
MINUTE 6 OF THE EXPERT PANEL

Invitation to comment

Ryans Road Industrial Area [FTAA-2504-1054]

(10 December 2025)

[1] The Panel issued Minute 3 (18 August 2025) inviting comments on the application under section 53 of the Fast-track Approvals act 2015 (FTAA). Parties from whom comments were invited under section 53(2) of the FTAA were listed in Appendices 1, 2 and 3 of that Minute. Appendix 4 listed the parties invited to comment under section 53(3) of the FTAA, and Appendix 5 provided additional questions directed to those parties. Comments were received by 15 September 2025.

[2] Following a request by the Applicant, the timeframe to receive the Applicant's response to comments was extended (Minute 4 – 24 September 2025). Processing of the application resumed at the request of the Applicant on 1 December 2025 (Minute 5), at which time the Applicant's responses had been received (Applicant's response).

[3] The purpose of this Minute is to request further information, under section 67 FTAA, to support an appropriately informed decision by the Panel with respect to specific potential adverse effects of the proposed activity.

[4] After reviewing the Applicant's response, the Panel requests the Airways Corporation of New Zealand (Airways), Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL), New Zealand Transport Agency, Christchurch City Council and Canterbury Regional Council provide the information specified in Appendix 1.

[5] Subject to responses received to this request, the Panel may pursue additional options to advance and refine any critical issues of disagreement

between parties. These may include caucusing, expert peer review, mediation and / or a hearing limited to particular issue(s).

[6] After receipt of the response to this request for further information, and prior to finalising the Panel's decision, further opportunity to review and comment on the Panel's draft conditions will be provided under section 70 FTAA.

[7] In accordance with section 67 FTAA, the information requested by this Minute must be received by the Environmental Protection Authority no later than **5pm on Thursday 18 December 2025**.

[8] Responses must be made to the EPA:

- (a) By email to substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz;
- (b) [By post to Private Bag 63002, Wellington 6149, New Zealand; or](#)
- (c) In person to Stewart Dawson's Corner, 366 Lambton Quay, Wellington 6011.



Chris Fowler
Expert Panel Chair

Appendix 1

Information requested under 67 FTAA

Airways Corporation of New Zealand (Airways) and Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)

Airways Corporation of New Zealand (Airways) and Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL) are requested to individually and separately respond to the following request for information.

The following safeguarding assessments were provided with the Applicant's response (collectively referred to as the safeguarding assessments):

- 'Technical Safeguarding Assessment of Air Navigation Equipment Report' (Appendix 18), prepared by Cyrrus (Cyrrus Report).
- 'Aviation Safeguarding Assessment' (Appendix 19), prepared by Navigatus (Navigatus Report).
- 'Christchurch International Airport Safeguarding Assessment' (Appendix 17), prepared by L&R Airport Consulting (L&R Report).

The Panel understands that the technical providers of the Cyrrus Report and the Navigatus Report are recognised experts and have been recommended by Airways. Please advise whether this is correct and also whether any further technical assessments or peer review(s) are considered necessary to assess safeguarding of the Christchurch Airport including Garden City Helicopters heliport from potential adverse effects of the proposal.

In relation to the above safeguarding assessments, and the various other assessments included in the Applicant's response relating to aviation safety matters, please provide commentary on the conclusions of these assessments.

Without limiting the above, please provide comment on whether there are any major uncertainties or information gaps influencing confidence in predictions about effects on aviation safety. And further, whether there are measures available to address these uncertainties or information gaps.

In relation to the conditions of consent regarding airport safety included in the Applicant's response, please provide commentary on these conditions.

Without limiting the above, please provide comment on whether the proposed mitigation and management measures specified in conditions proposed by the Applicant are adequate and appropriate to manage effects on aviation safety?

Further, do the proposed conditions ‘capture’ or include all of the measures recommended in the safeguarding assessments to address aviation safety matters? If any omissions are identified, please comment on the significance of these omissions with respect to aviation safety.

For effects that can be addressed through conditions that differ from those provided by the Applicant, please provide the particular text sought to be included shown in tracked changes from the conditions at Appendix 3 of the Applicant’s response. Brief reasons / explanations should also be provided.

The Cyrrus Report and Navigatus Report each conclude that with the adoption of recommend building height, orientation and setbacks, and other management measures, the potential effects of the proposed development on aircraft safety and associated airport operations will be ‘acceptable’. The Panel assumes that an ‘acceptable’ effect in this scenario will be an effect that will not result in any material change to the safe operation of aircraft. Conversely, an acceptable effect in another circumstance, such as construction noise in an urban environment, may be of more significant scale but of less consequence. Please include comment on the level of acceptability of the various identified effects, including whether and how they are to be managed or avoided through the consent conditions proposed by the Applicant. Specific comment is sought on the certainty of outcomes provided by the conditions.

The Planning Memo Response (Aviation Safety, NPS-UD, NPS-HPL and Economic Benefits (Appendix 2) prepared by Jeremy Phillips includes at Attachment 1 a table that provides the Applicant’s consolidated response to each airport safety topic/issue raised by CIAL’s comments on the application (Consolidated Table). Please provide an updated version of this table that includes an additional column on the right-hand side of the Consolidated Table entitled CIAL response and within that new column, in relation to each identified topic/issue, record your response as follows:

- Matters agreed and
- Matters disagreed, with concise reasons.

Christchurch City Council

Christchurch City Council (CCC) is requested to respond to the following request for information.

Please comment on the analysis and conclusions expressed by Mr Fuller (see Appendix 07: Memo: - 'FTAA-2504-1054: 104 Ryans Road, Christchurch Applicant S55 Response to Transport Comment'; prepared by Nick Fuller of Novo Group, 19 November 2025) regarding the current and future functioning of the Ryans Road / Pound Road intersection, and the need or otherwise for staging of the development and monitoring of traffic effects on that intersection.

CCC has requested that the footpath along Grays Road and Ryans Road be formed as a 2.5m wide shared path. Mr Fuller for the Applicant notes that achieving that width on Ryans Road would require significant road widening, and the opportunity to achieve that is constrained by the proposed naturalisation of the Paparua water race, which is supported by CCC. Further, he concludes that there is no known connection beyond Ryans Road that would justify a 2.5m wide shared path. Please expand on the reason for this request, including identification of any walking and cycling strategy or similar planning that indicates a future use or connection of that path to the west of the site and which justifies the 2.5m width that it is requested.

Similarly, Mr Fuller indicates that such a 2.5m width along Grays Road would not connect to other similar shared paths. Again, please expand on the reason for this request, including by reference to existing or planned improvements that would connect to such a path.

CCC has sought the undergrounding of power lines along Ryans Road. Please explain the reason for this request in terms of existing or future potential effects of the power lines on the use of the road.

New Zealand Transport Agency

The New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) is requested to respond to the following request for information.

Please consider and confirm the adequacy (or otherwise) of the Applicant's response prepared by Mr Fuller.

Please consider and comment on the conditions proposed in the Applicant's response.

Please provide any new or amended conditions that NZTA considers appropriate to address any residual concerns it may have on the potential adverse effects of the proposal on the state highway network. For effects that can be addressed through conditions that differ from those provided by the Applicant, please provide the particular text sought shown in tracked changes from the conditions at Appendices 3 & 4 of the Applicant's response. Brief reasons / explanations should also be provided.

Canterbury Regional Council and Christchurch City Council

Canterbury Regional Council (CRC) and CCC are requested to separately or collectively respond to the following request for information.

Please advise what condition mechanisms will require individual lot owners to comply with the various stormwater treatment requirements imposed by the resource consents (i.e. how will the Panel be certain that the proposed stormwater management for each lot will be implemented and enforced)?

If considered necessary, please provide any new or amended conditions considered appropriate to address this matter. The particular text sought to be included should be shown in tracked changes from the conditions at Appendices 3 & 4 of the Applicant's response, if possible. Brief reasons / explanations should also be provided