

---

## MINUTE 14 OF THE EXPERT PANEL

Further Procedural Steps

Ayrburn Screen Hub

FTAA-2508-1093

(13 February 2026)

---

[1] As foreshadowed in Minute 13, the Panel met on 12 February to consider whether it has all the information it requires to make a decision on the FTAA applications before us. The Panel also considered an application it has received from Ms Macdonald, on behalf of Mr Dougherty, seeking leave to adduce a further statement from him addressing new material on economic issues provided since the period for providing comments closed and requesting that the Panel obtain an independent economic peer review. A copy of Mr Dougherty's statement was appended to Ms Macdonald's memorandum so we could be satisfied that he had indeed only addressed new information.

[2] Addressing the latter, the Panel considers that it would be both fair to Mr Dougherty and useful to the Panel's consideration of economic issues given his obvious expertise in the field to receive his further statement. It will be treated as having been requested, and provided, pursuant to section 67 of the FTAA.

[3] Fairness to the applicant dictates that it has the opportunity to reply to Mr Dougherty. Any response should be provided by noon on 20 February.

[4] We do not consider that we need instruct an independent economic peer review. We already have the benefit of the expert peer review provided by Ms Hampson (and Mr Dougherty's own comments). We do, however, have some further information that we will request the applicant supply to us, as discussed below.

[5] Our consideration of the basis for Ms Macdonald's application has prompted us to the view that we should also afford Ms Hadley the opportunity to provide feedback on Mr Milne's Supplementary Landscape Assessment dated 10 February 2026, including the accompanying visualisations and amended design report, and Ms Gilbert's peer review dated 10 February 2026. Like Mr Dougherty in relation to economic issues, Ms Hadley has obvious expertise in relation to landscape issues that can assist us, and it is fair that she be given the opportunity to comment on these matters. Any comment Ms Hadley has should be solely directed at the revised planting plan for the areas to the west and south of the project site, including the extent to which they address the concerns Ms Hadley has previously raised and be provided by noon on 18 February. For the avoidance of doubt, we would not be assisted by a reiteration of those concerns except to the extent that it provides context for any additional comments Ms Hadley has.

[6] If Ms Hadley takes up that opportunity, the applicant has until noon on 20 February to file any reply it wishes to make.

[7] A number of commenting parties asked that we seek an independent peer review on noise issues. We have determined that this is not necessary given that the applicant has supplied us with a peer review, although we do have some questions of Mr Styles.

[8] Specifically, Mr Styles has not explicitly commented on the new conditions added by the applicant (namely conditions 37, 37A-K, 39, 40, 40A-B, 41, 42 and 42A-B), other than saying that his advice has been incorporated into the amended conditions (and Management Plan). Although perhaps implicit in what he has said, can Mr Styles confirm for the record that he is satisfied that the entire noise conditions package is fit for purpose (or otherwise)?

[9] Secondly, Document 17 supplied in response to comments provides specifications for the proposed acoustic barriers. We are particularly interested in the minimum thickness of the timber palings suggested (20mm) and whether this

will deliver the required acoustic dampening. Can Mr Styles please comment on the issue. It may be that Mr Cook can add useful commentary on the inter-relationship with the proposed conditions.

[10] Also on acoustic issues, the applicant's 10 February response answered the question we had (in Minute 12) about the effect of the re-routed trail going through the acoustic barrier on the southwestern side of the site. It did not however answer the question insofar as it related to the two points shown (e.g. on page 32 of the revised Design Statement) where there is a gap in the acoustic barrier around the proposed Studio backlot sufficiently wide to allow trucks to pass through, and what that will do to the barrier's acoustic performance. We request that the Marshall Day do so, and that Mr Styles provide his views also.

[11] Turning to economic issues, we have two further questions. One is a follow-up question to Mr Gibson. In answer to the Chair's question at the conference on 30 January, Mr Gibson told us that the different scenarios he provided (at paragraph 59 of his report) of expenditure at the proposed Screen hub included expenditure on location shoots, and accommodation spend for crew while on those shoots. The follow-up question is, what approximate proportion of the total expenditure for each scenario would be in that category? The associated question for Mr Osborne is whether that proportion of the total spend forms part of the counterfactual for the Screen Hub given Mr Gibson's advice that screen productions already come to Queenstown for location shoots, and non resident crew members presumably stay in local hotels and air bnb's while doing so.

[12] The second question arises out of the potential identified by Mr Gibson of the Screen Hub displacing studio demand currently met by the Frankton studio. Do either the applicant or QLDC have any information as to the extent of the Frankton Studio's contribution to the regional economy that might assist us in understanding the potential extent of displacement?

[13] We have also noted the amended and new National Policy Statements that took effect on 15 January. Can Mr Cook please provide us with an analysis of any relevant new national direction.

[14] We request that the further information on each of these matters be filed by noon on 20 February.

[15] We have noted also QLDC's reservation of position regarding proposed conditions 68 and 69. The Panel remains concerned that even as reframed, these conditions remain excessively complex and likely difficult to enforce. We are looking for assistance from the parties as to how they might be reframed in accordance with SMART principles.

[16] We therefore request that Messrs Cook, Langman and Vivian confer and produce a Joint Witness Statement describing what options they identify to achieve that, along with the pros and cons of each option. They should assume for the purposes of this exercise that the Panel accepts that the accommodation might be available for non-film studio use, provided it can be satisfied that film studio related use is and remains the primary purpose of the accommodation, consistent with the application.

[17] Their Joint Witness Statement should be filed by noon on 20 February.

[18] We record that the Panel considers that with the further inputs requested above, it should have all the information it needs to make a decision. On that basis, the Panel's view is that, consistent with section 56 of the FTAA, it does not need to hold a hearing of the application. The Panel will review the position at the end of the coming week, when all of the information is in hand, to ensure that remains the case.

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'T. Robinson', with a large, stylized flourish extending downwards from the end of the name.

Trevor Robinson  
Expert Panel Chair