

PPC17 - Addendum Section 42A Summary Report

Introduction

1. My full name is Damien McGahan, and I am principal author of the Section 42A Report dated 11 September 2025 and the Addendum Section 42A Report dated 27 November 2025. My qualifications and experience were set out in the initial Section 42A Report.

Scope of Summary Statement

2. This Addendum Section 42A Summary Report includes:
 - Introduction of a Section 32AA Further Evaluation (in support of the provisions attached to the Addendum Section 42A Report and post-hearing amendments).
 - A response to and update to the provisions tabled by Fonterra on 2 December.
 - An update response to matters that arose during the hearing, relevant to my area of expertise.
 - Recommendations.
3. In preparing this summary, I have relied on the expert advice of Council specialists including Naomi McMinn (Transportation); Chris Hardy (Water and Wastewater) and Iain Smith (Stormwater). Summary Statements from each have also been provided to the Independent Hearings Panel (IHP).

Section 32AA Further Evaluation

4. A Section 32AA evaluation supporting the proposed amendments I made to provisions which attached to the Addendum Section 42A Report.
5. My evaluation has focussed on the key moves (amendments) proposed only, covering off the objectives and policies (Chapter 12); critical rules relating to infrastructure (Chapter 3.9); and information requirements (Appendix 1.2) and assessment criteria (Appendix 1.3.3).
6. Based on my analysis, I consider that the proposed Council amended provisions are the most appropriate, efficient and effective way to achieve the amended objectives for the TRINZ, particularly as it relates to critical infrastructure and accounting for constraints associated with the transport network, water allocation and wastewater capacity. I acknowledge that Fonterra are in support of these proposed objectives (along with the associated policies, but with minor suggested amendments which I support).

Response to Fonterra's Updated PPC17 provisions

7. I focus on the provisions appended to Mr Grala's summary statement (dated 2 December). I attach to this Addendum Section 42A Summary Report Council's recommended amendments to PPC17 provisions following further discussion with Council specialists and Mr Grala on behalf of Fonterra.

Chapter 3.9

8. 3.9.2.5 (e) – Ms McMinn has stated in her post-hearing statement (5 December 2025) that the proposed cross-section should be revised for the reasons outlined in paragraph 14 of her

summary statement. In summary, a modified cross-section for Old Ruffell Road that includes a flush median and walking/cycling facilities within the existing road reserve is recommended. This upgrade is necessary because the current road does not meet industrial collector road standards and would lead to safety concerns. A flush median will also improve access to existing and potential future industrial vehicle crossings along Old Ruffell Road and PPC17 frontage. On this basis, I support her amendments.

9. Regarding the inclusion of figures showing general cross sections (Figures 3.9.2.5 (a) – e), I consider these to be helpful in helping understand the Structure Plan and what can be generally expected and where. I note that this approach is consistent with other Structure Plans within the District Plan. I recommend that the cross sections are all updated to include reference to 'Indicative' to provide flexibility.
10. 3.9.2.5 (n) and (p) – I support the proposed amendments on the basis they provide clarity.
11. 3.9.2.5 (o) – A new inclusion has been inserted to reflect Mr Apeldoorn's recommendation regarding safe crossing places across Te Rapa Road at bus stops and adjacent land use integration to/from the Te Rapa North Structure Plan area (para 5.1c of Mr Apeldoorn's summary statement, dated 27 November 2025). This recommendation is supported by Ms McMinn.
12. 3.9.2.6 (b) – I note Mr Grala has agreed to reintroduce this, which I support. I also note that this reference also sits at 3.9.3.4 and has also been amended for consistency. I make that point on the basis that Mr Grala would 'consider' the latter amendment.
13. 3.9.3.2 (a): Transport Upgrade Network table
 - Ms McMinn has recommended the retention of the 'Design and Construction of Old Ruffell Road intersection upgrade to roundabout' at (i) on the basis that the proposal will substantially increase traffic, and that a roundabout would result in a safer transport environment than retention of the existing priority tee-intersection. I agree with this inclusion.
 - The signalisation of Te Rapa Road / McKee Street struck out by Fonterra (formally (ii)), and this has been upheld on the basis that this is required to be delivered by TAL, being a condition of TAL's land development consent (ref. 011.2021.00011468.006, condition 72).
 - The Council's wording for the upgrade of Old Ruffell Road to Collector standard in accordance with the indicative cross-section shown in Figure 3.9.2.5.e, between the Structure Plan Spine Road (Access 1) and Ruffell Road at (iii) is reintroduced for clarity. Importantly it brings in a requirement to consider and provide for pedestrian connections in the vicinity, including across Te Rapa Road. This is important because given the Te Rapa Road / McKee Street works are now excluded, signalisation is also no longer provided for.
 - The Spine Road requirement is reintroduced at (xii), being required to be delivered for development above 20ha. Ms McMinn maintains concerns relating to its ultimate deliverability based on site constraints outlined by Fonterra during the hearing. In addition, Ms McMinn considers that an unconnected Spine Road at the appropriate stage (above 20ha) would lead to undesirable transport planning outcomes in relation to local trips.

14. Ms McMinn has recommended a provision at (xxii) to account for the existing Te Awa River Ride. As outlined in her summary statement (paragraph 26), it is undesirable for Te Awa River Ride cyclists to be mixing with industrial traffic along the northern section of Meadow View Lane.

15. 3.9.3.2 (b): Transport Upgrade Network requirements

- This provision has been amended to remove the 'Simple ITA' requirement (proposed by Fonterra) and tailored to require a Broad ITA to respond to the substantive stages of the development, as set out in the Transport Upgrade Framework table.

I maintain my position that a Broad ITA should be a requirement for stages once the 20ha limit has been reached, noting that:

- Timing and staging for PPC17 are not clear and therefore there is a degree of uncertainty around future traffic conditions and implementation of necessary infrastructure requirements.
- The dynamic nature of the surrounding land use, transport infrastructure and transport demands makes it difficult to assess the effects in 5-10 years into the future.
- This approach is consistent with other plan changes/ structure plans including TAL, Ruakura, Peacockes and Rotokauri.
- Ms McMinn has also described the levels of traffic generation that could also be expected from an industrial development triggering a Broad ITA under the District Plan (Rule 25.14.4.3(e)). I consider that this is informative when considering the proposed triggers the Council currently prefers.

- 3.9.3.2.b.(ii) – Te Rapa Road / Hutchinson Road roundabout has been introduced as a component to assess. As pointed out by Ms McMinn in her statement (para. 22), the effects of industrial traffic from the North Block of PPC17 using Hutchinson Road have not been assessed. On this basis, I agree that the effects on this roundabout should be examined in the future as part of the Broad ITA.
- There is an opportunity under (iv) to bring in a requirement to consult with TAL and other relevant stakeholders. I would recommend this on the basis that both developments share a common transport network environment and are both large developments.

16. 3.9.3.2 (c) – Regarding the preparation of ITA's, I consider the obligation is on all developers to undertake these for the developments of the scale of PPC17 and TAL for example. The ITA provides a critical 'check and balance', and this is particularly important given the dynamic nature of the environment and uncertainties that exist, particularly around timing and delivery of upgrades.

17. Figure 3.9.3.2a (Indicative Transport Upgrade Network) has been relocated to Appendix 2 as this is where they are designed to sit in the Operative District Plan. I note that Fonterra are considering an update to this figure based on Council feedback and to aid clarity.

18. 3.9.3.3: Strategic Three Waters Infrastructure / 3.9.3.3.a (table) – several of the amendments proposed by Fonterra are not supported. I have re-introduced Council's

proposed provisions (dated 27 November) while also recommending additional amendments to further strengthen them:

- The Infrastructure Plan requirement has been moved from the ‘Note’ section below the table to the preamble to give added primacy to it. Additionally, the reference to water availability, allocation and wastewater treatment capacity is reintroduced. This is on the basis that these matters represent critical infrastructure issues for the city and reflect more than just the implementation of physical infrastructure. It is important that the provisions clearly signal at the outset that there will be a process to manage and control these matters through the rules framework, and which is now also supported by a strengthened objectives and policies framework (Chapter 12).

I note Fonterra’s proposed cross-reference to the Water Impact Assessment and Three Waters Infrastructure Capacity Assessments as an alternative to the inclusion of the requirements in the table itself. While I had considered this as an option I note that while most elements are given coverage to, sub-part iii is not engaged as a provision that would relate to the PPC17 area – relating to an assessment of the available Three Waters infrastructure capacity to appropriately service the proposal.

While I don’t have a particular issue with the proposed cross referencing, I consider that front footing the critical matters as I have attempted to do in the Strategic Three Waters Infrastructure table gives the necessary full coverage to the matters required to be addressed in the Infrastructure Plan. This approach will ensure nothing ‘falls through the gaps.’ The provision aims to set up the process to resolve these critical infrastructure matters through early engagement with the Council. As such requiring these matters to be considered within the Infrastructure Plan to be implemented at each stage / block-level development, with those cross-references instead been relocated to the information requirements in Appendix 1.2 (Infrastructure Plan) is the preferred approach.

- Fonterra’s proposed amendment in the stormwater column of the Strategic Three Waters Infrastructure table contains a reference to “Area 1 rip-rap works.” Mr Smith has noted that Council has not yet agreed that the in-stream works is the preferred option for stream erosion resilience works. At this stage, both options from the ICMP remain open. I note the Infrastructure Plan requirements (at 1.2.2.30(b)) seeks to resolve this matter via a process to be worked through with Council and other stakeholders. On this basis, I do not support the proposed amendments.

19. 3.9.3.4(a)(i) – as previously noted, I recommend that the strikeout is introduced.

Chapter 12

20. I acknowledge Mr Grala’s general support for proposed objectives and policies, which I introduced as part of the Section 42A Addendum report (refer to Objectives 12.2.2 and 12.2.3 and associated policies). I set the reasons for their inclusion at paragraph 5.13. Mr Grala has recommended some amendments to the policy wording, and I am comfortable with these.

21. 12.4.1 (Note 2) – I support this inclusion on the basis it provides greater clarity.

22. 12.5.1(a) has been responded to by Ms McMinn in terms of workability and enforcement. Ms McMinn recommends that 12.5.1(b) is reintroduced on the basis that Hutchinson Road has not been assessed.

Information Requirements – Appendix 1.2

23. Mr Grala has introduced at (a) an additional matter which cross references back to Appendix 1.2.2.5 and 1.2.2.5a matters, which I have already discussed above.

24. 1.2.2.30(f) – Mr Smith has noted that provision 1.2.2.30e) parts i to v. generally duplicate 1.2.2.30 f) & g) and that 1.2.2.30e) should just read “Must demonstrate how it is consistent with the Te Rapa ICMP”.

Assessment Criteria – Appendix 1.3.3 – Q5

25. Q5c – This provision has been tailored to reflect the amendments proposed in 3.9.3.2 (b).

26. Q5e – Ms McMinn recommends revising the criterion to allow assessment of connections between the PPC17 area and bus stops on Te Rapa Rd, reflecting her position outlined in paragraph 12 of her post-hearing statement (5 December 2025). I support this recommendation.

27. Q5f – Mr Apeldoorn has recommended that this criterion is revised to provide for right turning at Access 2 and avoid the adverse effects of U-turning at the Te Rapa Road / Hutchinson Road intersection (para 5.1h of the summary statement, 27 November 2025). This recommendation is supported by Ms McMinn.

Updated response to key matters

28. I confirm that my conclusions on key matters relevant to my area of expertise, which are outlined in section 4.0 of my Addendum Section 42A Report dated 27 November 2025, have not changed following the hearing. To summarise, this includes conclusions reached on:

- Extent of PPC17 – noting that I consider the approach taken by Fonterra to be appropriate. I consider there is insufficient evidence to support an expansion of the PPC17 extent in this case.
- The transport baseline environment – amendments to provisions reflect the existing (consented) environment, but inclusion of a requirement to undertake Broad ITAs for substantive stages above 20ha to account for the dynamic transport environment, timing uncertainties and ability for Council to consider cumulative effects and any associated upgrade requirements.
- HES / PPC17 Boundary treatment – I remain of the view that the provisions are appropriate given the common underlying zoning of both sites and because the use of the adjacent HES site is not yet known (and that it is reasonable to assume it would be for industrial use).

Recommendations

29. Subject to the adoption of the recommendations outlined to the PPC17 provisions (and any necessary further refinements), I maintain my recommendation as set out at paragraphs 6.1 and 6.2 of the Section 42A Addendum report.