

Ridgeburn Development - Fast Track Referral Application

Table 1: Requirements for a Referral Application

REFERRAL APPLICATION		
Requirements of the Act		Comments
Steps before lodging referral application		
11(1)	Before lodging a referral application, the applicant must consult: (a) Relevant local authorities; and, (b) Relevant iwi authorities, hapu, and treaty settlement entities, including: 1) iwi authorities and groups that represent hapū that are parties to relevant Mana Whakahono ā Rohe or joint management agreements; and 2) the tangata whenua of any area within the project area that is a taiāpure-local fishery, a mātaihai reserve, or an area that is subject to bylaws or regulations made under Part 9 of the Fisheries Act 1996; and (c) any relevant applicant groups with applications for customary marine title under the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana Act) 2011; and (d) ngā hapū o Ngāti Porou, if the project area is within or adjacent to, or the project would directly affect, ngā rohe moana o ngā hapū o Ngāti Porou; and (e) the relevant administering agencies; and (f) if the proposed approvals for the project are to include an approval described in section 24C(3)(d) (land exchange), the holder of an interest in the land that is to be exchanged by the Crown.	The applicant and their representatives have consulted with: • The relevant local authorities are Queenstown Lakes District Council and Otago Regional Council; • The relevant iwi authorities being: ○ Aukaha; ○ Te Ao Mārama; ○ Te Rūnanga o Moeraki Incorporated; ○ Kāti Huirapa ki Puketeraki Incorporated; ○ Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou Incorporated; ○ Hokonui Rūnanga Incorporated; ○ Waihōpai Rūnanga Incorporated; ○ Te Rūnanga o Awarua Charitable Trust; ○ Ōraka Aparima Rūnanga Incorporated; and ○ Te Rūnanga O Ngāi Tahu • Treaty settlement entities:

		○ Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu – iwi authority under the Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996 ● The relevant administering agencies being: ○ Ministry for the Environment (MfE) ○ Department of Conservation (DOC) ○ Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (Heritage NZ) A summary of consultation undertaken with the stakeholders listed above is provided at Appendix 14. Subclauses 11(1)(b)(ii) – (d) and (f) are not relevant to the proposal.
11(2)	If a referral application is to be lodged by more than 1 person, any 1 of those persons may comply with this section on behalf of all of them	The referral application is lodged by only 1 person.
Referral application		
13(1)	A person or persons may apply to use the fast-track approvals process for a project by lodging a referral application with the responsible agency.	The referral application has been lodged.
13(2)	The referral application must— (a) must be lodged in the form and manner approved by the responsible agency; and (b) must be lodged jointly by all of the persons who are proposed to be authorised persons for the project; and (c) must include the information specified in subsection (3); and	(a) The application has been lodged in the form and manner approved by MfE. (b) The application has been lodged by Ridgeburn Limited (c) All of the information specified in subclause (3) has been provided. Please refer below. (d) The proposal seeks resource consent under the Resource Management Act and Permit under the Wildlife Act. (e) The application fee will be paid upon lodgement.

	(d) must specify all of the proposed approvals, but need only provide a general level of detail about each proposed approval, sufficient to inform the Minister’s decision on the referral application; and (e) must not be lodged unless any fee, charge, or levy payable under regulations in respect of the application is paid.	
12(3)	For each proposed approval,— (a) the applicant must be eligible to apply for any corresponding approval under a specified Act; or (b) if the referral application is lodged by more than 1 person, the person who is to hold the proposed approval must be a person who would be eligible to apply for any corresponding approval under a specified Act.	The application has been lodged by Ridgeburn Limited. The Applicant is eligible to apply for approval.

Information Requirements

The information to be included in the referral application is as follows:

13(4)(a)	A description of the proposed project and the activities it involves.	Refer to Section 3 of the AEE.
13(4)(b)	An explanation of how the project meets the criteria in section 22. The criteria is: a) the project is an infrastructure or development project that would have significant regional or national benefits; and	The project is a development project that will: • Increase the supply of housing, address housing needs, or contribute to a well-functioning urban environment (within the meaning of policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020). • This includes a commitment to construct affordable housing and to commence construction within 6 months of receiving necessary resource consents; • Delivers regionally significant economic benefits;

Barker & Associates

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Wānaka & Queenstown

	• Implements a regionally significant planting programme which will provide significant ecological benefits; • Establish a waste water treatment plant to service the development, with potential to service Arrowtown which will benefit the region by alleviating the pressure and capacity constraints associated with the Queenstown waste water treatment plant.
b) referring the project to the fast-track approvals process— (i) would facilitate the project, including by enabling it to be processed in a more timely and cost-effective way than under normal processes; and (ii) is unlikely to materially affect the efficient operation of the fast-track approvals process.	The Ridgeburn development would benefit significantly from referral under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024. Given the complexity of the existing planning framework, including rural zoning, the project would otherwise require a private plan change or a suite of non-complying resource consents. These paths would likely involve notification, lengthy processing timeframes, and appeal risk. We would anticipate a plan change process followed by a resource consent process would take in the order of 2 – 3 years. As such, the FTAA will facilitate the project and provide a considerably more timely and cost-effective process for seeking the necessary consents. Bringing forward the delivery of a substantial number of dwellings in a region facing acute affordability pressures will assist in creating a more balanced housing market and reduce upward price pressure on houses, as outlined in the AEE and economic report. Further, the development also includes 180 dwellings specifically identified as affordable housing. These would contribute to easing acute affordability pressures in Queenstown, where the average house price is approximately \$1.82 million and it takes 18 years to save a deposit on current income levels. Bringing forward this supply would

	assist in creating a more balanced housing market and reduce upward pressure on prices. In addition, a permit under the Wildlife Act 1953 would be required for the relocation of At Risk – Declining lizard species identified on-site, adding further procedural steps to an already complex consenting process. Referral under the Fast-track process would streamline these approvals, eliminate unnecessary delay, and enable the earlier delivery of affordable housing, housing supply and environmental enhancement. Although the project cannot remove or vary existing consent notices registered on the underlying titles under the FTAA, removal or variation of some consent notice conditions is required to enable the broader development. If the project is referred and approved under the FTAA, a separate application will subsequently be made under section 221(3) of the RMA to cancel or vary the relevant notices. The proposed development will supersede the basis for the original notice conditions and will represent a change in circumstance which means the consent notice conditions are no longer relevant or appropriate and should be removed on that basis. It follows that the consent notice registered on the underlying titles should not stand in the way of implementation of any approval obtained under the FTAA. Similarly, easement variations may be required to enable site access or realign infrastructure corridors. While these changes cannot be
--	--

	formalised under the FTAA, they can be efficiently progressed post-approval in parallel with detailed design and implementation. Importantly, the need for these secondary processes does not detract from the core efficiency gains provided by fast-track referral (and is the only practical pathway for progressing the development as a whole). This approach also addresses section 14(2)(b)(i) of the Act. The fast-track process will materially facilitate the project, as it consolidates multiple approvals and avoids the delay, uncertainty, and cost of separate plan change or notified consent processes. The need for a subsequent s221(3) application does not affect the utility or efficiency of fast-track referral. The fast-track process provides the necessary development context to support those follow-on steps, allowing them to be undertaken efficiently once the core approvals are in place. The project is unlikely to materially affect the efficient operation of the fast-track approvals process. Assessment of the proposal is considered to be relatively straightforward and unlikely to require additional resourcing given it does not raise novel issues, and the effects are known and easily quantifiable. Overall, fast-track referral will enable the earlier delivery of critical housing, supporting infrastructure, employment opportunities, and environmental enhancement measures, without placing undue burden on the operation of the fast-track approvals system. This is further supported by the fact that the applicant is also the developer responsible for constructing the housing and delivering the
--	---

		infrastructure, ensuring integrated and efficient implementation consistent with the purpose of the fast-track process.
	For the purpose of subsection (1)(a), the ministers may consider where the project -	
	(i) has been identified as a priority project in a central government, local government, or sector plan or strategy (for example, in a general policy statement or spatial strategy), or a central government infrastructure priority list	The project has not been identified as a priority project.
	(ii) will deliver new regionally or nationally significant infrastructure or enable the continued functioning of existing regionally or nationally significant infrastructure:	Not applicable to the proposal.
	(iii) will increase the supply of housing, address housing needs, or contribute to a well-functioning urban environment (within the meaning of policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020):	This is addressed in detail in the AEE and economic reports. To summarise, the proposal will deliver approximately 1,227 residential units, including a dedicated component of 180 affordable dwellings, representing a substantial increase in housing supply within the Queenstown Lakes District. This level of provision is significant in the context of the district's acute housing pressures, where high land and construction costs have constrained delivery and the median house price exceeds \$1.8 million. Further, the Applicant is committed to locking in fixed house prices as part of this approval process (by way of consent conditions or similar requirements) to capture this affordability commitment and ensure genuine delivery of lower-cost housing outcomes for the local community. The Applicant has also pledged to commence the construction of these units within 6 months of resource consents being granted. The scale and diversity of housing proposed will contribute to increased competition in the local housing market, support housing

		affordability, and promote economic efficiency through greater choice. The proposal is also aligned with the outcomes sought under Policy 1 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 by supporting a well-functioning urban environment—enabling a mix of housing types, integration with infrastructure, and accessibility to transport networks and local services.
	(iv) will deliver significant economic benefits	The Ridgeburn development will deliver substantial economic benefits at both the regional and national level. The Economic Impact Assessment (refer Appendix 7) confirms: • The development will result in approximately 6,555 full-time equivalent (FTE) job years, including a peak year with 1,462 FTEs over a five-year construction period; • Employment is distributed across 2,418 development-related FTEs, 3,298 construction FTEs, and 839 FTEs across other sectors; and • The project is expected to generate approximately \$398 million in household income throughout the Otago Region. • Ongoing employment opportunities in construction, retail, hospitality, and service sectors as a result of the proposed commercial centre and community facilities; and • Flow-on economic activity driven by increased resident spending, population growth, and improved infrastructure servicing. The proposal will also support the wider Queenstown tourism economy by enhancing visitor infrastructure and reinforcing the strategic role of the Wakatipu Basin as a lifestyle and recreation

		destination, and by providing much needed accommodation for seasonal workers. By delivering housing, services, and employment in an integrated way, the project is expected to act as a catalyst for long-term economic resilience in the region. These economic benefits are addressed in detail within the Economic Impact Assessment submitted with this application.
	(v) will support primary industries, including aquaculture:	Not applicable to the proposal.
	(vi) will support development of natural resources, including minerals and petroleum:	Not applicable to the proposal.
	(vii) will support climate change mitigation, including the reduction or removal of greenhouse gas emissions	The proposal supports climate change mitigation through several integrated design and infrastructure strategies. These include provision for solar panels on residential dwellings to enable on-site renewable energy generation, large-scale native planting across approximately 60 hectares acting as a long-term carbon sink, and the delivery of housing and commercial activities in close proximity to employment and public transport, reducing reliance on private vehicle travel. These measures collectively contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions and align with national climate change goals.
	(viii) will support climate change adaptation, reduce risks arising from natural hazards, or support recovery from events caused by natural hazards	Not applicable to the proposal.
	(ix) will address significant environmental issues:	Ridgeburn directly responds to regional biodiversity decline by restoring and enhancing habitat for the At Risk – Declining kōrero

	gecko, a native lizard species under pressure from habitat loss and predation. Although the site currently offers limited habitat within its modified grasslands, the proposal delivers a substantial ecological uplift through the creation of predator-resilient habitat embedded within a 60-hectare network of open space and ecological corridors. A Lizard Management Plan will guide the safe relocation of any geckos encountered during works. Long-term habitat enhancement will be achieved through structurally diverse native planting, installation of refugia (e.g. rock piles and logs), and comprehensive pest control targeting mustelids, rats, and feral cats. Around 150,000 native plants will be established across Morven Hill and the Kawarau escarpment, significantly improving habitat quality, food availability, and overall landscape function. These measures are expected to result in a measurable net gain in lizard habitat extent and quality, contributing directly to the conservation of indigenous fauna in the Otago Region.
(x) is consistent with local or regional planning documents, including spatial strategies	Not applicable to the proposal.
(b) any other matters the Minister considers relevant.	The development includes a 60-hectare native revegetation and pest control programme, restoration of wetland and riparian margins, and improved habitat for indigenous species, including the native lizard. In addition, the development enhances outdoor recreation and eco-tourism through integration with the Queenstown Trail network and delivery of high-quality open space and cycle infrastructure. These matters contribute to regional

		environmental and recreational values and support broader well-being outcomes.
	(6) For the purposes of subsection (1)(a), the Minister may compare the activity involved in the project against the current and other likely uses of the space, taking into account:	In this case, the site is zoned Rural Zone and Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone under the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan, and is subject to overlays including Outstanding Natural Features. These planning provisions significantly restrict any form of development. The land is currently used for low-intensity pastoral grazing, with fragmented and topographically constrained areas of productive soil. In the absence of the proposal, it is likely the site would remain in low-yielding rural use, with limited capacity to deliver housing, infrastructure, or coordinated environmental improvements.
	(a) the economic benefits and strategic importance of the proposed projects and	Strategically, the proposal provides: • A comprehensively master planned mixed-use development delivering approximately 1,227 residential units, including 180 affordable dwellings, to help meet critical housing demand in the Queenstown Lakes District, where affordability constraints and supply shortages are acute; • A development located on a key rural–urban interface site between Arrowtown and State Highway 6, with proximity to Queenstown, Frankton, and the Kawarau River corridor, enabling logical growth within an already pressured housing market; • Integration with the regional transport network through upgrades to the Morven Ferry Road / SH6 intersection and

		delivery of an internal roading network that supports future connectivity; • Provision for local commercial, open space, and community facilities, reducing pressure on Queenstown’s core services and supporting a more distributed urban form; • Wastewater infrastructure has been deliberately designed to be adaptable, with capacity to potentially service surrounding catchments such as Arrowtown and Ladies Mile in the future. This could significantly reduce pressure on the constrained QLDC’s wastewater network; • Strategic environmental enhancements, including native revegetation, riparian restoration, and the creation of skink habitat, addressing a recognised biodiversity issue in the Wakatipu Basin; • The economic benefits of the proposal, as detailed in the Economic Impact Assessment, include: ○ A regional economic contribution with a Net Present Value (NPV) of approximately \$710 million over a five-year period; ○ Construction and development expenditure of approximately \$385 million; ○ The generation of 6,555 full-time equivalent (FTE) job years, with a peak workforce of 1,462 FTEs during the busiest development year;
--	--	--

		○ A total of approximately \$398 million in household income generated across the Otago Region; ○ Improved local workforce retention and housing availability, including a 3,000 m² workers accommodation complex to support the region's seasonal labour force; ○ Flow-on benefits for the tourism, hospitality, and service sectors, through enhanced housing provision, workforce support, and commercial amenity. These combined strategic and economic outcomes highlight the regional significance of the Ridgeburn proposal and its alignment with the intent of the FTAA.
	(b) The likely impact of the proposed project on current and proposed marine management regimes; and	Marine management regimes are not applicable to this application.
	(c) The environmental impacts of the competing activities	While the site is currently used for pastoral farming, the environmental impacts of this activity are relatively low in scale but do little to enhance biodiversity, water quality, or ecological function. The ecological assessment confirms that the site has been extensively cleared and modified over decades of grazing and offers limited indigenous biodiversity value in its current form. In contrast, the proposed development includes a regionally significant ecological enhancement programme, including 60 hectares of native planting and pest control. Retaining the existing rural land use would maintain this degraded environmental state, with minimal contribution to the district's housing, economic, or climate objectives.

13(4)(c)	Information to demonstrate that the project does not involve any ineligible activities (other than activities that may be the subject of a determination under section 22D or 22DA):	Section 5 of the FTAA sets out the meaning of ineligible activity. We make the following comments to confirm that the proposal does not involve any ineligible activities: • None of the sites subject to the application would occur on: ○ Identified Māori land; ○ A customary marine title area; ○ Māori customary land; ○ Land set apart as a Māori reservation as defined in Section 4 of the Te Ture Whenua Maori Act 1993; • The proposal is not for an aquaculture activity; • The proposal is not for an activity that would require an access arrangement under section 61 or 61B of the Crown Minerals Act 1991; • The proposal is not for an activity that would be prevented under section 165J, 165M, 165Q, 165ZC, or 165ZDB of the Resource Management Act 1991 as the proposal does not involve a coastal permit or relate to the common marine and coastal area; • The proposal does not involve land that is listed in Schedule 4 and is unrelated to Section 24 of the FTAA; • The proposal does not involve land on a national reserve held under the Reserves Act 1977 or a reserve held under the Reserves Act 1977 that is vested to someone other than the Crown, the local authority or Department of Conservation;
----------	--	--

Barker & Associates

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Wānaka & Queenstown

		• The proposal does not involve a prohibited activity under the Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf (Environmental Effects) Act 2012 or regulations made under that Act; • The proposal does not involve an activity that is described in section 15B of the Resource Management Act 1991 and is a prohibited activity under that Act or regulations made under it; • The proposal does not involve an activity that is prohibited by section 15C of the Resource Management Act 1991; • The proposal does not involve a decommissioning-related activity (which is an activity described in section 38(3) of the Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf (Environmental Effects) Act 2012); • The proposal is not for an offshore renewable energy project.
13(4)(d)	A description or map of the whole project area that identifies its boundaries in sufficient detail to enable consideration of the referral application	As shown on Masterplan as attached in Appendix 2 and in Section 2 of the AEE.
13(4)(e)	• The anticipated commencement and completion dates for construction activities (where relevant).	• Construction of the Ridgeburn development is anticipated to begin immediately upon the issue of consent, with initial works to include infrastructure installation, road construction, and the delivery of affordable housing. The Applicant has committed to commencing the construction of the 180 affordable houses within 6 months of the issue of resource consent and is committed to the following maximum affordable house prices as a condition of consent:

		○ One-bedroom home with carpad – \$599,000 (54 dwellings) ○ Two-bedroom home with garage – \$899,000 (46 dwellings) ○ Three-bedroom home with garage – \$999,000 (12 dwellings) ○ Two-bedroom with rear yard/front patio – \$779,000 (16 dwellings) ○ Dual-key with car park – \$749,000 (52 dwellings) • The development will be delivered in stages over approximately five years, with: • Affordable housing construction commencing in Year 1, alongside infrastructure and roading; • House and land package delivery occurring progressively from Year 1 through Year 2, and • Community amenities and commercial elements, constructed during the latter stages of the programme. • Full build-out of the project is targeted for completion within five years of consent being granted, subject to detailed design and final consenting conditions. • This staged programme reflects the Applicant’s vertically integrated delivery model and commitment to timely, high-quality construction outcomes.
--	--	---

		Please refer to the Project Timeline included within the Ridgeburn Design Document as Appendix 15.
13(4)(f)	A statement of whether the project is planned to proceed in stages and, if so, (i) an outline of the nature and timing of the stages; and (ii) a statement of whether a separate substantive application is to be lodged for each of the stages; and (iii) an explanation of how each stage meets the criteria in section 22:	The Ridgeburn development will be delivered as a single comprehensive development under one substantive fast-track application. While construction will occur progressively over approximately five years, it is not divided into formally defined stages for the purposes of consenting. The development will be sequenced to prioritise infrastructure and affordable housing delivery early in the programme. Initial works will include bulk earthworks, internal roads, and servicing, followed by the construction of residential dwellings and commercial/community components. As the proposal is being consented as a single project, no separate applications under the Fast-track Approvals Act are proposed for later phases of construction. An explanation of how the project meets the criteria in section 22, noting that it is to occur as a single stage, is addressed above in Section 13(4)(b).
13(4)(g)	A statement of whether a part of the project is proposed as an alternative project in itself and, if so— (i) a description of that part of the project; and (ii) an explanation of how that part of the project meets the criteria in section 22B:	The project is not an alternative project in itself.
13(4)(h)	A description of the anticipated and known adverse effects of the project on the environment	Refer to Section 5 of the AEE. All anticipated and known potential adverse effects can be mitigated.

Barker & Associates

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Wānaka & Queenstown

13(4)(i)	A statement of any activities involved in the project that are prohibited activities under the Resource Management Act 1991.	No prohibited activities under the RMA 1991 are proposed in relation to this project.
Persons Affected		
13(4)(j)	A list of the persons and groups the applicant considers are likely to be affected by the project, including: i. Relevant local authorities ii. iwi authorities and groups that represent hapū that are parties to relevant Mana Whakahono ā Rohe or joint management agreements: iii. Other relevant iwi authorities: iv. Relevant treaty settlement entities v. Relevant protected customary rights groups and customary marine title groups vi. Ngā hapū o Ngāti Porou, if the project area is within or adjacent to, or the project would directly affect, Ngā rohe moana o Ngā 25 hapū o Ngāti porou vii. Relevant applicant groups under the Marine And Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 viii. Persons with a registered interest in land that may need to be acquired under the Public Works Act 1981.	Key stakeholders for the proposal include: ○ Aukaha; ○ Te Ao Mārama; ○ Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu ○ Te Rūnanga o Moeraki Incorporated; ○ Kāti Huirapa ki Puketeraki Incorporated; ○ Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou Incorporated; ○ Hokonui Rūnanga Incorporated; ○ Waihōpai Rūnaka Incorporated; ○ Te Rūnaka o Awarua Charitable Trust; ○ Ōraka Aparima Rūnaka Incorporated; ○ Te Rūnanga O Ngāi Tahu (iwi authority under the Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu Act 1996); ○ Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC); and ○ Otago Regional Council (ORC).

Barker & Associates

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Wānaka & Queenstown

13(4)(k)	A summary of (i) the consultation undertaken for the purposes of section 11 and any other consultation undertaken on the project with the persons and groups referred to in paragraph (ha); and (ii) how the consultation has informed the project:	A summary of consultation undertaken for the purpose of Section 11 is included as Appendix 14 .
13(4)(l)	A list of any Treaty settlements that apply to the project area, and a summary of the relevant principles and provisions in those settlements.	Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 and Ngāi Tahu Deed of Settlement 1997. The Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 is the legislation that gives effect to the Ngāi Tahu Deed of Settlement, signed in 1997, between the Crown and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu. A summary of the relevant principles and provisions in the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 is included in the AEE in Section
13(4)(m)	A description of any processes already undertaken under the Public Works Act 1981 in relation to the project.	No processes have been undertaken under the Public Works Act 1981.
13(4)(n)	A statement of any relevant principles or provisions in the Ngā Rohe Moana o Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou Act 2019.	No principles or provisions in the Ngā Rohe Moana o Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou Act 2019 are relevant to the application.
13(4)(o)	information identifying the parcels of Māori land, marae, and identified wāhi tapu within the project area.	No Māori land, marae, and wāhi tapu have been identified within the project area.

Information relating to potentially ineligible activities

13(4)(p)	a statement of whether the applicant is seeking a determination under section 23 and, if so, an assessment of the effects of the activity on the relevant land and on the rights and interests of Māori in that land:	Not applicable to this application.
----------	---	-------------------------------------

Barker & Associates

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Wānaka & Queenstown

13(4)(q)	a statement of whether the applicant is seeking a determination under section 24(2) and, if so, a description of— (i) the scale and adverse effects of the existing electricity infrastructure; and (ii) how, if at all, that scale or those adverse effects are anticipated or known to change as a result of the maintenance, upgrading, or continued operation of the infrastructure:	Not applicable to this application.
13(4)(r)	a statement of whether the applicant is seeking a determination under section 24(4) and, if so,— (i) a description of every alternative site considered by the applicant (or, if the referral application is lodged by more than 1 person, any of those persons) for the construction and operation of the new electricity lines (the activity); and (ii) for each alternative site considered,— (A) a statement of the anticipated and known financial cost of undertaking the activity; and (B) a description of the anticipated and known adverse effects of undertaking the activity; and (C) a description of the anticipated and known financial cost and practicality of available measures to avoid, remedy, mitigate, offset, or compensate for the anticipated and known adverse effects of the activity; and (D) a description of any issues (including financial cost) that would make it impractical to undertake the activity on the site; and	Not applicable to this application.

Barker & Associates

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Wānaka & Queenstown

	(E) an assessment of whether it would be reasonable and practical to undertake the activity on the site, taking into account the matters referred to in sub subparagraphs (A) to (D) and any other relevant matters:	
What is needed to complete the project		
13(4)(s)	A description of the applicant's legal interest (if any) or if the referral application is lodged by more than 1 person, the legal interest of any of those persons (if any), in the land on which the project will occur, including a statement of how that affects the applicant's ability to undertake the work.	The applicant is not the legal owner of the sites. A description of the applicant's legal interest in the land on which the project will occur: All seven titles that make up the project site at 122 Morven Ferry Road, comprising approximately 213 hectares, are currently legally owned by Lynette Joy Hamilton and Janice Margaret Clear, as executors. The Applicant holds a signed Sale and Purchase Agreement for the full landholding. The agreement provides sufficient legal interest to undertake the project and lodge this referral application.
13(4)(t)	An outline of the types of consents, certificates, designations, concessions, and other legal authorisations (other than contractual authorisations or the proposed approvals) that the applicant considers are needed to authorise the project, including any that the applicant considers may be needed by someone other than the applicant.	Refer to Section 4 of the AEE and Appendix 18 . This includes resource consents (including land use, subdivision and regional consents). While, there may be various modifications required to consent notices and easements that are registered on titles within the development area as a result of the development, these will be varied separately through section 221(3) RMA applications following fast-track approval. The potential instruments that may be required to be varied are outlined in Appendix 18 .
Other matters		

Barker & Associates

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Wānaka & Queenstown

13(4)(u)	Whether any activities that are involved in the project, or are substantially the same as those involved in the project, have been the subject of an application or a decision under a specified Act and, i. if an application has been made, details of the application: ii. if a decision has been made, the outcome of the decision and the reasons for it.	No. The activities involved in the Ridgeburn project, or any substantially similar activities, have not been the subject of an application or a decision under a specified Act
13(4)(v)	A description of whether and how the project would be affected by climate change and natural hazards.	Refer to Section 6.1.6 of the AEE prepared by B&A and the Infrastructure Assessment included as Appendix 9 .
13(4)(w)	if the referral application is lodged by more than 1 person, a statement of each proposed approval to be held by each of those persons:	The approval will be held by Ridgeburn Limited.
13(4)(x)	A summary of compliance or enforcement actions (if any), and the outcome of those actions, taken against the applicant (or if the referral application is lodged by more than 1 person, any of those persons) under a specified Act.	No compliance and/or enforcement actions have been taken against Ridgeburn Limited by a local authority under the RMA. This also applies to the shareholders of the applicant.

Matters relating to specific proposed approvals if the approvals include:

An approval described in section 42(4)(a) or (d) (resource consent or designation), the information specified in clause 2 of Schedule 5:

1(a)	An assessment of the project against: i. any relevant national policy statement; and ii. any relevant national environmental standards; and iii. if relevant, the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.	Please refer to section 5 of the AEE. The NZCPS is not relevant to the application.
1(b)	in relation to any proposed approval that is a resource consent, whether, to the best of the applicant's knowledge, there are any existing resource consents of the kind referred to in section 30(3)(a)	There are no existing resource consents of the kind referred to in section 30(3)(a).

Barker & Associates

+64 375 0900 | admin@barker.co.nz | barker.co.nz

Kerikeri | Whangārei | Warkworth | Auckland | Hamilton | Cambridge | Tauranga | Napier | Wellington | Christchurch | Wānaka & Queenstown

2	If the referral application is to be lodged by more than 1 person, the reference to the applicant in subclause (1)(b) must be read as a reference to the person who is to be identified in the application as the proposed holder of the resource consent	Noted.
---	---	--------