

POUND ROAD INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT NZTA MEETING MINUTES

Date 8 December 2025
Time 1.30pm
Location: Microsoft Teams

Attendees: Bruce Hawkins – Senior Planner – NZTA
Kevan Fleckney – Principal Traffic Engineer – NZTA
Dean Christie – Development Manager – NTP Development Holdings Limited
Jeremy Phillips – Directory & Senior Planner – Novo Group
Nick Fuller – Principal Transport Engineer – Novo Group
Georgia Brown – Senior Planner – Novo Group

Apologies: James Long – Safety Engineer – NZTA
Sagar Pandey – Senior Network Manager – NZTA
Priya Thakur – Senior Transport Engineer System Design - NZTA

Introductions:

1. Bruce opened the meeting and handed over to Nick, focusing on four items previously emailed by Bruce (dated: 4/12/25). Those four items are included in **Attachment 1** and are:
 - i. Does the modelling provide a satisfactory foundation for determining intersection upgrades required to mitigate the effects of the proposed subdivision?
 - ii. Is the Proposed Pound Road / SH1 upgrade practicable?
 - iii. Does the design mitigate the anticipated adverse effects arising from the subdivision and associated development?
 - iv. Does NZTA have the appetite to enter into a funding agreement with the applicant?

Key Discussion Points:

2. NZTA's s53 comments suggested NTP had not fully addressed pre-application feedback. Nick noted two areas needing clarification:
 - i. Distribution of traffic generated by the activity; and
 - ii. Signal co-ordination / blocking back in the modelling.



3. Nick considered that both matters were adequately addressed, noting:
 - i. **Traffic distribution:** Waterloo Business Park (Industrial General Zoning) was used as a basis for assumptions in the model as to traffic distribution. The development is expected to operate similarly to this existing zone, noting it is nearby (directly opposite the site) and permits the same activities and buildings as is proposed in the application by NTP.

Nick explained that the FTA application is a resource consent (not rezoning) proposal that implements industrial use and activity, although there is no specific Gross Floor Area basis on which to assess the traffic generation. The trip generation is therefore based on the site area, with comparisons made to other sites in Christchurch and Ashburton (as per email correspondence with NZTA) to confirm the adopted traffic generation rate is robust.

Nick also noted that the proposal 'adopts' existing rules from the Christchurch District Plan, meaning high trip generating activities will be subject to further scrutiny and assessment through future resource consent processes. Therefore, an added 'safety net' is provided to ensure atypical activities beyond (what has been modelled) are appropriately managed.
 - ii. **Blocking back:** The modelling includes blocking back from intersections, so it accounts for reduced upstream capacity.
4. Kevan noted the traffic distribution was challenging to follow in the ITA, but no issue with the modelling overall. He agreed that the two-lane right-turn upgrade is a good solution. Remaining questions relate to the funding and timing of the works.
5. All parties agreed the two-lane right-turn upgrade is practicable (physically feasible and reasonably achievable) and resolves traffic impacts. Items i-iii in NZTA's email of 4/12/25 are considered resolved, and the focus now shifts to item iv (funding and delivery).
6. On funding, Nick emphasised existing intersection issues and noted modelling confirms the upgrade is required by 2030 with the anticipated level of development from the NTP proposal on the network at that time. Therefore, NTP should contribute proportionately to its impact.
7. The Hornby Study was discussed as potentially relevant to funding/delivery. NZTA is in the early stages of this study, which may examine Pound Road as a bypass route. However, timeframes for the study (~12-18 months) exceed those of the FTA process. Parties agreed that the proposal might inform the Hornby Study, rather than vice versa.
8. Kevan reiterated the two-lane right-turn solution is viable, requires no additional land, and may attract some budget as unscheduled capital expenditure. Bruce noted this is best addressed by Sagar Pandey and a follow up meeting is needed.

Conclusions:



9. Jeremy summarised that NZTA's concerns have a feasible and achievable solution, providing confidence to progress the FTA application while funding/timing issues are resolved. Bruce agreed.
10. Dean requested clarity on NZTA's process for unscheduled works and securing funding. Bruce will follow up with further information.
11. All parties agreed a subsequent meeting focused on funding and timing is the logical next step.
12. The above conclusion will be useful to provide as a response to the Panel.

Next Steps:

13. Parties agreed:
 - i. There is a solution to address the issue.
 - ii. Another meeting is required to determine funding and a side agreement.
 - iii. CCC must be included in that meeting as the upgrade affects their road.

Meeting closed at 2:10pm.