

TOLLEMACHE

CONSULTANTS LTD.

To: Ministry for the Environment: Helen Willis and Max Gander-Cooper

From: Tollemache Consultants Ltd

Date: 2 March 2026

Subject: Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 - Ardmore Business Park: Further Information Response

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 This memorandum provides a response to the matters raised in the request for further information received on the 5th February 2026.

2.0 ITEM 1:

Clarification on what works would be included or not included in the project scope depending on the outcome of Ardmore airport's resource consent application for activities on airport land that is included in the project site.

2.1 The project scope is not altered by any resource consent application on the Ardmore airport site.

2.2 The Ardmore Airport site(s) would still fall within the total gross Project Area (being 511 hectares).

2.3 The Project has included a "range" for its net developable and gross floor areas. The lowest end of the range had already anticipated a scenario where that part of the Ardmore Airport site subject to current resource consent application were granted under the RMA and thus not forming part of the "net developable area" or "gross floor area" for industrial activities proposed by this referral. Conversely the "maximum" range numbers do account for those areas being included.

2.4 In either case the "activities" proposed do not change.

3.0 ITEM 2:

Clarification on whether approval for the project will be required under section 176 of the Resource Management Act 1991 from New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi as the requiring authority for the designation on Mill Road

- 3.1 The project is likely to require either Section 176 or 178 approvals under the RMA depending on the status of Mill Road which is currently a "Notice of Requirement" ("NoR") and not yet a confirmed "Designation".
- 3.2 Only works that may prevent or hinder the public work, require authorisations under Section 176 or 178 of the RMA.
- 3.3 The Project scope has anticipated that works (including intersection updates) could overlap and tie into the NoR. In this scenario authorisations under either Section 176 or 178 of the RMA would be required (depending on the progression of the NoR to the Project).
- 3.4 However, Section 6.12 in Attachment 1 to the Project Application confirms that:

"The Project is able to proceed in a manner which would not prevent or hinder the public work."
- 3.5 Specifically, where the NoR overlaps with land identified for industrial activities the NoR corridor is able to "as a worst case scenario" be left untouched, and as such would not prevent or hinder the designation such that no authorisations under either Section 176 or 178 of the RMA would be required (again depending on the progression of the NoR to the Project).
- 3.6 In either case the land subject to the NoR still falls within the "gross" area included in the Project scope. The "range" for the net developable areas has already excluded the use of the NoR land for the light industrial land use activities. Thus there is no change to the project scope should authorisations not be forthcoming and the Project can as identified above, *"proceed in a manner which would not prevent or hinder the public work."*