

15 April 2026

Novo Group Limited
Level 1, 279 Montreal Street
PO Box 365, Christchurch 8140
0 - 03 365 5570
info@novogroup.co.nz

MEMORANDUM

TO: Dean Christie, NTP Development Holdings Limited
Jo Appleyard, Anderson Lloyd

FROM: Georgia Brown (Senior Planner) & Nick Fuller (Principal Transport Engineer), Novo Group

PROJECT REF: Pound Road Industrial Development

POUND ROAD INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT [FTAA-2505-1057] SECTION 70(4) RESPONSE

1. The following assessment responds to the Expert Panel's Minute 16, and other matters raised as part of the comments on the Draft Decision and Conditions. In particular, the comments from New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) and Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin. The assessment is jointly provided on behalf of the Applicant by Georgia Brown (planning) and Nick Fuller (transport).
2. As previously confirmed to the Panel via the Memorandum accompanying the Canterbury Regional Council's (CRC) Response, dated 31 March 2026, the Applicant is in full agreement with CRC on the draft conditions relating to CRC consents. This Memorandum (31 March 2026) also included a response to the Wildlife Approvals condition table, and it is noted that the Applicant and Department of Conservation are aligned in their position on these conditions¹. A Memorandum accompanying the Christchurch City Council (CCC) Response was also filed on 2 April 2026 confirming that the Applicant and CCC are substantively aligned on the CCC conditions, with further clarification and amendment to be provided in relation to Condition 3 and Condition 127(g) of the subdivision conditions. This further clarification and condition amendments are provided as part of this response, refer to **Appendix 1** of this Memorandum.
3. For clarity, the Applicant has been in correspondence with CCC about this condition and our requested changes. CCC have reviewed the revised wording and confirmed that they have no further comment on the substance of the wording, as per the correspondence attached as **Appendix 2** to this Memorandum.
4. Lastly, as requested by the Expert Panel, attached as **Appendix 3** is a "Schedule of Management Plans Contained in Conditions" of the CCC, CRC and Wildlife Permit condition sets.

¹ Comments on draft conditions for a fast-track consenting application; from Director-General of Conservation; Fast Track Reference FTAA-2505-1057.



Minute 16

5. As per Minute 16, and in addition to requesting comments on the conditions, the Panel also requested clarification on several other matters. These are set out in paragraph 8 of the Minute and are repeated below with the Applicant's response in *italics*.
6. (a) Conditions 14A and 23 – 25, Construction Traffic Management Plan and Environmental Management Plan – neither of these plans currently address in detail the potential effects of construction noise and dust and traffic on residents along Barters Road. Parties are invited to comment on if amendments to the conditions are required.

Response: *The Christchurch District Plan controls noise generated by construction activities at 6.1.6.1.1 P2². The proposal did not apply for resource consent to breach this standard and will be required to abide by it. The Powell Fenwick Acoustic Assessment included a section on Construction Noise and Vibration, with the following conclusive comments:*

“Construction tasks vary in equipment and are not always continuous resulting in stages where noise levels are close to limits for parts of the defined periods, and stages where noise levels are well below the limits. In this case, with noise separation across Hasketts Road and Barters Road to the closest rural dwellings, and other dwellings being more remote, the majority of works can be expected to comply with the noise limits from NZS 6803... Assessment of vibration is not required in the District Plan for general construction activities. At this stage, we would expect assessed vibration levels would not exceed cosmetic damage guidance limits with reference to DIN standards”.

Reliance on Rule 6.1.6.1.1 P2 is a standard approach by Christchurch City Council. Thus, no condition is proposed regarding this matter.

Lastly, with respect to management of dust, Condition 27 already covers this including reference to the Canterbury Regional Air Plan. The CARP requires submission of a Dust Management Plan to confirm compliance with CARP Rule 7.32. A Dust Management Plan was provided as Appendix 13 to the Substantive Application and will be adhered to as part of the development and construction works.

7. (b) Condition 46 – does the Applicant have a view on the choice between a FW3 and FW4 level of fire flow service for water supply? If not, how should the condition be structured?

Response: *A decision will be made between FW3 and FW4 once further hydraulic modelling has been undertaken. The condition has now been structured to allow for this scenario and agreed with CCC.*

Further, and related to this matter, as part of the CCC response to conditions, comments were included from CCC's Water Supply Asset Engineer that referenced a 'draft' Firefighting Code and a request to reference the new 'draft' Code in an Advice Note.

² 6.1.6.1.1 P2 a. Construction activities shall meet the relevant noise limits in Tables 2 and 3 of NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics – Construction Noise, when measured and assessed in accordance with that standard.



Given this document is still a 'draft' and is in a submission period, it is not appropriate to give any weight to it nor include a reference to it in an advice note.

8. **(c)** Conditions 63 and 67 – there is currently some inconsistency in the drafting of draft conditions relating to on-site stormwater treatment devices. In particular, the devices referred to in CCC subdivision consent conditions 63 and 67 are different and differ from those referenced in CRC condition 17. The parties are to clarify their respective positions and propose conditions that address any inconsistencies.

Response: *There is no inconsistency in the CCC subdivision conditions 64 (previous 63) and 68 (previously 67), as set out in the condition table, provided as part of the joint response between CCC and NTP.*

There is also no inconsistency with the CRC conditions. CRC260877 Condition 9 relates to the stormwater discharge from the overall subdivision roads, footpaths, berms, hardstand, impervious surfaces and excess runoff from lots. The devices included in this condition are consistent with CCC condition 64.

9. **(d)** Conditions 88, 90 and 91A – road widening Barters Road and Hasketts Road – the Applicant and CCC are to confirm if the conditions 88, 90 and 91A reflect their agreement or otherwise advise the proposed wording.

Response: *Agreement has been reached with CCC on the wording of these conditions as per the joint response.*

10. **(e)** Condition 88 – The Applicant and CCC are to clarify whether the flush median suggested by the Applicant is required for the southern access point on Barters Road. The Panel is unclear whether the latest discussions with CCC on road widening have identified whether or not a flush median at the southern access intersection on Barters Road is required. We seek clarification from the Applicant and CCC on this point. We are also unclear whether the latest discussions with CCC on road widening have identified whether or not a flush median at the southern access intersection on Barters Road is required. We seek clarification from the Applicant and CCC on this point. We are also unclear on if the potential for additional heavy vehicles means that a flush median is required near 33 Barters Road. If the detailed design process is to be used to consider this issue further, CCC subdivision condition 88 should be updated to reflect that.

Response: *After discussion between the Applicant's Transport Specialist and CCC Transport, the flush median is not required for the southern access point on Barters Road. The parties consider that the safety audit (required per Condition 88) is the correct process to determine whether the median is required. The condition has not been updated, as per the joint response with CCC.*

11. **(f)** Condition 91 – the Applicant is to comment on the option of either a cycle path within the shoulder on Pound Road (of sufficient width in accordance with relevant Guidelines) or a cycle path along the frontage of stage 3 (see Mr Rodgers comments on 5 March 2026).

Response: *The condition has been re-drafted in consultation with CCC to provide for a cycle path within a sealed shoulder on Pound Road.*



12. **(g)** Condition 112 – we note that we are unclear on the number of culvert crossings within the PWRN (refer draft decision paragraph 43). We invite the Applicant to confirm the same in its comments on the condition.

Response: *One culvert crossing is proposed within the PWRN. The condition has been updated to reflect this also.*

13. **(h)** Consent notice conditions – the Applicant is required to put all consent notice conditions in one section.

Response: *This has been updated as per the condition table in the joint response between CCC and NTP.*

Panel Draft Staging Condition

14. The Panel proposed the following wording of the staging condition (Condition 3 of the subdivision consent):

“Condition X:

The Records of Title for Lots located in Stage 1 of the subdivision as shown on the plan titled “Pound Road Industrial Subdivision – For Consent Purposes,” (drawing Reference E20739 Revision 2, dated December 2025) shall not be issued before 31 December 2027;

The Records of Titles for lots located in Stage 2 or Stage 3 of the subdivision as shown on the plan titled “Pound Road Industrial Subdivision - For Consent Purposes,” (drawing reference E20739 Revision 2, dated December 2025) shall not be issued before 1 January 2029;

Records of Title shall not be issued for Lots located in Stage 4 of the subdivision as shown on the plan titled “Pound Road Industrial Subdivision - For Consent Purposes,” (drawing reference E20739 Revision 2, dated December 2025), unless the intersection of State Highway 1 and Pound Road and the intersection of Waterloo Road and Pound Road (the intersections) are upgraded to achieve Level of Service C or better and Saturation of 0.9 or less in general accordance with the concept design shown in drawing 0383-012-DWD1001-B prepared by Novo Group dated 27 June 2025;

The consent holder shall fund 20% of the costs of the upgrades to the intersections referred to in the clauses above; and

Condition X a), X b), X c) and X d) shall not apply if the consent holder enters into a developer agreement with NZTA and CCC for an alternative arrangement as to timing of intersection upgrades and cost sharing”

15. Firstly, after discussion with CCC it is now agreed that the condition should refer to ‘Section 224 Certificates’ instead of ‘Record of Title’. There is no opportunity to control the issue of Record of Titles as these can only be controlled via the issue of Section 224 Certificates.
16. The Applicant accepts the Panel’s intent to require the upgrade to the intersections to occur prior to Stage 4 as drafted in part (c) of the Condition. However, the Applicant does not agree



that inclusion of reference to a Level of Service is required, with the reasoning set out in paragraphs 29-33 below (as part of the response to NZTA's comments).

17. To avoid an outcome whereby the NZTA substantially delay any upgrade to the intersections (and thus Stage 4 is substantially delayed), the Applicant requests a 'sunset clause' to be included as part of the condition. The Applicant requests that the condition is revised to state that Section 224 Certificates for Stage 4 cannot be issued until the sooner of the intersection upgrades being completed or 1 July 2031. The rationale for this timeframe is based on the following points:

- i. The timeframe and date aligns with the Applicant's response to Minute 14³ setting out that the development programme anticipates that Titles for Stage 4 are to be issued Quarter 3 of 2031;
- ii. The timeframe enables the Applicant to utilise their land use consent from CRC to carry out the bulk earthworks (the consent has a duration of seven years). If the earthworks associated with Stage 4 are not completed within this timeframe, NTP would need to apply reapply for resource consent from CRC to undertake these works, resulting in unnecessary costs and delays and inefficiencies of process.
- iii. The proposed timeframe provides the transport agencies with a five-year period to plan, fund, and deliver the required intersection upgrades, which is more than adequate. This is further supported by the fact that the Hornby Study is already underway to determine appropriate improvement works across the corridor, including the intersection.
- iv. Lastly, the issuing of Section 224 certificates in July 2031 will not result in an immediate and noticeable effect on the transport network, as occupation of the Stage will still be some years away. As set out in Natalie Hampson's response to Minute 14⁴, construction of buildings on Stage 4 will be expected to take place two years after land development of Stage 4 commences (and finishes), occurring evenly over six years. Therefore, occupation of Stage 4 will be anticipated to occur between 2033 – 2038.

18. In terms of part (d) of the Panel's draft condition, the Applicant accepts the requirement to provide a contribution of 20% of the cost of the upgrades. The Applicant requests that this contribution is clearly linked to a specific / known cost to avoid any ambiguity in future. For example, should the NZTA Hornby Study identify a preference for a costlier upgrade, it would be unreasonable to expect the Applicant to contribute 20% towards an upgrade that is not required or in direct response to their application. Such a condition would be 'more onerous than necessary'.

19. The Applicant therefore considers that the 20% contribution should be based on the provisional estimate of the upgrade, being \$3,717,356.50 as prepared by Mr Inness in his response to Minute 14⁵. This estimate was based on the intersection upgrade design

³ Ngāi Tahu Property - Applicant response to Minute 14; date 24 February 2026

⁴ FTAA-2505-1057: Pound Road, Christchurch Applicant Response to Minute 14; prepared by Natalie Hampson, Savvy Consulting Limited; date: 25 February 2026

⁵ Davie Lovell Smith Pound Road Industrial Development, Panel Minute 14 Response Infrastructure Costs and Timeframe



prepared by the Applicant. The intersection design has been reviewed and accepted as being acceptable by all parties and thus the costing of this is appropriate to be included as a basis for the 20% contribution in the condition. The Applicant is happy for this cost to be made public for the purpose of the condition.

20. For the above reasons, the Applicant requests the following amendments of the Panel's wording (additions shown as **bold underline** and deletions as ~~strike through~~)

- a) ~~The Records of Title~~ **Section 224 Certificates** for Lots located in Stage 1 of the subdivision as shown on the plan titled "Pound Road Industrial Subdivision – For Consent Purposes," (drawing Reference E20739 Revision 2, dated December 2025) shall not be issued before 31 December 2027;
- b) ~~The Records of Titles~~ **Section 224 Certificates** for lots located in Stage 2 or Stage 3 of the subdivision as shown on the plan titled "Pound Road Industrial Subdivision - For Consent Purposes," (drawing reference E20739 Revision 2, dated December 2025) shall not be issued before 1 January 2029;
- c) ~~Records of Title~~ **Section 224 Certificates** shall not be issued for Lots located in Stage 4 of the subdivision as shown on the plan titled "Pound Road Industrial Subdivision - For Consent Purposes," (drawing reference E20739 Revision 2, dated December 2025), ~~unless~~ **until the sooner of:**
 - i. the intersection of State Highway 1 and Pound Road and the intersection of Waterloo Road and Pound Road (the intersections) are upgraded ~~to achieve Level of Service C or better and Saturation of 0.9 or less in general accordance with the concept design shown in drawing 0383-012-DWD1001-B prepared by Novo Group dated 27 June 2025;~~ **or**
 - ii. **1 July 2031**
- d) The consent holder shall fund 20% of the costs of the upgrades to the intersections referred to in the clauses above **and based on the figure indexed in the 'Davie Lovell Smith Pound Road Industrial Development, Panel Minute 14 Response Infrastructure Costs and Timeframe' included as Appendix 3 to this decision;** and
- e) Condition 3 a), 3 b), 3 c) and 3 d) shall not apply if the consent holder enters into a developer agreement with NZTA and CCC for an alternative arrangement as to timing of intersection upgrades and cost sharing.

21. The amendments sought as shown above satisfies s83 of the FTAA by avoiding a condition that is more onerous than necessary, appropriately applies s84A by ensuring infrastructure can be made adequate, manages the potential significant transport effects at the point that they have the potential to become consequential, and preserves the viability and deliverability of the projects significant regional benefits. The amendment to the condition, as proposed by the Applicant, ensures delivery of Stage 4 of the development via the inclusion of the 'sunset clause' enabling Section 224 certificates to be issued from 1 July 2031 should the intersection upgrades not be in place.



22. It is requested that CCC subdivision Condition 3 and Condition 127(g) are updated to reflect the above wording, as per the table in **Appendix 1** to this Memorandum.

NZTA Comments

Development Staging and Impacts and Timing of Contribution

23. The NZTA have commented on the Panel's draft condition relating to staging stating that *'the Condition allows development of Stage 3 to proceed, and significant impacts to occur, without any mitigation being provided by the Applicant'*⁶. This statement is contrary to the Draft Decision and the findings of the Panel that the impacts of the development would not be significant at Stage 3 but significant from Stage 3⁷.
24. The NZTA have also commented that *"... there is a risk that Stage 4 may never occur, and therefore the Applicant may not be required by the Condition to deliver or contribute to any mitigation that addresses the significant impacts generated by the development of Stage 3"*⁸.
25. Stage 4 forms a part of the 'development' and application, and thus it is speculative from the NZTA to question whether it will or will not occur. As above, the Applicant's requested changes to the condition wording further ensures that Stage 4 can occur, via the inclusion of a sunset clause. Nonetheless, in terms of the contribution, the Applicant has previously advised the NZTA that the 20% contribution could be offered at an earlier stage in the process, however NZTA confirmed that they have no ability to accept financial contribution to hold pending the intersection upgrade being undertaken.
26. The NZTA suggest that the condition should be amended to require the Intersection Upgrades to be undertaken prior to the completion of Stage 3, however no explicit timeframe was provided. This requested wording is not enforceable given it is unclear whether this means that one, two or thirteen lots (of the fifteen lots) within Stage 3 can be developed prior to the intersection upgrades being completed. The requested change would result in the condition being more onerous than necessary.
27. Evidence has been presented by the Applicant that the Project may not be viable, and therefore may not proceed, if the Applicant does not have sufficient certainty that all stages of the Project can be implemented. That evidence further indicates that the Project is expected to reach break-even only during Stage 3. Importantly, this evidence has not been challenged or contradicted by any other party.
28. Introducing a rigid condition that requires that Stage 3 shall not be completed until the intersection upgrades are complete introduces a level of uncertainty and risk that the evidence indicates the development is unlikely to withstand. As per the Draft Decision, the Panel has found that without the intersection upgrades, the effects of the project on the intersection become significant from Stage 3, by reason of the deterioration in their effective

⁶ Paragraph 2.3 of Memorandum of the New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi on the Pound Road Industrial Development [FTAA-2505-2057] Comments on the Draft Conditions; 31 March 2026.

⁷ Paragraph 267 Before the Pound Road Industrial Development [FTAA-2505-1057] Expert Panel - DRAFT Record of Decision of the Expert Consenting Panel under Section 87 of the Fast-Track Approvals Act 2024

⁸ Paragraph 2.4 of Memorandum of the New Zealand Transport Agency Waka Kotahi on the Pound Road Industrial Development [FTAA-2505-2057] Comments on the Draft Conditions; 31 March 2026.



functioning anticipated at that stage of development. Therefore, implementing the intersection upgrades before Stage 3 is completed is more onerous than necessary and the NZTA's suggested wording would risk the project being undermined such that the significant regional benefits are not realised.

Level of Service

29. The NZTA support the inclusion of the reference to a Level of Service in the proposed condition requiring the upgrades to the State Highway 1 / Pound Road and Pound Road / Waterloo Road intersections.
30. We consider that the inclusion of a reference to a Level of Service is not required, as the proposed condition refers to the concept design drawings of the intersection upgrade arrangement. As per the meeting minutes of our post application discussions with the NZTA⁹, all parties at that meeting agreed that *the two-lane right-turn upgrade is practicable (physically feasible and reasonably achievable) and resolves traffic impacts*. Given this, we consider the reference to the concept intersection design is sufficient for this condition.
31. Further to this, we also consider that including a reference to a Level of Service suggests that additional traffic modelling will be required, whereas the agreement with NZTA is that the proposed arrangement is acceptable. Introducing the potential for further traffic modelling means that the Applicant may be held responsible for mitigating the effects of other projects in the vicinity of the site, including future and yet-to-be constructed projects, rather than solely addressing the effects of their development on the existing environment. For example, the NZTA Hornby Study may seek to promote Pound Road as an alternative to State Highway 1 resulting in fundamentally different traffic flows and levels of service in this location. Or, the approval of Plan Change 19 would likely result in additional industrial development and traffic accessing the fourth arm at the State Highway 1 / Pound Road intersection, with associated impacts on levels of service and intersection performance. It is unreasonable to expect the Applicant to be held responsible for mitigating the effects of these other future and unconsented / unzoned activities.
32. Given all parties have agreed that the concept scheme indicated on Novo Group drawing 0383-012-DWD1001-B satisfactorily addresses the effects of this proposal and currently forecasted additional traffic generation, we consider this is the appropriate reference included in the condition, without the need for a reference to Levels of Service. Furthermore, changing the design of the intersection could result in the Applicant being held responsible for mitigating effects that are external to the project, and could affect the project's overall viability. The 20% contribution required as part of the condition wording is based on the design which has been accepted by all parties, and the traffic directly attributed to the proposal. This is the figure that has been used in the Applicant's feasibility study for the Application.
33. To conclude, the Applicant does not accept the wording or amendments to the Staging condition as sought by NZTA. The Applicant requests that the Panel retain the staging approach with the further amendments as requested and set out in paragraph 19 above.

⁹ Meeting of 08 December 2025 and minutes included as Attachment 4 to our 18 December 2025 response to the Panel.



Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin

34. We have reviewed the further comments provided by Cass Jones and Gemma McLaughlin (residents [REDACTED]), their comments primarily relate to the Barters Road access location, Barters Road pedestrian and cycling facilities, and the loss of rural character to Barters Road. The following provides our responses to the matters raised.

Access Location

35. The further comments request that the southern site access intersection be relocated further south. The comments indicate there is a *significant increase* in traffic on that segment of Barters Road. The modelling¹⁰ indicates the majority of traffic would use the Pound Road access roundabout, with the increase in traffic on Barters Road (south of the southern access) being approximately 60 to 70 vehicles per hour. We do not consider this to be a significant increase.
36. Even accounting for the existing traffic volumes on Barters Road, we would not anticipate issues turning to / from the access to [REDACTED]. Further safety consideration of this access location would be covered in through the Road Safety Audit process, along with associated recommendations to improve the safety (if required).
37. It is also implied there would be a District Plan non-compliance relating to their access in relation to the intersection, which is not correct. The Advice Note in District Plan Appendix 7.5.11 states that *Outside the Central City, the minimum distance of vehicle crossings from intersections only applies to an intersection on the same side of the road as the site*. The intersection is opposite the access to their property, so there the access is in a compliant location.
38. Overall, we consider that the access location is in a reasonably common and compliant location with any potential further safety considerations being provided through the Road Safety Audit process.

Pedestrian & Cycling Facilities on Barters Road

39. These comments request that a shared use path be provided along Barters Road, a crossing facility be provided at the Barters Road / Waterloo Road intersection and a pedestrian crossing to the proposed reserve.
40. We note that the increase in traffic on Barters Road is not significant and that the speed will reduce to 60km/h (from the existing 80km/h) with the development in place. This will improve pedestrian and cycling on Barters Road without the need for a dedicated path. Similarly, the changes in traffic volumes anticipated at the Barters Road / Waterloo Road intersection are sufficiently low that we consider the effects of the proposal at that location do not warrant the provision of a crossing facility, particularly noting the likely very low pedestrian / cycle demands heading to / from Templeton.

¹⁰ Appendix 5 of the Integrated Transport Assessment that accompanied the Substantive Application.



41. Finally, we note that the reserve within the application site is a stormwater facility, rather than being a recreation reserve. As such, we would not expect there to be any pedestrian demands to that location.
42. Given the above, we consider that no alterations are required to the draft conditions relating to these matters.

Barters Road landscape strip /Loss of rural character

43. The comments raised about the loss of rural character along the Barters Road and Hasketts Road frontage have already been acknowledged, and it is accepted that the development will result in a noticeable visual change beyond the existing. However, in the context of the wider environment, this change is not of a significant impact that is disproportionate to the regional benefits of the development.
44. The proposal will replace the existing boundary hedge with a five metre landscape strip, the width allows for substantial planting that over time will establish enclosure, and provide for both visual and ecological mitigation. The landscaping strip will be in private land, and a Consent Notice will be registered on each of the relevant Lots advising of the need for ongoing maintenance and care of the landscaping.

Other Parties Comments

45. For completeness, we have reviewed the other comments received on the draft conditions and consider that no further response is required to these comments.

Conclusion

46. The Applicant's requested amendments to the staging condition are both appropriate and necessary. They provide a clear, workable framework that enables development to proceed efficiently while continuing to manage effects in a manner consistent with the Panel's findings and the evidence before it. Importantly, the amended condition removes unnecessary sequencing constraints that are not supported by the Panel's conclusions and would otherwise undermine the timely delivery of the project. In doing so, the requested changes directly give effect to the purpose of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 by facilitating development that is nationally and regionally significant and providing certainty for implementation whilst managing significant impacts. For these reasons, the applicant considers that the revised staging condition is the most appropriate outcome and that the matters raised in relation to staging can be regarded as resolved.



APPENDIX 1: UPDATED COPY OF CCC CONDITION TABLE



APPENDIX 2: CCC CORRESPONDENCE ON STAGING CONDITION



APPENDIX 3: SCHEDULE OF MANAGEMENT PLANS CONTAINED IN CONDITIONS