

Director-General of Conservation s17 comments

Project name	Bangor Village
Applicant name	Hughes Developments Limited
Application number	FTAA-2511-1151
Project summary details	<p>The Bangor Village project is a proposal to subdivide and develop land for the purpose of establishing a master-planned community at 160 Bangor Road (State Highway 77), Darfield, Selwyn.</p> <p>The project will include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Subdivision to create approximately 700 – 800 allotments and enable construction of approximately 700 – 800 residential units across a range of densities (which may be constructed by a person or persons other than the applicant) b. Subdivision to create allotments for future non-residential activities (which may include community and commercial activities, and a school) c. Landscaping and development of an open space network including reserves and enhancement of an existing water race d. Associated infrastructure, including for three waters services and transport (including external site access works) <p>No Public Conservation Land has been identified on the Site</p> <p>Wildlife approval is sought for the handling, capture and relocation of lizards 'and any other wildlife' under the Wildlife Act 1953.</p>

1 General comment

- 1.1.1 As the project includes an approval under a specified Act for which DOC is the administering agency, the applicant was required to undertake pre-lodgement consultation in accordance with section 11(e) of the Fast-track Approvals Act (FTAA).

- 1.1.2 A meeting between DOC and the Applicant’s Agent occurred on the 29th of October wherein the Applicant provided an overview of the project. The Applicant provided a draft masterplan and draft aquatic ecology memo. DOC provided a formal pre-lodgement consultation summary to the Applicant on the 6th of November.
- 1.1.3 While DOC does not have sufficient information to determine the level of any actual and potential environmental effects, DOC considers that it is likely that with the appropriate design and conditions, effects can be managed to appropriate levels.
- 1.1.4 DOC is not aware of any reason the project should not be referred.

2 Minister’s decision on referral application

- 2.1.1 FTAA sections 21 and 22 set out matters to be considered in determining whether a referral application should be accepted.
- 2.1.2 DOC notes that other agencies are better placed to comment on most matters. Comments below are limited to sections where DOC has specific interests or information relevant to the Minister’s decision.
- 2.1.3 DOC has considered the criteria in section 22 and has not identified anything it considers the Minister should take into account that has not already been acknowledged by the Applicant in its referral application.
- 2.1.4 DOC has the following comments on sections 21(3) and (4), and section 22:

Section	Criteria	Comments
21(3)(b)	Does the project involve an ineligible activity	DOC has considered section 5(1) (f), (h), (i), (j) and (k). DOC has not identified any aspect of the project that would be considered ineligible under these sections.
21(3)(c)	Is there adequate information to inform a decision	<p>The Applicant provided a high-level aquatic ecology memo prepared by Aquatic Ecology to DOC that was not included in the referral application. This memo provides a broad survey of the aquatic habitats at the site. This report serves as a baseline assessment of the aquatic values. The report indicates that there are two freshwater races onsite with the presence of upland bully. The applicant has indicated a likely presence of lizard habitat onsite.</p> <p>If the project is referred, detailed ecological surveys (including for lizards, fish and avifauna) should be done with methodologies and results provided in the substantive application. This will inform what wildlife approvals will be required for the project. Confirmation should be provided in the substantive application of any</p>

UNCLASSIFIED

Section	Criteria	Comments
		<p>works proposed within waterways or wetlands, including enhancement activities. It is recommended that the applicant provide a stocktake of any current fish barriers onsite and advise of any works to remove or alter them.</p> <p>DOC considers the information to be adequate in terms of a referral decision.</p>
21(4)	Are there any other reasons not specified	DOC has not identified any other reasons why the project should not be referred.
21(5)(a)	<p>Is the project inconsistent with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a Treaty settlement; • Ngā Rohe Moana o Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou Act 2019; • Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011. 	<p>DOC has not identified any inconsistency with any relevant settlement or other obligation. Relevant Treaty Settlement Acts are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998
21(5)(b)	Would it be more appropriate to deal with the proposed approvals under another Act(s)	DOC has not identified any reason why wildlife approval should not be dealt with under the FTAA.
21(5)(c)	Would the project have significant adverse effects on the environment	Based on our knowledge of the existing environment and species expected to occur on the site, our understanding of the project, and our experience of the kinds of measures and conditions that could be implemented, we consider that once more detailed information is available, it would be possible to achieve a project with the imposition of conditions (that are appropriate, enforceable, include best management practice, and apply the relevant ecological management plans, where required), that does not have significant adverse effects on the environment.
21(5)(d)	Does the applicant(s) have a poor compliance history under a specified Act	DOC has not identified any issues with the Applicant's compliance history under the Wildlife Act 1953.
21(5)(g)	Would a substantive application have any competing applications	No competing applications relating to wildlife approvals have been identified.

Section	Criteria	Comments
22(1)(b)(i)	Would referring the project to the fast-track process facilitate the project, including in a way that is more timely and cost-effective than under normal processes?	A Wildlife Act approval would generally take approximately three to four months to process, which is not significantly longer than the FTAA process is expected to take. However, there may be benefits for the Applicant in terms of consideration being combined with RMA approvals (rather than being advanced by a separate process) and given the different decision-making framework under the FTAA.
22(2)(a)(ix)	Will this project address significant environmental issues?	No.
22(2)(a)(x)	Is the project consistent with local or regional planning document, including spatial strategies?	<p>The application is not inconsistent with the relevant statutory planning provisions. However, consideration needs to be given to the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Management of any threatened and at-risk species that may be found on the site to ensure their persistence; • Protection of freshwater fisheries, fish habitat and fish passage; • Preservation of threatened indigenous freshwater species.
22(b)	Any other matters the Minister may consider as relevant?	No other project specific matters which may be of importance for the Minister to consider have been identified.

3 Other considerations

3.1.1 DOC has provided input to a number of fast-track projects to date where additional conservation approvals that would have been available under the FTAA have not been included in a substantive application. In some cases, it has been necessary for applicants to

UNCLASSIFIED

seek additional approvals via normal processing. This can result in inefficiencies, additional costs and undermining the benefits of the 'one stop shop' approach of the FTAA.

- 3.1.2 DOC considers the Applicant should consider whether it should seek to include additional approvals that may be required for the project, and suggests the Minister should consider whether further information should be sought from the Applicant
- 3.1.3 DOC recommends consideration of whether any culverts or works within waterways might require complex freshwater fisheries approval, as highlighted to the Applicant as part of the pre-lodgement consultation. The referral application currently indicates that no approvals are sought under the Freshwater Fisheries Regulations 1983.
- 3.1.4 Given the lack of specific detail in the referral application, DOC considers it would be highly beneficial for the Applicant to engage further with DOC as it relates to any conservation approvals (as well as conservation matters subject to RMA consideration) prior to making any substantive application. Benefits include ensuring information necessary to support decision-making with respect to conservation approvals is included; supporting the management of any actual and potential adverse effects on the environment; and early identification and resolution of any issues.

4 Matters for the Minister to specify (s27)

- 4.1.1 None identified.



Jenni Fitzgerald
Fast-Track Applications Manager

Acting pursuant to delegated authority on behalf of the Director-General of Conservation.

Date: 9 February 2026

Note: A copy of the Instrument of Delegation may be inspected at the Director-General's office at Conservation House Whare Kaupapa Atawhai, 18/32 Manners Street, Wellington 6011