

NZTA acknowledges and appreciates the statements made by Waimakariri District Council (WDC) that support and align with NZTA’s proposed approach. In particular, NZTA notes WDC’s acknowledgement of the engagement undertaken prior to lodgement and throughout the application process to date. This collaborative approach has enabled WDC and NZTA to reach agreement on most issues, with only a limited number of matters remaining for further consideration, as outlined in the table below.

Attachment 4 - NZTA response to comments from Waimakariri District Council in relation to State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus)					
Date received	Document name & page / para reference	Comment ID	Topic	Extract / summary of comment	NZTA response
Commenter 3 – Waimakariri District Council					
04/05/26	Para 3.2	3.1	Cultural values	“The Bypass route passes through a number of Ngā whenua tapu o ngā iwi - Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori and also several silent file areas. Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga hold mana whenua status over the area within the district. WDC encourages effective consultation with Ngāi Tūāhuriri.”	NZTA acknowledges the cultural significance of the area and has undertaken extensive pre-lodgement consultation with Whitiara on behalf of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.
04/05/26	Para 3.3	3.2	Stormwater	“WDC highlights that matters relating to drainage and stormwater management will need to be appropriately addressed, to ensure there is no increase in effects from stormwater runoff and/or flooding on nearby properties.”	NZTA has engaged extensively with WDC Engineering Staff in relation to mitigating stormwater and flooding effects, including review of the Flood Modelling Report and review of design plans at various design stages. Final design plans will also be provided as part of the Outline Plan process.
04/05/26	Para 3.3	3.2A	Transport / design	“Connectivity with the surrounding business environments will also need to be carefully considered, particularly in light of the proposed changes to the Pegasus interchange, to support efficient, safe, and well-integrated transport and access outcomes so there is no negative impact on existing businesses, especially at Ravenswood.”	The designation route is already authorised, and the proposed interchange will support a functional transport system instead of the originally proposed roundabout which would no longer be fit for purpose given the growth in Ravenswood and Pegasus. As noted in the transport assessment, NZTA has contributed to further work with WDC in relation to local roads near the Pegasus interchange for the purpose of future local network planning. Traffic movements in this area are changing quickly as the land is developed. While this work is not within the scope of this designation and process, NZTA will continue to work with WDC so that state highway and local road vehicle movements can be considered in an integrated way.
04/05/26	Para 3.4	3.3	CSA	“The Construction Support Area (CSA) will be located directly opposite residential properties on Lees Road, Kaiapoi. There will be effects on these properties during the construction phase. It is important that, at the end of the project, the CSA is appropriately reinstated with consideration of footpaths.”	NZTA proposes a general reinstatement condition for the CSA (see proposed amendments to designation condition 39B(c)). This is currently a rural paddock with no adjoining footpaths, and NZTA is not proposing to add footpaths in this location.
04/05/26	Para's 3.7 – 3.14	3.4	Conditions	Removal of the Management Plan Certification process “3.12 As the detailed design has not yet been developed, the substantive application has similar characteristics to the Notice of Requirement considered in the 2015 Commissioners’ recommendation. WDC considers that the Certification process provides the necessary scope to review and require amendments to Management Plans beyond what is available through the Outline Plan process alone. 3.13 WDC considers the ability to make changes to Management Plans through certification is a more robust process in the absence of detailed information such as draft Management Plans, and deletion of Conditions 5 and 6 would also remove the useful dispute resolution process. 3.14 It is noted that the Outline Plan process and Management Plan certification could be undertaken concurrently to streamline the processes and avoid delays.”	NZTA does not support reverting to a certification framework for the management plans. The proposed approach aligns the management plans with the Outline Plan process under section 176A of the RMA, which already provides WDC with a statutory review function and the ability to request changes. A certification process would duplicate that statutory process and create an additional approval step. NZTA considers this achieves an appropriate balance between WDC oversight and NZTA's responsibility for implementation. Further, NZTA notes this approach is common across its designations, including Designation P19 in the Christchurch District Plan for the Brougham Street Project.

Attachment 4 - NZTA response to comments from Waimakariri District Council in relation to State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus)

Date received	Document name & page / para reference	Comment ID	Topic	Extract / summary of comment	NZTA response
04/05/26	Para's 3.15 – 3.19	3.5	Air quality / conditions	Retention of Construction Air Quality Management Plan - Condition 10 Retention of condition 10 sought – noting “Given that dust can cause significant effects on residents and adjoining property owners, WDC considers it necessary to amend the condition to ensure it fully captures and gives effect to the intent of the original condition.”	NZTA’s proposed removal of the requirement for a Construction Air Quality Management Plan under the designation is on the basis that the management of discharges to air is a regional council function and these matters are appropriately being addressed through the Canterbury Air Regional Plan framework and the proposed regional resource consents, including for discharge to air. Retaining a separate designation condition would create a dual management and approval process, with potential for duplication and inconsistency.
04/05/26	Para's 3.20 – 3.24	3.6	Conditions	Removal of Monitoring Conditions 100-103 “WDC supports monitoring conditions which clearly set out which organisations have responsibility for monitoring different effects and avoids overlapping responsibilities. 3.23 As part of recent consultation, NZTA has indicated agreement to a separate monitoring condition.” Seeks additional condition related to charging fees for inspections.	The designation cannot impose conditions on WDC. However, these matters could be addressed through an advice note to clarify aspects within WDC’s jurisdiction. NZTA has included proposed wording for this advice note in the 2C Proposed Alterations to Designation Conditions Tracker. NZTA does not agree to the additional clause which relates specifically to charging for inspections on resource consents, noting the ability to charge is already available under the RMA and set out within the accepted (with amendments) advice note. It is therefore unnecessary and inappropriate to include this separate clause relating to inspection charges.
04/05/26	Para's 3.25 – 3.27 Appendix 3	3.7	Landscaping / conditions	Comments related to the following conditions: • Conditions 39A and 40, and ‘certification of management plans’ in relation to the Pegasus Interchange • Condition 39B in relation to the Lees Road CSA • Landscaping proposed for the southern remnant lake can be addressed through the Management Plan certification process	Conditions 39A, 40 and 39B are addressed in the 2C Proposed Alterations to Designation Conditions Tracker. WDC’s proposal to reintroduction of certification for management plans is addressed in response to comment 3.4 above.
04/05/26	Para 3.28 Appendix 4	3.8	Noise and Vibration / conditions	“The retention of the Compliance Monitoring and cost recovery requirements has been outlined in the relevant technical memo.” Concern that the proposed framework weakens Council’s ability to independently monitor, audit, and enforce compliance (particularly noise and vibration), by shifting responsibility into applicant-led management plans. This creates a risk of self-regulation, lacks clarity on Council’s inspection role, cost recovery, and enforcement triggers, and undermines WDC’s statutory monitoring duties under the RMA.	See responses to comments 3.4 and 3.6 above.
04/05/26	Para 3.29 Appendix 5, Para's 3.1 – 3.2	3.9	Terrestrial ecology	“Further assessment is needed to fully understand the operational, mitigation and compensation relating to bird strike risk associated with the proposed wetlands.” “further assessment for avifauna (both those currently present, and those that may use the enhanced habitat in future) needs to be undertaken to fully understand operational impacts and potential mitigation and compensation.”	There is a risk of birds being killed or injured following collisions with vehicles using the road (termed “vehicle strike”). Kahu, pūkeko, and water birds are the species most at risk of vehicle strike. Kahu commonly feed on roadkill. Pūkeko often forage in roadside habitats, particularly when roads are close to waterways and wetlands, and they will often walk across roads rather than fly, leading to an increased risk of vehicle strike. Water birds (ducks, grebes, shags) using the proposed wetland may be at risk of bird strike when taking off from the water if they are not able to gain sufficient height quickly enough to avoid the risk of vehicle strike. It is not feasible to exclude pūkeko and kahu from the road corridor and it is therefore not possible to avoid this potential adverse effect. Both species have a conservation status of ‘Not Threatened’

Attachment 4 - NZTA response to comments from Waimakariri District Council in relation to State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus)

Date received	Document name & page / para reference	Comment ID	Topic	Extract / summary of comment	NZTA response
					and are common and widespread. It is unlikely that occasional mortality of individual birds will have an impact on these species at a population level and the magnitude of effect of vehicle strike is considered low, equating to an overall level of effect of very low. As such, no effects management is required for these species. Six water bird species were recorded on the Quarry Lakes: • Pūteketeke (great crested grebe) • Australasian coot • Kawaupaka (little shag) • Kāruhiruhi (pied shag) • Pāpango (New Zealand scaup) • Pūtangitangi (paradise shelduck) These species are all susceptible to vehicle strike and the species assemblage of birds likely to utilise the proposed wetland, which will replace the lake, is expected to be similar to that currently present. Mortality or injury caused by vehicle strike is likely to be a rare event; however, mortality of an adult female pūteketeke ('Threatened – Nationally Vulnerable') for example could have an impact at a population level given the low population of the species. While not recorded during site assessments, the loss of an adult female matuku-hūrepo ('Threatened-Nationally Critical') could also cause an impact at a population level due to species rarity. While the likelihood of bird strike is low, the potential population-level consequences of mortality, particularly of breeding females of pūteketeke and matuku-hūrepo mean the overall magnitude of effect from vehicle strike on native bird species is considered moderate. This leads to an overall level of effect (in accordance with the EIANZ framework) ranging from low (for 'Not Threatened' species with low ecological value) to high (for 'Threatened' species with very high ecological value). The risk of bird strike along the causeway will be provided through planting of the batter between the road edge and the wetland/lake edge. Batter planting will comprise native species including five finger, tauhimu, korokio, harakeke, mikimiki, mingimingi, and kohuhu. Most of these are expected to reach a height of c.2 m five years after planting, with five finger and kohuhu potentially reaching 4 m five years after planting. Two years after initial planting, specimen trees comprising tī kōuka, pokaka, and ribbonwood will be planted on the batters. These species could exceed 4 m in height five years after planting. The batter planting will reduce bird strike by forcing most birds to fly above road level. Planting will reduce the magnitude of effect of vehicle strike to very low, leading to an overall level of effect of very low and low depending on the species. As such, no residual effects are anticipated and offset/compensation is not required. In any event, bird strike is a potential effect of the Project authorised by the existing designation.

Attachment 4 - NZTA response to comments from Waimakariri District Council in relation to State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus)

Date received	Document name & page / para reference	Comment ID	Topic	Extract / summary of comment	NZTA response
04/05/26	Para 3.29 Appendix 5, Para 3.2	3.10	Terrestrial ecology	Information requested in relation to “Proposed mitigation to guide birds away from the highway when moving between the two areas of habitat.”	See above response to 3.9.
04/05/26	Para 3.29 Appendix 5, section 3.3	3.11	Terrestrial ecology / conditions	“Ecological Management Plan shall include deterrents for bird strike and operational effects, and monitoring protocols and schedules with defined objectives.”	Landscape planting on the batters either side of the causeway will sufficiently deter birds from flying across the causeway at a height where they are at risk of bird strike. As a result, there are no monitoring protocols required to be included in the EMP. In any event, bird strike is a potential effect of the Project authorised by the existing designation.
04/05/26	Para 3.29 Appendix 5, section 3.2	3.12	Terrestrial ecology	Information requested in relation to vegetation details of the proposed mitigation. “As part of the proposed Ecological Offset plan, there will be a 20 m planted buffer on the land either side of the lake. There are no details surrounding the height of vegetation and whether this is to be used as mitigation for bird strike or mitigation for disturbance from the operational impacts such as noise and dust creation.”	Planting on the batter either side of the causeway will comprise native species including five finger, tauhimu, korokio, harakeke, mikimiki, mingimingi, and kohuhu. Most of these are expected to reach a height of c.2 m five years after planting, with five finger and kohuhu potentially reaching 4 m five years after planting. Two years after initial planting, specimen trees comprising tī kōuka, pokaka, and ribbonwood will be planted on the batters. The specimen trees can be expected to reach heights of at least 4 m when mature. The batter planting will reduce bird strike by encouraging birds to fly above road level and will also help screen the wetland and lake habitats from operational noise and dust. Buffer planting to the south of the road adjacent to the lizard release area comprises the same species mix as the batter planting. This planting will help screen the lizard relocation area from operational noise and dust. Detailed planting plans will be provided as part of the landscape drawing package accompanying the Outline Plan . See comment ID 3.9 for further discussion of bird strike.
04/05/26	Para's 3.30 Appendix 6, page 2	3.13	Transportation / conditions	“3.30 WDC's Senior Traffic engineer emphasised the importance of retaining the Management Plan certification process.” Shifting management plans to the Outline Plan process would remove Council's certification role, undermining the original designation's intent and limiting Council's ability to influence project outcomes, so the previous certification provisions (particularly Clause 4) should be retained and reflected in related conditions.	See response to comment 3.4.
04/05/26	Para 3.31 Appendix 6	3.14	Transportation / conditions	“3.31 Minor changes are also recommended to Conditions 8(i), 9(a), 39, 98 and 99. These are incorporated into the tracked changes in Appendix 2” Appendix 6 also notes recommended changes to conditions 9(e), 10(a) and 11(b) (with other consequential amendments to conditions 30, 32, 35, 40, 59, 81, 92, 93, and 94 – which could alternatively be addressed by adding an ‘independence’ requirement into the SQP definition.)	The suggested changes to conditions 8(i), 9(a), 9(e), 39, 98 and 99 are generally accepted, as addressed in the 2C Proposed Alterations to Designation Conditions Tracker. Condition 10(a) relates to the CAQMP, which NZTA does not agree to being included in the designation conditions (addressed further in response to comment 3.5). Changes sought to Condition 11(b) relates to the SQP needing to be independent person, although this specific change has not been carried through to the tracked changed conditions. While the SQPs engaged for the Project would not be ‘independent’ in the sense of being appointed separately from NZTA, they would nevertheless be appropriately qualified professionals engaged to

Attachment 4 - NZTA response to comments from Waimakariri District Council in relation to State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus)

Date received	Document name & page / para reference	Comment ID	Topic	Extract / summary of comment	NZTA response
					provide expert technical input within their area of expertise and subject to their professional and ethical obligations. WDC retains appropriate oversight through the Outline Plan process, including review of management plans, and may seek its own independent technical input at that stage, if WDC deems that necessary. WDC also has monitoring and enforcement functions under the RMA independent of the Requiring Authority.
04/05/26	Para 3.32 Appendix 7 Appendix 8	3.15	Contaminated land / conditions	“A number of amendments are proposed to the conditions relating to contaminated land. These are shown as tracked changes to conditions in Appendix 8.” Appendix 7 also provides summary of the changes requested.	Responses are provided in the 2D Proposed Resource Consent Conditions (s55) Tracker. The majority of the requested changes are accepted by NZTA (see the NES-CS conditions). However, NZTA does not agree to the inclusion of conditions requiring certification of the DSI and RAP, as these documents are required to be certified by CRC under the regional resource consents. This approach avoids unnecessary dual certification.
04/05/26	Appendix 3, sections 3.3, 4.2	3.16	Landscape / conditions	Cam River bridge alteration: The alteration reduces physical and visual effects compared to the previously designated scheme through bridge retention and reduced new structures. Overall effects are acceptable within the modified transport environment. Final close-out is subject to securing bridge-edge and embankment planting through updated management plans. More spatially explicit landscape conditions are required to ensure the updated bridge design is matched by an appropriate landscape response.	The Landscape drawing package, including detailed planting plans and planting schedule, will be provided as part of the Outline Plan. These plans will address planting at the Cam River, including areas disturbed by construction. As described in the landscape and visual assessment, the updated Cam River bridge design does not result in additional adverse landscape or visual effects relative to the existing designation. WDC has accepted this position. Accordingly, NZTA does not consider it necessary or proportionate to impose new requirements specific to the Cam River Bridge, beyond the broader requirements applying to the designation.
04/05/26	Appendix 3, sections 3.4, 4.1	3.17	Landscape	Pegasus Interchange: Principal landscape / visual ‘pressure point’ Grade separated overbridge and associated works introduce a more dominant infrastructural form. Effects cannot be fully mitigated, with local residual adverse visual effects likely for some users/outlooks. Landscape controls should specify minimum planting density, height, and maintenance, with stricter mitigation for east- and west-facing views. Current visuals (including 10-year views) are helpful but only indicative; enforceable conditions are needed to ensure outcomes. Additional visual simulations at 3, 6, and 10 years were not provided but are necessary for proper assessment of effects. There is low confidence in the accuracy of the illustrated visual effects, particularly in the short term. Short-term planting growth (1–6 years) should be assessed, as early-stage heights differ significantly from 10-year maturity.	The ULDVA assesses change in visual effects from the previously approved design. Visualisations provided within the assessment are indicative of year 10 to determine level of effect and appropriate mitigation from the worst-case views (west and northeast of the interchange). Mitigation of the overpass is demonstrated in the landscape and urban design package through either screening retaining walls, providing a trellis for climbing plants or using MSE blocks with an aesthetic finish. Further integration of the overpass occurs at the interchange through planting of gore areas, revegetation of the realigned Taranaki Stream and screen planting between the Pegasus Golf Course and east retaining walls (noting designation condition 39A secures this visual screening). Between chainages 9000-9300, the alignment interfaces with the Garlick Street connection to Main North Road. This urban – rural junction is marked by layered vegetation, screen trees and river margin revegetation which provides vegetation screening between the urban environment and the bypass. The overpass is located within an existing road corridor, with a low magnitude of change experienced from the west due to existing Ravenswood commercial buildings. The magnitude of change experienced from the east is higher where there are no elevated structures, however screening mitigation is required through designation condition 39A.

Attachment 4 - NZTA response to comments from Waimakariri District Council in relation to State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus)

Date received	Document name & page / para reference	Comment ID	Topic	Extract / summary of comment	NZTA response
				Further landscape concept drawings are needed, with conditions to allow council control through the certification process.	Please see 2C Proposed Alteration to Designation Condition Tracker with respect to specific landscape conditions.
04/05/26	Appendix 3, section 3.5	3.18	Landscape	Reliance on later design development / management plans: Cautious to the extent the application replies on later management plans and ongoing design optimisation, however understands a separate checkpoint with WDC will be available to verify planting plans and that ECan will be involved with the lake remnant area.	The designation conditions require preparation of an Urban and Landscape Design Management Plan and Visual Effects Management Plan to guide and inform the detailed design of the Project. This framework was established within the existing designation conditions. Additional Conditions 39A and 39B have been proposed to secure mitigations specific to the alteration to designation at the Pegasus Interchange and Lees Road CSA respectively. The Landscape drawing package including detailed planting plans will be included as part of the Outline Plan process. The lake remnant area includes planting which is detailed in the Landscape design package however, will be in accordance with and lead by the Ecological Management Plan.
04/05/26	Appendix 3, section 3.6	3.19	Landscape / conditions	Lees Road CSA: Effects can be appropriately managed through conditions requiring bunding, screening and planting etc. The provided imagery demonstrates the bund is suitably designed. Maintenance and removal/remedial conditions are required.	NZTA agrees to amend Condition 39B in relation to the Lees Road CSA to include further detail around rehabilitation requirements.
04/05/26	Appendix 3, sections 3.7, 4.3	3.20	Landscape / conditions	Southern remnant lake / ecological offset landscape: Overall concept is supported and has potential to deliver ecological and landscape benefits over time. Current information (at ~30% design) is too schematic to confirm landscape and visual effects outcomes. Insufficient detail and lack of visual simulations mean effects cannot yet be verified. Outcomes are reliant on a separate certification process, with conditions needed to ensure intended landscape results are achieved. Appendix A acknowledges that the wetland is under CRC remit.	The quarry lakes are artificial features formed through consented quarrying activities, and the original designation anticipated a motorway embankment through the ponds. As a result of embankment construction, a remnant lake will remain to the south of the embankment. The Project proposes to backfill this remnant lake to create a wetland which will serve as an ecological offset wetland for the Project. The Urban, Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment identifies less than minor beneficial effects to urban form and land use, and landscape and natural features, with no visual effects. No adverse landscape or visual effects are anticipated as a result of wetland creation. Given the wetland will result in no adverse effects, NZTA does not consider conditions on the designation are necessary in this regard. The regional resource consents require the preparation of a Residual Effects Management Plan under condition MP.7, to be certified by CRC. This plan will set the approach for creation of wetland habitat, including an adaptive and staged restoration methodology informed by ongoing groundwater monitoring. The landscape drawing package, to be provided to WDC as part of the Outline Plan process, will include concept planting plans and typical details for the wetland. The detailed wetland methodology and final species selection will continue to be developed by the Project ecologists through an adaptive management process and certified by CRC under the regional consent conditions.
04/05/26	Appendix 3, section 3.8	3.21	Landscape / conditions	District-side condition framework:	This comment appears to be a comment to the WDC Planners. Regardless, NZTA considers the proposed designation conditions are fit for purpose and provide adequate certainty, including in relation to landscape outcomes.

Attachment 4 - NZTA response to comments from Waimakariri District Council in relation to State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus)

Date received	Document name & page / para reference	Comment ID	Topic	Extract / summary of comment	NZTA response
				Proposed conditions shift several ecology, stormwater, and landscape matters to other approval pathways, creating a risk that district-level landscape outcomes are under-secured. Landscape integration elements (e.g. corridor-edge planting, stream margins, remnant lake/wetland treatment, and embankment integration) require clearer and more enforceable controls. Greater coordination with ECAN is needed to ensure adequate landscape controls are secured at this stage. Given the design is only at ~30%, stronger conditions are required to provide certainty of outcomes before reliance on later management plans.	Condition 36 already provides a detailed framework to guide and inform the detailed urban and landscape design of the Project. The existing conditions provide a clear pathway for achieving the intended outcomes while appropriately allowing flexibility for detailed design development. Furthermore the landscape package will be provided within the Outline Plan and WDC will be able to review and fully test those details at that stage. It is noted that the existing designation conditions already contemplate preparation of management plans and detailed design following confirmation of the designation. This is a standard and well understood approach for infrastructure projects of this scale and complexity, where detailed design is typically progressed following statutory approvals.
04/05/26	Appendix 3, Appendix A	3.22	Landscape / conditions	Appendix A of the landscape memo (Appendix 3) provides a track change version of requested changes to conditions from the landscape reviewer. A range of new conditions / certification triggers are also included in Section 2 of Appendix 3 (Landscape review memo), specifically: • Pegasus Interchange – developed landscape package • Pegasus Interchange – maintenance period • CSA – building / materials controls • Southern remnant lake / wetland – ECAN consideration	The majority of the landscape reviewers recommended condition amendments are addressed in the 2C Proposed Alterations to Designation Conditions s55 Tracker. In regard to the new conditions / certification triggers, we note: • Response to the proposed Pegasus Interchange – developed landscape package: NZTA does not consider the proposed requirement for visual simulations and developed landscape plans necessary. This is duplicative of the role of the ULDMP, which is itself the mechanism through which the detailed design is developed and documented and which will be provided to WDC for their review as part of the Outline Plan. • Pegasus Interchange – maintenance period: NZTA accepts a 5 year maintenance period for the Pegasus Interchange visual screening (as per amendments to Condition 39A). • CSA – building / materials controls: NZTA does not consider conditions which control the colour/finish of buildings in the CSA to be necessary given the requirement for visual screening as per condition 39B. Southern remnant lake / wetland – CRC consideration: the wetland will not result in adverse landscape or visual effects and is for ecological offset purposes. It is appropriate the regional consent conditions address this matter.
04/05/26	Appendix 6, page 3	3.23	Conditions	“Former condition 7 required Council certification for any management plan amendments and it is unclear why this requirement has been removed and replaced with a simple reporting requirement for “material” changes. Further there does not appear to be a definition for “material” changes”	See response to comment 3.4 above regarding the certification of management plans. NZTA has proposed a new definition for Material Change, which is included in the 2C Proposed Alterations to Designation Conditions s55 Tracker.