

24 February 2026

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

MEMO

TO: Dean Christie – NTP Development Holdings Limited; and
Jo Appleyard – Anderson Lloyd

FROM: Georgia Brown – Senior Planner

PROJECT REF: Pound Road Industrial Development

FTAA-2505-1057 POUND ROAD INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT RESPONSE TO MINUTE 11 INSTRUMENTS PLANNING ASSESSMENT

INTRODUCTION

1. The Panel requested via Minute 11 that the Applicant undertake an evaluation of the application against ten new or amended national direction instruments which came into effect on 15 January 2026. The request sought confirmation of the extent to which new or amended national instruments raise additional matters for assessment under the resource consent approvals applied for under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA).
2. The Panel have also sought advice on the application of these instruments to the assessment and evaluation tasks the Panel must undertake pursuant to the FTAA.
3. This memorandum is an addition to the Assessment of Planning Provisions provided in the Substantive Application 'Assessment of Environmental Effects' document prepared by Novo Group, lodged in July 2025 at paragraphs 318 – 334 and in supporting **Appendix 23** of that document.

NEW NATIONAL POLICY DIRECTION

4. The following national direction documents (new or amended) are not assessed in detail as they are not relevant considerations for this application, as described further below:
 - *Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Detached Minor Residential Units) Regulations 2025*
 - No assessment is provided as any 'residential activities' (which includes 'detached minor residential units') are specifically excluded from the proposal, including by way of a consent condition.



- *New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement Amendment 2025*
 - The site is not located in the Coastal Environment to which the policy statement applies.
 - *National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation Amendment 2025*
 - Renewable electricity generation is not proposed as part of the application, and no evidence or comments received have indicated that the proposal will have reverse sensitivity effects on existing renewable electricity generation (REG) activities.
 - *National Policy Statement for Electricity Networks Amendment 2025*
 - This Policy Statement is primarily geared towards enabling the provision of Electricity Network (EN) infrastructure. In terms of policies 11 and 12 (which address the effects of third parties' activities on EN) there is no evidence of any effects, including on safety, efficiency, operational or reverse sensitivity.
 - *National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management Amendment 2025 and the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Freshwater) Amendment Regulations 2025.*
 - In relation to the amended NPS, the conclusions in the April assessment remain relevant as the 2025 amendments largely relate to reducing compliance barriers for infrastructure and mineral extraction activities. As noted in the June planning assessment, the NES is not relevant to the application as the Paparua Water Race Network is an artificial watercourse. The proposed amendments to the NES do not change that assessment.
 - *National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity Amendment 2025*
 - The earlier assessment stands as the amendments to the NPS only relate to mineral extraction activities and are not relevant.
 - *National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land Amendment 2025*
 - The earlier assessment is still relevant as the amendments only relate to providing for mineral extraction activities and class LUC3 productive soils. The subject site has class LUC2 soils.
5. That leaves two new instruments, the National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards 2025 (NPS-NH) and the National Policy Statement for Infrastructure 2025 (NPS-I) that require further consideration in relation to the application.



NPS – NATURAL HAZARDS

6. This new National Policy Statement for Natural Hazards 2025 (NPS-NH) contains the below primary objective and six related policies:
 - *Objective: Natural hazard risk to people and property associated with subdivision use and development is managed using a risk-based proportionate approach.*
 - *Policy 1: When considering natural hazard risk associated with subdivision, use or development, the risk level must be assessed using the risk matrix.*
 - *Policy 2: Natural hazard risk associated with subdivision, use and development must be managed using an approach that is proportionate to the level of natural hazard risk.*
 - *Policy 3: Where subdivision, use or development is assessed as having very high natural hazard risk, that risk must be avoided.*
 - *Policy 4: Where subdivision, use or development, including any associated mitigation measures, will create or increase significant natural hazard risk on other sites, that risk must be avoided or mitigated using an approach that is proportionate to the level of natural hazard risk.*
 - *Policy 5: Natural hazard risk assessment and decisions must be based on the best available information and must be made even when that information is uncertain or incomplete.*
 - *Policy 6: The potential impacts of climate change to at least 100 years into the future must be considered.*
7. In summary, the overarching objective of the NPS-NH is to reduce the risk from natural hazards to people and property in a proportionate and risk-based manner, while recognising that not all natural hazard risk can be avoided.
8. The NPS-NH requires decision-makers to identify and assess natural hazard risk using a consistent likelihood and consequence framework and to manage the risk through avoidance, relocation, reduction, or acceptance, depending on the level of risk and the ability to mitigate effects.
9. Consistent with the NPS-NH, flood and liquefaction **risk** is assessed by considering both:
 - The **likelihood** of a flood/liquefaction event occurring; and
 - The **consequence** of such an event for people and property.
10. Natural hazard risks for flooding and liquefaction at the site have previously been assessed in the substantive application with expert assessments completed by:
 - Davie Lovell Smith (Todd Inness) – Infrastructure Report - June 2025 (**Appendix 12**).



- KGA Geotechnical (Jade Bromley) – Geotechnical Engineering Report – 30 June 2025 (**Appendix 5**).

11. In relation to flood hazards, Mr Inness’ earlier assessment indicates that the site is not located in any Flood Management Area of the Christchurch District Plan and any historic flooding of the site is anticipated to have been restricted to natural low areas that corresponded to old river and water course channels. There are also no known watercourses or water sources within the site that are anticipated to cause flooding. Mr Inness notes that the low areas of the site will be filled during bulk earthworks and overland flow paths will be formed within the development to ensure that secondary flow is transported to the stormwater detention and infiltration facilities.
12. Based on the expert assessment of Mr Inness and acknowledging that this was prepared prior to the NPS being in effect, the flood hazard risk at the site has been assessed as Low in accordance with the risk matrix contained in the NPS (see **Figure 1** below). It is also noted that Christchurch City Council’s (CCC) Stormwater Engineer Mr Norton has also reviewed Mr Inness’ assessment and agrees that there are no flood hazards at the site.

Figure 1: Risk matrix

		Likelihood Level						
		Almost Certain	Very Likely	Likely	Possible	Unlikely	Rare	Very Rare
ARI (years)		up to 10	10-20	20-50	50-100	100-500	500-5000	> 5000
AEP		10% or more	10% to 5%	5% to 2%	2% to 1%	1% to 0.2%	0.2% to 0.02%	< 0.02%
Consequence Level	Catastrophic	Very High	Very High	Very High	High	Medium	Medium	Medium
	Major	Very High	Very High	High	High	Medium	Medium	Medium
	Moderate	High	High	High	Medium	Medium	Low	Low
	Minor	Medium	Medium	Medium	Medium	Low	Low	Low
	Negligible	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low

Figure 1: NPS-NH Risk matrix

13. In relation to geotechnical and liquefaction hazards, Ms Bromley’s assessment states that:

The site is situated in a N/A – Rural and unmapped area as per MBIE mapping available on the NZGD and indicated as ‘liquefaction damage is unlikely’ in the ECan mapping. Based on the ground conditions encountered onsite and depth to groundwater, we consider that the site has a negligible risk of liquefaction equivalent to a TC1 site if the site was residential.

14. Further, Ms Bromley notes no erosion or inundation hazards. In terms of lateral spreading and slope stability, Ms Bromley notes that there is a defined slope extending adjacent to the northern property boundary. However, based on their observations, encountered ground conditions, depth to groundwater and negligible liquefaction risk, the risk of lateral spreading potential for the site is low.



15. In terms of the risk matrix in **Figure 1** above, it can be interpreted from Ms Bromley's assessment that the likelihood of liquefaction at the application site is low (unlikely) and that consequence level is minor / negligible given the risk of ground settlement is low and that foundation design will be considered as part of building consent processes.
16. The CCC comments from Mr Brian Norton (Stormwater), Ms Yvonne McDonald (Subdivision Engineer), and Mr Sean Ward (Planning) also concur with the assessments provided by Mr Inness and Ms Bromley, with the planning assessment concluding that any natural hazard effects will be acceptable. Mr Ward also confirms that the subject site is not covered by any natural hazard overlay in the District Plan, which he notes is unusual for Christchurch.
17. Overall, based on the above, it is considered that the application is consistent with the relevant NPS-NH objective and policies as the risk of natural hazards at the site is low.

NPS - INFRASTRUCTURE

18. The sole objective of the National Policy Statement for Infrastructure (NPS-I) is primarily directed at ensuring that infrastructure is recognised, enabled and protected so that it can deliver national, regional and local benefits.
19. Most clauses of the objective relate to accommodating or providing for infrastructure needs. Of particular relevance to the proposal is clause (d) which seeks to '*ensure infrastructure is well-functioning, resilient and compatible, as far as practicable, with other activities*'. The inclusion of the qualifier "as far as practicable" is significant, recognising that compatibility requirements are not absolute.
20. Based on the technical assessments provided, and setting aside roading infrastructure which is addressed below, the proposal will not compromise the functioning, resilience or compatibility of relevant infrastructure. Notably, the proposal will result in significant investment and improvement to three-waters infrastructure to service the development.
21. Regarding roading infrastructure, the proposal, once fully developed, will further compound the existing capacity constraints at the State Highway 1 (SH1) / Pound Road and Waterloo Road / Pound Road intersections. It is recognised that this roading infrastructure is already operating with constraints and a poor service level, and the intersections will require upgrading in the near future, regardless of the development. The proposal offers a condition to ensure that the upgrade of the intersections can occur to support the project and external transportation growth, and times the pace of development will enable time for this to occur, recognising that there is no certainty around the upgrade, given it is outside of the control of the consent holder.
22. Given the proposal will adversely affect the roading infrastructure, the proposal is not fully consistent with the overall objective of the NPS-I. However, this must be considered within the context of the existing infrastructure constraints and the proffered condition. When doing so, and recognising that the development does not physically preclude the infrastructure being upgraded to support the development and external transport growth, including the change of the rural environment to meet the diverse and changing needs of



present and future generations, the development is not considered to be inconsistent with the intent of the NPS-I.

Policy 1: Providing for the benefits of infrastructure

23. This policy requires decision-makers to recognise and provide for the benefits of infrastructure, relative to any localised adverse effects.
24. Asides roading infrastructure, the assessment of effects demonstrates that infrastructure services and the benefits of those to the community will not be compromised and that adverse effects on infrastructure are appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.
25. Clause 3 addresses risks to public safety and wellbeing where infrastructure services are compromised. As per the transport assessment, safety and efficiency risks to the State Highway network exist should the development be fully completed prior to any upgrade to the intersections occur. Therefore, the proposal is not entirely consistent with Policy 1.
26. However, the proposal 'recognises and provides' for this infrastructure and the benefits it offers, by confirming the type and feasibility of upgrade required (e.g. physical space requirements) and by allowing time for the necessary upgrades to occur. It is also necessary to 'recognise' that these intersections require an upgrade irrespective of the proposal and that the application is only adding to existing constraints.
27. Thus, whilst the proposal is not consistent with this policy, it is clearly not contrary given the existing constraints to the roading infrastructure and the extent to which the application has 'recognised and provided' for this matter.

Policy 2: Operational or functional need

28. Policy 2 recognises that infrastructure may have an operational or functional need to locate in particular environments or locations.
29. Roothing infrastructure aside, the technical assessments confirm that the proposal does not impose any unreasonable operational, functional or financial burden on infrastructure providers, nor does it impede the efficient operation of interconnected infrastructure networks. Infrastructure can continue to operate effectively and efficiently.
30. In relation to roading infrastructure, it is acknowledged that the relevant intersections are already experiencing operational inefficiencies and that capacity constraints are expected to increase over time as a result of both background traffic growth and the proposed development. It is agreed with New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) that upgrades to these intersections will be required in the future. The applicant has proposed a solution to contribute to the upgrade of the intersections and is willing to enter into a Development Agreement to fund its proportionate share. Given that the development is anticipated to contribute approximately 20% of the traffic growth affecting the intersections, the proposal is not considered to impose an unreasonable operational or financial burden on the infrastructure provider.
31. On balance the proposal is consistent with Policy 2.



Policy 3: Considering spatial planning

32. Relevant infrastructure and associated management regimes are identified in applicable spatial plans and infrastructure documents. These have been taken into account through the technical assessments.
33. Notably, Policy 3 expressly recognises “that not all infrastructure can be spatially identified in advance”. This complements objective 2.1(1)(c) to “enable infrastructure to support the development change of urban and rural environments to meet the diverse and changing needs of present and future generation” and the new and upgraded infrastructure required to support the proposal is consistent with these provisions.
34. The proposal appropriately responds to Policy 3 on the basis of the volunteered condition which provides time for the relevant intersection upgrades to be planned and constructed.

Policy 4: Enabling the efficient and timely operation and delivery of infrastructure

35. Policy 4 is directed at enabling the efficient delivery, operation, upgrading and renewal of infrastructure, while recognising the role of infrastructure providers in identifying preferred locations and methods.
36. The proposal does not constrain infrastructure delivery, upgrades or operation, and does not give rise to unreasonable costs or inefficiencies for infrastructure providers for the reasons listed in the assessment of Policy 2 above (i.e. there is already a known capacity issue at the intersections, and the infrastructure is already operating with inefficiencies). The proffered condition regarding the timing of the issue of Titles for Stage 1, Stages 2 and beyond ensures the necessary intersection upgrades can occur, with the applicant willing to contribute a proportion of the costs of the upgrade, relative to the effect of their development.
37. The proposal is consistent with this Policy.

Policy 5: Infrastructure supporting activities

38. Policy 5 recognises the importance of infrastructure supporting activities. No infrastructure supporting activities are proposed as part of the application. Regardless, the proposal does not inhibit infrastructure supporting activities and adverse effects are appropriately managed. The proposal is therefore consistent with Policy 5.

Policy 6: Recognising and providing for Māori interests

39. Policy 6 requires decision-makers to recognise and provide for Māori interests in relation to infrastructure, including by considering the outcomes of engagement with tangata whenua. In this instance, comments received from Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga have been considered in accordance with this policy. Comments specifically relating to infrastructure included a request that the proposal implements the best practice methods for stormwater management. Based on the agreement reached with Environment Canterbury in regard construction and operational phase stormwater discharge, the potential effects will be appropriately managed to recognise and provide for these interests of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri.



Policy 7: Assessing and managing the effects of infrastructure activities

40. Policy 7 relates to the assessment and management of effects arising from infrastructure activities themselves. To the extent that new infrastructure activities are proposed, the effects of such activities will be appropriately managed as sought by this policy, as evidenced in the technical/ expert assessments provided to date.

Policy 8: Operation, maintenance and minor upgrade of existing infrastructure

41. The proposal will increase the capacity constraints of the SH1 / Pound Road and Waterloo Road / Pound Road intersections. The transport modelling confirms that background growth on the transport network will continue to contribute to the adverse effects of the intersection, however the growth added by the development will likely bring this forward. Whilst there is no upgrade planned for the intersections at this time and recognising that this is outside of the control of the consent holder, a condition is proffered which delays the issuing of Titles to provide time for the infrastructure provider NZTA to facilitate the upgrades.

Policy 9: Managing the effects of new infrastructure and major upgrades

42. Policy 9 relevantly seeks to enable new infrastructure in all environments and avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects of such infrastructure. Accordingly, the proposal is consistent with this policy as the recommendations of the relevant technical experts have been adopted.

Policy 10: Planning for and managing the interface and compatibility of infrastructure with other activities

43. Policy 10 relates to decisions on planning instruments (i.e. Regional and District Plans) and therefore is not relevant to this proposal.

Policy 11: Assessing and managing the interface between infrastructure and other activities

44. Policy 11 relates to planning instruments (i.e. Regional and District Plans) and is not relevant.

Overall Conclusion

45. Overall, the proposal is not entirely consistent with the NPS-I insofar as it will generate adverse effects on the roading infrastructure (SH1 / Pound Road and Waterloo Road / Pound Road intersections) which will constrain its efficiency and safety. However, it is emphasised that the intersection is already operating with capacity constraints which are forecast to worsen due to background traffic growth. Thus, whilst the development will further affect the intersection, it is not the sole cause of the deteriorating efficiency. Notably, the proposal, incorporating the timing constraints for development, 'recognises and provides for' the upgrade of these intersections, and in doing so 'ensures infrastructure is well-functioning, resilient and compatible, as far as practicable, with other activities'.



46. The proposal will otherwise provide for new and upgraded infrastructure (3-waters) to support the development and the social, economic and cultural wellbeing derived from it. On balance, whilst the proposal is not fully aligned with the intent of the NPS-I, the proposal is not inconsistent with nor contrary to it.

ASSESSMENTS OF OTHER NPS

47. In evaluating the new national direction instruments above, consideration has been given to recent decisions and draft decisions by panels on other applications for approvals under the FTAA¹. Accounting for those decisions, I note that the NPS-HPL clause 3.6 is not relevant. Whilst the AEE for this proposal considered clause 3.6 to be contextually relevant and assessed it accordingly, other panels have made it clear that this clause relates to urban rezoning, not subdivision by way of resource consent, and it is therefore not relevant. To the extent that clauses 3.8 (subdivision), 3.9 (use and development) and 3.10 (exemptions where constraints) are otherwise relevant, the Highly Productive Land and Soils assessment by Reeftide (**Appendix 20**) assessed the proposal against these provisions. Based on that assessment, that clause was assessed in the AEE originally submitted and that assessment remains unchanged.

Georgia Brown

Senior Planner

M: [REDACTED] | O: [REDACTED]

E: [REDACTED] | W: www.novogroup.co.nz

¹ In particular, Sunfield Draft Decision (FTAA-2503-1039).