

Memorandum on Completeness and Scope

File FTAA-2512-1157

Application State Highway 1 North Canterbury—Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus)

To Manager LOA/ Team Leader LOA

From [REDACTED], Application Lead

Date 30 January 2026

Subject Assessment whether the application complies with section 46(2) of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

Purpose

1. The purpose of this memo is to assist you in making your decision on whether the State Highway 1 North Canterbury—Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus) application, received by the Fast-track Team on 19 December 2025 lodged by New Zealand Transport Agency complies with the requirements of section 46(2) of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (**the Act**).

Decision-maker

2. You have delegated authority to make the decision under section 46 of the Act under the instrument of delegation dated 27 October 2025.

Conflict of interest

3. I confirm that I do not have any conflict of interest in this matter that would prevent me making this assessment.

The application

4. For projects listed in Schedule 2 of the Act and referred projects, authorised persons may lodge a substantive application for approvals available under the Act.
5. The State Highway 1 North Canterbury—Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus) is a listed project.

6. The EPA received the substantive application for State Highway 1 North Canterbury—Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus) on 19 December 2025 by New Zealand Transport Agency. The EPA must, in consultation with the relevant administering agencies and relevant consent authorities, decide whether this substantive application complies with section 46 of the Act by **30 January 2026**.
7. As set out in more detail below, the EPA must decide whether the application is complete and either:
 - provide the application to the Panel Convener for consideration and decision by the expert consenting panel (if complete and within scope); or
 - return it to the person who lodged it (if incomplete and not within scope).

Project and Scope

8. The project is described in Schedule 2 of the Act as¹:

Extend the State Highway 1 Christchurch Northern Corridor between Belfast and Pegasus

9. The approximate geographical location is identified in Schedule 2 of the Act as:

State Highway 1 North Canterbury

10. As stated in the Substantive Application Report (volume 2A, from page 1) The application is for the following activity:

The Project will extend the SH1 Christchurch Northern Corridor between Belfast and Pegasus and spans a linear length of approximately 11 km, commencing from approximately 600 m south of the Kaiapoi River Bridge and ending approximately 700 m north of the Pegasus/Ravenwood intersection. The Project includes upgrades to approximately 4 km of the existing SH1 and a new approximately 7 km bypass of Woodend township.

11. The application clearly states the project is an extension of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and includes a bypass of the Woodend township (which is included in the project name, under schedule 2 of the Act).
12. Section 3.2 of the Substantive Application report states the SH1 upgrades will occur from approximately 600 m south of Kaiapoi River Bridge to the Cam River / Ruataniwha, including:
 - Additional southbound lane – Between approximately 600 m south of the Kaiapoi River Bridge to the bridge itself

¹ The description of this project as listed in schedule 2 was amended on 17 December 2025 to delete “by approximately 4 kilometres, altering the existing designation, and additional land acquisition outside of that designation”: [Fast-track Approvals Amendment Act 2025 No 78, Public Act 52 Schedule 2 amended – New Zealand Legislation](#)

- Kaiapoi River Bridge upgrades – Seismic strengthening and widening to provide additional southbound lane.
 - Four-lane upgrades – Upgrade the SH1 carriageway from two lanes to four lanes from Lineside Road Overpass to the Cam River / Ruataniwha.
13. I consider the above SH1 upgrade activities to be within scope of the description listed in Schedule 2 of the Act as they are all located between Belfast and Pegasus.
 14. I also consider the above upgrades to be an extension of the current Christchurch Northern Corridor as they occur approximately where the current Northern corridor ends and includes 4 lane upgrades which is consistent with the current Northern corridor (which also has 4 lanes).
 15. The applicant also states the project will include project wide activities along the length of the project (see page 16 of the Substantive Application Report: storm water infrastructure, watercourse and drainage works, landscaping and planting, ecological offsetting and compensation, noise mitigation, utilities and services, road features and furniture), which I consider to be involved in, or support and be subsidiary to the project referred to in Schedule 2.
 16. The geographic location of the Project (State Highway 1 North Canterbury) is also aligned throughout the application documents.
 17. Based on the above information, I consider the substantive application therefore relates solely to the listed project

Fast-track consenting application process

Legislative context

18. The EPA must decide whether the substantive application complies with section 46(2) of the Act. A substantive application complies with section 46(2) of the Act, if the application:
 - complies with sections 42, 43 and 44;
 - relates solely to a listed project or a referred project;
 - the EPA considers that, on the face of the application, the project does not appear to involve an ineligible activity; and
 - any fee, charge, or levy payable under the Fast-track Approvals (Cost Recovery) Regulations 2025 (the Regulations) in respect of the application is paid.

Section 42 Requirements

19. Section 42 of the Act states that an authorised person may lodge a substantive application for one project or substantive applications for each stage of a project. Section 42(4) lists the approvals that may be sought under the Act.
20. This application has been lodged by New Zealand Transport Agency. This person is an authorised person as listed under Schedule 2 of the Act.
21. The approvals being sought are:

- a resource consent that would otherwise be applied for under the Resource Management Act 1991;
 - a designation or an alteration to an existing designation for which a notice of requirement would otherwise be lodged under the Resource Management Act 1991;
 - a wildlife approval as defined in clause 1 of Schedule 7;
 - an approval or a dispensation that would otherwise be applied for under regulation 42 or 43 of the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations 1983 in respect of a complex freshwater fisheries activity;
 - an archaeological authority described in section 44(a) or (b) of the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 that would otherwise be applied for under that Act
22. All of the above listed approvals are of the type set out in section 42(4) of the Act.
23. For each of the approvals sought, the applicant is eligible to apply for any corresponding approval under a specified Act.

Section 43 Requirements

24. Section 43 of the Act sets out the requirements for a substantive application. The substantive application was lodged in the form and manner approved by the EPA. Assessment of section 43 requirements is included at Appendix 1.

Section 44 Requirements

25. Section 44 of the Act requires that the information provided by the applicant under section 43 must be specified in sufficient detail to satisfy the purpose for which it is required. Assessment of section 44 sufficiency is included at Appendix 1.
26. In assessing the sufficiency of information provided by the applicant, we rely on the information provided to us through consultation with each relevant administering agency and consent authority, as summarised in Appendix 2.
27. As set out in more detail in Appendix 2, the agencies consulted have advised that the information required by section 44 is provided in **sufficient** detail to satisfy the purpose for which it is required.

Ineligibility

28. The EPA needs to decide whether it considers that, on the face of the application, the project does not appear to involve an ineligible activity, as defined in section 5 of the Act. As the EPA has to consider this on the face of the application, the EPA is only able to consider information contained in the application materials.
29. The list of ineligible projects includes activities:
- on land returned under a Treaty settlement, on identified Māori Land, on Māori customary land, on land set apart as Māori reservation, or in a customary marine title or protected customary rights area without written permission from the rights holder;
 - on Māori customary land, or land set apart as Māori reservation under Part 17 of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993;

- in a customary marine or protected customary rights area without written agreement from the rights holder/group;
 - within an aquaculture settlement area without the required authorisation;
 - activities that would be prevented under section 165J, 165M, 165Q, 165ZC, or 165ZDB of the RMA (which deal with occupation of space in the common marine and coastal area); or
 - that require permissions on national reserves held under the Reserves Act 1977 ; or
 - on land listed under clauses 1 to 11 or 14 of Schedule 4 of the Crown Minerals Act 1991 (and clauses 12 and 13 for mining activities).
30. I consider that, on the face of the application, the project does not appear to involve an ineligible activity.

Fees and levies

31. The EPA has received all fees, charges and levies payable by the applicant under the Regulations for the substantive application as follows:
- Application fee in the sum of \$250,000 plus GST; and
 - Levy in the sum of \$140,000 plus GST.

Consultation

32. We have consulted with and considered consultation responses from the following relevant administering agencies and relevant consent authorities:
- with Environment Canterbury Regional Council, Waimakariri District Council for an approval described in [section 42(4)(a) (resource consent) and section 42(4)(d) (designation)];
 - with the Department of Conservation for:
 - i. an approval described in section 42(4)(h) (Wildlife Act wildlife approval);
 - ii. an approval described in section 42(4)(j) (complex freshwater fisheries activity approval);
 - with Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga for an approval described in section 42(4)(i) (archaeological authority);
33. A summary of the consultation is included at Appendix 2.

Assessment of compliance for each section of each application form

34. We have assessed the application materials against the relevant checklists in the prescribed application form. Each assessment is contained within the appropriate approval checklist. These are included in Appendix 1 for ease of reference.
35. My view is that the application does comply with section 46 and the EPA may now notify the applicant of its decision.
36. The EPA must now decide whether the substantive application has a competing application under section 47(3) (under delegation from the Minister for Infrastructure under section 47(10)) within 10 working days from the date of the completeness decision.

37. Once the EPA has made the decision under section 47(3), the EPA can provide the application to the panel convener to commence consideration and decision of the application by the panel.

Appendix 1: Assessment of section 44 sufficiency

This application seeks the following approval(s) under the Act:

- A resource consent, change to or cancellation of a resource consent: **checklist A**
- A resource consent, change to or cancellation of a resource consent: **checklist A1 – subdivision or reclamation**
- A resource consent, change to or cancellation of a resource consent: **checklist A2 – freshwater fisheries activity.**
- A designation or an alteration to an existing designation: **checklist C.**
- A wildlife approval: **checklist E.**
- An archaeological approval: **checklist F.**
- Approval of person to carry out an activity under an Archaeological Authority: **checklist F1.**
- Complex freshwater fisheries approval: **checklist G**
- Information requirements for all applications **checklist J.**

CHECKLIST A – Resource consent, change to or cancellation of a resource consent

CHECKLIST A1 – Subdivision or reclamation resource consent

CHECKLIST A2 – Application including standard freshwater fisheries activity checklist

CHECKLIST C – Designation or alteration of existing designation

CHECKLIST E – Wildlife approval

CHECKLIST F – Archaeological authority

CHECKLIST F1 – Archaeological authority: Approval for person to carry out activity

CHECKLIST G – Complex freshwater fisheries approval

CHECKLIST J – Listed project information requirements

Appendix 2: Consultation Summary

The following agencies were consulted with to inform the assessment of the application for completeness. Each agency was requested to confirm whether the application documentation provided by the EPA regarding the proposal as provided by the applicant meets the requirements of sections 42 and 43 of the Act and is provided in sufficient detail to satisfy the purpose of the Act in accordance with section 44 of the Act.

This project has received generally positive feedback from all consulted agencies and councils, confirming that it meets the requirements of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024.

Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga confirmed that all archaeological and heritage-related documentation is complete, with no further information required.

The Department of Conservation (DOC) found the application meets the requirements of sections 42, 43, and 44 of the Act. DOC has provided further observations of relevance to further processing of the application and where further information could be needed for a decision by the panel (i.e. applicant to provide the draft lizard management plan and further information on the Barkers Road release site is an appropriate relocation site for the lizards).

Waimakariri District Council (WDC) confirmed that the application meets the requirements sections 42, 43 and 44 of the Act.

Environment Canterbury Regional Council (CRC) considered that the application meets the requirements of sections 42–43 of the Act and further information is not required at this stage. Although CRC have identified some technical gaps in the application CRC confirmed that they can be resolved through the next stages of the process with ongoing engagement with the Applicant. CRC has confirmed they are already in contact with the Applicant to work on the matters raised.

Overall, the application is considered complete, with some areas flagged for further clarification or follow-up in the next stages of the process.

1. Consultation with Environment Canterbury Regional Council and Waimakariri District Council as the relevant consent authority for the following approvals under the Resource Management Act 1991:

- Resource consent (section 42(4)(a) of the Act)
- Designation (section 42(4)(d) of the Act)

Response from Environment Canterbury Regional Council on 16 January 2026

Thank you for your letter dated 6 January 2026, regarding the State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus) from New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA).

Please find below the response from the Canterbury Regional Council (CRC) on considerations of the completeness of the Applicant’s Substantive Application under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA).

The assessment in Attachment 1 demonstrates that further information is not required in the Substantive Application in terms of the criteria specified in Checklist A from the FTAA Substantive Application Form Guidance (Fast-track-Approvals-Act-2024 Substantive-Application-Form-Guidance.pdf). Advice from CRC technical experts (summarised in Attachment 2) contributed to the conclusions made when undertaking this assessment.

Specific questions relating to this application in accordance with section 30 of the FTAA. Confirm that the written notice prepared by Council remains accurate at final at the time of receiving this letter.

CRC can confirm that the information contained in the written notice dated 2 December 2025 remains accurate as at the date of this letter. A copy of the written notice is provided as Attachment 3.

The substantive application includes applications for the following approvals under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) that CRC is the relevant consent authority for: a resource consent that would otherwise be applied for under the RMA (section 42(4)(a) of the FTAA).

Based on the information provided in the substantive application (and its Appendices), CRC considers that the Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP), Canterbury Air Regional Plan (CARP) and National Environmental Standards for Freshwater (NES F) would apply.

Consents under the RMA that would be administered by CRC:

Construction-Phase Consents –

a. Section 9 Land Use Consent

- a. Earthworks and land disturbance activities associated with the construction phase of the project.
- b. The consent is required under LWRP Rules 5.161, 5.176 and 5.178. The consent is also required under NES-F Regulation 45.
 - a. The requested duration for the consent is 20 years.

b. Section 13 Land Use Consent

- a. Works and the construction of structures within river and lake beds.
-

b. The consent is required under LWRP Rules 5.6 and 5.141A. The consent is also required under NES-F Regulation 57 and Regulation 71.

c. The requested duration for the consent is 20 years.

c. Section 14 Water Permit

a. Taking, using, diverting, and damming of surface water and groundwater to facilitate construction activities.

b. The consent is required under LWRP Rules 5.118, 5.120, 5.141A, 5.155 and 5.161. The consent is also required under NES-F Regulation 45.

c. The requested duration for the consent is 20 years.

d. Section 15 Discharge Permit

a. Discharge of stormwater and air contaminants during the construction phase.

b. The consent is required under LWRP Rules 5.6, 5.94B, 5.100, 5.120, 5.141A, 5.161 and 5.178. The consent is also required under CARP Rule 7.36 and under NES-F Regulation 45.

c. The requested duration for the consent is 20 years.

Operational-Phase Consents –

a. Section 13 Land Use Consent

a. Ongoing use and maintenance of culverts within the riverbed.

b. The consent is required under NES-F Regulation 71.

c. The requested duration for the consent is 35 years.

b. Section 14 Water Permit

a. Permanent diversion of water resulting from stream realignment, and the passive take and use of surface water and groundwater.

b. The consent is required under LWRP Rules 5.6, 5.132, 5.160 and 8.5.12.

c. The requested duration for the consent is 35 years.

c. Section 15 Discharge Permit

a. Discharge of stormwater during the operational phase.

b. The consent is required under LWRP Rules 5.97 and 5.132.

c. The requested duration for the consent is 35 years.

CRC considers that, based on our understanding of the proposal, the relevant documents identified by NZTA in the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) is correct, and that NZTA has assessed their proposal against the relevant Plans with regards to regional consenting.

Whether that substantive application made available to CRC, meets the requirements of sections 42 and 43 of the FTAA and is provided in sufficient detail to satisfy the purpose for which it is required in accordance with section 44 of the FTAA.

Overall, CRC considers that the application meets the requirements of sections 42–43 of the Act. However, CRC considers that further discussion is required with the Applicant to work through the comments provided in this report. Please refer to Attachment 2 for further details on this matter.

Section 42 – Authorised person may lodge substantive application for approvals

CRC considers the NZTA has identified and applied for all relevant RMA consents under CRC’s plans, as outlined above.

Section 43 – Requirements for substantive application

The primary areas of section 43 where CRC considers that information is lacking or could be clarified are highlighted below. Additional matters may also require further consideration.

1. Management Plans

- a. CRC considers that it would be beneficial for the Applicant to provide draft Management Plans to ensure that potential effects are fully considered. If this approach is not acceptable to the Applicant, further discussion will be required to ensure that the Conditions around Management Plans contain sufficient information to appropriately manage the effects.
- b. CRC further considers that the proposed timeframe for certification of the Management Plans is insufficient. Additional time will be required to ensure that the Management Plans are adequate to manage potential effects should draft Management Plans not be provided.

2. Ecological Effects

- a. CRC considers that the taxa surveys require further investigation by the Applicant. The reports provided rely on iNaturalist records; however, these records are not equivalent to comprehensive surveys. Further investigation into invertebrates and non-vascular plants would be beneficial.
 - b. CRC considers that an assessment by the Applicant of the potential effects of the proposed water take from the Quarry Lakes on aquatic ecology would be beneficial.
-

-
- c. CRC considers that further discussion regarding the proposed offset is required as there is disagreement over the ecological values assigned.

3. Contaminated Land

- a. CRC considers that investigation of HAIL sites that have not yet been completed is needed by the Applicant.
- b. CRC is particularly interested in the landfill at 162 Gladstone Road and considers further investigation of this site would be beneficial.

4. Stormwater

- a. CRC considers that further validation of the model should be completed, and that the model should cover the full extent of the project site.
- b. CRC considers that further discussion should be had on the stormwater infrastructure and effects.

5. Conditions

- a. CRC considers that refinement to the conditions would be beneficial to ensure that effects are managed.

Consultation requirements as per Section 11 of the FTAA

CRC considers the NZTA **has** undertaken adequate consultation as per Section 11 of the FTAA. See Volume 2I – Records of Consultation and Engagement from the Substantive Application that accurately reflects consultation undertaken with CRC and provides details of consultation with other parties.

Summary and Key Concerns

From CRC's perspective, further information **is not** required as part of the application.

The outstanding issues can be resolved through ongoing engagement with the Applicant in the coming weeks. We are already in contact with the Applicant and they have confirmed that they are willing and ready to engage to work through the matters raised.

Despite the feedback provided by CRC on the application, this is not considered unexpected for a project of this scale and significance. It is anticipated that the outstanding matters can be addressed through the next stages of the fast-track process by working collaboratively with the Applicant.

We trust that this information assists you determining the completeness of the application regarding the State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus) from NZTA, under section 46(1) of the Act.

Please advise if you need any further clarification on any matters raised in this letter. We look forward to working with you further on this application if it is considered to meet section 46(1) of the Act.

Nga mihi nui,

Manager Consents Planning

List of Attachments:

- Attachment 1 - CHECKLIST A – Resource consent, change to or cancellation of a resource consent
- Attachment 2 – CRC Technical Advice Summary
- Attachment 3 - Section 30 Letter 2nd December 2025
- Attachment 4 – CRC Pre Application Advice on Draft Application

Attachment 1: CHECKLIST A – Resource consent, change to or cancellation of a resource consent

Clause, Schedule 5	Information required for an approval described in section 42(4)(a) (resource consent) and/or section 42(4)(b) (change or cancellation of resource consent), Clauses 5-8 of Schedule 5	CRC Comment on whether this has been provided
5(1)(a)	A description of the proposed activity.	<p>This has been provided under section 3 of Volume 2A – Substantive Application Report (SA).</p> <p>The application consists of the following activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Applicant is seeking approval for activities associated with the construction phase of the proposed State Highway 1 – Woodend Bypass Project. These activities include earthworks and land disturbance; works within, and the construction of structures in, river and lake beds; the taking, use, diversion, and damming of surface water and groundwater to facilitate construction; and the discharge of stormwater and air contaminants during the construction phase. • The Applicant is seeking approval for activities associated with the operational phase of the proposed State Highway 1 – Woodend Bypass Project to enable the ongoing operation and maintenance of the completed works. These activities include the ongoing use and maintenance of culverts within riverbeds; the permanent diversion of water resulting from stream realignment; the passive take and use of surface water and groundwater; and the discharge of stormwater during the operational phase.

5(1)(b)	<p>A description and map of the site at which the activity is to occur, including whether the site is within or adjacent to—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) a statutory area (as defined in the relevant Treaty settlement Act); or (ii) ngā rohe moana o ngā hapū o Ngāti Porou (as defined in section 11 of the Ngā Rohe Moana o Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou Act 2019); or (iii) a protected customary rights area under the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011. 	<p>This has been provided under section 4.3 of the SA.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRC agrees with the Applicant that there are no Statutory Acknowledgment Areas along or near the alignment. • The application does not relate to Ngā Rohe Moana o Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou Act 2019) or a protected customary rights area under the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011. • There are a number of Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori that overlap the project site. These have been identified by the Applicant in section 4.3.1 of the SA.
5(1)(c)	<p>Confirmation that the consent application complies with section 46(2)(a), (b), and (d); being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • section 42; and • sections 43 and 44; and • relates solely to a listed project or a referred project; and • any fee, charge, or levy payable under regulations in respect of the application is paid. <p><i>Guidance note: Section 46 provides for the EPA to decide whether the substantive application is complete and within scope. The EPA will need to be satisfied that the application complies with these requirements. These matters are addressed throughout the substantive application form and relevant checklist.</i></p>	<p>This has been provided under section 1 of the SA.</p> <p>CRC considers that the SA complies with section 42 of the Fast-track Approvals Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The application has been made by NZTA who is the authorised person for this project as listed in schedule 2 of the FTAA. • The Applicant is eligible to apply for all corresponding approvals under the specified acts. • The SA seeks the following approvals, which would otherwise be required under separate legislation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resource consents under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) in relation to regional plans and National Environmental Standards; ○ An alteration to the existing designation under the RMA;
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wildlife approvals for activities that would otherwise constitute offences under the Wildlife Act 1953; ○ Approvals under the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations 1983; and ○ An archaeological authority under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. <p>CRC considers that the SA complies with section 43 of the Fast-track Approvals Act:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CRC agree that the SA is lodged in the form and manner approved by the EPA. • The SA explains how the project is consistent with the purpose of the FTAA. • CRC agree that the project does not involve any ineligible activities. • The SA states the approvals to be held by the authorised person. • The substantive application relates to a project listed in schedule 2 of the FTAA. • Complies with information requirements specified by the Minister under section 27(3)(b)(ii) – a summary of consultation with Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and relevant Papatipu Rūnanga and their representatives. • CRC notes that the Applicant has not confirmed whether the application is a priority project under section 43 of the FTAA, but that the project is identified as prioritised in the draft Government Policy Statement on Land Transport.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The requirements set out in clause 5 to 9 of schedule 5 are included in this SA.
5(1)(d) and 5(6)	<p>The full name and address of—</p> <p>(i) each owner of the site and of land adjacent to the site; and</p> <p>(ii) each occupier of the site and of land adjacent to the site whom the Applicant is unable to identify after reasonable inquiry;</p> <p>If the Applicant is not able to supply the name and address of the owner and each occupier of the site and of land adjacent to the site because the land is Māori land in multiple ownership, the Applicant must include a statement to that effect (clause 5(6)).</p>	The Applicant has included Volume 1D – Property Information Report, which identifies the full names and addresses of the owners and occupiers of the project site and adjoining properties.
5(1)(e)	<p>A description of any other activities that are part of the proposal to which the consent application relates.</p>	<p>This has been provided in sections 1 and 3 of the SA.</p> <p>As stated above for 5(1)(a) CRC agree with the Applicant that there are no other activities beyond those set out above that are part of the proposal to which the consent application relates.</p>
5(1)(f)	<p>A description of any other resource consents, notices of requirement for designations, or alterations to designations required for the project to which the consent application relates.</p>	<p>This has been provided in sections 1 and 3 of the SA.</p> <p>As stated above for 5(1)(a) and 5(1)(e) CRC agree with the Applicant that there are no other activities beyond those set</p>

		<p>out above that are part of the proposal to which the consent application relates.</p>
5(1)(g)	<p>An assessment of the activity against sections 5, 6 and 7 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p>	<p>This has been provided in section 6.7.13 of the SA.</p> <p>CRC considers that the proposal is consistent with the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 as set out in section 5. Section 5(1) of the Act states that the purpose of the RMA is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, enabling people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being.</p> <p>CRC considers that the proposal is consistent with the RMA and addresses the matters of national importance set out in section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>CRC consider that the proposal gives particular regard to the matters identified in section 7 of the RMA 1991.</p>

5(1)(h) (and also clauses 5(2) and 5(3))	<p>An assessment of the activity against any relevant provisions in any of the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a national environmental standard: • other regulations made under the Resource Management Act 1991: • a national policy statement: • a New Zealand coastal policy statement: • a regional policy statement or proposed regional policy statement: • a plan or proposed plan: • a planning document recognised by a relevant iwi authority and lodged with a local authority. 	<p>matters identified in section 7 of the RMA 1991.</p> <p>This has been provided in section 6.7 of the SA. There is further assessment against relevant provisions in Volume 2G – Regional and District Objectives and Policies Assessment.</p> <p>CRC understands that the SA assesses the following legislation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPS-FM) • National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land 2022 (NPS-HPL) • National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD)
	<p>This assessment must include an assessment of the activity against the requirements set out in clause 5(3) of Schedule 5 being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any relevant objectives, policies or rules in the documents listed; and • any requirement, condition, or permission in any rules in any of those documents; and <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any other requirements in any of those documents. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Policy Statement for Indigenous Biodiversity 2023 (NPS-IB) • National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health 2011 (NES-CS) • National Environmental Standard for Freshwater 2020 (NES-F) • National Environmental Standards for Sources of Human Drinking Water 2007 (NES-SHDW) • Resource Management (Measurement and Reporting of Water Takes) Regulations 2010 • Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan • Ngāi Tahu Freshwater Policy Statement • Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) • Canterbury Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP) • Canterbury Air Regional Plan (CARP) • Partially Operative Waimakariri District Plan • Operative Waimakariri District Plan <p>CRC considers that the SA and associated documents, including Volume 2G – Regional and District Objectives and Policies Assessment, assesses the relevant rules and policies under the legislation listed above.</p>
5(1)(i)	<p>Information about any Treaty settlements that apply in the area covered by the consent application, including—</p> <p>(i) identification of the relevant provisions in those Treaty settlements; and</p>	<p>The information is provided in section 4.3.2 of the SA. The text in section 4.3.2 was prepared by Whitiōra on behalf of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, the hapū of Ngāi Tahu to which this application relates. CRC agrees with the assessment completed by Whitiōra.</p>

	(ii) a summary of any redress provided by those settlements that affects natural and physical resources relevant to the project or project area.	
5(1)(j)	A list of any relevant customary marine title groups, protected customary rights groups, ngā hapū o Ngāti Porou (where an application is within, adjacent to or directly affecting ngā rohe moana o ngā hapū o Ngāti Porou), or Applicants under the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011.	The Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 is not relevant to this application. This matter is addressed in section 4.3.1 of the SA.
5(1)(k)	The conditions that the Applicant proposes for the resource consent.	This has been provided in Volumes 2C-2F of the Substantive Application as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Volume 2C – Proposed Alterations to Designation Conditions • Volume 2D – Proposed Resource Consent Conditions • Volume 2E – Proposed Wildlife Approval Conditions • Volume 2F – Proposed Archaeological Authority Conditions
5(1)(l)	if a notice under section 30(3)(b) or (5) has been received,— <p>(i) a copy of that notice showing that it was received within the time frame specified in section 30(6)(b); and</p> <p>(ii) if a notice has been received under section 30(5), any more up-to-date information that the</p>	This has been provided in Volume 2I – Records of Consultation and Engagement. The CRC letter has also been included as Attachment 3. Further details are as follows: <p>CRC received a section 30 request under the FTAA from NZTA on the 2nd of December 2025. CRC provided a section 30 response on the 2nd of December 2025.</p> <p>This demonstrates that timeframes under s30(6)(b) of the FTAA were met.</p>
	Applicant is aware of about the existing resource consent referred to in the notice.	
5(4)(a)	An assessment of the activity's effects on the environment that includes the information required by clause 6. <p><i>Guidance note: See rows below for requirements in clause 6.</i></p>	This has been provided in section 6.6 of the SA and Volumes 3A-3M. <p>Further discussion of the assessment of effects on the environment is provided below under clause 6.</p>
5(4)(b)	An assessment of the activity's effects on the environment that covers the matters specified in clause 7. <p><i>Guidance note: See rows below for requirements in clause 7.</i></p>	This has been provided in section 6.6 of the SA and Volumes 3A-3M. <p>CRC considers that the SA and associated volumes assesses effects on people in the neighbourhood and the wider community, including social, economic, recreational, and cultural effects, as well as effects on landscape (visual effects) and habitats within the vicinity.</p> <p>CRC consider that from our view the SA and associated volumes appropriately assess the requirements in clause 7 of schedule 5 of the FTAA.</p>
6	(1) The assessment of an activity's effects on the environment must include the following information: <p>(a) an assessment of the actual or potential effects on the environment;</p> <p>(b) if the activity includes the use of hazardous installations, an assessment of any risks to the environment that are likely to arise from such use:</p>	As stated above clause 5(4)(a) applies here. <p>CRC considers that the actual and potential effects on the environment have been assessed in the SA and associated volumes. In particular, the SA describes the nature of, and receiving environment for, both the construction and operational phases of the proposed approvals in section 6.6.</p> <p>CRC considers that hazardous installations have been assessed in section 6.6.13 of the SA.</p>

	<p>(c) if the activity includes the discharge of any contaminant, a description of—</p> <p>(i) the nature of the discharge and the sensitivity of the receiving environment to adverse effects; and</p> <p>(ii) any possible alternative methods of discharge, including discharge into any other receiving environment:</p> <p>(d) a description of the mitigation measures (including safeguards and contingency plans where relevant) to be undertaken to help prevent or reduce the actual or potential effect of the activity:</p> <p>(e) identification of persons who may be affected by the activity and any response to the views of any persons consulted, including the views of iwi or hapū that have been consulted in relation to the proposal:</p> <p>(f) if iwi or hapū elect not to respond when consulted on the proposal, any reasons that they have specified for that decision:</p> <p>(g) if the scale and significance of the activity's effects are such that monitoring is required, a description of how the effects will be monitored and by whom, if the activity is approved:</p> <p>(h) an assessment of any effects of the activity on the exercise of a protected customary right.</p>	<p>CRC considers that the discharge, including the nature and sensitivity of the receiving environment, is described in section 6.6, and that alternative methods of discharge have been considered in section 6.7.14.3.</p> <p>CRC considers that a description of the mitigation measures has been included in the form of proffered conditions in Volumes 2C-2F. Further discussion on conditions and draft management plans is required.</p> <p>CRC considers that the Applicant has identified persons who may be affected, as set out in Volume 1D – Property Information Report, and has engaged with the relevant hapū, as documented in Volume 1E – Whitiōra Statement of Cultural Values, Interests and Priorities.</p> <p>The hapū have responded to the Applicant.</p> <p>CRC considers that the Applicant has provided a description of how the effects will be monitored in the proffered conditions in Volumes 2C–2F.</p> <p>The site is not within or adjacent to a protected customary rights area.</p>
--	--	--

	<p><i>Guidance note: Clause 6(2) provides that a consent application need not include any additional information specified in a relevant policy statement or plan that would be required in an assessment of environmental effects under clause 6(2) or 7(2) of Schedule 4 of the Resource Management Act.</i></p>	
7	<p>The assessment of an activity's effects on the environment must cover the following matters:</p> <p>(a) any effect on the people in the neighbourhood and, if relevant, the wider community, including any social, economic, or cultural effects:</p> <p>(b) any physical effect on the locality, including landscape and visual effects:</p> <p>(c) any effect on ecosystems, including effects on plants or animals and physical disturbance of habitats in the vicinity:</p> <p>(d) any effect on natural and physical resources that have aesthetic, recreational, scientific, historical, spiritual, or cultural value, or other special value, for present or future generations:</p> <p>(e) any discharge of contaminants into the environment and options for the treatment and disposal of contaminants:</p> <p>(f) any unreasonable emission of noise:</p>	As stated above for 5(4)(b) also applies here.

	(g) any risk to the neighbourhood, the wider community, or the environment through natural hazards or hazardous installations.	
5(5)(a)	If a permitted activity is part of the proposal to which the consent application relates, a description that demonstrates that the activity complies with the requirements, conditions, and permissions for the permitted activity (so that a resource consent is not required for that activity under section 87A(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991).	The Applicant has assessed permitted activities in Volume 2H – Resource Consent Requirements. CRC has reviewed this assessment and agrees that the permitted activities applicable to the application have been correctly identified.
5(5)(b)	If the activity is to occur in an area that is within the scope of a planning document prepared by a customary marine title group under section 85 of the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 or the environmental covenant prepared by Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou under section 19 of the Ngā Rohe Moana o Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou Act 2019, an assessment of the activity against any resource management matters set out in that document.	Not relevant to this application as proposal does not occur within these areas. However, noting that the Applicant has provided an assessment against the relevant iwi management plan in section 6.7.11 of the SA.
5(5)(c)	If the activity is to occur in an area that is taiāpure-local fishery, a mātaimitai reserve, or an area that is subject to bylaws made under Part 9 of the Fisheries Act 1996, an assessment of the effects of the activity on the use or management of the area.	This information is provided in section 9 of the SA, with additional information provided in Volume 3I – Ecological Impact Assessment.

Attachment 2: CRC Technical Advice Summary

Technical Team	Technical expert considers all expected technical reports are provided	Technical expert has identified gaps in the provided technical reports	Technical expert considers the conditions are appropriate	Comments; Key Findings & Concerns
Consent Planning	Yes	Yes	<i>Refinement required</i>	<i>The Consent Planning experts are willing to work with NZTA around the issues raised above under the section 43 header.</i>
Planning	Yes	Yes	<i>N/A – the Planning team does not typically comment on the conditions.</i>	<i>The Planning expert is willing to work with NZTA around the issues raised above under the section 43 header.</i>
Air Quality	Yes	Yes	<i>Refinement required</i>	<i>The Air Quality expert is willing to work with NZTA around the issues raised above under the section 43 header.</i>

Compliance	<i>Partial</i>	Yes	<i>Refinement required</i>	<i>The Compliance expert is willing to work with NZTA around the issues raised above under the section 43 header.</i>
Contaminated Land	<i>Partial</i>	Yes	<i>Refinement required</i>	<i>The Contaminated Land expert is willing to work with NZTA around the issues raised above under the section 43 header.</i>
Groundwater Resources	Yes	Yes	Yes	<i>The Groundwater Resources expert is willing to work with NZTA around the issues raised above under the section 43 header.</i>
Land Ecology	<i>Partial</i>	Yes	<i>Refinement required</i>	<i>The Land Ecology expert is willing to work with NZTA around the issues raised above under the section 43 header.</i>
River Engineering	Yes	Yes	<i>Refinement required</i>	<i>The River Engineering expert is willing to work with NZTA around the issues raised above under the section 43 header.</i>

Stormwater Engineering	Yes	Yes	<i>Refinement required</i>	<i>The Stormwater Engineering expert is willing to work with NZTA around the issues raised above under the section 43 header.</i>
Surface Water Resources	Yes	Yes	Yes	<i>The Surface Water Resources expert is willing to work with NZTA around the issues raised above under the section 43 header.</i>
Water Ecology	Yes	Yes	<i>Refinement required</i>	<i>The Water Ecology expert is willing to work with NZTA around the issues raised above under the section 43 header.</i>

Attachment 3: Section 30 letter 2 December 2025

2 December 2025

New Zealand Transport Authority c/- Bill Harrington
Principal Planner – Environmental Planning
New Zealand Transport Authority
PO Box 1479 Christchurch
8140
[REDACTED]



Kia Ora Bill,

Section 30(3)(b) of the Fast Track Approvals Act 2024

Thank you for your email dated 2 December 2025 regarding NZTA's proposed State Highway 1 North Canterbury-Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus).

We acknowledge that the proposal is listed under Schedule 2 of the Fast Track Approval Act 2024 (FTAA).

In accordance with section 30(3) of the FTAA, the Canterbury Regional Council is required to:

...advise the authorised person—

(a) of any existing resource consent to which section 124C(1)(c) or 165Z1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 would apply if the approval were to be applied for as a resource consent under that Act; or

(b) that there are no existing resource consents of that kind.

Canterbury Regional Council can confirm that there are no existing resource consents as per section 30(3)(b) of the Fast Track Approvals Act.

CRC trust this clarification provides the necessary information for proceeding with the application under the FTAA. Should you require any further information or have additional queries, please do not hesitate to contact us.

Ngā mihi

Pre-Application Advice for Woodend Bypass Project, NZTA – RMA250379

Disclaimer: *This note provides preliminary technical council guidance on potential matters that may affect applications under the Fast-Track Approvals Act 2024. It does not constitute legal advice and should not be relied upon as such. The advice reflects an initial review of material within limited timeframes and is not a full or definitive assessment.*

New Zealand Transport Agency – Waka Kotahi (NZTA) (the applicant) have been consulting with Canterbury Regional Council regarding their fast-track application for the Woodend Bypass Project. The Project is an extension of the Christchurch Northern Motorway and will provide four lanes of grade-separated motorway over an approximately 10 kilometre (km) length. The Project Site spans from approximately 600 metres (m) south of the Kaiapoi River Bridge and extends to approximately 700 m north of the Pegasus/Ravenwood intersection, including a bypass of Woodend township.

Fast-Track Act Consenting:

Under the FTAA, the applicant is required under section 11(1)(a) to consult with relevant local authorities. NZTA will need to provide evidence of this consultation as part of their application. Canterbury Regional Council are happy for this document to be used as evidence of consultation.

Canterbury Regional Council staff have raised the following concerns regarding this proposal:

Planning – Victoria Watt

- The planning team will provide comments once Volume 2G – RMA Objectives and Policy Assessment is provided.
- The Policy Assessment should include a detailed evaluation against the CRPS and the relevant NPSs, rather than simply listing or referencing them.

Compliance – Georgia Simmonds

- The documents referred to in Table 1 of Schedule 2 in Volume 2D, are proposed to be submitted at least 20 working days prior to commencement of works but this is far too short of a timeframe for compliance to certify this volume of

documents without at least having a “for consent” version already filed and considered. The effects on the environment cannot be properly assessed without these management plans as they would ideally show how this project will be undertaken.

- Condition C1.14 wording: It should be referred to as a ‘condition note’ rather than an ‘advice note,’ as advice notes are not enforceable.
- Condition C1.16 refers to a Groundwater Management Plan (GMP). Please reference the consent condition that requires the GMP – MP19-21.
- C2.11 Condition does not allow for compliance to be assessed with the clause c requirement.
 - Add a clause stating that the SQP will prepare and submit a confirmation to CRC that the inspection has been completed. If substrate has not been retained and fish passage has not been provided then the inspection confirmation shall include what modifications were recommended by the SQP and if these have been completed.
- C2 Currently no Fish Management Plan mentioned or required. A condition mentioning/requiring a fish management plan should be included.
- There are no erosion and sediment control drawings.

Water Quantity – Jen Dodson

- One report is cited as reference to described environmental setting that was not available at the time of my review.
 - PDP (May 2025) Groundwater – Surface water interactions along proposed Belfast to Pegasus Woodend Bypass

This report should be made available to Environment Canterbury and be reviewed prior to finalisation of technical review.

- I would like confirmation that any dewatering of stream flows is discharged to or just upstream of the affected reach and not some distance downstream.

Water Quality & Ecology – Nuwan De Silva

- A Fish Management Plan shall be included as a condition of consent for both the permanent culvert design and the realignment works of Waihora Stream, Taranaki Stream, and the Taranaki Stream tributary. A fish management plan shall be prepared by a suitably qualified freshwater ecologist. The plan should be in general accordance with Canterbury Regional Council and Christchurch City Council’s “Fish Salvage Guidance for Works in Waterways” (12 October 2017) and include:
 - Location where fish and aquatic organisms shall be salvaged
 - Location of release
 - Methods to ensure fish are not entrained in pump units

-
- Methods to prevent fish entering the works area once defishing occurs
 - Methods used to hold fish following capture and prior to release
 - Roles and responsibilities for the ecologist/s, contractors and other people on site
- For dewatering and over-pumping activities from surface waterbodies, it is recommended to include a consent condition requiring the installation of a suitably designed fish screen over the water intake hose to prevent the entrainment or injury of fish. The fish screen should have an appropriate mesh size, be maintained in good working order, and be monitored regularly throughout the pumping operation to ensure its effectiveness.
 - Quarry lakes – The EIA states that effects from suspended sediment to common bully are low due to their susceptibility to elevated suspended sediment. However, as it was proposing to continue the work during common bully peak spawning season, how the elevated suspended sediment will impact on their eggs as most fish species' eggs are vulnerable to excess sedimentation. Therefore, if not manage appropriately suspended sediment can disrupt common bully recruitment process in the lakes.
 - EIA recommended to remove coarse fish from the Southern remnant lake in order to reduce predation and resource competition on common bullies. However, separate southern lake from rest of the lakes may result reduced number of adult common bullies remain in the Southern remnant lake, that may adversely impact on their recruitment process, therefore, risk that they may not be able to maintain viable population over time.
 - As surface waterbodies in the area are mainly "spring-fed", the discharge shall not have a TSS concentration greater than 50 grams per cubic metre (instead of the 100 grams per cubic metre specified in C4.6) at the point the discharge enters a Watercourse or drain except when the background total suspended solids in the waterbody is greater than 50 grams per cubic metre in which case the Schedule 5 visual clarity standards in the CLWRP shall apply.
 - The applicant is required to monitor the concentrations of contaminants of concern in the receiving waterbody prior to discharging dewatering water into surface waterbodies, to ensure that these concentrations remain below the receiving water standards for the relevant water classification. The applicant must also conduct an assessment to ensure that the Schedule 5 mixing zone definitions are met for the relevant receiving waterbody. If any contaminant of concern in the dewatering water exceeds the applicable threshold, the relevant water quality standards must be achieved at the point of discharge. This requirement should be included as a condition of consent.

Land Ecology – Kate McCombs

- Information and assessment is missing for non-vascular plants and fungi.

-
- Information and assessment is missing for the smaller terrestrial fauna groups, notably arthropods (includes insects, spiders, crustaceans), annelids, molluscs.
 - There are threat classification reports for at least some of the groups listed in the two bullet points above, which should be checked to see if there are any threatened species.
 - A list of taonga species and their locations would be useful.
 - Pest plants and animals have not been directly addressed. For instance biosecurity risks, Regional Pest Management species.
 - It would be helpful to see the scores, for the matters in Appendix B Table 2, that were used to derive the scores for the habitats that are included in Table 5.22. (Similar to what has been done for the wetlands, e.g. Table 5.1)
 - Coordinates of photo locations would be helpful.
 - Spatial files for the locations of all of the wetlands and all of the terrestrial vegetation would be helpful.
 - The assessments of ecological value do not appear to take into account the paucity of indigenous vegetation left on the plains (Threat Category 1 of the Threatened Environment Classification 2012), or the loss of wetlands. The 3I report notes that “wetlands are nationally rare and regionally very rare. Native vegetation and habitats are also very rare in the Low Plains ED, which makes any remaining native vegetation of high relative value.” The scores in Table 5.1 have assigned these sites as ‘medium, whereas ‘high’ seems more appropriate. This change would then affect the overall score of some of the wetlands, for instance CR_W2_NPSFM would then score ‘high’ ecological value overall. The same comment applies elsewhere in the valuation of the wetlands.
 - Habitat for rare species should be scoring higher for ecological value. Review and consider revising scores. Update assessment of ecological effects and calculations of offsets.
 - I2.1.1 scores rank grass low for lizard habitat, but it is providing and connecting habitat for an ‘At Risk’ species. “Rank grassland is not considered a preferred habitat for Canterbury grass skink because they prefer greater habitat complexity that provides a greater range of shelter, foraging and basking opportunities. As such, rank grassland has been assigned an ecological value of low for habitat provision.” (I3.1.4) They may well prefer better habitat but this is what they have and are using, so should score moderate at least.
 - I3.1.4 Indigenous planting with semi-mature totara – should score ‘moderate’ because there are so few (mature) podocarps on the plains.
 - p. 82 (EIA) Total and permanent vegetation removal has been scored as ‘high’ but better fits ‘very high’. This would raise some of the overall effects in Table 6.1 from ‘low’ to ‘moderate’, and from ‘very low’ to ‘low’.
-

-
- Haven't seen the lizard management plan, so unable to comment on suitability at this time.
 - Comments on conditions:
 - It is difficult to comment on many of the conditions in Schedule 3 (Vol 2D) since they refer to an Ecological Management Plan, which we have not seen.
 - EM.2 An advice note is not enforceable. Change the advice note to a condition.
 - The Lizard Management Plan should also be a condition.
 - EM.3 The protocol is unclear as to what would happen – what does “references the framework” mean? There should be some requirement for immediate action – e.g. consulting DOC within 24 hours.
 - Table 1. The timeframe of 20 working days to consider an Ecological Management Plan is very short.

Groundwater – Mark Trewartha

- A 400 m distance from proposed activities is used to identify potential groundwater receptors. However, no reason/justification for the adequacy of this distance is provided in the report.
- Two reports are cited as reference to described environmental setting that were not available at the time of my review.
 - PDP Memorandum. Dated 1 November 2024. To New Zealand Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi). Re. NZTA Woodend Corridor Investigation – Groundwater Assessment Update.
 - PDP (May 2025) Groundwater – Surface water interactions along proposed Belfast to Pegasus Woodend Bypass

It is recommended that these reports be made available to Environment Canterbury and are reviewed prior to finalizing my technical review and monitoring requirements.

- Groundwater Surface modelling and Dewatering assessments are included in Appendix F and Appendix G. It is recommended that the electronic files from the modelling be provided to ECan and reviewed prior to finalizing of technical review and monitoring requirements.
- It should also be noted that some permanent structures could provide preferential pathways for contaminants from the surface to leach to underlying aquifers. Proposed good management and environmental management practices will mitigate the risk of this potential during construction. Methods of mitigating mixing of groundwater between aquifers is described, but it is unclear from what is presented in the Hydrogeologic Assessment report on how the

design of permanent structures will prevent/mitigate leaching of contaminants from the surface to the underlying aquifers.

- I find the dewatering assessment appropriate and acceptable for consent purposes and the input parameters reflective of anticipated site conditions and timeframes. If site conditions or timeframes differ/exceed modelling assumptions, it is recommended that additional assessment be conducted to evaluate the potential additional effects to groundwater.
- In general, I agree with the effects on groundwater flow due to quarry filling (Section 10.4.2.4). This is under the assumption that the infill does not result in runoff away from the quarry lakes. Additionally, and under the assumption that only clean fill is used as infill material (proposed Condition C1.13), potential effects to groundwater quality are considered to be negligible to low.
- I agree with the applicant's proposed activity to decommission existing bores within the designation in advance of construction activities and that this be done in accordance with ECan Guidelines. I also recommend that bore casing be removed prior to filling and sealing of borehole (decommissioning) when practical.
- I recommend consent conditions include a monitoring/sampling program for water that is discharged to land.
- For water discharged to land during construction activities, water discharged should be analysed for any potential contaminants that are present in the area where water originates.
- I recommend a stormwater sampling program be developed to verify discharge water quantity and quality and compare results to discharge area (swale/basin) design and performance assumptions.
- I recommend the Groundwater Management Plan provide response plans based on monitoring/sampling program results.

Contaminated Land – Hana Christenson

- The contaminated land investigation assesses contamination presence at two HAIL sites in the roading corridor. The investigation does not include multiple other HAIL or potential HAIL sites, and investigation of these is proposed prior to construction. This investigation is essential, and the investigation reports should be supplied for review to ensure their sufficiency.
- Contamination discovery protocols will be important for managing unknown contamination disturbed during the project. This is proposed to be managed through a contamination site management plan. The Contamination Site Management Plan should be submitted for review prior to the consent. This will be a critical part of risk mitigation, and even a draft would be useful to provide comment on. The final plan should also be submitted to ensure its sufficiency.

-
- Use of WasteMINZ Class 4 'leaching to water' criteria – please only use these where some mitigation/capping will be used – I do not concur that they are appropriately protective of shallow groundwater.
 - Surface water protection - Extend distance for reuse of soil with contamination up to DGV to 100 m from surface water.
 - Soil reuse – Please use Class 4 adopted waste acceptance criteria for soil reuse that will not have capping or other appropriate management.
 - Landfill dewatering - This might extract groundwater with significant contamination, and conditions on quality for discharge might be appropriate.
 - Conditions should control the concentrations of contaminants for reuse, rather than the 'mean concentration' which might be difficult for enforcement.
 - In the Contaminated Land Investigation, the comparison to ANZG default guideline values did not account for a unit difference for organic compounds, and this criterion is exceeded by a factor >100. This risk is likely to be highest with regard to soil runoff in stormwater.
 - Discharge of stormwater into contaminated soils should be avoided across the entire project, and contaminated soil reuse should not occur in stormwater infrastructure.

Natural Hazards – Callum Margetts

- No specific concerns regarding ECan matters related to flooding.
- Comfortable with WDC providing comments on flooding matters related to the earthworks.

Rivers Engineering – Minke Unwin

- There are no details provided on the soffit R.L or abutment location for the proposed Cam River Bridge. We need these to determine whether the proposed bridge will encroach on the waterway capacity or cause hydraulic effects within the flooded waterway. The soffit level should also allow for pedestrian access underneath the bridges.
- The details of stormwater discharge into the Cam River are not clear. The proposed changes to flow and timing should be outlined so an assessment on the effects on the flood capacity of the waterway can be conducted.
 - Please provide details of current vs proposed stormwater discharges into the Cam River due to the changes. If these are significant, it is possible to discuss this with the River Engineering team at ECan as the stopbanks downstream of this location are planned for upgrade over the next few years.
- There is no estimate of changes in stormwater quantities discharging to waterways due to the Project. This should be combined with approximate

existing normal and storm flows. This is important information for the assessment of effects on the flood carrying capacity of the waterways.

- There is no mention of construction phase stormwater estimates to show the discharge will be less than 1% of a 1 in 5-year event (CLWRP s15 5.94 A/B).
- There is a concern about erosion at stormwater discharge points in all drains and waterways. It is unclear if the proposed riprap mitigations will be applied to all discharge points. (Acknowledging that Condition C4.5 applies to construction phase).
- Native vegetation has been proposed along the banks of the waterways. Waterways can become choked by plants if not correctly planned, reducing flood capacity.
 - Environment Canterbury has developed guides for planting in and around waterways with flood functioning in mind. Contact the River Engineering team for further guidance on species and spacings which are appropriate in different waterways.
- Cut off drains have been proposed and have been designed to an acceptable flow. It is unclear where the discharge locations of these will be, and if they are discharging to different waterways. There is concern about whether the downstream drains or waterways are able to accommodate the extra flow.
- There is no comment on the continued geomorphic processes for the proposed culverts. For those that are wet, the applicant could outline how the new culvert allows the passage of sediment and debris.
- Culverts are often undersized and cause problems for surface water flooding. Not all of the culverts proposed mention the nominal size of the culverts in relation to AEP flows, and therefore no way to determine if these culverts are undersized for flooding.
- The flood assessment did not include the proposed works south of the proposed Cam River Bridge. There are proposed cut-off drains and culverts in this area.
 - If the reason for this is negligible differences due to extensive surface water flooding in the current scenario, it could be made clear. This also relates to the above point about culvert sizing.
- It is unclear how the proposed scour protection at the Cam River Bridges will interact with the existing flood infrastructure (stopbanks). Tying in the rock to the stopbank may damage the integrity of the bank. The installation of rock work also creates a higher risk of erosion at the soft/hard interface.
 - Coordinate with river engineers to determine if there are any unintended effects on the stopbanks due to the installation of scour protection.
- The proposed re-alignment of Taranaki Stream is less than ideal where it cuts back at an angle of less than 90degrees. This is of concern to erosion within the waterway during higher flow events.

-
- There may be a possibility to lessen this angle, but would potentially require land purchase. Otherwise appropriate erosion control might be considered depending on expected velocities.
 - There is no detail about temporary structures in the riverbed (Cam) as proposed in Document 2H.
 - The likely requirement of temporary bunding or coffer dam for the new bridge abutments should not interfere with the minimum channel volume during a design flood event.
 - Designed so that the water surface does not exceed 2.55m R.L (NZVD16) at 34cumecs in the main channel. A large flow event is possible (though less likely) at any time, and design consideration should be given to whether the site must remain dry in a flood.
 - Temporary structures for the Cam River Crossing have been mentioned in in Document 2H, but no details have been given as to what that might look like or how that will interact with the flood capacity of the river.
 - If there are ideas on construction methodology and the possibility of temporary structures in the riverbed, it would be good to share this early so we can work out problems.
 - There is no detail on the construction methodology in the area of the stopbank on the Cam River. This is an important flood protection structure and there will need to be consideration given to maintaining the existing level of protection during construction. Several options are possible for maintaining a level of service during construction and should be discussed with river engineers:
 - Abutment construction occurs behind the bank and the bank is only pulled down when the abutment is performing this function.
 - Alternate protection is in place for the duration of the construction.
 - If the construction duration is short, it can be treated like a stopbank upgrade, and the section of the bank can be pulled down and built back up as the abutment.

In all cases, the weather should be closely monitored, and protection up to design height should be implemented in anticipation of a high rainfall event.

- Similar to the above point, the existing stopbank must be tied into the bridge abutment on both sides of the bridge. The bridge abutment will act as a continuation of the stopbank for flood protection.
- Any damage to flood protection assets caused by the Project must be repaired as soon as practicable, and in anticipation of a high rainfall event.
- Machinery should be removed from within banks in anticipation of high rainfall.
- Proposed works intersecting with CRC's flood protection and drainage infrastructure.

-
- In accordance with the Canterbury Flood Protection and Drainage Bylaw 2013, made under the Local Government Act 2002, written authorisation from the Council is required to undertake the proposed works at the Cam River bridge site.
 - For the Kaiapoi Bridge site, while the current design is not anticipated to trigger the need for Bylaw authority, the construction methodology—particularly if it involves temporary works, access, or machinery operating near flood protection assets—may require further assessment. Engagement with Council staff during the detailed design and construction planning phases is recommended to confirm whether Bylaw authorisation will be necessary.
 - This requirement is separate from and in addition to any approvals granted under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024.

Consents – Joanne Mitten & Sam Prystupa

- The consents team are in general agreement with the rule assessment provided by the applicant. Additional technical advice from Air Quality and Stormwater Specialist is being sought to confirm rule assessments for these areas.
- CRC and WDC still need to review the proposed amendments to the designation conditions to ensure that any conditions proposed for removal are appropriately captured within the resource consents.
- An assessment against the policies of the CLWRP and CARP should be provided as part of the 2G – RMA Objectives and Policy Assessment.

Response from Waimakariri District Council on 19 January 2026

Consultation regarding a substantive application
Fast-Track Approvals Act 2024

**Fast Track Application FTAA-2512-1157
The State Highway 1 North Canterbury—Woodend Bypass Project
(Belfast to Pegasus)**

Our Reference: RC255399, Trim number 260107001997

Date: 19 January 2026

To: Jessie Richardson
Application Lead, Fast-track Applications

From: Waimakariri District Council

Fast-track project: FTAA-2512-1157 The State Highway 1 North Canterbury-
Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus).

Thank you for your invitation to provide written comments on the completeness of the application for the State Highway 1 North Canterbury-Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus) under the Fast Track Approvals Act 2024. Please see below Waimakariri District Council's (WDC) comments on the completeness of this application.

Completeness of the Substantive application to meet the requirements of sections 42 and 43 of the Fast Track Approvals Act 2004.

1. The substantive application includes applications for the following approvals under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) that Waimakariri District Council (WDC) is the relevant consent authority for a resource consent and an alteration to a designation that would otherwise be applied for under the RMA (section 42(4)(a) and 24(4)(d) of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 ('FTAA')), as follows:
 - a) A resource consent for a Discretionary Activity under the National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health (NES-CS).
 - b) Alteration of a designation under s181 of the RMA.
 2. Waimakariri District Council has reviewed the documentation related to the relevant RMA approvals, as submitted by the applicant as part of the substantive application.
-

Section 42 – Authorised person may lodge substantive application for approvals

3. NZTA Waka Kotahi is the requiring authority for the Woodend Bypass Designation identified in the Operative Waimakariri District Plan (D58A) and Partially Operative Waimakariri District Plan (NZTA-3).
4. WDC considers that the Applicant has identified and applied for all relevant RMA consents under the WDC District Plan(s), as outlined under 1. above.

Section 43 – Requirements for substantive application

5. WDC considers the application meets the requirements under Section 43 of the Fast Track Approvals Act 2024.
6. WDC is undertaking ongoing consultation with the applicant on matters relevant to this application.

Specific questions relating to this application in accordance with section 30 of the Act

7. WDC confirms that the written notice prepared by Council on the 8th December 2025 Reference RC255399 / 251209234109 and sent to NZTA Waka Kotahi remains accurate and final at the time of preparing this response.

Conclusion

8. WDC considers the application meets the requirements of sections 42 and 43 of the Act and is provided in sufficient detail to satisfy the purpose for which it is required in accordance with section 44 of the Act.
 9. We trust this information assists you in determining the completeness of the application under section 46(1) of the Act.
-

2. Consultation with the Department of Conservation as the administering agency for the following Acts:

- Wildlife approval an approval described in section 42(4)(h) (Wildlife Act wildlife approval);
- an approval described in section 42(4)(j) (complex freshwater fisheries activity approval);

Response from the Department of Conservation on 20 January 2026

Department of Conservation advice for EPA compliance assessment

Overview

Project name	State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus)
Project applicant	New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)
EPA unique ref. no	FTAA-2512-1157
EPA Request Number	REQ002651V3T3
Conservation approvals sought	Wildlife Approval Complex Freshwater Fisheries Approval
EPA request summary	To inform the Environmental Protection Authority's (EPA) completeness assessment of the application, could you please let us know, in your view, whether the documentation provided by the EPA regarding the complex fisheries approval and wildlife approval ¹ as provided by the applicant meet the requirements of sections 42 and 43 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (the Act) and is provided in sufficient detail to satisfy the purpose for which it is required in accordance with section 44 of the Act.
Date due to EPA	19 January 2025

Background

A substantive application for the State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus) (a listed project) as defined in Schedule 2 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (the Act) was lodged by NZTA on 24 October 2025. The Act described the project as: *extend the State Highway 1 Christchurch Northern Corridor between Belfast and Pegasus by approximately 4 kilometres, altering the existing designation, and additional land acquisition outside of that designation.*

The Department of Conservation (DOC) provided advice to the EPA to inform its decision on whether the application complied with the requirements of section 46(2) of the Act. On 10 November 2025, the application was withdrawn by NZTA. A referral application was then lodged by NZTA on 28 November 2025 which was then withdrawn by NZTA on 12 December 2025 due to changes to the listed project.

The description of the listed project was changed as part of the Fast-track Approvals Amendment Act 2025 to delete: *by approximately 4 kilometres, altering the existing designation, and additional land acquisition outside of that designation.*

On 19 December 2025, NZTA submitted a new substantive application for the listed project as defined in the Fast-track Approvals Amendment Act 2025 to the EPA.

Introduction

On 6/01/2026 DOC received a request from the EPA seeking its views whether the application lodged on 19 December 2025 meets the requirements of sections 42 and 43 of the Act and whether the information is specified in sufficient detail to satisfy section 44 of the Act.

DOC is advised that the application in respect of the wildlife approval and complex freshwater fisheries approval has not been substantially altered since the last time DOC reviewed the application. Therefore advice previously provided remains relevant in most areas of assessment. Given this is a new application, this advice is provided again, with any changes to reflect current understanding of the application and information contained in the application documents specifically highlighted in **blue text**.

The purpose of this document is to provide advice to assist the EPA in making its decision whether the application lodged by NZTA complies with the requirements of section 46(2) of the Act.

The advice covers compliance with the following:

- Information requirements for relevant approvals

The advice also includes further observations of relevance to further processing of the application, for example where further information could be needed for a decision by the panel.

DOC understands that this document will be passed on to the applicant, the Panel Convener and the Panel.

Compliance with information requirements

Our detailed assessment of the information requirements for the relevant approvals is provided in the attached tables. In summary, DOC's advice is that the application meets the requirements of sections 42, 43, and 44 of the Act.

Further observations

In addition to the compliance requirements, DOC makes the following observations:

-
- The application provides a high level outline of the components of the Ngāi Tahu Treaty Settlement (Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998) and includes a reference that the Treaty Settlement provides for the special relationship between Ngāi Tahu and Taonga Species. Further detail in relation to any relevant Treaty principles or provisions particularly relating to Taonga Species may be warranted and may be provided in the section 18 report.
 - In relation to the information requirements of Clause 3(a)(ii) and (iii) and 3(d) of Schedule 9 for the complex freshwater fisheries approval, the note in the Table 6.9 of the Ecological Impact Assessment says: "...will aim to meet permitted activity fish passage requirements in clause 70 in NES-F or be informed by the NZFPG to provide fish passage." These are the appropriate documents to be using for structure design, however the use of the word 'aim' introduces uncertainty regarding whether the final designs will be suitable or not.
 - The wildlife approval as part of the substantive application is limited to the activities of lizard capture, handling and relocation from within the project footprint only. It excludes activities associated with post-release monitoring, which therefore cannot be assessed. In the absence of this information, any activities involving lizard disturbance, capture or handling associated with post release monitoring would require a separate Wildlife Act approval once the post-salvage monitoring plans have been developed. A suggested alternative is to request that a draft Lizard Management Plan containing this additional information be submitted to the Panel for assessment (as opposed to submitting it later on as a condition of consent).
 - The impacts on threatened, data deficient, and at-risk wildlife species (as defined in the New Zealand Threat Classification System) is contained in the wildlife approval as part of the application. The Lizard Management Plan that is proposed as a condition of approval is likely to provide additional, relevant information. It is recommended a draft Lizard Management Plan (LMP) is requested by the Panel.
 - There are inconsistencies regarding the quantum of moderate-value lizard habitat (exotic grassland/scrub mosaic) to be lost between the Ecology Impact Assessment (ECIA) (0.66ha) and the Wildlife Approval Report (WAR) (4.1ha). Clarification on the loss of each habitat type, together with planting quantum and the identification of any residual permanent loss (excluding managed pasture) would be useful.
 - Section 16 of the Wildlife Approval Report briefly outlines details of consultation with DOC but does not refer to details of any consultation with hapu or iwi on the application specific to wildlife impacts. The Substantive Application Report (Section 5.3) briefly outlines consultation undertaken including with relevant iwi authorities, hapū, and Treaty Settlement entities, at a project level and in relation to a previous wildlife approval (Permit 1). Limited information is included on consultation on the wildlife impacts for the wildlife approval sought.
-

It is noted that relevant Treaty Settlement entities and iwi authorities will be invited to comment on the substantive application including the wildlife approval.

Further information

Although DOC's advice is that the application meets the requirements of sections 42, 43, and 44 of the Act, DOC considers that the following information will be important for further processing and deciding on the application. Therefore, we intend to recommend that the following information is requested in the future.

- In relation to the wildlife approval sought, the Barkers Road release site is identified as Crown land, but specific confirmation that landowner approval has been gained appears missing from the application. The Panel may wish to request further information from the applicant to confirm the Barkers Road release site is an appropriate relocation site for the lizards.
- In relation to the wildlife approval sought, a draft Lizard Management Plan providing additional detailed information to fully understand the actual and potential wildlife effects of the proposed activity and any methods to avoid and minimise those effects.

Applications for wildlife approvals

Clause 2 of Schedule 7 outlines the information required in an application for a wildlife approval.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments <i>[If the information is not considered sufficient add a short statement why]</i> <i>Delete this guidance and if appropriate add comment</i>
Schedule 7 clause 2(1) - For the purposes of section 43(3)(h), an application for a wildlife approval must include the following information:				
(a) specify the purpose of the proposed activity:	Yes	3J Wildlife Approval Report Section 4	Yes	Refer to further observations section above: The wildlife approval as part of the substantive application is limited to the activities of lizard capture, handling and relocation from within the project footprint only. It summarises key objectives associated with the LMP, but excludes detailed methods on how objectives associated with post-release monitoring may be achieved. Without providing more detail, post-release monitoring methods cannot be adequately

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments <i>(If the information is not considered sufficient add a short statement why)</i> Delete this guidance and if appropriate add comment
				assessed and therefore any activities associated with post release monitoring would require a separate Wildlife Act approval once the LMR has been developed.
(b) identify the actions the applicant wishes to carry out involving protected wildlife and where they will be carried out (whether on or off public conservation land):	Yes	3J Wildlife Approval Report Section 5	Yes	Refer to further information section above: The Barkers Road release site is identified as Crown land, but specific confirmation that landowner approval has been gained appears missing from the application. The Panel may wish to request further information to confirm the Barkers Road release site is an appropriate relocation site.
(c) include an assessment of the activity and its impacts against the purpose of the Wildlife Act 1953:	Yes	3J Wildlife Approval Report Section 6	Yes	
(d) list protected wildlife species known or predicted to be in the area and, where possible, the numbers of wildlife present and numbers likely to be impacted:	Yes	3J Wildlife Approval Report Section 7	Yes	Note – numbers are provided in the substantive application for salvaged lizards to be impacted.
(e) outline impacts on threatened, data deficient, and at-risk wildlife species (as defined in the New Zealand Threat Classification System):	Yes	3J Wildlife Approval Report Section 8	Yes	Refer to further observations and further information section above: The impacts on threatened, data deficient, and at-risk wildlife species (as defined in the New Zealand Threat Classification System) is contained in the wildlife approval. The Lizard Management Plan that is proposed as a condition of approval may contain information about At-Risk species that are present within the proposed lizard release area.
(f) state how the methods proposed to be used to conduct the actions specified under paragraph (b) will ensure that best practice standards are met:	Yes	3J Wildlife Approval Report Section 9	Yes	Note – appropriate references to the relevant DOC guidelines for lizard salvage are included in the draft substantive application.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments <i>(If the information is not considered sufficient add a short statement why)</i> Delete this guidance and if appropriate add comment
(g) describe the methods to be used to safely, efficiently, and humanely catch, hold, or kill the animals and identify relevant animal ethics processes:	Yes	3J Wildlife Approval Report Section 10	Yes	
(h) state the location or locations in which the activity will be carried out, including a map (and GPS co-ordinates if available):	Yes	3J Wildlife Approval Report Section 10	Yes	<i>Refer to further information section above:</i> The Barkers Road release site is identified as Crown land, but specific confirmation that landowner approval has been gained appears missing from the application. The Panel may wish to request further information to confirm the Barkers Road release site is an appropriate relocation site.
(i) state whether authorisation is sought to temporarily hold or relocate wildlife:	Yes	3J Wildlife Approval Report Section 12	Yes	
(j) list all actual and potential wildlife effects (adverse or positive) of the proposed activity, including effects on the target species, other indigenous species, and the ecosystems at the site:	Yes	3J Wildlife Approval Report Section 13.1	Yes	<i>Refer to the further information and further observation sections above.</i> Note – the effects are limited in scope to the effects on salvaged lizards only as the application is very specifically limited to the activities of salvage. Impacts associated with releasing up to 1500 indigenous animals into a novel site, including restoration activities at the release site are not included but are to be addressed within the Lizard Management Plan (LMP) proposed as a condition of consent. Therefore, these impacts remain unaddressed within the Wildlife Approval Report. The Panel may wish to request the draft LMP to be provided. Additionally, clarity is required on the quantum of lizard habitat to be lost as there are inconsistencies

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments <i>[If the information is not considered sufficient add a short statement why]</i> Delete this guidance and if appropriate add comment
				between quantum presented in the EclA and the WAR. For example 0.66ha of exotic grassland/scrub mosaic in the EclA, versus 4.1ha of the same habitat type presented in the WAR.
(k) where adverse effects are identified, state what methods will be used to avoid and minimise those effects, and any offsetting or compensation proposed to address unmitigated adverse effects (including steps taken before the project begins, such as surveying, salvaging, and relocating protected wildlife):	Yes	3J Wildlife Approval Report Section 13.2	Yes	Refer to further information section above: For the purposes of completeness these activities are all well described in relation to the impacts on lizards during the salvage process. All impacts to released lizards and resident lizards at the release site are to be described within the LMP that is not yet prepared, and consequently cannot be assessed. Total lizard habitat to be lost (ha) remains unclear due to the discrepancy between submitted reports.

				The Panel may wish to request the draft LMP to be prepared and provided to the Panel so that methods can be adequately assessed.
(l) state whether the applicant or any company director, trustee, partner, or anyone else involved with the application has been convicted of any offence under the Wildlife Act 1953:	Yes	3J Wildlife Approval Report Section 14	Yes	
(m) state whether the applicant or any company director, trustee, partner, or anyone else involved with the application has any current criminal charges under the Wildlife Act 1953 pending before a court:	Yes	3J Wildlife Approval Report Section 15	Yes	
(n) provide proof and details of all consultation, including with hapū or iwi, on the application specific to wildlife impacts:	Yes	2A Substantive Application Report Section 5.3 (Recent consultation	Yes	Refer to further observations section: Section 16 of the Wildlife Approval Report briefly outlines details of consultation with DOC but does not refer to details of any consultation

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comments <i>[If the information is not considered sufficient add a short statement why]</i> <i>Delete this guidance and if appropriate add comment</i>
		and engagement)		with hapu or iwi on the application specific to wildlife impacts. The Substantive Application Report (Section 5.3) briefly outlines consultation undertaken including with relevant iwi authorities, hapū, and Treaty Settlement entities, at a project level and in relation to a previous wildlife approval (Permit 1). Limited information is included on consultation on the wildlife impacts for the wildlife approval sought. It is noted that relevant Treaty Settlement entities and iwi authorities will be invited to comment on the substantive application including the wildlife approval.
(o) provide any additional written expert views, advice, or opinions the applicant has obtained concerning their proposal.	Yes	3 Wildlife Approval Report Section 17	Yes	

Applications for complex freshwater fisheries approvals

Clause 3 of Schedule 9 outlines the information required in an application for complex freshwater fisheries activity approval. Note that due to section 13(4)(y)(iv), and Schedule 5 clause 9, this information is also required for resource consent applications that include standard freshwater fisheries activities.

Relevant section	Is the information present? Y/N	Application document reference (include section/page reference)	Is the information provided in sufficient detail? Y/N	Comment <i>[If the information is not considered sufficient add a short statement why]</i> <i>Delete the guidance and if appropriate add a comment</i>
Clause 2 and 3 Schedule 9 - For the purpose of section 43(3)(j), an application for a complex freshwater fisheries activity approval must include the following information:				
s13(4)(y)(vi), Clause 2 of Schedule 9 – For listed projects				
Cl 2 Schedule 9 (a) Whether an in-stream structure is proposed (including formal notification of any dam or	Yes	3 Ecological Impact Assessment	Yes	

diversion structure) and the extent to which this may impede fish passage		Table 6.9(P128); Culvert and stream realignment design 6.4.5 and 6.4.6		
(b) Whether any fish salvage activities or other complex freshwater fisheries activities are proposed.	Yes	3I Ecological Impact Assessment Table 6.9 (P128); Fish salvage information 6.4.2	Yes	
Clause 3 of Schedule 9 for listed and referred projects				
(a) in relation to the structure and any fish facility:				
(j) a description of the type of structure or fish facility:	Yes	3I Ecological Impact Assessment Table 6.9 (p129). Further detail in Section 6.4.6.1 and 6.4.6.2, Table 6.11	Yes	
		and within Volume 3L Stormwater and Flooding Assessment of same document (links to above further detail are in Table 6.9).		
(ii) the dimensions of the structure or fish facility:	Yes	3I Ecological Impact Assessment Table 6.9 (p130)	Yes	Refer to further observations section above: The note in the table says: <i>"...will aim to meet permitted activity fish passage requirements in clause 70 in NES-F or be informed by the NZFPG to provide fish passage."</i> These are the appropriate documents to be using for structure design, however the use of the word 'aim' introduces uncertainty

				regarding whether the final designs will be suitable or not.
(iii) the design of the structure or fish facility:	Yes	(p130) 3I Ecological Impact Assessment Table 6.9	Yes	Refer to further observations section above: The note in the table says: "...will aim to meet permitted activity fish passage requirements in clause 70 in NES-F or be informed by the NZFPG to provide fish passage." These are the appropriate documents to be using for structure design, however the use of the word 'aim' introduces uncertainty regarding whether the final designs will be suitable or not.
(iv) the placement of the structure or fish facility:	Yes	3I Ecological Impact Assessment Table 6.9	Yes	
(v) the water flows:	Yes	3I Ecological Impact Assessment	Yes	

		Table 6.9 and section 6.4.6.1, and 3L Stormwater and Flooding Assessment; Section 3 onwards		
(vi) the operating regime:	Yes	3L Stormwater and Flooding assessment	Yes	
(b)the freshwater species and values present (with particular focus on threatened, data-deficient, and at-risk species as defined in the New Zealand Threat Classification System):	Yes	3I Ecological Impact Assessment Table 5.22 and Appendix C.3.	Yes	
(c)the water quality and quantity in the surrounding habitat (at the proposed structure location, upstream and downstream):	Yes	3I Ecological Impact Assessment Table 5.22 and 3L Stormwater and Flooding Assessment	Yes	

(d)how the passage of fish will be provided for or impeded.	Yes	3l Ecological Impact Assessment Table 6.9	Yes	Applicant states: "As noted above culvert designs either meet fish passage requirements in clause 70 in the NES-F or designs are informed by the NZFPG (2024) to provide fish passage. Stream realignments will match the current fish passage requirements at each stream and be informed by the NZFPG."
---	-----	---	-----	---

3. With **Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga** for an approval described in section 42(4)(i) (archaeological authority);

Response from Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga on 16 January 2026



Competing Interests and Completeness check for project under the Fast Track Approvals Act 2024

State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass Project (Belfast to Pegasus), FTAA-2512-1157

Contact Details			
Organisation Name	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT)		
Contact person	Ben Henson		
Contact Number	██████████	Alternative	
Email	fasttrack@heritage.org.nz		

Introduction

1. New Zealand Transport Authority (the Applicant) has re-lodged a substantive application for State Highway 1 North Canterbury – Woodend Bypass (Belfast to Pegasus) (the Project) with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
2. On 6 January 2026 the EPA requested feedback regarding completeness to determine whether the substantive application complies with section 46(2) of the FTA Act.
3. HNZPT has also undertaken a check for competing applications to assist in determining if there are any competing applications or existing resource consents under section 47 of the FTA Act.

Completeness Check

4. HNZPT confirms that all documentation has been provided that is required for an archaeological authority application.

Competing Interests Check

5. HNZPT confirms that there are no current competing archaeological authority applications under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga 2014 Act that relate to the same activity and site.