

BEFORE THE FAST-TRACK EXPERT PANEL

AT CHRISTCHURCH

IN THE MATTER of the Fast-track Approvals Act
2025

AND

IN THE MATTER of applications for Pound Road
Industrial Area [FTAA-2505-
1057]

**TRANSPORT MEMORANDUM FOR CHRISTCHURCH CITY COUNCIL RESPONDING TO
APPLICANTS AMENDED APPLICATION FILES on 27 FEBRUARY**

Dated: 5 March 2026

Christchurch City Council
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch, 8011
PO Box 73016, Christchurch, 8154

POUND ROAD SHARED PATH

1. In the applicants amended application files on 27 February 2026, in Appendix's 2 and 3 the applicant stated their position on Council's requirement for a shared path along Pound Road.

Council's comment on this position as follows:

2. The CCC Infrastructure Design Standards (IDS), 8.13.6 Cross Section design, states that Minor arterial – Rural roads should have separate cycle facilities.
3. The NZTA Cycle network guidance also recommends cycle paths on roads with higher traffic volumes and speeds.
4. Council acknowledges the fact that SH1 Russley Road north of Yaldhurst Road contains no separated path. This is, however, not a road which CCC controls nor has controlled in the past. It is a state highway under NZTA control and subject to NZTA's standards and to NZTA's acceptance of any deviation from standards, and is not generally subject to the CCC IDS standards unless NZTA chooses to apply those standards.
5. The applicant's proposal to include road shoulders only on Pound Road does provides some space for cycling, however it is not in a way that is consistent with the CCC IDS nor the recommendations of the NZTA cycling network guidance, and also does not provide for walking, and by extension, public transport, as any public transport trips start and end on foot.
6. I do not consider it out of context to require that a development be accessible to a range of transport modes – specifically, in the District Plan, Council reserves discretion to impose conditions under the high trip generator rule in the District Plan in relation to Rule 7.4.4.18 iv:
“Accessibility of the location: Whether the proposed activity has

demonstrated the accessibility of the site by a range of transport modes and whether the activity's location will minimise or reduce travel to and from the activity by private vehicles and encourage public and active transport use.”

7. It is true that previous development along the Pound Road corridor (such as the Waterloo Business Park) has not required shared path facilities along Pound Road. It is my view that such a facility along Pound Road was not required as a much more direct route for walking and cycling is provided via the internal roads and private roads. This is not the case with the applicants proposed development, where the shape of the development means that Pound Road itself would be the most direct route to stage 2 and beyond.
8. Requiring a path connection external to a development site I do not consider to be out of context or without precedent in the rest of the city. For example, the Highfield Park Outline Development Plan in the District Plan (Appendix 8.10.16) requires upgrading of Hills Road with a shared path in conjunction with any new road connections to Hills Road (8.10.26.D, 4 g and 7 e). This requires upgrading of Hills Road external to any one site on Hills Road. In other situations, high trip generating activities have been required to make changes to transport infrastructure beyond their immediate site boundaries.
9. It is acknowledged that there can be technical difficulties and expense related to providing this shared path, including but not limited to stormwater design and drainage, and the presence of overhead power poles, however Council's position is that this does not remove the need for such a facility to be provided.
10. As an alternative to removing power poles, Council is open to the concept of a strip of land along the Pound Road frontage being vested as road reserve to contain the shared path, avoiding the need to remove existing power poles, and has raised this possibility with the applicant. We acknowledge that with uncertainty as to the timing of the development of Stage 3 this may mean that there will be a gap in the

path until such a time as Stage 3 develops, and may require an appropriate tool such as a consent notice on the Stage 3 property requiring the vesting of a strip of land and completion of the path upon developing, but this will provide more certainty as to how a path will be delivered in the long term.

Dated 5 March 2025

Peter Rodgers

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Peter Rodgers', written in a cursive style.