

15 January 2026

Ayrburn Screen Hub

Supplementary Assessment – Masterplan Peer Review

1 Purpose

This Supplementary Assessment Memo relates to comments made by Rebecca Hadley in the section titled 'Masterplan review by Mr Barret-Boyes' on pages 3 and 4 of her response.

For ease of understanding, I set out the theme of her comments as headings with my response following.

There are a number of comments raised in this section of Ms Hadley's comments that relate to other experts. As stated at section 5.0 of my original report, the scope of my peer review was:

5. Scope of Peer Review

5.1 *The scope of the peer review is as follows:*

- I. *Peer review process*
- II. *Context – The evolving neighbourhood*
- III. *Connectivity with surrounding neighbourhood*
- IV. *Relevant site features*
- V. *Masterplan outcomes*
- VI. *Summary*

5.2 *The scope of my review concentrates on the quality of the built environment of the proposal and how it stitches into its existing natural context. I have, in addition, had regard to how it fits into the adjacent consented and constructed context. This is in essence an inside out lens on the qualitative aspects of the proposed development.*

5.3 *I rely on Mr Tony Milne in terms of the Landscape and Visual Assessment and the aspects of the proposal from an external lens.*

5.4 *Given the departure of the application from what is anticipated within this Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (WBRAZ) I have not undertaken a comprehensive review of the proposal against the WBRAZ Rules in Chapter 24 of the District Plan. However, I have been cognisant of the height rules and the materiality aspects in my review.*

My review focused on the spatial relationships and arrangements within the cluster of buildings comprising the Screen Hub and how they as a collective relate to the surrounding context.

As stated in my review I adopted an inside out lens and I rely on the Landscape and Visual Assessment by Mr Tony Milne for the external lens of how the proposal fits within the immediate and broader surrounding landscape, and in relation to other landscape matters.

I also rely on Mr Robin Miller for heritage matters. I therefore respond to themes and comments made by Ms Hadley in relation to my scope.

2 Appropriateness of Location and Wider Context

The claim that the review is “introspective” and fails to consider appropriateness of location and wider context overlooks the fact that the Screen Hub is fundamentally not a standalone development. It forms part of an integrated cluster with Ayrburn and the other consented developments, collectively surrounded by open space. The urban design approach for the Screen Hub appropriately considers connectivity to Ayrburn in its entirety, as the immediate context, which is consistent with planning principles for integrated hubs rather than isolated rural sites.

Ayrburn is connected to the wider community and context via the existing trail network, the existing roading structure and the existing public transport network.

3 Heritage Character

Ms Hadley’s claim that the proposed design response degrades the existing cluster of heritage buildings and only valid if surrounded by open space overlooks the fact that the Screen Hub follows the existing pattern of clustering. There is, in my view, adequate breathing room and open space around the Screen hub and between the Screen Hub and Ayrburn. The existing clustering pattern is most evident in the way the readapted heritage structures form a unified hub of buildings informally grouped around open space within their own setting and the way the consented Northbrook retirement community forms a cluster or string of buildings along Mill Creek within their own setting. The Screen Hub and Northbrook are in essence two spokes off the central Ayrburn hub working in unison.

4 Community Integration and Connectivity

While connections to tourism assets are highlighted, Ayrburn itself is part of the local community and forms the immediate context for integration. The proposed Screen Hub development is an extension of an existing hub, not an isolated resort as a tourist attraction.

5 Authenticity of Design

The claim by Ms Hadley is made that one of the reasons the design is “not authentic” is because it is focused on guest experience as opposed to film making. From an urban design perspective the masterplan successfully integrates the form and character of film studios with the scale of the accommodation that support it and the character of the informal open spaces that are intertwined. It is a carefully crafted assemblage of buildings that are well orientated and integrated.

The language of the architecture of the Screen Hub is derived from the local vernacular and is sympathetic to the existing heritage buildings without trying to emulate or replicate them. In my opinion the design is unique, site specific and contextual.

Gerald Barratt-Boyes

For and on behalf of Studio of Pacific Architecture Limited.

Founding Director Studio Pacific Architecture

BArch, FNZIA, ARB, RIBA