

19 February 2026

Lauren Christie
Waterfall Park Developments Limited

P. 09 308 9015
E. info@stylesgroup.co.nz
W. www.stylesgroup.co.nz
Saatchi & Saatchi Building,
L2, 125 The Strand, Parnell
PO Box 37857, Parnell,
Auckland 1151

By email: [REDACTED]

Dear Lauren,

Ayrburn Screen Hub and Accommodation – Response to Minute 14

Introduction

This advice follows my original review of the noise-related aspects of the Proposal, the ONMP and proposed consent conditions. My original review is dated 22 January 2026 (the **Original Review**). This advice uses the same abbreviations and terminology set out in my original review. My experience, qualifications and commitment to abide by the Environment Court's Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses is set out in Appendix One of my Original Review.

This advice responds to the questions raised by the Panel in Minute 14 (dated 13th February 2026).

The questions raised by the Panel that require a response from me are questions 8, 9 and 10. These questions and my responses are set out in the same order below.

Question 8

Question 8 from the Panel states:

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)?

The condition set I worked on and referred to in my Original Review (appended to the Marshall Day Supplementary Noise Memo dated 20 January 2026 as Appendix F) is very similar to the set the Panel refer to which I understand to be the version dated 04 February 2026 submitted in response to Minutes 11 and 12.

There are some very minor differences in terms of advice notes, additions to enhance clarity and certainty, re-ordering, and numbering changes.

I have provided comments below on where any of these minor differences are, and my subsequent opinion on these. I have also made some additional minor recommendations to the conditions to improve consistency and certainty.

Overall, I consider that the condition set dated 04 February 2026 including my suggestions below will be adequate for managing the noise from the Proposal and that they are fit for purpose.

1.1 Condition 37

The Advice Note to Condition 37 has had the following words added since my Original Review (new words underlined):

Advice Note: The noise limits specified above are consistent with the applicable rules in the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan at the date of issue of this consent (with the exception of the additional 75dB LAFmax added to the Lifestyle Precinct limits) and would apply irrespective of this consent. They are included here for clarity and ease of reference.

I consider that these additional words are helpful. Otherwise, Condition 37 is the same as the version that I refer to in my Original Review.

1.2 Conditions 37A-K

Condition 37A is the same as the version I refer to in my Original Review.

Condition 37B is the same as the version I refer to in my Original Review.

Condition 37C is the same as the version I refer to in my Original Review, except that an Advice Note has been added to define “*Studio related activities*”. I consider that this advice note is helpful.

Condition 37D is the same as the version I refer to in my Original Review, except that an Advice Note has been added to define “*Accommodation activities*”. I consider that this advice note is helpful.

Condition 37E is the same as the version I refer to in my Original Review.

Condition 37F is the same as the version I refer to in my Original Review.

Condition 37G is the same as the version I refer to in my Original Review.

Condition 37H is a new condition that requires studio-related traffic to access the site away from the neighbouring properties. This condition delivers what was set out in the noise modelling undertaken by MDA (see Appendix E of the original MDA Report). It does not therefore require anything ‘new’. I support this condition.

Condition 37I relates to a non-acoustic issue (signage) that I do not comment on.

Conditions 37J and K are new conditions that were not in the set I reviewed. They require the construction of the acoustic barriers at or before specific times. Whilst the conditions were not in the set I reviewed, the barriers they require are incorporated into and required by the ONMP I

reviewed in my Original Review. They do not therefore require anything 'new'. I support these conditions.

1.3 Condition 39

Condition 39 is the same as the version I refer to in my Original Review.

1.4 Condition 40

Condition 40 is the same as the version I refer to in my Original Review except that the words "adjacent properties" has been qualified by adding in reference to an attachment to the conditions. I consider that the addition of a plan to clearly define which properties are receive the letter drop is helpful.

1.5 Conditions 40A, 40B and 41

Conditions 40A, 40B and 41 were in the originally proposed set of conditions as Conditions 31 and 32. I recommended Condition 41. I have advised the Project Team that these three conditions now overlap and have some minor inconsistencies. I recommend that these are integrated into one new condition 41, and that Conditions 31(40A) and 32(40B) can be deleted.

I have set out my recommendation for new Condition 41 below. This is very similar to the original condition 41 except that it is more specific about the noise level from works outside of the normal daytime hours. It also covers the requirements that were in conditions 40A and 40B except it provides for some work to be undertaken outside of the core daytime hours. My revised condition below requires that any such work that is undertaken outside of normal daytime hours must be inaudible off the site. I have also made it clear that the limitations in condition 41 apply in addition to the requirement to comply with the noise limits in condition 39.

41. *In addition to the requirements of condition 39, earthmoving plant, trucks, craneage, rock excavation equipment and any other noisy plant, machinery or construction processes used or undertaken during the construction of the project may only be operated between 0730 and 1800 hrs from Monday to Friday, and between 0830 and 1300 on Saturday. Only construction work that is inaudible at any occupied building on another site (such as planting, painting, electrical fitout or interior work) may be conducted outside of these hours.*

1.6 Condition 42

Condition 42 is the same as the version I refer to in my Original Review.

1.7 Condition 42A & B

Condition 42A is the same as the version I refer to in my Original Review.

Condition 42B is the same as the version I refer to in my Original Review.

2.0 Question 9

Question 9 from the Panel states:

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.

I have reviewed Document 17. I consider that the specification of 20mm thick timber is appropriate. New Zealand pine has a density of approximately 500kg/m³ when dried to typical moisture levels. 20mm thick treated pine (as a typical example) will have a mass of approximately 10kg/m² when the posts and rails are ignored.

A mass of 10kg/m² is widely regarded as an appropriate minimum for a general-purpose acoustic barrier of this nature. A barrier with this density will achieve a sufficient degree of acoustic transmission loss through the barrier such that its' acoustic performance is controlled by the noise that is transmitted by diffraction over the top of the barrier.

The vast majority of environmental noise prediction work in New Zealand is conducted according to International Standard ISO9613-2:1996. This standard states in section 7.4 that an object is only a barrier if the surface density is at least 10kg/m².

3.0 Question 10

Question 10 from the Panel states:

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.

MDA have prepared a memo in response to this question¹. I have read this memo and I agree with the conclusions.

I consider that the 'gaps' in the barrier will allow some noise from the yard area to 'escape', but the effects would be localised and have no appreciable effect on the noise level at neighbouring properties.

¹ Response to Para 10 Minute 14 Marshall Day Acoustics Mm 002 16 February 2026

Please contact me if you require any further information.

Yours sincerely,



Jon Styles, MASNZ
Director and Principal