# Your Comment on the State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus) – Applications for Replacement Resource Consents application

Please include all the contact details listed below with your comments and indicate whether you can receive further communications from us by email to substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz

| **1.** Contact Details | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Please ensure that you have authority to comment on the application on behalf of those named on this form. | | | |
| **Organisation name (if relevant)** | Canterbury Regional Council | | |
| **First name** | Brett | | |
| **Last name** | Aldridge | | |
| **Postal address** | 200 Tuam Street<br>Christchurch 8011 | | |
| **Home phone / Mobile phone** | | **Work phone** | [redacted] |
| **Email** ***(a valid email address enables us to communicate efficiently with you)*** | [redacted]<br>fasttrack@ecan.govt.nz<br>[redacted] | | |

| **2.** We will email you draft conditions of consent for your comment | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| X | I can receive emails and my email address is correct | ☐ | I cannot receive emails and my postal address is correct |

**Please provide your comments below, include additional pages as needed.**

## Thank you for your comments

**1 May 2026**
**Rob van Voorthuysen**
**Woodend Bypass Expert Panel Chair**
substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz

Environment Canterbury Regional Council
Kaunihera Taiao ki Waitaha

Customer Services
P. 03 353 9007 or 0800 324 636

PO Box 345
Christchurch 8140

P. 03 365 3828
F. 03 365 3194
E. ecinfo@ecan.govt.nz

www.ecan.govt.nz

Tēnā koe Rob,

**RMA262921 – New Zealand Transport Agency Fast Track Proposal**

**State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project – Belfast to Pegasus**

**Section 53 Panel invite to comment on substantive application**

Thank you for your email dated 1 April 2026 inviting Canterbury Regional Council to comment on State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass (Belfast to Pegasus) under sections 53 and 54 of the Fast Track Approvals Act (FTAA).

Please find the Canterbury Regional Council's comments attached. The Applicant has consulted with us substantially such that there are very few matters outstanding for the Panel to draw their attention to. This is reflected in the length and nature of the attached comments.

If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to get in touch.

Canterbury Regional Council look forward to continuing to work with the Panel on this project.

Ngā mihi nui
Brett

*Brett Aldridge*
**Director Operations**

## Summary

1. Canterbury Regional Council's (CRC) review of the application has identified outstanding issues for the Panel to consider particularly in relation to adverse effects on contaminated land, ecology, and stormwater as well as the proposed 'deemed certification' approach to management plan conditions.
2. CRC considers the project to be generally consistent with the relevant objectives, policies, and rules of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP), and Canterbury Air Regional Plan (CARP), as well as the National Environmental Standards for Freshwater (NES-F).
3. CRC considers that any adverse environmental effects arising from the approvals sought in Table 1 can be appropriately avoided, remedied, mitigated, or offset/compensated. However, CRC considers that, in its current form, the Application does not fully achieve this for the reasons discussed in this comment, with changes needed to the condition set.
4. CRC regards the updated conditions of consent it seeks in Appendix 11 as important, and expects that, as discussions with the Applicant continue regarding outstanding issues, the conditions are further refined should the Panel approve the application.
5. A number of technical peer reviews have been completed for CRC. The key points that CRC emphasise are set out in Table 2 below. Table 2 captures the Applicant's assessment (summarised), CRC's assessment and any of CRC's recommended actions and/or conditions. As set out in the Table, there are a number of areas in which further information from the Applicant would assist.
6. CRC's comment is also accompanied by the following technical reports, that should also be read in full:
    a. Appendix 1: Air Quality – Ms Suzanne Cawood
    b. Appendix 2: Compliance – Ms Georgia Simmonds
    c. Appendix 3: Contaminated Land – Dr Hana Christenson
    d. Appendix 4: Groundwater Resources – Mr Mark Trewartha
    e. Appendix 5: Land Ecology – Ms Kate McCombs
    f. Appendix 6: River Engineering – Ms Minke Unwin
    g. Appendix 7: Stormwater – Mr Philip Claassens
    h. Appendix 8: Surface Water Resources – Ms Jen Dodson
    i. Appendix 9: Water Ecology – Dr Nuwan De Silva
    j. Appendix 10: Planning – Ms Victoria Watt

## Background

7. The substantive application by New Zealand Transport Agency – Waka Kotahi (NZTA) was lodged on 19 December 2025 and deemed complete under section 46(2) of the FTAA by the Environmental Protection Authority (EPA) on 30 January 2026.

8. The Applicant seeks approvals under the FTAA for the following regional consents outlined in Table 1 below. Further information regarding activity status and the relevant rules can be found in the CRC Letter[1] filed for the section 46 completeness check:

| Table 1: Regional Consents Sought | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Activity** | **Planning Document** | **Phase of Project** | **Activity Status** | **Consent Number** |
| Section 9[2] earthworks and land disturbance | LWRP and NES-F | Construction phase | Discretionary | CRC263282 |
| Section 13[3]structures and works in river and lake beds | LWRP and NES-F | | Discretionary | CRC263283 |
| Section 14[4] take, use, divert and dam surface water and groundwater | LWRP | | Discretionary | CRC263285 |
| Section 15[5] discharge water and contaminants to land, water, and air | LWRP and CARP | | Discretionary | CRC263287 |
| Section 13**Error! Bookmark not defined.** structures and works in river and lake beds | LWRP and NES-F | Operational phase | Discretionary | CRC263284 |
| Section 14**Error! Bookmark not defined.** take, use, divert and dam surface water and groundwater | LWRP | | Discretionary | CRC263286 |
| Section 15**Error! Bookmark not defined.** discharge water and contaminants to land and water. | LWRP | | Discretionary | CRC263288 |

9. List of documents reviewed by CRC:

[1] New Zealand Transport Agency - State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass (Belfast to Pegasus) – s46 Substantive Completeness Check Response, Dated 19th January 2026.

[2] Restrictions on use of land, Resource Management Act 1991

[3] Restriction on certain uses of beds of lakes and rivers, Resource Management Act 1991

[4] Restrictions relating to water, Resource Management Act 1991

[5] Discharge of contaminants into environment, Resource Management Act 1991

a. Initial Lodgement Documents:
    i. 2A Substantive Application Report
    ii. 2D Proposed Resource Consent Conditions
    iii. 2G Regional and District Objectives and Policy Assessment
    iv. 2H Resource Consent Requirements Assessment
    v. 3A Construction Methodology
    vi. 3B Design Statement
    vii. 3E Construction Air Quality Assessment
    viii. 3F Ground Contamination Investigation
    ix. 3F Ground Contamination Investigation Appendices group 1
    x. 3F Ground Contamination Investigation Appendices group 2
    xi. 3I Ecological Impact Assessment
    xii. 3I Ecological Impact Assessment Appendix A
    xiii. 3I Ecological Impact Assessment Appendix B to I
    xiv. 3K Hydrogeology Assessment
    xv. 3K Hydrogeology Assessment Appendices
    xvi. 3K Hydrogeology Assessment Appendix B – Borehole and Testpit Logs (A)
    xvii. 3K Hydrogeology Assessment Appendix B – Borehole and Testpit Logs (B)
    xviii. 3K Hydrogeology Assessment Appendix B – Site Location Investigation Plans
    xix. 3L Stormwater and Flooding Assessment
    xx. 3M Economic Benefits
    xxi. 4A General Arrangement – Part 1
    xxii. 4A General Arrangement – Part 2
    xxiii. 4B Typical Cross Sections
    xxiv. 4C Project Site and Environment Features
    xxv. 4E Ecological Offset Plan
b. Further Documents Supplied Post Lodgement to CRC directly (and not yet before the Panel):
    i. 2D Proposed Resource Consent Conditions April 2026
    ii. Attachment A_Response to ECan stormwater and river engineering matters
    iii. Attachment B_100% Stormwater Design Drawings
    iv. Attachment C_11320-AUR-0350-PWI-SW-RPT-0002[B] (Stormwater Design Report 100%)
    v. Attachment D_11320-AUR-0350-PWI-SW-RPT-0001 (Flood Modelling Report Rev B)
    vi. Attachment E_Stormwater Discharge Summary
    vii. Attachment F_Waimakariri District Council Correspondence
    viii. Modified Southern Remanant Lake Infilling Methodology Email

<u>Scope of Comments</u>

10. CRC considers it necessary to clarify the scope of its comments under section 53 of the FTAA in relation to conditions, information received directly from the Applicant, and on terrestrial ecology.

11. In accordance with the Panel's direction, CRC's comments on conditions are based on the conditions as lodged with the Substantive Application on 19 December 2025. However, the Applicant subsequently provided CRC with an updated set of construction-phase conditions on 2 April 2026. These have been taken into account in CRC's review, with annotations included in the condition set to identify where changes relate to provisions introduced by the Applicant through the updated material, and agreed to by CRC, or that are proposed separately by CRC.
12. As no updated operational phase conditions have been provided by the Applicant, CRC has developed proposed amendments to those conditions for the Panel's consideration as part of its section 53 assessment.
13. Through on-going consultation with the Applicant, CRC has been provided with other information outside the formally lodged application (as listed above). This includes additional material relating to the proposed modification of the infilling methodology for the Southern Remnant Quarry Lake (received 23 March 2026) and stormwater management (received 10 April 2026). While CRC acknowledges and, where relevant, references this information in its commentary, it emphasises that its assessment is grounded in the documentation as lodged with the Substantive Application, rather than that additional information.
14. CRC also considers it useful to clarify the scope of its comments on terrestrial ecology at this stage. CRC's assessment of terrestrial ecology is focused on areas within 10 metres of waterbodies, reflecting its remit for indigenous biodiversity under Chapter 9 of the CRPS. This remit is limited to the beds of rivers and lakes, their riparian margins (generally considered to extend within 10 metres of waterbodies), and wetlands. However, where relevant, CRC identifies instances where consideration of these matters in the broader context of the Project may assist the Panel.

Consultation

15. Consultation between CRC and the Applicant has been occurring since pre-lodgment of the application. Planning and technical staff have corresponded via meetings and emails throughout the process. Internally, CRC staff have met to discuss the application to provide an opportunity for staff across different relevant disciplines to raise questions, identify issues and provide comments within their respective areas of expertise.
16. CRC provided high-level feedback via a Memorandum filed for the purposes of the Panel Convenor Conference, with the 'Issues' list contained in that Memorandum forming the basis for subsequent discussions with the Applicant.
17. As a result of these discussions, CRC received additional information relating to stormwater management, a revised methodology for the infilling of the Southern Remnant Quarry Lake, and updated conditions for the construction phase of the project. However, this material does not form part of the Substantive Application as lodged. Accordingly, while CRC acknowledges the additional information provided, its assessment is primarily based on the application documentation as lodged.

**Regional / National Benefits**

18. The purpose of the FTAA is to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure and development projects with significant regional or national benefits.

19. While ultimately a matter for the Panel, the application outlines the regional and national benefits of the State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus), identifying it as a regionally and nationally significant state highway development. The stated benefits include improvements to efficiency, reliability, accessibility, safety, and economic outcomes.

20. The Applicant's economic consultant, Property Economics, identifies a range of economic benefits in Volume 3M – Economic Benefits Assessment. These include an estimated economic injection of approximately $320 million into the Canterbury economy over a seven-year period, as well as wider benefits to the regional supply chain associated with project delivery. The assessment also anticipates that the project will support up to 624 FTE jobs at peak construction.

21. The benefits of the Project as set out by Property Economics are not being questioned by CRC. A peer review of the Property Economic assessment was not undertaken by CRC.

**Key Issues**

22. CRC acknowledges that the Applicant has provided a substantial volume of technical reports and supporting information to date. However, several key issues identified during the section 46 stage, and through subsequent discussions with the Applicant, remain unresolved. In most cases, this reflects instances where CRC and the Applicant have agreed to disagree, leaving the issue identified for the Panel's consideration.

23. The key issues that CRC identifies as matters the Panel may wish to turn their mind to are:
    a. **Certification of management plans**:
        a. in the absence of draft management plans, the composition of the conditions to ensure outcomes are secured outside of the management plans.
        b. Deemed certification conditions relating to those management plans.
        c. The proposal of an alternative approach to the certification of management plans.
    b. **Contaminated Land effects** based on soil reuse criteria, thresholds for the requirement for remediation, and the provision of site investigation prior to earthworks occurring.
    c. **Ecology effects** including values assigned to habitat where residual adverse effects remain, the extent of offset/compensation required and the ability for it to be realized, and whether further taxa surveys are required.
    d. **Stormwater effects** including understanding of how the water quantity and quality outcomes will be achieved, peer review of the flood model, and the flood modelling south of the Cam River.
    e. **Conditions** a limited conditions set was provided by the Applicant; therefore, CRC has provided substantial amendments to the conditions set, as set out in Appendix 11. These conditions will still require further work with the Applicant and the Panel to make them more robust.

24. These key issues concerning adverse effects have been addressed in the relevant areas of technical expertise (refer to Appendices 1 to 11) and are discussed further in Table 2.

25. Based on a review of the relevant technical reports as listed in paragraph 9(a), updated technical reports as listed in paragraph 9(b), and supporting assessments provided by the Applicant as listed in paragraph 9(b), CRC considers that the Applicant has not adequately addressed the potential adverse effects across the key matters relevant to CRC's jurisdiction.

26. CRC considers that the key issues identified in the application could potentially be appropriately managed in-line with the intent of the FTAA, by the Applicant proffering appropriate offsetting/compensation measures and conditions. In some cases, further information is required to allow for a completed assessment of the environmental effects, as set out in Table 2. In particular, the further information CRC considers necessary from the Applicant is as follows:

    a. **Provision of a Dust Management Plan** demonstrating compliance with the permitted activity requirements of the Canterbury Air Regional Plan (CARP).
    b. **Justification for the use of a 400-metre buffer distance** for identifying groundwater receptors.
    c. **Provision of electronic files for groundwater surface modelling and dewatering assessments** to enable the development of an appropriate monitoring programme.
    d. **Details of mitigation measures to prevent or minimise the leaching of contaminants** from the surface environment into underlying aquifers as a result of permanent structures.
    e. **Justification that the proposed enhancement planting is sufficient** to address residual adverse effects for the loss of Canterbury grass skink habitat.
    f. **Provision of detailed design for the proposed modifications to the Quarry Lake offset plan**, demonstrating that the revised proposal appropriately represents wetland habitat where residual adverse effects remain.

27. CRC notes for the Panel that the proposal includes the passive interception of groundwater via subsoil drainage associated with stormwater infrastructure. This is considered a take under the LWRP, and an annual volume will need to be assigned for each of the groundwater allocation zones intersected by the project. CRC has discussed this matter with the Applicant and understands that the Applicant intends to propose annual volumes. In response, CRC has proposed condition O2.3 to address effects on groundwater quantity, with placeholder volumes pending confirmation by the Applicant.

**Management Plans**

28. The Applicant has not provided draft management plans as part of the FTAA process, with the intention that these plans will instead be developed and approved through the compliance framework should approval be granted. While CRC's preference is for draft management plans to be provided and assessed as part of the substantive application, which is consistent with Fast-Track Approvals Act 2024: Panel Conveners' Practice and Procedure Guidance (22 July 2025), CRC acknowledges that this approach is at the discretion of the Applicant, and then up to the Panel as to how it manages that approach.

Accordingly, CRC's assessment proceeds on the basis that such plans may not be available at the time of decision-making. Where there are no draft management plans available, CRC considers it particularly important that key environmental outcomes and performance standards are clearly specified and secured through enforceable consent conditions, rather than deferred to subsequent management plan approvals. Appendix 11 sets out CRC's proposed amendments to the conditions lodged as part of the Substantive Application, including the incorporation of trigger levels, monitoring requirements, and reporting obligations to ensure that the intended environmental outcomes are achieved. In particular, CRC considers that the proposed conditions in Appendix 11 now secure the environmental outcomes associated with the Contaminated Soils Management Plan and the Construction Air Quality Management Plan. However, further work is required to ensure that the environmental outcomes associated with the Ecological Management Plan and the Groundwater Management Plan are appropriately secured.

***Deemed Certification***

29. CRC strongly opposes the use of deemed certification of management plans in the draft conditions for this Project.[6] Deemed certification that allows a management plan to be certified where CRC does not respond within a certain timeframe,[7] will not ensure that the intended environmental outcomes are achieved. CRC considers that the inclusion of deemed certification provisions creates a risk that substandard management plans may be approved for construction activities, resulting in suboptimal environmental outcomes, with a consequential risk that CRC (through its compliance function) may need to intervene to monitor, manage, or remedy such outcomes should they arise.
30. The Environment Court has previously rejected that approach when proposed by NZTA in 2024, identifying such provisions as presenting a risk to the environment[8]. In a separate case, the Environment Court has been clear that given the environmental risks arising, it is better to require an independent check of the management plans before work commences. The reasons for that were explained in an earlier decision of the Environment Court:[9]

---

[6] Noted in Minute 4 SH1 North Canterbury

[7] MP.3: The Consent Holder shall not commence any Construction Works within an area to which Management Plan condition(s) apply until the required Management Plan, or an amendment in accordance with condition MP.4(c), has been certified. However, if the applicable Management Plan has been submitted to CRC for certification, and 30 Working Days has passed, and CRC has not certified the applicable Management Plan or advised that the Management Plan is not suitable to certify, the Management Plan will be deemed to have been certified and the Consent Holder may commence Construction Works in accordance with the applicable Management Plan as submitted. (2D Proposed Resource Consent Conditions)

[8] *Re New Zealand Transport Agency-Waka Kotahi* [2024] NZEnvC 133 at [124]-[127] citing *Meridian Energy Ltd v Wellington City Council* [2011] NZEnvC 232 at [402].

[9] *Meridian Energy Ltd v Wellington City Council* [2011] NZEnvC 232 at [402].

It is essential that there is no uncertainty about the approved proposal and what the consent conditions require, including the details to be approved as part of the certification process in the future. The conditions referred to the process for approval of management plans which were intended to provide environmental protections. Meridian sought that if it did not hear back from the Council as to approval of a management plan within a specified time period then the management plan was deemed to be approved. This approach is not sound environmental management (or we suspect good project management), and we do not accept Meridian's approach.

31. NZTA recently proposed 'deemed certification' conditions for management plans in the Takitimu North Link – Stage 2 Fast-track project (opposed by various local authorities, HNZPT, DOC and hapū in that case).[10] The Panel decided to remove deemed certification of Management Plans because they could result in sub-optimal planning outcomes and potentially adverse environmental impacts.[11]
32. Consistent with Environment Court authority, the Panel decision in Takitimu North Link – Stage 2 (recognising that it is not binding on this Panel), and good resource management practice, CRC considers that 'deemed certification' of management plans should be removed from the conditions.
33. The Panel requested CRC's view on an appropriate timeframe should deemed certification be retained. While CRC maintains its opposition to deemed certification, it considers that, for an application of this scale and complexity, a timeframe of 40 working days would be appropriate. This timeframe would enable the assigned compliance officer to obtain and incorporate input from relevant technical specialists in the review of the seven management plans requiring certification, without the need for external technical advice, which may impose additional cost implications for either CRC or the Applicant.
34. Notwithstanding the provision of an indicative timeframe, CRC maintains its strong opposition to the inclusion of deemed certification within the regional resource consent conditions for management plans.
35. Alternatively, CRC proposes an alternative approach to the certification of management plans whereby the Applicant nominates a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person (SQEP) to certify the management plan, subject to CRC approval of the nominated SQEP. This approach would remove reliance on CRC certification timeframes and place responsibility for meeting certification timeframes with the Applicant. CRC has not, at this stage, drafted a condition to give effect to this approach but could do so should the Panel prefer this option.

[10] Takitimu North Link – Stage 2 amended decision report dated 19 March 2026 (TNL2-Panel-Final-Decision-Amended-decision-report-20-April-2026.pdf)

[11] Takitimu North Link – Stage 2 amended decision report dated 19 March 2026 (TNL2-Panel-Final-Decision-Amended-decision-report-20-April-2026.pdf), at [332] (see also [64], [66], [68], [80], [244]).

**Table 2: Summary of analysis of potential effects – CRC review of application document and recommendations**

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| **Air Quality** – CRC Expert – Ms Suzanne Cawood – Appendix 1 | | |
| The Applicant has provided an Air Quality Assessment[12], which assesses the actual and potential air quality effects associated with discharges to air arising from construction of the project.<br><br>The assessment provides a summary of effects associated with discharges from the outdoor storage of bulk materials, where consent is required, as well as an assessment of potential offensive or objectionable air quality effects arising from construction activities to determine compliance with permitted activity standards. | Ms Cawood has reviewed the information provided by the Applicant. Relying on Ms Cawood, CRC considers that:<br><br>a. There is potential for dust nuisance to arise under the conditions as proposed in the application, particularly as a result of the removal of the requirement for a Construction Air Quality Management Plan (CAQMP) to apply across the entirety of the site (as is currently required under the designation conditions). Ms Cawood considers that the CAQMP should continue to apply to all construction activities across the site, rather than being limited in scope to outdoor storage of bulk materials under the regional resource consents. While such activities may meet the permitted activity standards of the Canterbury Air Regional Plan (CARP), a site-wide CAQMP is necessary to ensure that | CRC considers that the adverse dust effect should be mitigated so as to not cause a nuisance. The Applicant's consultants recommend mitigation measures to manage adverse dust effects, but no CAQMP is provided with the Application.<br><br>CRC acknowledges that the CAQMP applies only to stockpiles as required by the consent, and recommendations for additional provisions are set out in the paragraph below. However, CRC considers that the Applicant should provide further information in the form of a Dust Management Plan to demonstrate compliance with permitted activity Rule 7.32 of the Canterbury Air Regional Plan (CARP). This information will enable CRC to fully understand how dust discharges are proposed to be managed across the site and to confirm that all relevant activities can comply with the permitted activity standards.<br><br>CRC has proposed specific amendments to condition MP.9 in Appendix 11 to address additional matters, including the inclusion of provisions to clearly define roles and responsibilities and to ensure appropriate reporting requirements for complaints.<br><br>CRC acknowledges that the Applicant does not intend to provide draft management plans as part of the FTAA process, with the expectation that such plans will instead be developed and approved through the compliance framework should approval be |

[12] Volume 3E – Construction Air Quality Assessment

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| | potential dust effects are appropriately managed.<br>b. A draft CAQMP should be provided as part of the application material. In the absence of a draft plan, it is not possible to adequately assess whether the proposed mitigation measures will be effective in managing potential dust emissions associated with the project. This is particularly important given that inadequate implementation of mitigation measures presents a risk of nuisance effects at sensitive receptors. | granted. While CRC's preference is for draft management plans to be submitted and assessed as part of the substantive application, it recognises that this approach is at the discretion of the Applicant and the Panel. Accordingly, CRC has provided its assessment on the basis that draft management plans may not be available at the time of decision-making. In this context, CRC reiterates its view that provisions for deemed certification of management plans should be removed from the regional resource consent conditions, to ensure that environmental outcomes are appropriately secured through enforceable conditions. This position is reflected in the amendments to the proposed conditions set out in Appendix 11, including proposed condition MP.3.<br><br>CRC considers that a condition specifying monitoring requirements should be included within the construction phase discharge consent (proposed condition C4.14). This amendment is reflected in Appendix 11. |
| **Compliance** – CRC Expert – Ms Georgia Simmonds – Appendix 2 | | |
| The Applicant has provided a set of Regional Resource Consent Conditions[13] and the Construction Methodology[14], which collectively seek to address the environmental effects associated with the project.<br><br>The proposed conditions are structured across seven regional consents (refer Table 1) | Ms Simmonds reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and considers that, in the absence of draft management plans being provided as part of the FTAA process, further consideration of the proposed certification process is required.<br><br>Also relying on Ms Simmonds, CRC consider that: | CRC acknowledges that the Applicant does not intend to provide draft management plans as part of the FTAA process, with the expectation that such plans will instead be developed and approved through the compliance framework should approval be granted. While CRC's preference is for draft management plans to be submitted and assessed as part of the substantive application, it recognises that this approach is at the discretion of the Applicant and the Panel. Accordingly, CRC has provided its assessment on the basis that draft management plans may not be available at the time of decision-making. In this context, CRC considers that |

[13] Volume 2D – Regional Resource Consent Conditions

[14] Volume 3A – Construction Method Statement

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| and include requirements for the preparation and implementation of a suite of management plans to manage adverse environmental effects. The conditions also include provisions to address residual adverse effects through offset and/or compensation measures.<br><br>The Construction Methodology outlines the proposed approach to construction activities, including the mitigation and management measures intended to avoid, remedy, or mitigate potential environmental effects. | a. Concerns regarding matters specific to the Erosion and Sediment Control Management Plan (ESCMP) remain, noting that it does not identify discharge locations for sediment control, include monitoring requirements, or provide sufficient detail on the staging of works. These elements are considered critical for effectively managing potential sediment discharges.<br>b. A limit on the maximum area of exposed ground at any one time should be imposed, to appropriately manage the potential mobilisation of contaminants within the project site. | provisions for deemed certification of management plans should be removed from the regional resource consent conditions. This position is reflected in the amendments to the proposed conditions set out in Appendix 11, including proposed condition MP.3.<br><br>CRC has proposed amendments to condition MP.10 to address matters identified by its technical expert, Ms Simmonds, including the incorporation of discharge locations, monitoring requirements, and staging of works. These amendments are reflected in Appendix 11.<br><br>CRC also proposes the inclusion of a new condition (C1.9) to limit the maximum area of active disturbance at any one time to 5 hectares. This limit is considered appropriate as it enables large-scale construction activities while reducing the potential for mobilisation of contaminated material. This amendment is reflected in Appendix 11. |
| **Contaminated Land** – CRC Expert – Dr Hana Christenson – Appendix 3 | | |
| The Applicant has provided a Ground Contamination Investigation[15], Construction Methodology[14], and Stormwater Assessment[16], which collectively address the proposed approach to managing potential environmental effects associated with contaminated land. | Dr Christenson has reviewed the documentation provided by the Applicant and agrees with the proposed investigation approach for contaminated land and the management of operational stormwater to avoid interaction with contaminated materials. | CRC considers that the concerns raised in relation to contaminated land can be addressed through the following amendments to the proposed conditions:<br><br>a. In relation to soil reuse criteria, by adopting the Class 4 'Adopted' criteria within the conditions of consent. Specifically, condition C1.20 should be amended to reference the 'Adopted' criteria, as set out in Appendix 11. The application of the 'Adopted' criteria will provide a |

[15] Volume 3F – Ground Contamination Investigation

[16] Volume 3L – Stormwater and Flooding Assessment

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| The documentation provides an overview of identified contamination risk areas within the project site, including summarising contamination at three locations and outlining preliminary assessments for sites where detailed investigation has yet to be undertaken. It also sets out the methodology for managing risks associated with contaminated soils during construction activities.<br><br>In addition, the documentation describes the approach to stormwater management during the operational phase, with particular regard to preventing interaction between stormwater flows and potential contaminated materials. | However, Dr Christenson does not agree with the Applicant in relation to the following matters. Relying on Dr Christenson, CRC considers that:<br><br>c. The Applicant's proposed soil reuse criterion of Class 4 'Leaching to Water' is not sufficiently protective of receptors during both the construction and operational phases. Dr Christenson considers that the Class 4 'Adopted' criteria provide a more appropriate and protective standard.<br>d. The trigger level for the preparation of a Remediation Action Plan (RAP) has not been agreed. Dr Christenson considers that where exceedances of ANZG Guideline Values – High are identified, a RAP should be prepared in addition to the Contaminated Site Management Plan (CSMP).<br>e. Proposed construction phase conditions, including separation distances from waterways for erosion and sediment control measures and the absence of limits on the extent of concurrent ground disturbance, are not adequately protective of environmental receptors.<br>f. The provision of Detailed Site Investigations (DSIs) to CRC only | more appropriate and protective framework for receptors during both the construction and operational phases of the project.<br>b. The threshold for requiring a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) can be addressed by specifying that a RAP is required where exceedances of ANZG Guideline Values – High are identified. Specifically, condition C1.17 should be amended to reflect this trigger, such that a RAP is required in addition to the Contaminated Site Management Plan (CSMP) where exceedances occur. The inclusion of this threshold will ensure that environmental outcomes are appropriately secured through the conditions of consent.<br>c. In relation to construction phase controls, condition C1.10 should be revised to require erosion and sediment control measures to be implemented at least 20 metres from waterways. CRC also proposes the inclusion of a new condition (C1.9) limiting the maximum area of active disturbance at any one time to 5 hectares. This limit is considered appropriate and necessary to manage adverse effects as it enables large-scale construction activities while reducing the potential for mobilisation of contaminated material. These amendments are reflected in Appendix 11.<br>d. In relation to the timing of Detailed Site Investigations (DSIs) condition C1.16 should be modified, such that DSIs are required to be provided to CRC prior to the commencement of earthworks. This amendment ensures that sufficient information is available to inform review and compliance monitoring prior to construction activities occurring.<br>e. Concerns regarding operational phase stormwater contamination monitoring can be addressed through the addition of conditions O3.16-O3.20. This should include requirements for sediment sampling in accordance with the maintenance schedule, with any identified |

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| | following completion of earthworks is not appropriate, as it does not enable sufficient review of the adequacy of the assessment or allow compliance verification of CSMP implementation during works.<br>g. In addition to the proposed maintenance schedule for operational stormwater infrastructure, sediment sampling should be undertaken to assess potential contamination. Where contamination is identified, material should be appropriately managed and disposed of in accordance with relevant standards. | contamination managed and disposed of appropriately. Annual reporting to CRC should also be required. These amendments are reflected in Appendix 11. |
| **Groundwater Resources** – CRC Expert – Mr Mark Trewartha – Appendix 4 | | |
| The Applicant has provided a Hydrogeology Assessment[17], which assesses the potential effects of the proposal on groundwater resources. The document provides a summary of the proposed construction activities and future operation of the project, and the associated temporary and permanent effects on groundwater. This includes an assessment of potential changes to groundwater levels, flow regimes, and water quality. | Mr Trewartha has reviewed the report provided by the Applicant and is generally in agreement with the assessment of the hydrogeological setting, and that, subject to the implementation of appropriate management and environmental controls, effects will in most cases be negligible to low.<br><br>However, Mr Trewartha seeks clarification and further information on the following matters to ensure a complete assessment. Relying on Mr Trewartha, CRC consider: | CRC considers that the concerns raised in relation to groundwater resources can be addressed through the provision of further information through the Applicant's s55 response to these comments, with the outcomes of that information reflected in the proposed conditions as follows:<br><br>a. Further information is required to justify the use of a 400-metre buffer distance for identifying potential groundwater receptors, including evidence demonstrating that this distance is appropriate and adequately protective. Accordingly, CRC has not proposed specific amendments to the conditions in Appendix 11 in relation to this matter. However, CRC |

[17] Volume 3K – Hydrogeology Assessment

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| | a. That a 400-metre buffer distance has been applied by the Applicant to identify potential groundwater receptors. However, no supporting justification has been provided to demonstrate that this distance is appropriate or adequately protective.<br>b. While groundwater surface modelling and dewatering assessments have been undertaken by the Applicant, the associated electronic modelling files have not been provided as part of the application material.<br>c. Further information is required regarding the mechanisms by which permanent structures will prevent or mitigate the leaching of contaminants from surface environments into underlying aquifers.<br>d. The requirements for the Groundwater Management Plan (GMP), as set out in the proposed conditions, are insufficient to ensure that the desired groundwater resource outcomes are achieved. | considers that the Panel should request the additional information to enable a complete assessment of effects.<br>b. The electronic modelling files underpinning the groundwater surface modelling and dewatering assessment should be provided to CRC (and the Panel / other parties). Review of these files will enable verification of the assessment and inform the development of appropriate monitoring requirements within the conditions or Groundwater Management Plan (GMP). Accordingly, CRC has not proposed specific amendments to the conditions in Appendix 11 in relation to this matter. However, CRC considers that the Panel should request the additional information to enable the development of an appropriate groundwater monitoring protocol, which can then be carried through into the consent conditions.<br>c. Further information is required regarding the mitigation measures that will be implemented to prevent or minimise leaching of contaminants from the surface environment into underlying aquifers as a result of the establishment of permanent structures. Accordingly, CRC has not proposed specific amendments to the conditions in Appendix 11 in relation to this matter. However, CRC considers that the Panel should request the additional information to enable a complete assessment of effects, with any relevant mitigation to be incorporated into the conditions of consent.<br><br>In respect of the fourth issue, CRC does not consider that additional information is required, but considers that:<br><br>d. Concerns relating to the GMP can be addressed through amendments to condition MP.11, including additional requirements to strengthen groundwater management |

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| | | outcomes. These amendments are reflected in Appendix 11.<br><br>If the information set out in (a) to (c) is not forthcoming, then CRC requests that the Panel afford it a further opportunity to comment on the conditions prior to the decision under section 70 of the FTAA, to address any residual uncertainty regarding effects through the imposition of conditions. |
| **Land Ecology** – CRC Expert – Ms Kate McCombs – Appendix 5 | | |
| The Applicant has provided an Ecological Impact Assessment**Error! Bookmark not defined.**and Ecological Offset Plan[18], which collectively assess the potential effects of the proposal on terrestrial ecology and wetlands.<br><br>These documents describe the habitats and wetland systems supporting taxa that may be affected by the project and assign ecological values to those environments. They also outline the proposed mitigation measures to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects, and identify any residual effects that remain following the implementation of those measures, including the associated ecological values of the affected habitats. | Ms McCombs has reviewed the information provided by the Applicant. Following expert to expert discussions to discuss key matters directly with the Applicant, the following issues remain outstanding. Relying on Ms McCombs, CRC considers that:<br><br>a. The Applicant has undervalued habitat for the Canterbury grass skink, noting the species is classified as 'At Risk – Declining'. This undervaluation has implications for the calculation of compensation required to address residual effects.<br>b. There is uncertainty as to whether the proposed compensation for the | CRC considers that the following measures would address the issues raised by Ms McCombs:<br><br>a. Canterbury grass skink habitat subject to residual adverse effects from project works within 10 metres of waterways should be assigned at least moderate ecological value, reflecting the presence of a species classified as 'At Risk – Declining'. This is supported by the technical advice of Ms McCombs. While additional skink habitat exists within the wider project area, this falls outside CRC's jurisdiction[19], and it is for the Panel to determine whether a broader reassessment of habitat values is warranted. CRC emphasises that appropriate habitat valuation is critical to ensuring that compensation is correctly calculated. As the regional condition set, including condition EM.4, enables recalculation of compensation based on the final extent of disturbance, the compensation proposed in the |

[18] Volume 4E – Ecological Offset Plan

[19] Under the RPS and s 30 of the RMA.

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| In addition, the documents set out the methodology used to quantify offset and compensation requirements to address residual effects, and identify the areas proposed to deliver these offsets and compensation.<br><br>The Applicant has also provided CRC with a modified approach to infilling the Southern Remnant Quarry Lake to establish wetland habitat. While this approach does not form part of the application as lodged, CRC has nonetheless provided commentary on the proposed modification. | loss of lizard habitat, through enhancement planting, will adequately address residual effects.<br>c. The Applicant has undervalued wetland remnants and indigenous vegetation. This undervaluation has implications for the proposed offset intended to address residual effects.<br>d. Further information is required to demonstrate that the proposed wetland offset is representative of the habitat to be lost.<br>e. Additional taxa surveys are required for non-vascular plants, invertebrates, and Canterbury mudfish to ensure that the ecological values are appropriately characterised. | Ecological Offset Plan is not fixed. Accordingly, achieving the outcome of no net loss as per the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 (NPS-IB) will depend on the correct assignment of habitat values through the decision-making process.<br>b. Further information is required to confirm that the proposed enhancement planting will adequately address residual adverse effects associated with the loss of Canterbury grass skink habitat. CRC notes that the Barkers Road site, as identified in the Ecological Offset Plan, is proposed for enhancement planting; however, the current habitat density and baseline ecological condition are uncertain. As a result, the extent of enhancement required to increase carrying capacity and address residual effects cannot be confidently determined. While the proposed planting may address the residual effects within CRC's scope, the Panel must consider the application in its entirety, including land proposed to be incorporated into the designation.<br>c. The ecological values assigned to wetlands and associated indigenous vegetation subject to residual adverse effects should be reassessed to better reflect the affected habitats. The revised values and supporting rationale are set out in Appendix 5 of this section 53 comment. As with compensation, the regional condition set (including condition EM.4) allows for recalculation of offset requirements based on the final extent of disturbance. While CRC supports this adaptive approach, it introduces uncertainty regarding the delivery of the proposed offset identified in the Ecological Offset Plan. |

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| | | Consequently, achieving no net loss will rely on the appropriate assignment of habitat values through the Panel decision.<br>d. The proposed wetland offset within the Quarry Lakes has been modified as per the additional information provided to CRC under paragraph 9(b)(viii) from that described in the Ecological Impact Assessment. CRC has therefore assessed the modified proposal and considers that a more detailed design of the modified Quarry Lakes offset plan is required to demonstrate that the proposed offset will adequately represent the habitat subject to residual adverse effects, including ensuring that it supports comparable ecological characteristics and the same or similar taxa.<br>e. Additional taxa surveys should be undertaken by the Applicant, particularly for non-vascular plants, invertebrates, and Canterbury mudfish. Recommended survey locations have been provided to the Applicant and are included in Appendix 5 for the Panel's consideration, with a focus on areas within 10 metres of waterways and wetlands. CRC also considers that wetlands should be further surveyed for the potential presence of Canterbury mudfish. These surveys are important to ensure that appropriate management measures are implemented and that any additional ecological values are properly reflected in the assessment of residual effects. While CRC considers that it would be preferable for these surveys to be completed prior to a decision on the Fast-track application, it acknowledges time constraints and considers that this matter could be addressed through |

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| | | conditions, noting that the regional consent conditions (including EM.4) provide for offset and compensation values to be revisited.<br><br>If the information set out in (d) is not forthcoming, then CRC requests that the Panel afford it a further opportunity to comment on the conditions prior to the decision under section 70 of the FTAA, to address any residual uncertainty regarding effects through the imposition of conditions.<br><br>It is noted that, in relation to the information set out in (a), (b), (c), and (e), CRC has not proposed amendments to the conditions at this stage. This is due in part to time constraints, and also because certain elements are dependent on determinations to be made by the Panel before they can be appropriately reflected in the conditions. Accordingly, CRC requests that the Panel provide a further opportunity for CRC to comment on the conditions prior to the decision under section 70 of the FTAA, at which time CRC will seek to address any residual uncertainty arising from the Panel's determinations through the drafting of conditions. |
| **River Engineering** – CRC Expert – Ms Minke Unwin – Appendix 6 | | |
| The Applicant has provided a Stormwater and Flooding Assessment[16], which evaluates the potential effects of the proposal on the flood conveyance capacity of affected catchments. The assessment addresses the hydrological and hydraulic implications of stormwater discharges, as well as the installation of structures within the beds of waterways. | Ms Unwin has reviewed the information provided by the Applicant including the additional information provided under paragraph 9(b) and generally agrees that, for most waterways, the predicted changes in flow magnitude and timing are negligible. Ms Unwin also considers that many concerns relating to temporary works and potential damage to flood protection infrastructure | CRC considers that the concerns regarding increased flows within Waihora Drain could be addressed through design modifications to accommodate the additional discharge, such as increasing the conveyance capacity of the drain. Alternatively, this matter could be addressed through engagement with the Waimakariri District Council (WDC) drainage team to confirm whether the predicted increase in flow can be appropriately accommodated within the existing network. Accordingly, CRC has not proposed specific amendments to the conditions in Appendix 11 in relation to this |

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| The Applicant has also provided CRC with additional information following expert to expert discussions, which provides further details regarding the flood conveyance capacity of affected catchments up to the 100% detailed design. CRC notes that this information does not form part of the Substantive Application and has not been provided to the Panel. However, the Panel may wish to request this information should it consider it necessary to inform its assessment. | can be appropriately addressed through the relevant bylaw approval process.<br><br>However, relying on Ms Unwin, CRC consider that:<br><br>a. There are outstanding concerns in relation to the level of effects that will result from the predicted changes in flow within Waihora Drain. Ms Unwin notes that the increase in flow is not negligible, with modelling indicating an approximate 25% increase across the drain. Ms Unwin further considers that reliance on highly infiltrative soils to mitigate this increase is not sufficiently substantiated, as infiltration effects have not been quantified. In addition, during storm events where antecedent soil moisture conditions are elevated, infiltration capacity may be reduced, and the increased flows would persist.<br>b. There are outstanding concerns regarding the stormwater and flood modelling, noting that it has not been subject to independent peer review. She considers that peer | matter at this time; however, brings the issue to the Panel's attention.<br><br>CRC also considers that concerns regarding the flood modelling can be addressed by requiring an independent peer review of the model. The outcomes of this review should be used to inform the final design of stormwater infrastructure, to ensure that the intended hydraulic performance and flood management outcomes for the catchment are achieved. Accordingly, CRC proposes the inclusion of an additional condition within the operational phase discharge consent requiring peer review of the flood model (proposed condition O3.4). This amendment is reflected in Appendix 11. |

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| | review is standard industry practice and is an important mechanism for identifying potential gaps or errors in modelling assumptions and outputs. | |
| **Stormwater** – CRC Expert – Mr Philip Claassens – Appendix 7 | | |
| The Applicant has provided a Stormwater and Flooding Assessment[16], which assesses the stormwater and flooding effects of the project based on the 30% design. The assessment outlines the proposed stormwater management approach, including the use of cut-off drains, bridge structures, stormwater treatment infrastructure, and the overall approach to catchment drainage, supported by an assessment of flood behaviour.<br><br>The Applicant has also provided CRC with additional information following expert to expert discussions, including stormwater management details developed as part of the 100% detailed design. CRC notes that this information does not form part of the Substantive Application and has not been provided to the Panel. However, the Panel may wish to request this information should it consider it necessary to inform its assessment. | Mr Claassens has reviewed the information provided by the Applicant and is generally in agreement with the anticipated effects of the project. However, he has identified several key areas of concern in relation to the proposed management of those effects. Relying on Mr Claassens, CRC consider:<br><br>a. That the additional stormwater information provided to CRC, including material developed to a 100% detailed design level, should also be made available to the Panel for consideration, notwithstanding that it does not form part of the Substantive Application.<br>b. That the information provided in relation to the proposed stormwater system is insufficient, particularly with respect to the sizing of treatment devices and the level of treatment performance to be achieved. | CRC considers that the concerns raised by Mr Claassens can be addressed through the following measures:<br><br>a. It would be beneficial for the Panel to request the stormwater information developed to a 100% detailed design level. Provision of this information would enable a more robust assessment of the proposed stormwater system and a clearer understanding of the Applicant's proposed mitigation measures. Accordingly, CRC has not proposed specific amendments to the conditions in Appendix 11 in relation to this matter, albeit would be able to do this if requested by the Panel, on received of the100% detailed design.<br>b. Concerns regarding insufficient information on the sizing and treatment performance of stormwater infrastructure can be addressed through the inclusion of an additional condition within the operational phase discharge consent (proposed conditions O3.12). This condition would require the provision of detailed design information to demonstrate that appropriate treatment standards are achieved. This amendment is reflected in Appendix 11.<br>c. Concerns regarding flood modelling can be addressed through a requirement for independent peer review of the model. The outcomes of this review should be used to |

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| | c. Consistent with Ms Unwin's position, that the flood model should be subject to independent peer review to ensure that model inputs, assumptions, and outputs are robust.<br>d. That the modelling should incorporate Maximum Probable Development (MPD), assessment of the 10-year event, and post-development scenarios including mitigation measures.<br>e. That the model should be updated to include the alignment area south of the Cam River, as the current assessment does not clearly demonstrate how effects and mitigation performance will be evaluated in this area.<br>f. That bridges and large culverts (as defined in the NZTA Bridge Manual) should be subject to independent peer review to confirm that scour protection and mitigation measures are appropriately designed to manage events up to the 100-year Average Recurrence Interval (ARI).<br>g. Concerns regarding potential stormwater discharges to the Gladstone Landfill HAIL site remain, | inform the final design of stormwater infrastructure, to ensure that the intended hydraulic performance and flood management outcomes for the catchment are achieved, and that all relevant modelling inputs, assumptions, and parameters have been appropriately considered. Accordingly, CRC proposes the inclusion of an additional condition within the operational phase discharge consent requiring peer review of the flood model (proposed condition O3.4). This amendment is reflected in Appendix 11.<br>d. Peer review of bridges and large culverts can be addressed through the inclusion of a condition requiring independent review of these structures to confirm that appropriate scour protection and mitigation measures are incorporated, particularly for events up to the 100-year ARI. Accordingly, CRC proposes an additional condition within the operational phase discharge consent (proposed condition O3.5). This amendment is reflected in Appendix 11.<br>e. Concerns regarding the mobilisation of contaminants on HAIL sites as a result of stormwater discharges can be addressed through the inclusion of an additional condition to avoid or appropriately manage stormwater discharges to contaminated land (proposed condition O3.10). This amendment is reflected in Appendix 11.<br>f. Erosion and scour concerns associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of stormwater infrastructure can be addressed through the inclusion of an additional condition requiring the implementation of appropriate erosion and scour protection measures |

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| | noting the potential for mobilisation of contaminants within runoff.<br>h. Concerns regarding erosion and scour protection for waterways associated with stormwater infrastructure remain. He considers that such measures should apply to all relevant structures, including minor and major culverts and stream diversions.<br>i. The resource consent conditions, as lodged, lack sufficient detail to ensure that stormwater effects are appropriately managed. He considers that the conditions should address the following matters:<br>i. Water quality treatment design;<br>ii. Attenuation of peak flows from new impervious areas;<br>iii. Waterway realignments and the sizing of culverts and bridges for cross-catchment conveyance;<br>iv. Fish passage provisions at culverts;<br>v. Mitigation of effects associated with infilling within the floodplain; | (proposed condition O3.13). This amendment is reflected in Appendix 11.<br>g. A suite of additional operational phase discharge conditions (proposed conditions O3.6–O3.9) is required to address the remaining matters raised by Mr Claassens, including water quality treatment, attenuation of peak flows, and other stormwater management requirements. These amendments are reflected in Appendix 11. |

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| | vi. Demonstration of how flood risk mitigation outcomes will be achieved;<br>vii. Effects of groundwater inflows on stormwater infrastructure capacity;<br>viii. Groundwater influences on proposed infiltration devices;<br>ix. Specific requirements for stormwater management within landfill areas;<br>x. Design documentation to demonstrate compliance of stormwater infrastructure with consent requirements; and<br>xi. As-built information to confirm that stormwater infrastructure has been constructed in accordance with the approved design. | |
| **Surface Water Resources** – CRC Expert – Ms Jen Dodson – Appendix 8 | | |
| The Applicant has provided a Hydrogeology Assessment[20], which summarises the proposed site activities and assesses potential effects on surface water. | Ms Dodson is generally in agreement that the proposed management practices and environmental controls will adequately | CRC considers that this concern could be addressed through the provision of further information regarding whether any treatment is undertaken prior to discharge, and the associated temporal lag between abstraction and discharge. Ms Dodson further notes that |

[20] Volume 3K – Hydrogeology Assessment

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| The assessment identifies surface waterways that may be permanently or temporarily affected by construction activities, including groundwater dewatering and associated discharges to surface waterbodies. It also outlines proposed management practices and environmental controls to mitigate potential effects on surface water flows. | mitigate effects on surface water flows. However, relying on Ms Dodson:<br><br>a. Clarification is sought regarding whether dewatering discharges will be treated prior to discharge, and if so, the expected time lag between abstraction and discharge.<br>b. Any delay in discharge related to time lag mentioned above could result in temporary reductions in stream flows, which may have adverse effects on freshwater ecological values. | consideration could be given to the use of an alternative water source during this lag period, in order to mitigate potential effects on surface water bodies. Accordingly, CRC has not proposed specific amendments to the conditions in Appendix 11 in relation to this matter at this time; however, the Panel should have regard to the considerations outlined by Ms Dodson when determining the appropriate approach. |
| **Water Ecology and Quality** – CRC Expert – Dr Nuwan De Silva – Appendix 9 | | |
| The Applicant has provided an Ecological Impact Assessment**Error! Bookmark not defined.** and Construction Methodology[14], which include an assessment of effects on freshwater ecology and water quality.<br><br>The proposal includes the permanent realignment and culverting of waterways within the project area, stormwater discharges to surface waterbodies, and the reclamation and diversion of waterbodies within the project boundary.<br><br>A range of mitigation measures has been proposed to manage adverse effects | Dr De Silva is generally in agreement with the water quality and ecological assessment of the waterways affected within the project boundary. This includes the proposed culvert installation methodology and associated mitigation measures to ensure adequate fish passage for permanent culverts.<br><br>Dr De Silva also supports the proposed ecological offsetting through enhancement of McIntosh Drain to address residual effects on aquatic ecological values arising from the reclamation of waterbodies within the project area. | CRC considers that concerns regarding total suspended solids (TSS) concentrations exceeding 50 g/m$^3$ within the first 24 hours of dewatering can be appropriately addressed through amendments to the proposed conditions. Specifically, CRC recommends the removal of clauses (b) and (c) from condition C4.6, which would result in a more protective approach to freshwater ecological and water quality outcomes.<br><br>These proposed amendments are reflected in the tracked changes and supporting commentary provided in Appendix 11. |

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| associated with these activities. Where residual effects remain, the Applicant proposes to address these through ecological offsetting, including enhancement works within McIntosh Drain. | Dr De Silva is largely in agreement with the proposed erosion and sediment control measures and discharge mitigation. However, one outstanding matter has been identified in relation to the quality of dewatering discharges within the first 24 hours, as set out in conditions C4.6(b) and (c). Relying on Dr De Silva, CRC considers that discharges should comply with a total suspended solids (TSS) limit of 50 $g/m^3$ at all times to avoid adverse effects on habitat quality and ecological function. | |
| **Planning** – CRC Expert – Ms Victoria Watt – Appendix 10 | | |
| The Applicant has provided a Substantive Application Report[21] and Regional Policy Assessment[22], which summarise the relevant provisions of applicable regional and national policy documents.<br><br>The assessment includes consideration of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP), and the following National Policy Statements: the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM), the National | Ms Watt has reviewed the planning reports for CRC. Ms Watt generally considers that the assessment provided by the Applicant is thorough and identifies the relevant statutory instruments.<br><br>However, relying on Ms Watt, CRC considers that:<br><br>a. certain elements of the assessment, when made against | CRC considers that the updated condition set in Appendix 11 provides improved alignment with the relevant policies and objectives.<br><br>CRC has also provided an assessment against Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) to ensure a comprehensive assessment against the relevant objectives and policies applicable to the project, this is in Appendix 6 to these comments. |

[21] Volume 2A – Substantive Application Report

[22] Volume 2G – Regional and District Objectives and Policy Assessment

| Applicant's assessment summary | CRC technical assessment summary | Solution / necessary changes to conditions |
|---|---|---|
| Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 (NPS-HPL), the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD), and the National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity (NPS-IB). | relevant policies and objectives, do not include measurable evidence or supporting information to demonstrate consistency with the stated provisions.<br>b. there is limited assessment against the objectives and policies of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), which relates to the Greater Christchurch metropolitan urban area, including Woodend/Pegasus. | |

**Conditions**

36. The base document for CRC's position on the conditions is the application set of CRC related conditions, as requested by the Panel. As mentioned earlier, NZTA has, post lodgement, provided an updated version to CRC. The conditions in Appendix 11 therefore include NZTA's post lodgement changes, where they are supported by CRC, as well as further changes as outlined above and supported by CRC's technical experts, as well as input from the CRC Compliance function. These are attached as Appendix 11.

37. The amended conditions seek to address CRC's concern that a number of key environmental outcomes were not sufficiently secured through enforceable conditions, with reliance instead placed on the preparation and approval of management plans, resulting in mitigation being deferred to subsequent processes/plans.

38. CRC has focused its review on conditions relevant to approvals that would otherwise be granted by CRC. CRC remains willing to continue working on the conditions, including in collaboration with the Applicant and other parties, to the extent directed or requested by the Panel. CRC will also continue to engage with NZTA to progress further alignment. CRC acknowledges NZTA's consultation efforts to date, including the provision of an updated set of proffered construction-phase conditions, and notes agreement that further work will be undertaken in relation to operational-phase conditions.

39. Accordingly, CRC acknowledges that the conditions and associated comments set out in Appendix 11 remain subject to ongoing refinement through continued engagement, with the objective of ensuring that appropriate environmental outcomes are secured through enforceable conditions rather than reliance on subsequent management plans.

**CRC's Concluding Comments**

40. CRC has reviewed the Substantive Application and supporting technical appendices for the proposed State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus) by New Zealand Transport Agency – Waka Kotahi. CRC considers that there are a number of effects for which appropriate management measures remain unresolved, despite discussions with the Applicant. These matters include soil reuse criteria, the assignment of ecological values to habitats subject to residual adverse effects, the suitability of proposed offset and compensation measures to achieve stated outcomes, the need for additional taxa surveys, the peer review of flood modelling, and the approach to management plans, including the use of 'deemed certification'.

41. The specific changes to conditions CRC recommend are set out in Appendix 11, and are required in order to address its technical advice across a range of adverse effects issues, and remove 'deemed certification'. In addition, there are a number of matters where further information from the Applicant is required in order for the effect of the proposal to be assessed.

42. Where CRC has recommended that further information be provided by the Applicant, CRC has not proposed conditions to address those effects at this stage, as the additional information will inform the development of more robust and appropriate conditions. Should the requested information not be provided, CRC will propose conditions to address those outstanding effects.

43. If the further information set out in paragraph 26 is not provided, CRC requests that the Panel afford it a further opportunity to comment on the conditions prior to the decision under section 70 of the FTAA, to address any residual uncertainty regarding effects through the imposition of conditions.

44. In relation to CRC's comments on terrestrial ecology where CRC has not proposed amendments to the conditions at this stage. This is due in part to time constraints, and also because certain elements are dependent on determinations to be made by the Panel before they can be appropriately reflected in the conditions. Accordingly, CRC requests that the Panel provide a further opportunity for CRC to comment on the conditions prior to the decision under section 70 of the FTAA, at which time CRC will seek to address any residual uncertainty arising from the Panel's determinations through the drafting of conditions.

45. CRC's view is that the outstanding issues can be resolved through amendments to the proposed conditions as proposed, or through further engagement with the Applicant.

46. CRC trusts that the comments provided will assist the Panel in its determination of the application and is available to support the Panel by providing any further information, clarification, or technical input as required.

**Appendices- as separate attachments**

**Appendix 1:** CRC Technical Advice- Air Quality – Ms Suzanne Cawood

**Appendix 2:** CRC Technical Advice- Compliance – Ms Georgia Simmonds

**Appendix 3:** CRC Technical Advice- Contaminated Land – Dr Hana Christenson

**Appendix 4:** CRC Technical Advice- Groundwater Resources – Mr Mark Trewartha

**Appendix 5:** CRC Technical Advice- Land Ecology – Ms Kate McCombs

**Appendix 6:** CRC Technical Advice- River Engineering – Ms Minke Unwin

**Appendix 7:** CRC Technical Advice- Stormwater – Mr Philip Claassens

**Appendix 8:** CRC Technical Advice- Surface Water Resources – Ms Jen Dodson

**Appendix 9:** CRC Technical Advice- Water Ecology – Dr Nuwan De Silva

**Appendix 10:** CRC Technical Advice- Planning – Ms Victoria Watt

**Appendix 11:** CRC's Comments on Conditions as Lodged