

Peer Review; Supplementary Assessment

Project:	Proposed Ayrburn Screen Hub
Subject:	Peer Review of Landscape Assessment Report; Supplementary Assessment
Prepared By:	Shannon Bray
Date:	14 January 2026

Introduction

This document sets out my peer review of the Supplementary Landscape Assessment memo (Supplementary Memo) of the proposed Ayrburn Screen Hub that has been prepared by Tony Milne of Rough Milne Mitchell (RMM), dated 9 January 2026. The Supplementary Memo is in response to a peer review (dated 04 December 2025) prepared by Bridget Gilbert. Ms Gilbert's peer review covers the primary Landscape Assessment Report (LAR) prepared by Mr Milne (dated 16 July 2025), supplementary information provided by Mr Milne, and includes reference to the peer review memo (Peer Review) of the LAR that I prepared on 19 August 2025. Mr Milne's Supplementary Memo also responds to matters raised in the evidence of Rebecca Hadley and comments from Jan Andersson and Greg and Lianne Collins.

I find that the commentary provided by Mr Milne in the Supplementary Memo to be justified and consistent with the methodology and assessment in the LAR. I consider that the conclusions of the Supplementary Memo can be relied on for the purposes of considering granting resource consent for the proposal.

Peer Review Methodology

The description of the methodology that has been used in this memo is contained in the Peer Review and I summarise it here for clarity. This technical peer review has been prepared in accordance with s6.57 to s6.63 of Te Tangi a te Manu, the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects (NZILA) published best practice guidance for landscape assessment¹. While this memo is not Environment Court evidence, I confirm that this supplementary peer review has been prepared in accordance with the relevant expert witness codes and guidance, is within my area of expertise and without omission of material facts.

Additional Commentary

This supplementary peer review only considers the matters responded to by Mr Milne in his Supplementary Memo. With respect to the responses provided by Mr Milne, I find his arguments to be consistent with his methodology and interpretation of concepts taken from Te Tangi a te Manu. I agree with his conclusions and add further commentary to specific areas below, following the same numbering as the Supplementary Memo.

¹ https://nzila.co.nz/media/uploads/2022_09/Te_Tangi_a_te_Manu_Version_01_2022_.pdf



2.2 Identity or Sense of Place

In my opinion assessment of identity and sense of place has been dealt with both in the LAR and the Peer Review. Mr Milne's Supplementary Memo addresses the specifics that are addressed in the LAR and I find the response to be credible. In addition to this, and with respect to my Peer Review, while I may not use the specific words identity or sense of place, there are many references to the landscape attributes that contribute to these concepts. In my opinion, sense of place is about continuity and change, and about experiential qualities. I consider that the proposal clusters buildings within a defined area, avoids sprawl, and retains open space (Christine's Hill and the vineyard), which helps maintain spaciousness and rural character. The Wakatipu Basin is in ongoing transition from rural farmland to a mixed-use landscape. The proposal aligns with this evolving identity while maintaining the 'breathing space' around the proposal, openness of the surrounding landscape with views to mountains and other features beyond, and the sense of ruralness (derived from the existing attributes) that will be maintained.

2.6 16mm Visual Simulation Photographs

I support the explanation given by Mr Milne and agree that the visualisations follow the best practice guidelines. Visualisations assist with analysis and decision making, and should always be read in conjunction with the landscape assessment report and used in combination with site and locality visit/s.

2.9 Landscape Effects

Regarding the comments from Ms Gilbert about *visual effects as a proxy for landscape effects*, I support Mr Milne's reference back to Te Tangi a te Manu. His assessment of effects on landscape values is appropriately tailored to focus on the matters he identifies from the PDP and is consistent with his application of the methodology in the LAR.

I would add to the response regarding *cumulative adverse effects* that Te Tangi a te Manu explains how '*cumulative effects come into play in circumstances where an additional effect takes a landscape beyond a 'tipping point'*'². This usually involves a benchmark that could come from the district plan or from 'capacity' of a landscape. In my opinion, Mr Milne's analysis of the PDP, the capacity of LCU8 and the development anticipated by the ASP demonstrates that the proposal does not result in cumulative effects (i.e. a 'tipping point' in additional effect/s) beyond the proposal's landscape effects.

The Evidence of Rebecca Hadley

On the matters in Ms Hadley's evidence that Mr Milne has addressed in this section of his Supplementary Memo, I find that his conclusions are justified and consistent with the LAR. Mr Milne does not specifically address Ms Hadley's reference to Chapter 24 of the PDP including Mr Carey Vivian's evidence attached to her evidence, which directly evaluates these provisions. As noted in the Peer Review, Chapter 24 sets out the specific requirements that the LAR needed to address. Although the LAR and Supplementary Memo do not explicitly address each policy, in my opinion the LAR remains detailed, and addresses the key concerns of this chapter with robust arguments throughout.

I also note that Ms Hadley has commented directly on the Peer Review. There is nothing that has been raised by Ms Hadley that I wish to make any comment on other than to state that I stand by my conclusions.

² Te Tangi a te Manu, page 154, paragraph 6.48



Effects on Immediate Neighbours

On the matters in the evidence of Jan Andersson and Greg and Lianne Collins, that Mr Milne has addressed in this section of his Supplementary Memo, I find that his conclusions are justified and consistent with the LAR.

Conclusion

This document has set out my peer review of the Supplementary Memo of the proposed Ayrburn Screen Hub that has been prepared by Tony Milne of Rough Milne Mitchell (RMM), dated 18 December 2025. My review has used a methodology outlined in the NZILA best practice guidelines, Te Tangi a te Manu.

I find that the commentary within the Supplementary Memo in response to the peer review by Bridget Gilbert, and to comments from Rebecca Hanley, Jan Andersson, and Greg and Lianne Collins to be justified, and consistent with the methodology and assessment described in the primary Landscape Assessment Report.

Shannon Bray
Registered Fellow Landscape Architect
