <p><b>Appendix 9</b> - Stormwater response (Eoghan O'Niell (PDP))</p>	Airways and CIAL yet to confirm agreement with updated conditions.

<sup>1</sup> Under section 70, the Panel is required to invite comments from all persons who previously provided comments on the application prior to granting approval, meaning the section 53 parties will have a further opportunity to respond to the conditions proposed by the Applicant.

Lizard values	5.	The <b>actual and potential effects managed</b> by the Lizard Management Plan and the condition set agreed with DOC.		O	<p><b>Appendix 13</b> Ecology Response (Jarred Arthur (PDP)) dated 20 November 2025.</p> <p><b>Appendix 14</b> Revised Lizard Management Plan dated 19 November 2025</p>	The LMP and associated conditions are agreed between the Applicant and DOC (with exception of two minor points of clarification).
Transport	6.	<p><b>Modifications and amendments to the conditions will mitigate potential adverse effects and ensure that the proposed activity will have acceptable and no more than minor effects</b> on safety and capacity at the SH1/SH73 intersection, the SH73/Pound Road intersection, and, to a lesser extent, the Pound Road/Ryans Road intersection.</p> <p>Any potential adverse transport effects are limited to pedestrian and cycle safety and convenience and are assessed as <b>minor</b> and <b>not significant</b>.</p>		O	<p>Integrated Traffic Assessment (6 March 2025) Appendix 10 to the AEE</p> <p><b>Appendix 7</b> Transport response (Nick Fuller (Novo Group))</p> <p>- <b>Appendix 1</b> – Memorandum of Clare Dale (Novo Group)</p>	Areas of disagreement between CCC and the Applicant regarding appropriate conditions.
Three waters infrastructure	7.	<b>Modifications and amendments to conditions mitigate potential adverse effects</b> noting that treatment and storage of runoff will now be managed by a Stormwater360 Filterra Bioscape and Soak Pit system.		O	<p><b>Appendix 9</b> Stormwater response (Eoghan O'Niell (PDP))</p> <p><b>Appendix 5</b> Capture Land Development Plans</p>	<p>CCC and the Applicant has agreed to a set out conditions on relation to stormwater.</p> <p>Waste water and water supply conditions also agreed.</p>

Water Quality	8.	<b>Modifications and amendments to conditions mitigate potential adverse effects</b> noting that the detailed assessment of historical and site-specific groundwater levels show that proposed stormwater soak pit system is unlikely to pose a significant contamination risk to downgradient drinking water supply bores, and the design and placement of soak pits are considered appropriate and protective of groundwater quality.		O	Appendix 10 Water Quality Response (Tom Garden (PDP))	Conditions in relation to water quality fully agreed between CRC and the Applicant.
Contamination	9.	Contaminated soils can be <b>appropriately managed</b> by standard practices (including the development of a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) for the site outlining the remediation requirements) and any risk to human health or in regard to runoff to waterways are <b>less than minor and acceptable</b> .		O	Detailed Site Investigation (Tetra Tech) attached as Appendix 6 to the Application  Appendix 1 – Memorandum of Clare Dale (Novo Group)	Full agreement between the Applicant, CRC and CCC
Freshwater Ecology	10.	<b>Modifications and amendments to conditions mitigate potential adverse effects</b> of the development on the Paparua Water Race now proposes as an open channel, incorporating culverts where vehicle access or roads are required.  Further survey works and the provision of detailed design level drawing for the proposed culverts now included in the conditions.		O	Appendix 13 - Ecology response (Jarred Arthur (PDP))	Applicant and CRC are generally in agreement on the proposed and associated conditions.  The considers the additional requirements proposed by CCC to be unnecessary.
Indigenous vegetation effects	11.	Any effects on indigenous vegetation in are <b>appropriately managed and less than minor</b> - Re-drafted the Geranium retrorsum conditions that provide that geraniums are monitored and maintained in		O	Appendix 13 – Ecology response (Jarred Arthur (PDP))	Full agreement between the Applicant and CRC.

		accordance with other landscape plantings at the site, given that the indigenous plants will form part of the overall landscaping palette.				Appendix 4 – Updated Regional Council Conditions  <b>Appendix 1 –</b> Memorandum of Clare Dale	
--	--	--	--	--	--	---	--

<b>*Key for Table 2</b>		
<i>Potential impact (after considering avoidance, remediation, mitigation, offsetting or compensation measures)</i>	+	Positive Impact
	O	Neutral/no more than minor impact
	-	Negative Impact

**Table 3. Summary for section 85(3) evaluation**

**Comparison of adverse impacts after taking into account conditions or modifications that the applicant proposes avoid, remedy, mitigate, offset, or compensate for those adverse impacts against the projects regional or national benefits**

**Remaining adverse impacts** (after taking into account conditions or modifications that the applicant proposes avoid, remedy, mitigate, offset, or compensate for those adverse impacts)

**Regional benefits of the Ryans Road Industrial Development** (as set out in the reply of Greg Akehurst (Market Economics) dated 31 October 2025 (**Appendix 20**))

- 1. Loss of Agricultural Production (Highly Productive Land (LUC 2):** Conversion of 55.5 ha of LUC 2 land to industrial use displaces agricultural activity generating ~\$0.16–0.42 million p.a. in value added.
- 2. Loss of rural amenity:** Reduction rural character and amenity for adjoining neighbours .
- 3. Pedestrian and cyclist safety and convenience:** Limited options for pedestrians within the development area and cyclists accessing the site (noting that this a limited minor effect, safety and capacity effects have otherwise been mitigated through modifications and conditions)
- 4. Aviation Safety and aerodrome operations:** minor at most and acceptable (and not significant) effects on the environment

- 1. Construction phase benefits:** construction of industrial buildings and supporting infrastructure generates significant one-off benefits through direct, indirect, and induced activity. The project supports approximately 2,070 FTEs and contributes around \$263 million to Christchurch GDP.
- 2. Operational Phase benefits:** Once developed and fully occupied, ongoing business operations will sustain around 3,300 FTEs annually and contribute approximately \$320 million per year to regional GDP.
- 3. Land Market Efficiency:** Increased supply of freehold, serviced industrial land in a constrained sub-market, improving competition, choice, and responsiveness within the Christchurch industrial land market
- 4. Urban Function and Spatial Efficiency:** Reinforces a strategic industrial node within the Airport environs, consistent with UDS and NPS-UD objectives for a well-functioning, consolidated urban form.
- 5. Resilience and Economic Diversification:** Supports regional resilience by providing modern, flexible industrial land for logistics, manufacturing, and export-oriented firms.

	<p><b>6. Transport Outcomes and Emissions:</b> co-location near SH1 and Christchurch Airport reduces average travel distances for freight and employees, lowering vehicle-kilometres travelled (VKT) and associated emissions per unit of output. Incorporation of EV-ready infrastructure and potential mode-shift measures further enhance long-term sustainability</p> <p><b>7. Infrastructure efficiency:</b> The development leverages existing transport and servicing infrastructure (Ryans and Grays Roads, and nearby water/wastewater networks), minimising the need for major new public investment. Development contributions and rates are expected to fully cover local infrastructure costs, avoiding cross-subsidy from the wider community.</p>
--	--