

## Your Comment on the Ayrburn Screen Hub

If you wish to make comments on the application, please include all the contact details listed below with your comments and indicate whether you can receive further communications from us by email to [substantive@fastrack.govt.nz](mailto:substantive@fastrack.govt.nz).

1. Contact Details			
Please ensure that you have authority to comment on the application on behalf of those named on this form.			
Organisation name (if relevant)			
First name	Rebecca		
Last name	Hadley		
Postal address	[REDACTED]		
Home phone / Mobile phone	[REDACTED]	Work phone	
Email (a valid email address enables us to communicate efficiently with you)	[REDACTED]		

2. We will email you draft conditions of consent for your comment			
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	I can receive emails and my email address is correct	<input type="checkbox"/>	I cannot receive emails and my postal address is correct

### COMMENT ON THE AYRBURN SCREEN HUB

BY REBECCA HADLEY

#### Introduction

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed Ayrburn Screen Hub (SH) development. As a long term resident of Speargrass Flat Road and a practicing local Landscape Architect of 30 years I am very familiar with the Wakatipu Basin and in particular the Speargrass Flat area. I have walked, cycled or driven along Speargrass Flat Road travelling to and from Queenstown and driven along ALH Road travelling to or from Arrowtown every day for over 20 years. Like many other locals I am aware of and appreciate the spectacular landscapes that we live in. I am also very aware of the sensitivity of these landscapes to change and the incremental erosion of open space and increase of development that I have witnessed over time. I consider that as an experienced landscape architect working

in the Wakatipu Basin and a long term resident that I have an obligation to share my personal views, experiences and perceptions as to the unique qualities of this environment and my personal desire to maintain and enhance the amenity values of the Wakatipu Basin. I am also considered an adjacent neighbour to the SH proposal site where I live with my husband James Hadley and my two adult children still call home.

I first became involved with the Ayrburn land in 2015 when I made a submission to the Queenstown Lakes District Council Proposed District Plan (PDP) review to say that the open pastoral landscape of the Speargrass Valley, through to Hogan Gully should remain as a Rural zone. I presented a submission to the Independent Commissioner panel on the reasons why including that the open pastoral landscape was very important as a “breathing space” between Arrowtown and the North Lake Hayes Rural Residential zone (RR). The concept of breathing space was taken on board by the Commissioners and in their Decision, they agreed with me that it was important for the Speargrass Flat Valley to remain as open rural land. After appeal by the applicant, the decision of the Environment Court also agreed and breathing space is specifically referred to in the description of Speargrass Flat in Landscape Character Unit (LCU) 8 in the PDP. The site of the SH is located in this breathing space.

My comment will focus on landscape issues as that is my area of expertise. My husband includes a chronology of the 10 year history of attempted development of the site by Winton. I have reviewed the applicants Landscape Assessment by Tony Milne and accompanying graphic attachments and the Peer Review by Shannon Bray. I have also read the Masterplan review by Mr Barret-Boyes, the Ayrburn Design report and the Architectural Design report.

## **Executive Summary**

I strongly oppose the Ayrburn Screen Hub proposal in its entirety.

I believe that it is a Trojan Horse for visitor accommodation or high density residential subdivision.

The loss of landscape and amenity values will negatively outweigh any short term economic value.

The landscape of the Wakatipu Basin has much greater future economic value than a film studio in this location.

The activity should not be located in an important rural landscape that provides open space (breathing space) between Arrowtown/Millbrook Resort and the North Lake Hayes Rural Residential zone.

The proposal is poorly designed and is not authentic.

The landscape report, landscape peer review and masterplan review are flawed and do not appropriately consider the wider landscape context.

The landscape report, landscape peer review and masterplan review do not consider the adverse effects of the proposal on adjacent residents.

## **The Proposed Screen Hub design**

The Screen Hub (SH) is described as a cluster of buildings typical to the Central Otago area and the largest building at 15m high as similar to a large farm building. To screen the buildings the hill above is being extended by constructing an artificial ridge or spur of 65,000 m<sup>3</sup> of fill material. I understand that this is equivalent to 25 Olympic sized swimming pools. On top of this new landform there will be a forest of native trees and shrubs planted.

This design concept is flawed. It is not authentic. A cluster of buildings is a term that has been used in the Wakatipu Basin for several decades. First as a residential subdivision structure. The most important part of the concept is the balance of built form by surrounding open space that is maintained with a rural character, usually mown or grazed pasture. This concept therefore works well in the rural area where a farm homestead and associated farm purposed buildings were sited close to each other, often with tree planting and were surrounded by open farmland. The Ayrburn homestead is a good example, however, the concept does not work if there is no open space. The proposed SH “cluster” would be adjacent to the existing Ayrburn farm cluster and an existing Rural Residential (RR) zone. The only open space is located to the west, but this is where the hill extension is proposed so that the “cluster” of buildings is not visible from the Countryside trail. Even then, planting is required on top to prevent views into the development.

Planting on the top of a ridgeline is unlikely to be successful as plants will be exposed to wind and water run off. Further, native plants grow naturally in gulleys not on exposed ridgelines. The planting will look out of context and incongruous to the existing predominantly deciduous or gully planting that comprises the vegetation pattern.

The proposed mitigation of extensive earthworks and planting will block views of the open space that are enjoyed by walkway users. It will also, result in a loss of legibility of the natural form and geological features of the landscape by suddenly blocking the valley floor and extending the hill slope in an unnatural manner. It will also alter the topography so that the original geomorphological processes that formed the valley are no longer evident or recognisable. Further, the mitigation will obstruct the breathing space required to be maintained by the PDP.

It is my experience that if mitigation measures result in adverse effects of their own, the proposed development is not appropriate within the site and landscape context.

## **Masterplan review by Mr Barret-Boyes**

I have read the review of the masterplan design by Mr Barret-Boyes. This review is very introspective to the site and does not consider if the activity is appropriate in this location. Instead, it discusses how successfully the SH will connect to and integrate with the Ayrburn hospitality precinct and the surrounding recent and proposed golf course developments and other tourist attractions. The SH will be “stitched into surrounding networks and existing amenity” according to the review. I think this means that guests can cycle to Millbrook and pop into Te Wharehuanui convention centre using a cycle trail. If the main function of the SH was

actually to make films, this would not be important. It really is apparent in Mr Barret-Boyes review that the application is for visitor accommodation to create more customers for the Ayrburn restaurants and bars and will not be a national economic benefit at all.

Mr Barret-Boyes celebrates a cocooning effect achieved by the artificial hill, some existing topography and existing planting that will screen the proposal from view. Again this is an introspective view as the main cocooning element is earthworks of a volume so great that a hill is extended and then still requires planting on top of it to successfully screen the huge buildings. The existing conifer trees located on the southern terrace are also utilised as a part of the cocoon and for visual mitigation. I note that in my experience QLDC landscape experts do not accept wilding conifer species as screening. They require replanting with appropriate non invasive species.

There is no consideration given to the effects of the cocoon from outside of the site or the sprawl that the development will create. Mr Barret Boyes also gives no consideration to the existing rural amenity or consideration of the landscape context and how this could have influenced a better design or more responsibly concluded that the activity is not appropriate in its proposed location.

Further, he does not discuss how the development will degrade the heritage values of the existing cluster of heritage buildings at the Ayrburn hospitality precinct by removing the open rural character that surrounds them. Instead, he notes as a positive feature that the proposal will be connected to Ayrburn by flower beds!

Mr Barret-Boyes review in my opinion shows limited understanding or consideration of the development from outside of the site and how it will fit into the existing landscape and community. There is also no consideration of the adverse effects that will be experienced by adjoining residential neighbours. I note that the RR zone and the residential homes that adjoin the site, only 50m away have been there for a lot longer than the Ayrburn restaurants, Te Wharehuanui conference centre and the surrounding golf resorts.

The proposed masterplan design is not authentic for the following reasons.

- It requires mitigation to the extent that a very large artificial hill extension is proposed with planting on top of a ridge to screen built form.
- It will isolate a left over area of land that it plans to further degrade by planting an unconnected paddock of grapes that is not associated with any other signs of farming.
- Connections are to tourist attractions not community facilities.
- The design is focussed on guest experience not film making

The resulting development will not fit into the existing landscape or community and instead is fighting against it to the extent that it requires “cocooning” or more clearly, hiding.



## **Applicants Landscape Assessment**

As Mr Milne explains in his assessment, in order to determine landscape effects of a proposal the landscape attributes and values of the site and surrounding landscape context must first be identified. I consider that Mr Milne has not identified all of the attributes and values of the site and surrounding landscape context correctly and he has therefore assessed the level of adverse effects that will result from the proposed SH incorrectly.

### *Attributes and values of the site*

Prior to the development of the Ayrburn hospitality precinct the site was an open pastoral landscape. Currently the lower land is used as a stockpile area for construction materials and temporary buildings. Either side of the site the applicant has planted grapevines. The permitted baseline for activity within the Residential area of the Ayrburn Structure Plan is 3 or 4 residential dwellings. The remaining portion of the site is shown as Open Space in the Structure Plan and includes the steeper slope of the site. The existing activities throughout the site have modified it and reduced the cohesive quality of the land, however the permitted baseline remains 3 or 4 houses on the lower area with the steeper slopes to be retained as open space. The current mess of construction, earthworks and buildings has reduced the open space value and increased the complexity of the site, but this current state does not comply with the intent of the structure plan and should not detract from the values of the site.

The attributes of the site should be identified in accordance with the Structure Plan which is 3 or 4 houses and not be derived from the existing modified condition of the site. The attributes of the site that would result using the Structure Plan as the permitted baseline are as follows.

- Open space with views from the Countryside trail of rural landscape to the west and east.
- Simple and cohesive pasture covered slopes with rural character.
- Connection of the rural character and pastoral landscape of the Speargrass valley via the open slopes and views over the permitted 3 or 4 houses through to Hogan Gully maintaining the breathing space.
- High rural amenity values of the RR zone through similar land use activity (3 or 4 houses) located on low topography and softened by vegetation.
- Recognition of the low capacity for development of the site in order to maintain landscape values and “breathing space”.

### *Attributes and values of the wider landscape context*

The attributes and values of the wider landscape context are as follows.

- Legible topography of the Speargrass Valley floor that continues through to Hogan Gully.
- Pastoral character of the valley floor and southern slopes of Wharehuanui Hills.

- Rural amenity of openness, naturalness and quiet enjoyed by the RR zone, users of the trail and surrounding roads.
- Wide open views of the rural landscape from the trail and surrounding roads.
- Breathing space that provides a sense of place by defining the edge of built form to Arrowtown/Millbrook Resort and the RR zone.

The Site is a part of an important and legible landscape feature – the Speargrass Flat valley. The valley has an open pastoral landscape character with high rural amenity values. This landscape character provides important rural amenity to the existing RR zone, residential homes to the north, users of the surrounding local roads and the walkway. The open landscape character also provides an important break or “breathing space” between Arrowtown and the RR zone.

The same breathing space is experienced when using the Countryside trail between Millbrook and Speargrass Flat Road. The trail descends the escarpment slope offering elevated panoramic views to the Remarkables, Crown Terrace and Lake Hayes with a foreground of open pasture to the west along the Speargrass Flat Road corridor and to the east, continuing into Hogans Gully. The complexity of the landscape has increased with the addition of grapevines to the Ayrburn paddocks adjacent to Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road, but views across the vines are possible therefore retaining an open character and a connection with Hogan Gully. These views will remain once the 3 permitted houses in the Structure Plan are constructed to the west of Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road. The Ayrburn hospitality precinct appears as a cluster of farm buildings which is appropriate as the precinct has been developed around the original Ayrburn homestead. The trail then continues through the flatter paddocks to the west of the Site before reaching the RR zone at the end of the breathing space. The open pastures between Millbrook and the RR zone are important as they enable Millbrook to have a defined edge and the RR zone to have a defined edge and the trail user can be immersed in the rural landscape. A sense of place and appreciation of the wider scenery of the Wakatipu Basin can be experienced.

Mr Milne concludes that the landscape values of the site are low to moderate and the landscape values of the wider environment are moderate to high. I don't agree with this assessment as the site is a part of the continuum of the Speargrass Valley including the northern slopes and is not a separable portion of this topography and landscape feature. I consider that the site does not have any low landscape values even with the addition of 3 or 4 houses south of the farm road on the lower topography as they can easily be absorbed into the landscape without any need for extensive mitigation.

Mr Milne does not recognize the importance of the existing rural character values to the RR zone although he does note the visual amenity of the RR zone as a potential issue, but only the visual amenity. Other potential issues recognized are also predominantly only visual amenities.

## **Discussion of adverse effects**

### *Effects of proposed mitigation*

The proposed enormous extent of earthworks and planting to screen the built form of the SH will abruptly block views to the east from the walkway and result in an unnatural and illegible mass in the open views currently enjoyed from the trail. This will reduce enjoyment of the Countryside trail, reduce rural character and severely reduce the legibility of the landscape by changing the landform and planting in an unnatural form and pattern. It will also reduce the effect of breathing space.

### *Heritage values*

The heritage values of the existing Ayrburn farm buildings will also be reduced as the cluster of buildings will no longer be a cluster but a sprawl. The legibility of the settlement pattern will be lost by locating another “cluster” adjacent to the existing buildings. It therefore raises the question of whether the applicant really wants to locate an industrial activity next to his upmarket hospitality precinct? It is more likely that the film making activity will be dropped and replaced with accommodation or high density residential subdivision. The proposed SH will change the permitted baseline to make it easier for a higher density of residential or accommodation activity to be permitted in future applications.

### *Wider amenity values*

The open rural character of the Speargrass Flat valley is, along with Malaghans Valley, one of the only remaining rural areas in the Wakatipu Basin. It is therefore of vital importance that this be maintained not only to the local community of Speargrass Flat but to the wider Queenstown community as it provides an open, pastoral, rural character that is now rare in the Wakatipu Basin. In essence, the open rural character of the Speargrass Flat valley, together with that of Malaghans valley, underpins the landscape amenity of the wider Wakatipu Basin for the Community. Refer to Attachment 1, Photograph 1, an annotated image identifying the continuous Speargrass Flat valley landform.

To remove that open rural character by allowing industrial scale buildings and 201 accommodation units to obscure views and block the continuity of the valley form will undermine amenity for the whole Wakatipu Basin Community. The rural amenity values that the Speargrass Flat LCU8 provides are experienced and valued not only by the local residents, but also by residents of the wider community travelling through the area in their daily lives and by tourists and visitors. The rural character values are experienced on the roads by occupants of passenger vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians as well as on the Countryside Trail by people recreating in a spectacular landscape. I understand that the landscape character is appreciated widely on a local, national and international level. The landscape character of the Speargrass Flat valley provides rural character that has important community value due to the breathing space that LCU8 provides between Arrowtown and the RR zone.

### *Rural amenity value to RR zone*

At a more local level the rural residential and rural lifestyle zones provide an alternative option for residential living in the Wakatipu Basin with a lower density of houses and rural location. Residents within the RR zone appreciate and value this amenity. The proposed industrial activity of the SH represents a significant change in character and will result in a very significant loss of amenity to residents of the RR zone. It will result in the RR zone losing its rural residential character.

The amenity appreciated by the RR zone residents is not only a rural outlook, but also a peaceful, quiet surrounding with little traffic, little night lighting and very little noise. The proposed industrial activity and visitor accommodation will completely change the character of the properties located in the RR zone and destroy the rural amenity of the Speargrass Flat area.

### *Visibility*

I note, as does the Peer review by Shannon Bray, that Mr Milne's evidence and conclusions are predominantly focussed on visibility. I have taken from Mr Milne's evidence that in his opinion if visibility is minimised then there are few other effects. That assumption appears to have influenced the use of the huge earthworks and inappropriate mitigation planting that is proposed. I disagree with such a narrow approach.

Mr Milne describes how the proposed SH buildings will be visible from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road but only amongst vegetation and only for a short time. This may be so, but the buildings will not appear rural due to the very large scale and will be incongruous in location adjacent to the existing cluster of heritage buildings and the existing RR zone. The open space buffer will no longer exist resulting in a loss of not only visual amenity but rural character and legibility of the heritage landscape.

The pastoral character of the valley is clearly visible with the open paddocks either side of the walkway revealing the valley formation as it continues through the treed Ayrburn Farm homestead area and out again over the eastern paddocks and into Hogan Gully to the east. The pastoral valley provides the foreground to the wider views of the surrounding Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL). Refer to Attachment 2, Photograph 2 from the top of the Countryside trail prior to modification of the site.

Views of the proposal from higher on the Countryside trail are described By Mr Milne as appearing like a "small village". This is obviously not appropriate in an open pastoral landscape with rural character located adjacent to a cluster of heritage buildings. The heritage cluster can no longer be described as a cluster as there is no open space to offset it. It will appear as sprawl. However, Mr Milne considers the adverse effect to be only low to low – moderate. He considers the adverse effect of the SH to the heritage values of the Ayrburn homestead cluster to be very low. I strongly disagree as the location of the SH directly adjacent to the heritage buildings will completely disrupt the historic settlement pattern of the buildings as they can no

longer be considered a cluster of farm buildings surrounded by open space but just become part of the Ayrburn sprawl.

Views east from the lower portion of the Countryside trail will change considerably as the mitigation earthworks and planting will obscure the open paddocks adjacent to the trail and views through to Hogan Gully and the Crown Range. Mr Milne suggests that the proposed grape planting in the foreground to the mitigation will add vitality and visual interest and the increase in the visual complexity will have the development be sympathetic to its setting and appear as a well considered development. I consider the opposite will occur as there is nothing sympathetic about 15m high buildings located in an open, pastoral buffer zone or the accompanying enormous extent of earthworks to create an artificial hill extension or planting on top of the hill. The increase in complexity of this landscape can only be negative. The design is not appropriate in this setting and fights against all of the values not just visual that make this an important and highly appreciated landscape. This is because the activity of the SH is industrial and requires industrial scale buildings that are not appropriate and do not provide anything positive to this location.

Mr Milne states that change is expected and the proposed SH will have similar visual effects to the 3 or 4 houses permitted under the Structure Plan – this is completely ridiculous. The scale and associated activity of the SH and accommodation units will be very different to 3 or 4 rural residential houses. Change should only be “expected” if the District Plan is not adhered to.

The Speargrass Flat valley landscape is clearly visible from elevated locations including Tobins Track. The SH proposal will interrupt the valley form and reduce rural character and landscape legibility even from distant locations.

### *Summary of adverse effects*

The applicants landscape assessment is very narrow. It gives very little consideration to landscape effects and endorses the further degrading of landscape values by minimizing and not assessing mitigation measures that will result in further adverse landscape effects. The proposed mitigating earthworks and planting will obscure views of the largest buildings from the Countryside trail but in doing so they will destroy the legibility of the landscape and create unnatural vegetation patterns.

In my opinion the adverse effects that will result on the site are high and cannot be separated from the surrounding landscape context as the site is an integral part of the continuous Speargrass Flat valley. The adverse effects on the surrounding environment are also in my opinion high.

I consider that the Speargrass Flat valley provides one of only two remaining green corridors with a rural landscape character in the Wakatipu Basin, the other being Malaghans Valley. The open pastoral landscape character of the land has a high rural amenity value that is important

to the amenity of the Wakatipu Basin, the wider Wakatipu Basin Community and to New Zealand. Queenstown and its scenic beauty are important on a national level for tourism and the national economy. The rural amenity of the land provides a breathing space between the RR zone and Arrowtown as experienced on all surrounding roads, but particularly the Countryside trail. This breathing space is important and recognised by both local residents and visitors.

### *Statutory Context*

In my opinion the Landscape Assessment has not correctly assessed the proposal against the PDP and fails to consider and apply the character description of LCU 8. It also fails to acknowledge that the character values of the Speargrass Flat Valley, particularly Christine's Hill, will not be protected or maintained and they will certainly not be enhanced. I have read the statement prepared by Mr Carey Vivian and agree with his conclusion that the proposed SH is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the PDP, in particular, the Chapter 4 Urban Development and Chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone objectives and policies. Refer to Attachment 3 Evidence of Carey Vivian.

I have also included the LCU 8 description from the PDP, found under Chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin included in Attachment 4. Applicable parts of the description are as follows.

*Complexity – The valley floor itself displays a relatively low level of complexity as a consequence of its open and flat nature*

*Coherence – Gully vegetation patterning serves to reinforce the landscape legibility in places.*

*Sense of Place – Whilst Hawthorn Triangle and Lake Hayes Rural Residential LCUs form part of the valley landscape, their quite different character as a consequence of relatively intensive rural residential development sets them apart from the Speargrass Flat LCU with the latter effectively reading as breathing space between the two.*

*Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development – Open character, in combination with walkway/cycleway, makes it sensitive to landscape change.*

*Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained or enhanced – Maintenance of spacious and open outlook in views from the Queenstown Trail and Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road including the southbound view as one descends Christines Hill.*

*Capability to absorb additional development - Low*

*Moderate – within the Residential Activity areas shown on the Ayrburn Structure Plan*

I note that the proposed mitigation and the largest buildings are located in the Open Space area of the Structure Plan which has a **LOW** capacity to absorb further development.

### **Peer review of applicant's landscape assessment.**

I have read the Peer Review of the applicants Landscape Assessment by Mr Shannon Bray and disagree with much of his review and his conclusions. Mr Bray, similar to Mr Milne has a lack of depth of understanding of the Speargrass Flat landscape and its importance to the rural amenity of the Wakatipu Basin. Speargrass Flat is a continuous valley landform that is characterised by open paddocks and rural character. The proposed SH will stop the continuity of the valley form and reduce the breathing space and change in character for users of the Countryside trail. The sprawl of Ayrburn into the site will interrupt the open paddocks and the landscape legibility will be reduced.

I disagree that the applicants Landscape assessment describes the landscape context and its values accurately. Much is made of the changing landscape and development such as the Arrowtown Retirement Village, Ayrburn hospitality precinct, Hogan Gully Golf Resort, The Hills Golf Resort and residential areas around Lake Hayes. I note that all of these developments are zoned Resort or Rural Residential or are Fast Track such as The Hills or Special Housing Areas such as the Arrowtown Retirement Village. None were zoned Rural and granted approval under the democratic process of a District Plan.

It is noted that the effects of the proposed mitigation earthworks have not been assessed. I consider this to be a significant failure of the assessment. The Peer Review determines that the earthworks and planting mitigation will be effective and it will integrate into the overall context. I strongly disagree as the form of the valley will be abruptly stopped and the evergreen planting on a ridgeline will be out of character with the surrounding vegetation species and pattern. In my experience, a proposal that requires such extensive mitigation is likely not appropriate in the location proposed.

The Peer Review goes on to state that the grapevines will have seasonal benefits and add to rural character. I disagree as the grapevines are isolated from the other grapevines located to the east by the SH and will not appear authentic because of this. They will look like an after thought on an isolated and forgotten area of land that the remainder of the development has its back to.

The Peer review also fails to consider the effects on amenity values of the RR zone and adjacent residential neighbours to the north. Mr Bray states that noise will not be relevant. I disagree. The Wakatipu Basin is very quiet, particularly at night. The Ayrburn restaurants and bars have conditioned noise controls, but these are often broken and music is heard clearly by the adjacent neighbours. Of greater impact is the noise of people leaving the bars at night, shouting and yelling in an intoxicated state. The accommodation component of the SH will be even closer and result in greater effects on the local residents as guests return to their rooms from the bars of Ayrburn. I understand that the activities of a film studio require activity 24 hours a day and 7 days a week with large vehicles making deliveries and outdoor filming occurring. This will certainly result in even greater noise effects.

Rural views from the adjacent houses will also be lost, traffic will increase on the local roads in addition to noise effects. The local residents of the RR zone will most certainly suffer adverse effects from this proposal and neither the landscape assessment nor the Peer Review have considered them at all.

The Peer review purports that the SH will be a natural extension to Ayrburn hospitality precinct. I note that most of this development is located in a Resort zone and I have never objected to this. I do object to development in the rural zone. The large film studio buildings are located in the Open Space area of the Ayrburn Structure Plan. This area should be open pasture upholding rural amenity values. Instead it will be screened by an artificial hill. The sprawl of Ayrburn into the rural area and obscuring the continuous form of the valley is a negative effect and not a natural extension of development as suggested by the Peer Review.

The Peer review also neglects to understand that the existing cluster of heritage buildings that is the hospitality precinct will lose historic values due to the loss of open space surrounding it. This degrades the historic settlement pattern. The proposed SH is described in the design report as a cluster of buildings also. I do not think 2 clusters of buildings located adjacent to each other can be described as 2 clusters – they become sprawl.

The Peer Review in my opinion fails to address many of the incorrect conclusions of the Landscape Assessment and instead endorses them.

The Peer Review differs slightly in approach to the Statutory considerations but still fails to recognise that the proposal is clearly and blatantly inconsistent with the PDP.

### **Additional comments**

I consider that we are getting close to killing off the proverbial golden goose in the Wakatipu Basin if inappropriately sited development continues to spread through the rural area. I do not believe that a SH will be of national benefit in this location as it will sacrifice too much amenity value. I believe that the rural amenity values will provide more benefit at a local, regional and national level than this proposal will.

I do not believe that the SH proposal is authentic by design or purpose. The track record of this developer shows that he will use any Trojan Horse going to upvalue this site. If approval is given for the SH, he will drop the film component and develop the accommodation or just subdivide for residential use and run the argument that residential activity will have less effects than the approved SH. Granting this application under fast-track approval will not provide an ongoing economic benefit to the regional or national economy, it will just result in further sprawl into the rural landscape. It is the rural amenity and the scenic beauty of the landscape that has value not an excuse for sprawling residential development that only makes money for the developer.



The District Plan has undergone 10 years of review and is almost fully operational. The relevant Policies, Objectives, Assessment Matters and Rules of the PDP as apply to this site are operational. This proposal is not consistent with the Ayrburn Structure Plan or the PDP. To disregard the PDP in this Fast Track process will mean disregard for the democratic process that created it and a disregard for democracy. Where does that leave us?

## **Conclusion**

The proposed SH represents sprawl into the rural landscape and will degrade landscape values that are important locally, regionally and nationally. These landscape values if retained will have a greater economic return for New Zealand than a film studio. Once the activity of the land is changed the landscape values will always be degraded. This is a long-term loss versus the SH which is a short term, unsubstantiated and not guaranteed gain.

My submission is that the proposed Ayrburn Screen Hub proposal is declined in its entirety.

Rebecca Hadley



17 December 2025

## **Attachments**

Attachment 1 Photograph 1 View from Tobins track lookout

Attachment 2 Photograph 2 View from Countryside trail

Attachment 3 Statement of Carey Vivian

Attachment 4 Landscape Character Unit 8 Description





Photograph 1. View from Tobins Track lookout.



Hogan Gully



Photograph 2. View from top of Countryside trail (prior to modification of site).



**BEFORE THE EXPERT PANEL APPOINTED UNDER  
THE FAST-TRACK APPROVALS ACT 2024**

<b>APPLICATION</b>	<b>AYRBURN SCREEN HUB</b>
	<b>FTAA 2508-1093</b>
<b>APPLICANT</b>	<b>WATERFALL PARK DEVELOPMENTS LIMITED</b>

---

**BRIEF OF EVIDENCE OF CAREY VIVIAN IN SUPPORT OF THE COMMENTS OF JAN  
ANDERSSON, DAVID KIDD AND JAMES & REBECCA HADLEY**

---

**BRIEF OF EVIDENCE OF CAREY VIVIAN IN SUPPORT OF THE COMMENTS OF JAN  
ANDERSSON, DAVID KIDD AND JAMES & REBECCA HADLEY**

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>QUALIFICATION AND EXPERIENCE</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>CODE OF CONDUCT</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>SCOPE OF EVIDENCE</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>PART (A) THE PROJECT'S CONSISTENCY WITH LOCAL OR REGIONAL PLANNING DOCUMENTS.</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CHAPTER 3 – STRATEGIC DIRECTION</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>CHAPTER 4 URBAN DEVELOPMENT</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>CHAPTER 6 – LANDSCAPES – RURAL CHARACTER</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>CHAPTER 24 – WAKATIPU BASIN RURAL AMENITY ZONE</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>CHAPTER 25 – EARTHWORKS</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>CONCLUSION ON OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES</b>	<b>57</b>
<b>PART (B) - IF THE PANEL IS MINDED TO GRANT CONSENT, MAKE RECOMMENDATIONS AS TO HOW THE CONDITIONS OF CONSENT CAN CONSTRAIN THE USE OF THE HOTEL AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE SO AS TO ENSURE THE SCREEN HUB ACTIVITY OCCURS.</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>CONDITION 67 - PHASED IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<b>58</b>
<b>CONDITIONS 68 AND 69 - USE OF ACCOMMODATION UNITS</b>	<b>59</b>

**Introduction**

1. My full name is Carey Vivian. I am a director of Vivian and Espie Limited, a resource management and landscape planning consultancy based in Queenstown.
2. I have been engaged by the following statutory participants who have been invited to comment on the proposal under s53(2)(h) of the Fast-Track Approvals Act 2024 (FTAA):
  - (a) Mr Jan Andersson, 3 Millvista Lane, RD 1, Arrowtown (Lots 1-3 DP 27027 comprised in Record of Title 520807)
  - (b) Mr David Kidd, 529 Speargrass Flat Road, Lake Hayes, Arrowtown (Lot 4 & 6 DP 336908 comprised in Record of Title 151018); and

- (c) Mr James Hadley and Mrs Rebecca Hadley, 509 Speargrass Flat Road, Lake Hayes, Arrowtown (Lot 2 DP 447353 comprised in Record of Title 564544).

### **Qualification and Experience**

3. I hold the qualification of Bachelor of Resource and Environmental Planning (Hons) from Massey University. I have been a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute since 2000. I have been practicing as a resource management planner for over 30 years, having held previous positions with Davie Lovell-Smith in Christchurch; the Queenstown-Lakes District Council (QLDC or the Council), Civic Corporation Limited, Clark Fortune McDonald and Associates and Woodlot Properties Limited in Queenstown.
4. I am familiar with the subject site, and surrounding environment, having presented evidence to the Environment Court on behalf of section 274 parties and appellants on the construction of Ayr Avenue and zoning of the site. I also have undertaken a number of resource consent applications for the adjoining property to the west of the proposed site (Summit Structures Limited) as well as have used the trails in the vicinity of the site many times.
5. I have a detailed understanding of the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**), having been involved in its development and having applied for many resource consents under its provisions.

### **Code of Conduct**

6. Although this is not an Environment Court hearing I have read and agree to comply with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023. This evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on material produced by another person. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express.

### **Scope of Evidence**

7. I have been asked to address the following:
  - (a) The Ayrburn Screen Hub project's (**ASH project**) consistency with local or regional planning documents; and
  - (b) If the panel is minded to grant consent, make recommendations as to how the conditions of consent can constrain the use of the accommodation units as much as possible so as to ensure the screen hub activity occurs.

8. In preparing this evidence, I have read:
- (c) Ayrburn Screen Hub Planning Report dated 18 November 2025 (track changes)
  - (d) Proposed Draft Consent Conditions, Version 2, 18 November 2025 (track changes)
  - (e) Ayrburn Screen Hub Architectural Design Report dated 27 June 2025
  - (f) Ayrburn Screen Hub Design Report dated 3 June 2025
  - (g) Ayrburn Screen Hub [Film Expert] Report, Dave Gibson, May 2025
  - (h) Ayrburn Screen Hub Fast Track Economic Impact Assessment, Property Economics, June 2025
  - (i) Various documents (including Economic Assessments, Economic Memos, Economic Joint Witness Statement, Panel Minutes, Application Responses, Proposed Conditions, Decisions and Final Conditions) relating to the Silverlight Studios Fast Track Consents FTC000027 and FTC000054.
9. I have also read, and rely on, the economic evidence prepared by Ms Hampson on behalf of my clients.

**Part (a) The project's consistency with local or regional planning documents.**

8. I understand under the FTAA that expert panels and Ministers considering a fast-track application must consider relevant planning documents, including a project's consistency with local or regional planning documents, but these are only one set of criteria. In contrast, the purpose of the FTAA is to facilitate the delivery of infrastructure and development projects with significant regional or national benefits. Having been referred under the FTAA, central government has accepted that the project would have such benefits, including as set out in s 22 of the FTAA.
9. In this section of my evidence, I consider whether the ASH project is consistent with the relevant objectives and policies of the Queenstown-Lakes Proposed District Plan (**PDP**).
10. In making this assessment, I have first considered how the PDP defines the ASH project. In my opinion, the ASH project falls squarely within the defined activity of **Urban Development** as follows:

Means development which is not of a rural character and is differentiated from rural development by its scale, intensity, visual character and the dominance of built structures. Urban development may also be characterised by a reliance on

reticulated services such as water supply, wastewater and stormwater and by its cumulative generation of traffic. For the avoidance of doubt, a resort development in an otherwise rural area does not constitute urban development, nor does the provision of regionally significant infrastructure within rural areas.

11. As such, I consider the following objectives and policies are relevant to the ASH project (as an Urban Development) are contained in the following PDP Chapters:
  - (a) Chapter 3 Strategic Directions
  - (b) Chapter 4 Urban Development
  - (c) Chapter 6 Landscape – Rural Character
  - (d) Chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin
12. I have also considered the following PDP Chapters, but I have no comment to make in respect of them:
  - (a) Chapter 5 Takata Whenua
  - (b) Chapter 27 Subdivision and Development
  - (c) Chapter 28 Natural Hazards
  - (d) Chapter 29 Transport
  - (e) Chapter 36 Noise
13. I have also considered the following Regional Plan and Policy Statement objectives and policies, but I have no comment to make in respect of them:
  - (a) Regional Plan Water for Otago
  - (b) Partially Operative Regional Policy Statement 2019
  - (c) Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2021 (Decisions Version)
  - (d) Otago Operative Regional Policy Statement 2019



### Chapter 3 – Strategic Direction

14. The Chapter 3 Strategic Issues are overarching. While not intended to be an exhaustive list or description of issues to be addressed in the District's pursuit of sustainable management, these Strategic Issues are identified as warranting to be addressed at the present time and during the lifetime of the Plan (and beyond) to enable the retention of the special qualities including:
- a. distinctive lakes, rivers, alpine and high country landscapes free of inappropriate development;
  - b. clean air and pristine water;
  - c. vibrant and compact town centres;
  - d. compact and connected settlements that encourage public transport, biking and walking;
  - e. diverse, resilient, inclusive and connected communities;
  - f. a district providing a variety of lifestyle choices;
  - g. an innovative and diversifying economy based around a strong visitor industry;
  - h. a unique and distinctive heritage;
  - i. distinctive Ngāi Tahu values, rights and interests;
  - j. indigenous biodiversity and ecosystems.

Provision	Objective/Policy	Applicant's Assessment	My Comment
SO 3.2.1	The development of a prosperous, resilient and equitable economy in the District.	The Ayrburn Screen Hub is considered to significantly contribute to the development of a prosperous, resilient, and equitable economy in the Queenstown Lakes District by delivering substantial, measurable, and sustained economic benefits. As outlined in the Economic Impact Assessment	I agree the ASH project is aligned with the QLDC's Economic Diversification Plan and will likely strengthen New Zealand's global film reputation, increase production capacity, and attract international investment.

		<p>(Appendix 11), the project will generate \$258 million in regional activity during its three-year construction phase, supporting over 1,890 full-time equivalent (FTE) job years, with more than 630 jobs each year across Otago. Once operational, it is expected to contribute \$462 million in additional economic output over ten years, sustaining more than 370 specialised FTE roles annually.</p> <p>The Project is aligned with Queenstown Lakes District Council's (QLDC) Economic Diversification Plan, and advances key objectives such as growing the local film industry's capabilities. Supported by industry leaders (refer to Appendix 33 for letters of support), the Screen Hub's design ensures flexibility to accommodate both large-scale and smaller productions, serving diverse screen and filming activities.</p> <p>The Project will strengthen New Zealand's global film reputation, increase production capacity, and attract international investment. It is considered that the Project will not only drive short-term construction-</p>	<p>I also note Ms Hampson finds that the screen production infrastructure will have moderate regional economic benefits if delivered when compared to status quo. I agree with Ms Hampson that these moderate benefits relate to the positive effect of the additional infrastructure could have on Otago's reputation as a place for production activity.</p> <p>I am, however, less certain about the ASH projects economic resilience given the acknowledgement of a steady decline in internationally funded productions taking place in New Zealand (refer paragraph 34 of Ms Hampson's evidence), uncertainties whether or not the consented Silverlight Studio in Wanaka will be constructed, the effect of this proposal on the existing Studio at Remarkables Park and what effect Artificial Intelligence (AI) will on the film industry in the future.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>related growth but also create a more resilient economy in the long term.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this objective.</p>	<p>However, overall, I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this Strategic Objective.</p>
<p>SO 3.2.1.1</p>	<p>The significant socioeconomic benefits of well designed and appropriately located visitor industry places, facilities and services are realised across the District.</p>	<p>The Ayrburn Screen Hub will realise significant socioeconomic benefits across the district by providing a well-designed, strategically located facility that drives sustained economic growth, creates short- and longterm employment, supports industry diversification, and strengthens the region's position as a premier destination for creative and visitor industries. A dedicated Screen Hub in Queenstown is considered to increase the duration of productions, generating additional economic activity for the wider film industry.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this objective.</p>	<p>I agree the ASH project is a well-designed, but disagree it is appropriately located within the District. In my opinion, the ASH project is an Urban Development which the PDP discourages from locating in rural areas, such as that proposed.</p> <p>Overall, I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this Strategic Objective.</p>
<p>SO 3.2.1.6</p>	<p>Diversification of the District's economic base and creation of employment opportunities through the development of innovative and sustainable enterprises.</p>	<p>The proposed Screen Hub will offer a range of employment opportunities, and as noted above will support jobs during the construction phase and once operational (refer Appendix 11).</p>	<p>I agree the ASH project will contribute to the diversification of the districts economic base and create employment opportunities through the development of innovative and sustainable enterprise (with the possible exception of advances</p>

		<p>Beyond these direct economic gains, the Project aligns closely with QLDC's Economic Diversification Plan (refer to Assessment of Effects (Section 10.5.2)) by establishing an innovative, future-focused enterprise that responds to critical industry demand in Otago, enabling the district to generate and facilitate film production spending that might otherwise not occur. It will strengthen the Wakatipu Basin's economic resilience, reduce reliance on seasonal industries, and foster high-value creative sector growth.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this objective</p>	<p>of AI in the film industries as I noted above).</p> <p>Overall, I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this Strategic Objective.</p>
SO 3.2.1.8	<p>Diversification of land use in rural areas beyond traditional activities, including farming, provided that:</p> <p>a. the landscape values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding</p>	<p>The proposal is not located within any Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape areas. A Landscape Assessment ('LA') prepared by RMM is attached as Appendix 22 and confirms that the Project results in a low level of landscape effects and is considered acceptable due to the retention of key landform features, the continuation of rural land use elements (such as vineyard planting), and the integration of built form within an already modified</p>	<p>For reasons expressed in addressing Chapter 6 objectives and policies, it is my opinion that parts (a) and (b) of this Strategic Objective are not relevant to the ASH project.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with part (c) this Strategic Objective.</p>

	<p>Natural Landscapes are protected;</p> <p>b. the landscape character of Rural Character Landscapes is maintained and their visual amenity values are maintained or enhanced; and</p> <p>c. significant nature conservation values and Ngāi Tahu values, interests and customary resources, are maintain</p>	<p>and evolving rural environment. Accordingly, the Project is considered to diversify rural land use without compromising the landscape character of Rural Character Landscapes, while avoiding any Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes. Engagement with Ngāi Tahu regarding values, interests and customary resources is ongoing.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this objective.</p>	
SO 3.2.3	<p>A quality built environment taking into account the character of individual communities.</p>	<p>As detailed in Section 9.1.1 of the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE), this proposal will result in a high-quality, architecturally-designed buildings, which will be visually integrated within the environment. The design and appearance of the proposed development has been carefully considered with respect to the characteristics of the</p>	<p>Section 9.1.2 of the AEE states that the studio buildings will reach a height of 15m and to be finished in dark profiled metal to reduce reflectivity and recess the built form into the surrounding landscape; the office and accommodation buildings are smaller in scale and adopt pitched</p>

		<p>receiving environment (refer Landscape Assessment at Appendix 22). The proposal incorporates various mitigation measures to reduce visual dominance and integrate the built form into the character of the surrounding landscape.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this objective.</p>	<p>roof forms, stained vertical timber cladding, and simplified detailing consistent with rural vernacular building types; and the accommodation buildings are spatially separated toward the southern edge of the site, contributing to a low-density appearance and supporting rural landscape character.</p> <p>The ASH project describes a form of urban development that is typical to most greenfield subdivision in Queenstown. The exception to this is the studio buildings, which at 15m in height, are more typical of an industrial nature building.</p> <p>The scale and density of the ASH project, particularly the studio buildings, does not take into account the character of this community, which is low density (1 ha residential) rural-residential development surrounded by open space. The ASH</p>
--	--	---	--

			<p>project is a urban development under the relevant definition of the PDP.</p> <p>Overall, I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this Strategic Objective.</p>
SO 3.2.4	The distinctive natural environments and ecosystems of the District are protected.	The Project will ensure that the District's distinctive natural environments and ecosystems are protected, while the proposed measures within the application will enhance the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and indigenous biodiversity.	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this Strategic Objective.</p>
SO 3.2.4.1	Development and land uses that sustain or enhance the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems, and maintain indigenous biodiversity.		
SO 3.2.4.4	The water quality and functions of the District's lakes, rivers and wetlands are maintained or enhanced.	As detailed in the AEE (Section 9.7, Page 75), any adverse ecological effects from construction will be low in magnitude and confined to the immediate project footprint. Installation of the proposed sediment trap will cause only localised disturbance to Mill Creek, with fish salvage protocols in place to	<p>As discussed above.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this objective.</p>

		<p>maintain aquatic connectivity. Mill Creek, a functioning ecosystem of moderate to high ecological value, will significantly benefit from the proposed sediment traps, riparian planting, and stormwater treatment measures. The inline sediment trap will significantly contribute to the improvement of downstream water quality at Lake Hayes.</p> <p>Stormwater disposal will be managed in accordance with the recommendations of the CKL Stormwater Management Plan (Appendix 13), ensuring the ongoing protection of Mill Creek's water quality. No works are proposed within the immediate vicinity of lakes or wetlands, safeguarding their water quality and ecological functions.</p> <p>Overall, the development will result in a net biodiversity gain through native planting, riparian buffers, and engineered wetlands, enhancing habitat, ecosystem resilience, and water quality while keeping residual effects low and acceptable, with a significantly positive outcome for Mill Creek and Lake Hayes.</p>	
--	--	--	--



		The proposal is considered to achieve these objectives.	
SO 3.2.3.1	The District's important historic heritage values are protected by ensuring development is sympathetic to those values.	<p>An Archaeology &amp; Heritage Report has been prepared by Origin Consultants Ltd as attached in Appendix 30 to evaluate the potential impacts of the proposed Ayrburn Screen Hub Project on the historic and archaeological values of the site. Overall, the Project is assessed to have a negligible effect on the heritage and archaeological values of the site. The distance from heritage-protected features, the low likelihood of encountering intact archaeological deposits, and the absence of changes to heritage items collectively ensure the protection of the site's historical integrity.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this objective.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this objective.</p>
SO 3.2.5.8	<p>Within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone:</p> <p>a. the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Basin and of its</p>	This objective is addressed in the Landscape Assessment (Appendix 22, page 24-25), which concludes that the existing vineyard and established vegetation will function as a landscape buffer, while the contained nature of the built area will allow it to integrate quickly into the surrounding environment.	<p>This is discussed in more detail under the Chapter 24 Objectives and policies.</p> <p>Generally speaking, any Urban Development in the WBRAZ is highly</p>

	<p>Landscape Character Units, as identified in Schedule 24.8 are maintained or enhanced; and</p> <p>b. the landscape capacity of each Landscape Character Unit and of the Basin as a whole is not exceeded.</p>	<p>Overall, the proposal's effects on the values identified for maintenance and enhancement within Landscape Character Unit 8 (LCU8) are assessed as being very low to low.</p> <p>Based on the findings of the Landscape Assessment (Attachment 22), the proposal is considered to achieve this objective.</p>	<p>likely to exceed the landscape capacity of the relevant Landscape Character Unit.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this objective.</p>
SO 3.2.6.2	<p>A diverse, resilient and well-functioning community where opportunities for arts, culture, recreation and events are integrated into the built and natural environment.</p>	<p>The Ayrburn Screen Hub is considered to align with this objective by creating a purpose-built film and television production facility. The facilities including filming stages, workshops, offices, and dedicated accommodation for crew supports the long-term presence of creative professionals in the region, strengthening the cultural presence within Otago. By providing spaces for collaboration, screenings, and wellness, the Screen Hub facilitates community engagement.</p> <p>The Ayrburn Screen Hub also offers a unique opportunity to enhance the existing network of cycle trails. By linking existing trails and providing</p>	<p>The creation of a commercial purpose-built film and television production facility does not equate to <i>diverse, resilient and well-functioning community</i> where opportunities for arts, culture and events are integrated into the built and natural environment.</p> <p>I acknowledge, however, the proposed cycle trails do provide for well-functioning recreation opportunities and the wider site, including the Ayrburn hospitality area, which caters for community events.</p>

		<p>improved infrastructure, the Project supports the Queenstown's worldclass cycle network that appeals to both domestic and international visitors.</p> <p>The development has been designed to minimise effects on the built and natural environment, with enhancements including riparian planting, water quality improvements for Lake Hayes, and extensive landscaping. Any effects that remain are proposed to be managed through a comprehensive suite of conditions attached at Appendix 6.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this objective.</p>	<p>I also acknowledge the proposal integrates this urban development into the natural environment through riparian planting, water quality improvements for Lake Hayes, and extensive landscaping.</p> <p>Overall, on balance, I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this Strategic Objective.</p>
SP 3.3.17	Identify heritage items and ensure they are protected from inappropriate development.	<p>The Archaeology &amp; Heritage Report completed by Origin Consultants Ltd at Appendix 30 confirms that the wider Ayrburn Farm encompasses several heritage-protected features, including five stone farm buildings located on Lot 1 DP 540788, the Homestead and stone cookhouse on Lot 2 DP 540788, and a protected avenue of trees on Lot 2 recognised under Chapter 26 of the PDP. As detailed above the Project is assessed to have a negligible effect on the heritage and archaeological values of</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this objective.</p>

		<p>the site and wider environment, therefore it is considered that heritage items are protected from inappropriate development.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this objective</p>	
SP 3.3.20	<p>Manage subdivision and / or development that may have adverse effects on the natural character and nature conservation values of the District's lakes, rivers, wetlands and their beds and margins so that their life-supporting capacity is safeguarded; and natural character is maintained or enhanced as far as practicable.</p>	<p>The management of stormwater disposal and its effects on water bodies, the protection of natural character, and the scale and intensity of the development in relation to life-supporting capacity have been considered and addressed in Section 11.3.4 of the AEE.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this objective.</p>
SP 3.3.25	<p>That subdivision and / or development be designed in accordance with best practice land use</p>	<p>The proposal will comply with best practice techniques for land development, as recommended in the Geotechnical Investigation Report attached as Appendix 25. The water quality improvements as a</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this objective.</p>

	management so as to avoid or minimise adverse effects on the water quality of lakes, rivers and wetlands in the District.	result of proposed ecological enhancement measures are expected to provide regionally and nationally significant benefits as detailed in Section 5.3.3 of the AEE. Adverse effects on water bodies, including, Mill Creek and Lake Hayes will be avoided.  The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.	
--	---	---	--

## Chapter 4 Urban Development

15. As noted above, I consider the proposal falls within the definition of Urban Development under the PDP. As such, Chapter 4 Urban Development objectives and policies are relevant to the proposal. The purpose of Chapter 4 Urban Development is to elaborate on the strategic direction in Chapter 3 and set out the objectives and policies for managing the spatial location and layout of urban development within the District. Chapter 4 forms part of the strategic intentions of this District Plan and guides planning and decision making for urban growth and development within the District.
16. The objectives and policies in Chapter 4 provide a framework for a managed approach to urban development that utilises land and resources in an efficient manner, and preserves and enhances natural amenity values. The approach seeks to achieve integration between land use, transportation, infrastructure, services, open space networks, community facilities and education; and increases the viability and vibrancy of urban areas.
17. Urban Growth Boundaries are established for the urban areas of the Wakatipu Basin (including Queenstown, Frankton, Jacks Point and Arrowtown), and where required around other settlements, providing a tool to manage anticipated growth while protecting the individual roles, heritage and character of these areas. Specific policy direction is provided for these areas, including provision for increased density

to contribute to more compact and connected urban forms that achieve the benefits of integration and efficiency and offer a quality environment in which to live, work and play.

18. I note the applicant does not appear to assess the proposal under Chapter 4.

Provision	Objective/Policy	Applicant's Assessment	My Comment
4.2.1	Objective - Urban Growth Boundaries used as a tool to manage the growth of urban areas within distinct and defensible urban edges. (from Policies 3.3.13 and 3.3.14)	Not assessed by the applicant.	The subject site is not within an Urban Growth Boundary (UGB). As an Urban Development, located outside of an UGB, I consider the ASH project to be <b>inconsistent</b> with this objective.
Policy 4.2.1.1	Define Urban Growth Boundaries, where required, to identify the areas that are available for the growth of urban settlements.	Not assessed by the applicant.	As an Urban Development, located outside of an UGB, I consider the ASH project to be <b>inconsistent</b> with this objective.
Policy 4.2.1.2	Focus urban development primarily on land within and adjacent to the existing larger urban areas and, to a lesser extent, within and adjacent to smaller urban areas, towns and rural settlements.	Not assessed by the applicant.	The proposed ASH project is not within or adjacent to the existing larger urban areas or smaller urban areas, towns and rural settlements.  Overall, I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.

Policy 4.2.1.3	Ensure that urban development is contained within the defined Urban Growth Boundaries, and that aside from urban development within existing towns and rural settlements, urban development is avoided outside of those boundaries.	Not assessed by the applicant.	<p>The ASH project is not contained within the defined UGB. As such this policy requires the proposed urban development to be avoided.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.</p>
Policy 4.2.1.4	<p>Ensure Urban Growth Boundaries encompass, at a minimum, sufficient, feasible development capacity and urban development opportunities consistent with:</p> <p>(a) the anticipated medium term demand for housing and business land within the District assuming a mix of housing densities and form;</p> <p>(b) ensuring the ongoing availability of a competitive land supply for urban purposes;</p> <p>(c) the constraints on development of the land such as its topography, its ecological, heritage, cultural or landscape significance; or the risk of natural hazards limiting the ability of the land to</p>	Not assessed by the applicant.	<p>The PDP implements this policy by identifying a number of UGBs throughout the district and avoiding sporadic urban development in rural areas outside of those UGBs.</p> <p>The ASH project is sporadic urban development in rural area.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.</p>

	<p>accommodate growth;</p> <p>(d) the need to make provision for the location and efficient operation of infrastructure, commercial and industrial uses, and a range of community activities and facilities;</p> <p>(e) a compact and efficient urban form;</p> <p>(f) avoiding sporadic urban development in rural areas;</p> <p>(g) minimising the loss of the productive potential and soil resource of rural land; and</p> <p>(h) a future development strategy for the District that is prepared in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity.</p>		
Objective 4.2.2.A & B	<p>A - A compact, integrated and well designed urban form within the Urban Growth Boundaries that:</p> <p>(i) is coordinated with the efficient provision, use and operation of infrastructure and services; and</p>	Not assessed by the applicant.	The ASH project has a compact and well-designed urban form. However, it is not located within a UGB. As such it is <b>inconsistent</b> with Part A and B of this objective.



	<p>(ii) is managed to ensure that the Queenstown Airport is not significantly compromised by the adverse effects of incompatible activities.</p> <p>B - Urban development within Urban Growth Boundaries that maintains and enhances the environment and rural amenity and protects Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features, and areas supporting significant indigenous flora and fauna. (From Policy 3.3.13, 3.3.17, 3.3.29)</p>		
4.2.2.1	<p>Integrate urban development with existing or proposed infrastructure so that:</p> <p>(a) Urban development is serviced by infrastructure of sufficient capacity; and</p> <p>(b) reverse sensitivity effects of activities on regionally significant infrastructure are minimised; and</p> <p>(c) in the case of the National Grid, reverse sensitivity effects avoided to the extent reasonably possible and the operation,</p>	Not assessed by the applicant.	<p>It is understood the ASH project can be serviced by infrastructure with sufficient capacity consistent with (a). Clauses (b) and (c) do not appear to be relevant.</p> <p>Overall, I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>

	maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid is not compromised.		
4.2.2.3	Enable an increased density of well-designed residential development in close proximity to town centres, public transport routes, community and education facilities, while ensuring development is consistent with any structure plan for the area and responds to the character of its site, the street, open space and surrounding area.	Not assessed by the applicant.	<p>The proposed Urban Development is not in close proximity to a town centre, community and education facility. The ASH project is not consistent with 27.13.22 Ayrburn Structure Plan.</p> <p>Overall, I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.</p>
4.2.2.4	Encourage urban development that enhances connections to public recreation facilities, reserves, open space and active transport networks.	Not assessed by the applicant.	<p>The ASH project does connect to (and improve) active trail networks, which in turn connect to reserves and open space.</p> <p>Overall, I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>
4.2.2.5	Require larger scale development to be comprehensively designed with an integrated and sustainable approach to infrastructure, buildings, street, trail and open space design.	Not assessed by the applicant.	The ASH project has been comprehensively design with an integrated and sustainable approach to infrastructure, buildings, street, trail and open space design.

			Overall, I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.
4.2.2.7	Explore and encourage innovative approaches to design to assist provision of quality affordable housing.	Not assessed by the applicant.	<p>The ASH project does not explore and encourage innovative approaches to design to assist provision of quality affordable housing.</p> <p>Overall, I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.</p>
4.2.2.10	Ensure lighting standards for urban development avoid unnecessary adverse effects on views of the night sky.	Not assessed by the applicant.	<p>The application states that all lighting will be specified to meet the QLDC Southern Light standards to ensure there is no excessive glare.</p> <p>Overall, I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>
4.2.2.12	Define the Urban Growth Boundary for Arrowtown, as shown on the District Plan web mapping application that preserves the existing	Not assessed by the applicant.	Not relevant to the ASH project as it does not adjoin the Arrowtown UGB.

	urban character of Arrowtown and avoids urban sprawl into the adjacent rural areas.		
4.2.2.13	<p>Define the Urban Growth Boundaries for the balance of the Wakatipu Basin, as shown on the District Plan web mapping application that:</p> <p>(a) are based on existing urbanised areas;</p> <p>(b) identify sufficient areas of urban development and the potential intensification of existing urban areas to provide for predicted visitor and resident population increases over the planning period;</p> <p>(c) enable the logical and sequenced provision of infrastructure to and community facilities in new areas of urban development;</p> <p>(d) protect the values of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes;</p> <p>(e) avoid sprawling and sporadic urban development across the rural areas of the Wakatipu Basin.</p>	Not assessed by the applicant.	<p>The subject site is not within a defined UGB. As such, the proposal is sprawling and sporadic Urban Development within the rural areas of the Wakatipu Basin. This policy requires this to be avoided.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.</p>

4.2.2.20	Rural land outside of the Urban Growth Boundaries is not used for urban development until a change to the Plan amends the urban Growth boundary and zones additional land for urban development purposes.	Not assessed by the applicant.	No change to the plan has amended the UGB.  I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.

## Chapter 6 – Landscapes – Rural Character

19. The purpose of Chapter 6 is to provide greater detail as to how the landscape, particularly outside urban settlements, will be managed in order to implement the Strategic Objectives and Policies in Chapter 3. This chapter needs to be read with particular reference to the Chapter 3 Strategic Objectives and Policies, which identify the outcomes the policies in this Chapter are seeking to achieve. The relevant Chapter 3 Strategic Objectives and Policies are identified in brackets following each policy.
20. Landscapes have been categorised to provide greater certainty of their importance to the District, and to respond to regional policy and national legislation. Categorisations of landscapes will provide decision makers with a basis to consider the appropriateness of activities that have adverse effects on those landscapes.
21. Policy 6.3.1.4 provides a separate regulatory regime for the WBRAZ, within which the ONF, ONL and Rural Character Landscape (RCL) categories and the policies of Chapter 6 related to those categories do not apply. As such, I consider that only the general Chapter 6 objectives and policies are of relevance to the ASH project.

Provision	Objective/Policy	Applicant's Assessment	My Comment
Policy 6.3.2.2	Ensure that the location and direction of lights does not cause excessive glare and avoids unnecessary degradation of views of the night sky and of landscape character, including of the sense of remoteness where it is an important part of that character.	<p>All lighting will be specified to meet the QLDC Southern Light standards to ensure there is no excessive glare.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>
Policy 6.3.2.8	Encourage any landscaping to be ecologically viable and consistent with the established character of the area.	<p>A comprehensive landscaping plan is attached within the Ayrburn Design Report at Appendix 7.</p> <p>As detailed in Section 5.1.5 of the AEE, the planting is intended to assist with mitigation of the proposed buildings in the landscape. In addition, the planting will enhance the overall ecological values of the site by providing enhancement of freshwater ecology associated with Mill Creek and increasing native plant diversity and habitat.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>

		<p>Landscaping is therefore considered to be ecologically viable and consistent with the established character of the area.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	
Policy 6.3.4.1	Recognise that subdivision and development is unsuitable in many locations in Rural Character Landscapes and successful applications will need to be, on balance, consistent with the objectives and policies of the Plan.	<p>The Landscape Assessment (Appendix 22, page 24-24), concludes that adverse effects of the proposed development will be mitigated by a range of measures, including retention of existing structural planting and the vineyard to the west of the site, revegetation of the drainage swale, and maturing of newly developed landscaping. It is further considered that the contained nature of the built area will allow the development to integrate into the surrounding environment.</p> <p>Overall, the proposal's effects on the values identified for maintenance and enhancement within LCU8 are assessed as being very low to low. Based on the findings of the Landscape Assessment it is considered that the proposed</p>	I consider this policy is not relevant to the ASH project.

		<p>development is consistent with the objectives and policies in the Plan.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to be consistent with this policy.</p>	
Policy 6.3.4.4	<p>Have particular regard to the potential adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values where further subdivision and development would constitute sprawl along roads.</p>	<p>Based on the Landscape Assessment attached at Appendix 22 (page 19), the proposed development will have limited visibility from Arrowtown–Lake Hayes Road (ALHR) and Hogans Gully Road. This is due to the Project being located behind existing exotic trees on the property, which are to be retained. These established trees, along with the landscaped foreground, form a layered visual buffer that significantly reduces the development’s prominence from these roads.</p> <p>The location of the development and the proposed and existing screening will ensure that the proposal will not contribute to any perception of sprawl along ALHR or Hogans Gully Road. From these vantage points, the</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>



		<p>built elements will be largely absorbed into the existing pattern of vegetation and landform.</p> <p>As a result, the landscape character and visual amenity values of the area will be maintained, and the potential adverse effects associated with linear, road-frontage sprawl will be avoided.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	
Policy 6.3.4.5	Ensure incremental changes from subdivision and development do not degrade landscape character, or important views as a result of activities associated with mitigation of the visual effects of proposed development such as screen planting, mounding and earthworks.	<p>The Landscape Assessment (Appendix 22) concludes that the proposal will result in a very low to low–moderate level of adverse effects on the existing visual amenity and landscape character within the identified visual catchment, and when experienced from viewpoints 5 – 9 that these will be low-moderate to moderate.</p> <p>The proposed development will not be highly visible from public places and will not form the foreground to any views from public roads towards any ONF or ONL.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with these policies.</p>
Policy 6.3.4.8	Avoid adverse effects on visual amenity from subdivision, use and development that:		

	<p>a. is highly visible from public places and other places which are frequented by members of the public generally (except any trail as defined in this Plan); or</p> <p>b. forms the foreground for an Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape when viewed from public roads.</p>	<p>The proposal is considered to achieve these policies.</p>	
<p>Policy 6.3.4.9</p>	<p>In the Wakatipu Basin, avoid planting and screening, particularly along roads and boundaries that would degrade openness where such openness is an important part of its landscape character.</p>	<p>The Landscape Assessment (Appendix 22) notes the project involves native margin planting to 'wrap around' the proposed development and border the riparian areas and amenity planting in areas in closer to buildings, infrastructure and private spaces. The native margin planting will, in effect, provide the backdrop to the built form of the proposed development and will clothe the proposed earth mounding and will also provide an ecological benefit. This planting will not be along roads and boundaries. Overall, it is</p>	<p>The ASH project seeks to locate some very large buildings within an area designated for open space. It is considered this open space is important to the openness of this part of the basin.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.</p>

		<p>considered that planting will not degrade openness to the extent that is part of the landscape character of the site and locality.</p> <p>Based on the Landscape Assessment and assessment above, this proposal is considered to be consistent with this policy.</p>	
Policy 6.3.4.11	Encourage development to utilise shared accesses and infrastructure, and to locate within the parts of the site where it will minimise disruption to natural landforms and to rural character.	<p>Existing infrastructure will be utilised where possible including the existing access to the site from Ayr Avenue. The development is predominantly located within a part of the site that is identified in Chapter 24 of the PDP as having moderate capability to absorb additional development and where it will minimise disruption to natural landforms and natural character.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to be consistent with this policy.</p>	<p>The screen hub buildings are located in an area that the PDP requires to be maintained in open space. A significant amount of earthworks are proposed to site the proposed buildings within this sloping land.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.</p>

## Chapter 24 – Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone

22. Chapter 24 applies to the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (WBRAZ) and its sub-zone, the Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct (WBLP). The purpose of the Zone is to maintain or enhance the character and amenity of the Wakatipu Basin, while providing for rural living and other activities.
23. The Rural Amenity Zone is applied to areas of the Wakatipu Basin which have either reached, or are nearing a threshold where further landscape modification arising from additional residential subdivision, use and development (including buildings) is not likely to maintain the Wakatipu Basin's landscape character and visual amenity values. There are some areas within the Rural Amenity Zone that have a landscape capacity rating to absorb additional development of Moderate, Moderate-High or High. In those areas limited and carefully located and designed additional residential subdivision and development is provided for while maintaining or enhancing landscape character and visual amenity values.

Provision	Objective/Policy	Applicant's Assessment	My Comment
Objective 24.2.1	Landscape character and visual amenity values in the Wakatipu Basin are maintained or enhanced.	As detailed in the Landscape Assessment (Appendix 22 Page 25):  "Overall, it has separately been established that parts of the Site have the potential to absorb development whilst maintaining the environmental characteristics and visual amenity values of the LCU. It is considered the proposed Screen Hub facility will satisfactorily maintain landscape character and visual amenity values."	The ASH project does not maintain and enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values of this part of the Wakatipu basin.  While parts of the site have limited potential to absorb some development (ie. 4 residential units), other parts of the site have no potential to absorb additional development, including the area designated for open space where

		Based on the conclusions of the Landscape Assessment it is considered that the landscape character and visual amenity values in the Wakatipu Basin are maintained, and that this Project is consistent with this policy.	the Screen Hub buildings are proposed.  I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.
Policy 24.2.1.2	Subdivision or residential development in all areas outside of the Precinct that are identified in Schedule 24.8 to have Very Low, Low or Moderate-Low capacity must be of a scale, nature and design that:  a. is not inconsistent with any of the policies that serve to assist to achieve objective 24.2.1; and  b. ensures that the landscape character and visual amenity values identified for each relevant Landscape Character Unit in Schedule 24.8 and the landscape character of the Wakatipu Basin as tail Assessment a whole are maintained or	The development is predominantly located within a part of the site that is identified in Chapter 24 of the PDP as having moderate capability to absorb additional development. While a portion of the proposal will be located within an areas identified as having low capacity, the Landscape Assessment provided in Appendix 22 concludes:  “Rural character and amenity values will remain high and therefore the impact of the proposal on the values identified to be maintained and enhanced within LCU8 are considered to be very low - low.”	This policy is relevant as the ASH project is outside of the Precinct Sub-Zone.  The ASH project is not of a scale, nature or design consistent with Objective 24.2.1 and Schedule 24.8 of the PDP.  I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.

	enhanced by ensuring that the landscape capacity is not exceeded.	<p>The Addendum Landscape Assessment Memo concludes that:</p> <p>“...adverse effects arising from the proposal on landscape and visual amenity values as experienced in viewpoints 5 – 9 will range from low to moderate”</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	
Policy 24.2.1.3	<p>Subdivision or residential development in all areas of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone outside of the Precinct that are identified in Schedule 24.8 to have Moderate capacity must be of a scale, nature and design that:</p> <p>a. is not inconsistent with any of the policies that serve to assist to achieve objective 24.2.1; and</p> <p>b. ensures that the landscape character and visual amenity values of each</p>	<p>As detailed in Section 9.1.1 of the AEE and in the Landscape Assessment provided in Appendix 22, this proposal is considered to maintain the landscape character and visual amenity values identified in LCU 8.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>As per above, the ASH project is not of a scale, nature and design that is consistent with Objective 24.2.1 and Schedule 24.8 of the PDP.</p> <p>Overall, I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.</p>

	relevant LCU as identified in Schedule 24.8 is maintained or enhanced by ensuring that landscape capacity is not exceeded.		
Policy 24.2.1.6	Ensure subdivision and development is designed (including accessways, services, utilities and building platforms) to minimise inappropriate modification to the natural landform.	<p>The proposal has been comprehensively designed to utilise existing infrastructure where possible and to minimise the effect on the natural landform. Any effects which result from modification to the natural landform are proposed to be managed through a comprehensive suite of conditions attached at Appendix 6.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>Approximately 80,400 m<sup>3</sup> of material will be excavated, with around 74,400 m<sup>3</sup> of fill placed on site over an area of approximately 91,000m<sup>2</sup>. The earthworks will involve cut depths of approximately 9.5 metres and fill depths of approximately 12 metres. (Para 5.1.10 of the AEE).</p> <p>This amount of earthworks, much of it within the area designated under the District Plan as Open Space, does not minimise inappropriate modification to the natural environment.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.</p>

Policy 24.2.1.7	Ensure that subdivision and development maintains or enhances the landscape character and visual amenity values identified in Schedule 24.8 - Landscape Character Units.	<p>As detailed in Section 9.1.1 of the AEE and in the Landscape Assessment provided in Appendix 22, this proposal is considered to maintain the landscape character and visual amenity values identified in LCU 8.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve these policies.</p>	<p>The ASH project does not maintain or enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values identified in Schedule 24.8 of the PDP.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.</p>
Policy 24.2.1.8	<p>Maintain or enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Rural Amenity Zone including the Precinct and surrounding landscape context by:</p> <p>a. controlling the colour, scale, form, coverage, location (including setbacks) and height of buildings and associated infrastructure, vegetation and landscape elements.</p>	<p>As detailed in Section 9.8.2 of the AEE, built form has been carefully located mostly within an area zoned and anticipated for residential development and has been treated with architectural design responses that minimise its visual prominence. Recessive cladding, varied rooflines, and articulated building profiles work alongside extensive native planting and vineyard rows to soften the development's edge and reinforce rural character. Shaped landforms, existing vegetation, and proposed planting along</p>	<p>The ASH project does not maintain or enhance the landscape character and visual amenity values of the WBRAZ by adequately controlling the height of buildings (particularly the film studio buildings).</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.</p>



		<p>the site boundaries provide further separation and screening from adjacent landholdings.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	
Policy 24.2.1.9	Require all buildings to be located and designed so that they do not compromise the landscape and amenity values and the natural character of Outstanding Natural Features and Outstanding Natural Landscapes that are either adjacent to the building or where the building is in the foreground of views from a public road or reserve of the Outstanding Natural Landscape or Outstanding Natural Feature.	<p>N/A –The proposal is not located within or adjacent to and no buildings are in the foreground of any Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape areas.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>
Policy 24.2.1.10	Provide for farming, commercial, community, recreation, tourism related and other non residential activities that rely on the rural land resource, subject to	The proposal provides for commercial activity, recreation and tourism related activities that rely on the rural land resource of the site as provided for by this policy.	This ASH project does not rely on rural land resource and does not maintain or enhance landscape character and visual amenity values.

	<p>maintaining or enhancing landscape character and visual amenity values.</p>	<p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>There are alternative areas, within the UGB, where this type of urban development could take place (subject to resource consent approval) within the District. Undeveloped land of a similar size to that required by the ASH project, within the UGB, includes Remarkables Park, the Frankton Flats, Frankton Flats North, Kelvin Heights, Ladies Mile and the Southern Corridor (the area south of the Kawarau River which includes Coneburn, Parkburn, Hanley Farm, Jacks Point and Homestead Bay).</p> <p>Other areas, which are located outside of the UGB but zoned something other than Rural, include the Gibbston Character Zone, Gibbston Resort Zone, and various Rural Visitor Zones (also subject to resource consent approval).</p>
--	--	---	--

			I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.
Policy 24.2.1.13	Control earthworks and vegetation clearance to minimise adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values.	<p>Earthworks are proposed to be controlled in accordance with the EMP attached at Appendix 21. The total volume, in the context of the site is suitable and will not result in adverse effects on landscape character and amenity values.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>As described above, a significant amount of earthworks is proposed to facilitate this urban development, particularly in that area of the site designated under the District Plan as Open Space.</p> <p>As such, the ASH project does little to minimise adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.</p>
Policy 24.2.1.15	Provide for activities that maintain a sense of spaciousness in which buildings are subservient to natural landscape elements.	As detailed above, open space is proposed to be maintained by locating the development within an area that can be largely screened by well-established	The PDP anticipates four residential dwellings in order to ensure buildings are subservient to the natural landscape elements. Additionally, the

		<p>vegetation, and is located in an enclosed location on the site. This will maintain the sense of spaciousness of the surrounding land and will ensure that the buildings are subservient to natural landscape elements.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>PDP anticipates the Open Space areas remain just that.</p> <p>The ASH project will not result in a sense of spaciousness in which buildings are subservient to natural landscape elements.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.</p>
Policy 24.2.1.16	Manage lighting so that it does not cause adverse glare to other properties, roads or public places, or degrade views of the night sky.	<p>All lighting will be specified to meet the QLDC Southern Light standards to ensure there is no excessive glare.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>
Policy 24.2.1.17	Have regard to the spiritual beliefs, cultural traditions and practices of Tangata Whenua in the manner directed in Chapter 5: Tangata Whenua.	<p>WPDL has engaged with mana whenua and those discussions have addressed landscape, freshwater values, restoration of ecological values and stormwater management principles (refer Consultation</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>

		<p>Summary Report at Appendix 31).</p> <p>Recommendations on the proposal are included in the CIA attached at Appendix 44 and engagement with Ngāi Tahu regarding values, interests and customary resources is ongoing.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	
Objective 24.2.2	Non-residential activities maintain or enhance amenity values.	<p>Based on the Landscape Assessment attached as Appendix 22, the Screen Hub is considered to maintain amenity values through various mitigation measures including the maintenance of existing vegetation, the location of the development within an enclosed area and the comprehensive landscaping proposed as detailed in the Ayrburn Design Report (Appendix 7, page 15 and 26–30).</p> <p>As addressed in more detail in terms of Policy 24.2.2.1, noise and traffic from activities will be managed to maintain</p>	<p>The ASH project proposes to introduce Urban Development into this rural landscape. With that will come a significant amount of domestication, which will in turn, affect amenity values of this part of the WBRAZ.</p> <p>It is very unlikely the ASH project will be able to maintain and enhance these amenity values.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this objective.</p>

		<p>amenity values of adjoining residential properties.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this objective</p>	
Policy 24.2.2.1	Ensure traffic, noise and the scale and intensity of non-residential activities do not have an adverse impact on landscape character and amenity values, or affect the safe and efficient operation of the roading and trail network or access to public places.	<p>The effects of the Project relating to noise, traffic, and the scale and intensity of the development have been considered in Section 9 of the AEE. In particular, the Transport Assessment (Appendix 29) confirms that the site will operate safely and efficiently from a traffic perspective and the Noise Assessment (Appendix 26) confirms that the Screen Hub can be operated in compliance with the District Plan noise rules, when taking into account the proposed mitigation measures. The Landscape Assessment (Appendix 22) confirms that landscape character and amenity values can be maintained by this proposal.</p>	<p>The ASH project proposes to introduce Urban Development into this rural landscape. With that will come a significant amount of domestication, which will in turn, affect amenity values of this part of the WBRAZ.</p> <p>It is very unlikely the ASH project will be able to maintain and enhance these amenity values.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with these policies.</p>
Policy 24.2.2.2	Ensure the effects generated by non-residential activities (e.g. traffic, noise, hours of operation) are compatible with surrounding uses.		
Policy 24.2.2.3	Ensure non-residential activities other than farming, with the potential for nuisance effects from dust, visual, noise or odour effects, are located a sufficient distance from formed roads,		

	neighbouring properties, waterbodies and any residential activity.	<p>Dust and odour effects will be further mitigated by the EMP controls (Appendix 21) and the noise effects will be managed by the Draft Operational Noise Management Plan (Appendix 27).</p> <p>In this regard, the proposal is considered to be consistent with these policies.</p>	
Objective 24.2.3	Reverse sensitivity effects are avoided or mitigated where rural living opportunities, visitor and tourism activities, community and recreation activities occur.	<p>Objective 24.2.3 and Policy 24.2.3.3 seek to manage the effects of reverse sensitivity. In this regard, the proposal is well separated well from any other horticultural and agricultural activities on adjoining properties. It is not considered, therefore, that any reverse sensitivity effects will result from the proposal or that the proposal will constrain productive activities.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to be consistent with these policies.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this objective.</p>

Objective 24.2.4	Subdivision and development, and use of land, maintains or enhances water quality, ecological quality, and recreation values while ensuring the efficient provision of infrastructure.	<p>As detailed earlier in this assessment, the development will maintain water quality and ecological quality, while ensuring the efficient provision of infrastructure. The inline sediment trap will enhance water quality in Lake Hayes.</p> <p>This proposal is considered to achieve this objective.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>
Policy 24.2.4.1	Avoid adverse cumulative impacts on ecosystem services and nature conservation values.	<p>It is considered that there will be no adverse cumulative impacts on ecosystems due to the proposed Stormwater Management Plan attached as Appendix 13.</p> <p>This proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>
Policy 24.2.4.2	Restrict the subdivision, development and use of land in the Lake Hayes catchment, unless it can contribute to water quality improvement in the catchment commensurate with the	As detailed in Section 9.6.4 of the AEE, the stormwater design will ensure stormwater runoff is effectively managed, that potential adverse effects on Mill Creek and the Lake Hayes catchment are	<p>Agree.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>



	nature, scale and location of the proposal.	<p>avoided, remedied, or mitigated to a level that is acceptable, and that water quality generally will be improved. The inline sediment trap will make a significant contribution to water quality improvement in Lake Hayes which is commensurate with the nature, scale and location of the proposal.</p> <p>This proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	
Policy 24.2.4.3	Provide for improved public access to, and the maintenance and enhancement of, the margins of waterbodies including Mill Creek and Lake Hayes.	<p>This proposal will provide for improved public access to Lake Hayes and Mill Creek by proposed Trail A (Lake Hayes Trail Connection). The development includes public access easements over the site to facilitate a future trail connection between the Ayrburn Trail and the Lake Hayes Trail via the Mill Creek esplanade reserves.</p> <p>This proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>

Policy 24.2.4.4	Provide adequate firefighting water and emergency vehicle access to ensure an efficient and effective emergency response.	<p>As detailed in Section 9.6.2 of the AEE the Screen Hub, is serviced by a 315 millimetre outside diameter polyethylene trunk main, which connects to a bulk supply from the ALHR corridor. This trunk main provides potable, firefighting and irrigation water to the broader Waterfall Park area. Adequate firefighting water supply, is therefore provided for the development.</p> <p>This proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>
Policy 24.2.4.5	Ensure development has regard to servicing and infrastructure costs that are not met by the developer.	<p>Infrastructure costs will be met by the developer for the proposed Screen Hub.</p> <p>This proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>
Policy 24.2.4.6	Facilitate the provision of walkway and cycleway networks and consider opportunities for the provision of bridle path networks.	As detailed in Section 9.1 of the AEE, the development includes public access easements over the site to facilitate a future trail connection between the	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>

		<p>Ayrburn Trail and the Lake Hayes Trail via the Mill Creek esplanade reserve, a connection between the Countryside Trail and Ayrburn Domain, and the realignment of a steep section of the existing Countryside Trail to improve safety, reduce erosion, and provide a more accessible and resilient route. These measures have been developed in consultation with the Queenstown Trails Trust and will support active transport, recreational use, and access to open space across the Lake Hayes and Arrowtown areas. The proposal will make a positive contribution to public recreational infrastructure and local amenity.</p> <p>This proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	
Policy 24.2.4.7	Ensure traffic generated by non-residential development does not	Based on the Transportation Assessment attached as Appendix 29, the proposal will not compromise road safety or efficiency.	Agreed.

	individually or cumulatively compromise road safety or efficiency.	This proposal is considered to achieve this policy.	I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.
Policy 24.2.4.9	Encourage the planting, retention and enhancement of indigenous vegetation that is appropriate to the area and planted at a scale, density, pattern and composition that enhances indigenous biodiversity values, particularly in locations such as gullies and riparian areas, or to provide stability.	<p>The comprehensive landscaping drawings provided at Appendix 7, which show proposed and existing planting to be retained, are consistent with the scale, density and pattern of existing landscaping on the site and in the wider area. This is based on the Landscape Assessment attached as Appendix 22.</p> <p>This proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>

## Chapter 25 – Earthworks

24. Chapter 25 recognises that both rural and urban locations earthworks have the potential for adverse effects on landscape and visual amenity values and require management to ensure the District's Outstanding Natural Features, Landscapes, amenity values, cultural values, waterbodies and their margins are protected from inappropriate development.
25. Chapter 25 also recognises that earthworks associated with construction, subdivision, land use and development can cause erosion of land and sedimentation of stormwater. Unless appropriately managed this could affect stormwater networks, or result in sediment

entering wetlands, rivers and lakes. Earthworks can also create temporary nuisance effects from dust, noise and vibration that require management.

26. The focus of Chapter 25 is therefore on ensuring the adverse effects of earthworks are appropriately managed and minimised. It does not seek to discourage or avoid earthworks in the District.

Provision	Objective/Policy	Applicant's Assessment	My Comment
Objective 25.2.1	Earthworks are undertaken in a manner that minimises adverse effects on the environment, including through mitigation or remediation, and protects people and communities.	As detailed in Section 9.2 of the AEE, appropriate erosion and sediment controls will be in place to minimise sediment run-off, and dust suppressants will be in place to minimise nuisance effects in accordance with the EMP attached at Appendix 21.  This proposal is considered to achieve this objective.  The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.	Agreed.  I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this objective.
Policy 25.2.1.1	Ensure earthworks minimise erosion, land instability, and sediment generation and offsite discharge during construction activities associated with subdivision and development.	As detailed above, the Geotechnical Investigation Report prepared by Geosolve (Appendix 25) addresses geotechnical stability. Environmental protection	Agreed.  I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.

		<p>measures will be undertaken to minimise sediment generation.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	
<p>Policy 25.2.1.2</p>	<p>Manage the adverse effects of earthworks to avoid inappropriate adverse effects and minimise other adverse effects, in a way that: a. Protects the values of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes; b. Maintains the amenity values of Rural Character Landscapes; c. Protects the values of Significant Natural Areas and the margins of lakes, rivers and wetlands; d. Minimises the exposure of aquifers, in particular the Wakatipu Basin, Hāwea Basin, Wānaka Basin and Cardrona alluvial ribbon aquifers; Note: These aquifers are identified in the Otago Regional Plan: Water for Otago 2004. e. Protects Māori cultural values, including wāhi tapu and wāhi tūpuna and other sites of significance to Māori; f. Protects the</p>	<p>The site is well separated from historic heritage as detailed in the Archaeology &amp; Heritage Report at Appendix 30. The proposal maintains public access to and along lakes and rivers, avoids Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and maintains the amenity values of Rural Character Landscapes. Environmental protection measures will be undertaken to further minimise any impact on these features, as detailed above.</p> <p>The project has been designed to protect Māori cultural values, including wāhi tapu, recommendations on the proposal are included in the CIA attached at Appendix 44 and engagement with Ngāi Tahu</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>

	values of heritage sites, precincts and landscape overlays from inappropriate subdivision, use and development; and g. Maintains public access to and along lakes and rivers.	regarding values, interests and customary resources is ongoing.  The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.	
Policy 25.2.1.4	Manage the scale and extent of earthworks to maintain the amenity values and quality of rural and urban areas	The scale and extent of the proposed earthworks will maintain the amenity values and quality of rural areas, based on the Landscape Assessment attached as Appendix 22.  The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.	A significant amount of earthworks is proposed to facilitate this urban development, particularly in that area of the site designated under the District Plan as Open Space.  As such, the ASH project does little to maintain the amenity values and quality of this rural area.  I consider the ASH project is <b>inconsistent</b> with this policy.
Policy 25.2.1.5	Design earthworks to recognise the constraints and opportunities of the site and environment.	The earthworks will be undertaken to ensure they do not adversely affect surrounding infrastructure, buildings and	Agreed.

Policy 25.2.1.6	Ensure that earthworks are designed and undertaken in a manner that does not adversely affect infrastructure, buildings and the stability of adjoining sites.	<p>stability of the land, and to recognise the constraints and opportunities of the site and environment based on the Landscape Assessment attached as Appendix 22 and the Geotechnical Investigation Report attached at Appendix 25.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.
Policy 25.2.1.7	Encourage limiting the area and volume of earthworks being undertaken on a site at any one time to minimise adverse effects on water bodies and nuisance effects of adverse construction noise, vibration, odour, dust and traffic effects.	<p>The area of earthworks being undertaken on a site at any one time will be minimised in accordance with the EMP attached at Appendix 21. Dust and odour effects will be further mitigated by the EMP (Appendix 21) and construction noise and vibration will be managed by the Draft Operational Noise Management Plan (Appendix 27).</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>A significant amount of earthworks is proposed to facilitate this urban development.</p> <p>In my opinion, if an urban development such as that proposed is approved in a rural area, it is better to undertake all of the earthworks as quickly as possible, subject to the EMP being able to handle such. Prolonging the effects of earthworks, through staging, just prolongs the time neighbours are exposed.</p>



			I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.
Policy 25.2.1.8	Undertake processes to avoid adverse effects on cultural heritage, including wāhi tapu, wāhi tūpuna and other taonga, and archaeological sites, or where these cannot be avoided, effects are remedied or mitigated.	<p>WPDL has engaged with mana whenua, including to understand wāhi tapu, wāhi tūpuna and other taonga, and archaeological sites. The applicant will continue to address feedback from tangata whenua within the proposal and earthworks will be undertaken in accordance with the EMP attached at Appendix 21.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>
Policy 25.2.1.9	Manage the potential adverse effects arising from exposing or disturbing	As outlined in the Proposed Draft Conditions of Consent (Appendix 6), an	Agreed.

	<p>accidentally discovered material by following the Accidental Discovery Protocol in Schedule 25.10.</p>	<p>Accidental Discovery Protocol will be followed.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.</p>	<p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>
<p>Policy 25.2.1.10</p>	<p>Ensure that earthworks that generate traffic movements maintain the safety of roads and accesses, and do not degrade the amenity and quality of surrounding land.</p>	<p>As detailed in the AEE at Section 9.4.2, an Integrated Transportation Assessment (ITA) prepared by Carriageway Consulting Limited in Appendix 29 has determined that the ALHR and the Speargrass Flat Road intersection are expected to operate well with the addition of construction traffic, and no road safety issues have been identified in the area. Further, Ayr Avenue has been designed to accommodate large vehicles and includes existing traffic calming. Pedestrian and cyclist access is separated where possible and can be maintained safely during the works.</p> <p>The surrounding roading network has sufficient capacity to absorb construction-related traffic.</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>

		The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.	
Policy 25.2.1.11	Ensure that earthworks minimise natural hazard risk to people, communities and property, in particular earthworks undertaken to facilitate land development or natural hazard mitigation.	<p>As detailed in Section 9.6.3 of the AEE, it is considered that any potential adverse flooding effects can be appropriately managed through proposed mitigation measures though the recommended conditions.</p> <p>The proposal is considered to achieve this policy</p>	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>
Objective 25.2.2	The social, cultural and economic wellbeing of people and communities benefits from earthworks.	The proposal enables people and communities to support their social, economic, and cultural well-being. It will generate employment, deliver extensive native planting, enhance recreational cycle trails, and establish a purpose-built Screen Hub to address a critical gap in the production industry, creating substantial economic benefits.	<p>Agreed.</p> <p>I consider the ASH project is <b>consistent</b> with this policy.</p>

		The proposal is considered to achieve this policy.	
--	--	--	--

### **Conclusion on Objectives and Policies**

27. Overall, I consider the ASH project is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the PDP, in particular, the Chapter 4 Urban Development and Chapter 24 Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone objectives and policies.

**Part (b) - If the Panel is minded to grant consent, make recommendations as to how the conditions of consent can constrain the use of the hotel as much as possible so as to ensure the screen hub activity occurs.**

28. I have reviewed the draft conditions and agree, in general, they are appropriate for an urban development of this size in the rural environment (including the Lake Hayes catchment). However, I wish to comment on conditions 62, 67, 68 and 69 as follows.

Condition 62 – External Appearance

29. Proposed condition 62 states:

62. Building materials and colours shall be in accordance with the materials and colours approved in the Architectural Design Report under Condition 1 of this consent. Any amendments shall be provided by the consent holder to the Monitoring Planner of the QLDC for certification prior to being used on the building.

30. In my opinion, any amendments to the approved materials and colours approved in the Architectural Design Report under Condition 1 should go through a s127 RMA application, as the Council retains discretion over the external appearance of buildings within the WBRAZ. The applicant has also stated that, in relation to SO 3.2.3, that the proposal will result in a high-quality, architecturally-designed buildings, which will be visually integrated within the environment and the design and appearance of the proposed development has been carefully considered with respect to the characteristics of the receiving environment. The second sentence of this condition does not guarantee that will occur. Accordingly, I consider the second sentence should be deleted as follows:

62. Building materials and colours shall be in accordance with the materials and colours approved in the Architectural Design Report under Condition 1 of this consent. ~~Any amendments shall be provided by the consent holder to the Monitoring Planner of the QLDC for certification prior to being used on the building.~~

Condition 67 - Phased Implementation

31. Proposed Condition 67 states:

67. This consent may be implemented in phases provided that:
- a) Phase 1: contains one of the two studios and associated workshop and workroom spaces, and includes the ephemeral stream riparian planting, the in-line sediment trap, and the public trail connections;
  - b) Phase 2: Once 100 accommodation units have been constructed, the next stage of development must include the second studio along with

its associated workshop and workroom spaces. For the avoidance of doubt, the second stage of the studio development may also be undertaken before 100 accommodation units have been constructed.

32. In my opinion, the wording of this condition is very important in achieving the economic benefits that the ASH project purports to have. Without a strong condition on phasing or staging development, there is a risk that the ASH project may just become another urban development in the rural area without the regional or national benefits that the FTAA framework requires.
33. My concern with condition 67, as drafted by the applicant, is the consent holder is only committing to the development on one studio building ahead of building the first 100 accommodation units. It is possible, under this condition, that the second studio may never be built, and the purported regional or national benefits of the ASH project may never be realised.
34. I also note Ms Hampson recommends that consideration should be given to a condition that prioritises buildings B1 and B2 to maximise the utility of the Screen Hub as soon as practicable. I agree with Ms Hampson.
35. Accordingly, I consider condition 67 should prioritise the construction of the studio infrastructure (and associated facilities, sediment trap, trails etc), prior to the construction of the accommodation units. In my opinion, this is not fatal to the application, and Buildings B1 and B2 includes accommodation and the Wakatipu Basin has an abundance of accommodation options available for film production staff/crew if booked far enough ahead. I have accordingly redrafted condition 67 as follows:

67. This consent shall be implemented in the following stages:

Stage 1 - The construction of the Studio and Shooting Facilities (A) inclusive of Workshop Space, Backlot and Multipurpose Office areas (B1 and B2);

Stage 2 – The construction of the Accommodation (C1 to C9);

Stage 3 – Construction of the Reception, Gym and Wellness facilities (E);

Stage 4 – Construction of the Ayrburn Depot (D).

All of Stage 1 construction must be completed prior to any construction of any buildings under Stages 2 to 4.

All of Stage 1 and 2 construction must be completed prior to any construction of any buildings under Stages 3 to 4.

All of Stage 1, 2 and 3 construction must be completed prior to any construction of any buildings under Stage 4.

#### Conditions 68 and 69 - Use of Accommodation Units

36. Two key conditions offered by the applicant are 68 and 69 as follows:

68. A proportion of the accommodation units must remain available for booking by person(s) associated with studio activities, in accordance with the Table below:

- **Column A** sets out future time periods, measured from (and including) the date (Booking Date) the booking is made to the date (Commencement Date) of the period during which the accommodation is required.

- **Column B** specifies the minimum percentage of accommodation units that must be available on the Booking Date for booking by person(s) associated with studio activities, for accommodation commencing on the Commencement Date.

Column A – Period of time	Column B – Percentage of Accommodation Units
395 days	90%
365 days	80%
270 days	60%
180 days	40%
90 days	30%
45 days	15%

**Note:** The Table operates on a sliding scale. For time periods falling between those listed, the required availability is adjusted proportionally. For example, if a booking is requested for a Commencement Date 380 days after the Booking Date, the minimum required availability would fall between 80% (for 365 days) and 90% (for 395 days) and would be calculated (rounded if necessary) at 85%.

**Advice Note:** This condition ensures that a portion of the accommodation remains available for people associated with studio activities when booking in advance. The further ahead the booking is made, the greater the proportion of units that must be available for studio-related use, up to 90% for bookings 395 days in advance.

69. To ensure compliance with Condition 68, the consent holder shall ensure maintenance of a record of all bookings in the form of a register containing details of when the film studio is in use and the number of rooms occupied by a film production at that time. The register shall also include any complaints with regards to availability of accommodation rooms for film production crews. Details of all bookings for at least the preceding 5 years shall be continually maintained. This register shall be made available for inspection by the Council at all times.

37. With respect to condition 68, I understand the purpose of the condition is to ensure a minimum amount of accommodation units are available to be booked by production companies also wanting to book the studios/film facilities. I understand from Ms

Hampson's evidence (paragraph 76) that a portion of the economic benefits stated for the ASH project, including benefits described in industry support letters, are contingent on the ability of production companies being able to access the accommodation they need.

38. I understand the effect of the applicants draft condition 68 is illustrated on Ms Hampson's Figure 1. As Ms Hampson points out in paragraph 80, this means the larger the scale of the production (wanting to use the facility), the earlier they will need (or be encouraged to) book in advance in order to secure accommodation in addition to the studio facilities AND the applicant will need to target short term visitor accommodation where they have the most capacity to work with. That is also my understanding of how condition 68 is proposed to work.
39. My concern with conditions 68 (and 69), as drafted, are their reliability and effectiveness in achieving the stated purpose. In my opinion, condition 68 is confusing and would be hard for the Council to effectively monitor the intent of the condition; even with the register being available for Council to inspect at any time. In my opinion, condition 68 is unlikely to be monitored by the Council in the medium to long-term given the amount of consent conditions the Council has to monitor throughout the district, and its limited resources to do so. The intent of conditions 68 and 69, in my opinion, will most likely become lost in time.
40. A method to ensure this does not happen is simply to require all of the accommodation to be reserved for studios/film facilities. The Silverlight Studio consent contained a similar condition 15 requiring the accommodation units within the buildings Venice, Paris or New York must only be made available persons using the site for film or television productions and ancillary support activities.
41. Ms Hampson recommends at number of changes to condition 68 and 69, which are summarised in paragraph 98 as follows:

98. Based on my assessment of the Application, the following are my recommendations for amendments to the proposed consent conditions (some of which have been alluded to above). In my view, these amendments more closely align the accommodation provision on the Site with the functional and operational needs of an integrated screen production studio and the stated intent of the Project. I do not consider that such amendments would materially affect commercial viability of the accommodation facilities.

- a. Condition 68 should (for clarity and ease of compliance monitoring) include the counts next to the percentages and include "or less" and "or more" for the lower and upper thresholds.
- b. The merits of changing Condition 68 to apply to bedrooms instead of units should be considered as rooms is likely to be a more accurate reflection of production company demand/needs.



- c. Consideration should be given, subject to industry expert advice, on whether the priority booking for production companies should apply first to self-catering units/rooms and then standard rooms to make up the balance of the threshold to ensure that the accommodation capacity is best aligned with the needs of production workers.
- d. If the purpose of the accommodation is “integral” to the studios as stated, then consideration should be given to the 365 and/or 395 day thresholds being increased to 100%. Else, justification should be provided as to why retaining the opportunity for a number of accommodation units for long term visitor bookings (a year or more in advance) aligns with the intent of only using the accommodation units for tourist when not needed.
- e. Consideration of how condition 68 will be effective (for the benefit of production activity) during the construction period when the full number of accommodation units has yet to be reached. This may require a condition for each period (construction period and fully operational period).
- f. Consideration should be given to a condition that prioritises buildings B1 and B2 to maximise the utility of the Screen Hub as soon as practicable.
- g. The wording of condition 68 should be amended to decouple the priority booking for production activities in the region to only those bookings that include the studio. This will protect accommodation capacity for other types of production activity that may require office and accommodation rooms, but not the studio per se.
- h. Condition 69 could be amended to monitor compliance of tourism bookings (ensuring they don't exceed the minimum thresholds required to be protected for production bookings).
- i. An alternative approach would be to make buildings B1 and B2 only available to screen production activity and adjusting condition 68 to relate only to 'C' buildings. This may mean that the percentages could change to account for the accommodation units (or rooms) already secured in B1 and B2. I consider that there could be greater economic benefits of this outcome whereby, the studio facility can be marketed as inclusive of those buildings (increasing the critical mass of the production area as portrayed by the precinct plan but not secured through any conditions), production companies benefit from the rooms closest to the studio being assured at all times, and local screen companies may see value in 'leasing' office space/rooms long-term to be actively part of the hub environment (and creating agglomeration benefits by given the local industry a central base).

42. I agree with Ms Hampson that the above changes closely align the accommodation provision on the Site with the functional and operational needs of an integrated screen production studio and the stated intent of the ASH project. With respect to (a) to (g) and (i) I therefore recommend conditions 68 be amended as follows:

68A. The accommodation units within Buildings B1 and B2 must only be made available to employees, contractors or associated personnel associated with

the studios/film facilities. For the avoidance of doubt, Buildings B1 and B2 are prohibited from entering into the visitor activity pool.<sup>1</sup>

- 68B. In addition to condition 68A, a proportion of the bedrooms<sup>2</sup> within the accommodation units (C1 to C9 inclusive) must remain available for booking by person(s) associated with ~~studio activities~~ the studios/film facilities, (A, B1 and B2), in accordance with the Table below:

- **Column A** sets out future time periods, measured from (and including) the date (Booking Date) the booking is made to the date (Commencement Date) of the period during which the accommodation bedrooms are is required.

- **Column B** specifies the minimum percentage of accommodation ~~units~~ bedrooms<sup>3</sup> that must be available on the Booking Date for booking by person(s) associated with ~~studio activities~~ the studios/film facilities for accommodation commencing on the Commencement Date.

Column A – Period of time	Column B – Percentage of Accommodation <u>Units bedrooms</u>
395 days <u>(or more)<sup>4</sup></u>	<u>90%-100%<sup>5</sup></u>
365 days	80%
270 days	60%
180 days	40%
90 days	30%
45 days <u>(or less)<sup>6</sup></u>	15%

**Note:** The Table operates on a sliding scale. For time periods falling between those listed, the required availability is adjusted proportionally. For example, if a booking is requested for a Commencement Date 380 days after the Booking Date, the minimum number of bedrooms<sup>7</sup> required ~~availability to be available~~ would fall between 80% (for 365 days) and 90%-100% (for 395 days) and would be calculated (rounded if necessary) at ~~85%~~ 90%.

**Advice Note:** This condition ensures that a portion of the accommodation bedrooms<sup>8</sup>, in addition to those in Buildings B1 and B2, remains available for people associated with ~~studio activities~~ the studios/film facilities, when booking in advance. The further ahead the booking is made, the greater the proportion of units bedrooms<sup>9</sup> that must be available for studio-related use ~~activities or~~

<sup>1</sup> Addresses (c), (e) [in combination with changes I recommend to condition 67 above], (f), (g) and (i).

<sup>2</sup> Addresses (b).

<sup>3</sup> Addresses (b).

<sup>4</sup> Addresses (a).

<sup>5</sup> Addresses (d).

<sup>6</sup> Addresses (a).

<sup>7</sup> Addresses (b).

<sup>8</sup> Addresses (b).

<sup>9</sup> Addresses (b).

production activities based at the screenhub, up to ~~90%-100%~~ for bookings 395 days in advance.

43. Ms Hampson addresses condition 69 in paragraph 91 of her evidence. She states that Condition 69, as she understand it, is to demonstrate to the Council that condition 68 is being complied with. She states, as currently drafted, the focus is demonstrating the amount and timing of the rooms booked/occupied by film productions and it is not necessary to prove how successful the accommodation facilities are at securing production bookings.
44. Ms Hampson considers it is only necessary to be able to demonstrate to Council that tourism bookings (out front) do not exceed the thresholds. Ms Hampson considers what is most relevant is being able to periodically show tourism unit bookings for the next 395 days (for example) do not exceed the condition 68 thresholds.
45. I agree with Ms Hampson that the key information should be the number of tourism unit bookings for the next 395 days. Accordingly, I have amended condition 69 below to do this, but have not gone as far as discounting information on the number of bedrooms booked associated with studios/film facilities, as that information may still be necessary in determining compliance with condition 68.

69. ~~To ensure compliance with Condition 68, The consent holder shall ensure maintenance of a record of all bookings in the form of a register containing details of: (i) the number of bedrooms booked (and dates booked) associated with studios/film facilities; and (ii) all other bedrooms booked (and dates) for any purpose: for the proceeding 395 days, presented in a way that demonstrates compliance with condition 68 on any given day.<sup>10</sup> when the film studio is in use and the number of rooms occupied by a film production at that time.~~ The register shall also include any complaints with regards to availability of accommodation rooms for film production crews. Details of all bookings for at least the preceding 5 years shall be continually maintained. This register shall be made available for inspection by the Council at all times.

46. While I consider the above amendments to conditions 68 and 69 are improvements, I still have significant concern about their reliability and effectiveness in achieving their stated purpose.
47. In addition to above, I also consider there is merit in prohibiting the further subdivision of the studio buildings from the accommodation units to ensure the ASH project, as a whole, does not separate the operation of the screen hub from the accommodation (thus undermining the intent of conditions 68 and 69). I recommend, if the Panel is minded to grant consent, that the following condition is imposed:

---

<sup>10</sup> I note a useful way of presenting this information may be actual bookings compared to permitted bookings as illustrated in Ms Hampson's Figure 1.

69A. The Studio buildings (A, B1 and B2) and accommodation units (C1 to C9 inclusive) shall be held in one ownership and shall not be subdivided into individual units or otherwise made available for individual ownership or occupancy (e.g. Individual leasehold).

Carey Vivian

17 December 2025

<b>characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained or enhanced</b>	Set back of buildings from river cliff/ONL edges. Integration of buildings with plantings. Maintaining a sense of openness in views from Domain Road to the Shotover River corridor and surrounding ONL mountain context.
<b>Capability to absorb additional development</b>	<b>Moderate-High</b>

## 8: Speargrass Flat

<b>Landscape Character Unit</b>	8: Speargrass Flat
<b>Landform patterns</b>	Relatively open pastoral flat framed by the south-facing slopes of the Wharehuanui Hills to the north, and the steep margins of the Slope Hill 'Foothills' to the south.
<b>Vegetation patterns</b>	Scattered exotic shelterbelts and patches of mixed scrubland in gullies. Isolated bush fragment to eastern end. Exotic pasture grasses dominate.
<b>Hydrology</b>	A series of watercourses and overland flow paths drain southwards across Speargrass Flat from the Wharehuanui Hills to Lake Hayes.
<b>Proximity to ONL/ONF</b>	Unit does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, has open longer-range views to surrounding ONL mountain context.
<b>Character Unit boundaries</b>	North: ridgeline crest, Millbrook Structure Plan area. East: crest of hill slopes, Lake Hayes Rural Residential landuse pattern/cadastral boundaries, Speargrass Flat Road. South: ridgeline crest, Hawthorn Triangle hedging. West: vegetation patterns/stream.
<b>Land use</b>	Predominantly pastoral land use with sparsely scattered rural residential lots.
<b>Settlement patterns</b>	Dwellings tend to be well separated and framed by plantings, or set into localised landform patterns. Generally dwellings are located on the flat land adjacent the road although a very limited number of consented but unbuilt platforms located on elevated hill slopes to the south (that enjoy northern aspect). Overall very few consented but unbuilt platforms (3). Typical lot sizes: the majority of lots are over 50ha.
<b>Proximity to key route</b>	Located away from a key vehicular route. Part of the area is adjacent to Speargrass Flat Road, Hogans Gully Road and Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road.
<b>Heritage features</b>	Two heritage buildings/features identified in PDP.
<b>Recreation features</b>	Speargrass Flat Road is identified as a Council walkway/cycleway. Forms part of Queenstown Trail 'Countryside Ride'.
<b>Infrastructure features</b>	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Reticulated water in places.
<b>Visibility/prominence</b>	The relatively open character of the unit makes it highly visible from the public road network and the elevated hills to the north and south, although the escarpment confining the character unit to the north blocks some views from the north.



<b>Views</b>	Key views relate to the open and spacious pastoral outlook from Speargrass Flat Road (including the walkway/cycleway route) across to the escarpment faces and hillslopes flanking the valley, backdropped by mountains.
<b>Enclosure/openness</b>	The landform features to the north and south providing a strong sense of containment to the relatively open valley landscape.
<b>Complexity</b>	The hillslopes and escarpment faces to the north and south display a reasonably high degree of complexity as a consequence of the landform and vegetation patterns. The valley floor itself displays a relatively low level of complexity as a consequence of its open and flat nature.
<b>Coherence</b>	The relatively simple and legible bold valley landform pattern, in combination with the predominantly open pastoral character, contributes an impression of coherence. Gully vegetation patterning serves to reinforce the landscape legibility in places.
<b>Naturalness</b>	The area displays a reasonable degree of naturalness as a consequence of the relatively limited level of built development evident.
<b>Sense of Place</b>	Generally, the area displays a predominantly working rural landscape character with scattered and for the most part, relatively subservient rural residential development evident in places. Whilst Hawthorn Triangle and Lake Hayes Rural Residential LCUs form part of the valley landscape, their quite different character as a consequence of relatively intensive rural residential development sets them apart from the Speargrass Flat LCU, with the latter effectively reading as 'breathing space' between the two. To the eastern end of the unit, there is the perception of the Lakes Hayes Rural Residential area sprawling west into Speargrass Flat.
<b>Potential landscape issues and constraints associated with additional development</b>	Absence of a robust edge to the Lake Hayes Rural Residential LCU makes Speargrass Flat vulnerable to 'development creep'. Open character, in combination with walkway / cycleway, makes it sensitive to landscape change.
<b>Potential landscape opportunities and benefits associated with additional development</b>	Riparian restoration potential. Easy topography.
<b>Environmental characteristics and visual amenity values to be maintained or enhanced</b>	<b>Central and western portion of LCU 8</b>  Sense of openness and spaciousness as a 'foil' for the more intensively developed rural residential areas nearby. Maintenance of unobstructed rural views from Speargrass Flat Road to the largely undeveloped hillslopes and escarpment faces to the north and south.  <b>Eastern portion of LCU 8</b>  Integration of buildings with landform and/or planting. Maintenance of a spacious and open outlook in views from the Queenstown Trail and Arrowtown Lakes Hayes Road, including the southbound view as one descends Christine's Hill. Maintenance of openness in views from Hogans Gully Road to the backdropping hill /escarpment landforms and broader ONL mountain context.



Capability to absorb additional development

Low.

Moderate - within the Residential Activity Areas shown on the Ayrburn Structure Plan in Section 27.13.

## 9: Hawthorn Triangle

<b>Landscape Character Unit</b>	9: Hawthorn Triangle
<b>Landform patterns</b>	Flat alluvial river terrace landform. Localised (man-made) mounding within the triangle to assist the integration of dwellings and provide privacy.
<b>Vegetation patterns</b>	Tall hawthorn hedging around almost all three sides of the triangle. Elsewhere exotic shelterbelt plantings. Extensive parkland and amenity plantings within the triangle. Mown grass.
<b>Hydrology</b>	Sporadic amenity ponds and truncated streams.
<b>Proximity to ONL/ONF</b>	Unit does not adjoin ONL or ONF; however, has mid and longer-range views above the hedging and tree plantings to the ONL mountain context.
<b>Character Unit boundaries</b>	North: Speargrass Flat Road and shelterbelt/hawthorn hedging. East/South: Domain Road and hawthorn hedging. West/South: Lower Shotover Road and hawthorn hedging.
<b>Land use</b>	Rural residential.
<b>Settlement patterns</b>	Densely configured arrangement of consistently high value rural residential dwellings. Dwellings set into mounding and a planted parkland character. A high number of consented but unbuilt platforms (43). Evidence of a high degree of consistency in terms of building development controls (height, colours, fencing, etc.) Overall a distinctly large-lot suburban character. Typical lot sizes: predominantly under 4ha. Largest lots in the 4-10ha range. The Lifestyle Precinct Zoning anticipates change to the existing settlement patterns including an overall density of residential activity at 1 hectare average and settlement patterns that are sympathetic to the wider amenity landscape context and surrounding ONFs and ONLs.
<b>Proximity to key route</b>	Located away from a key vehicular route.
<b>Heritage features</b>	One heritage building / feature identified in PDP.
<b>Recreation features</b>	A council walkway / cycleway runs along the south portion of Domain Road edging the triangle, then dog-legs through the unit, emerging to run along the north end of the Lower Shotover Road bordering the triangle. Forms part of Queenstown Trail 'Countryside Ride'.
<b>Infrastructure features</b>	No reticulated sewer or stormwater. Reticulated water in several locations.
<b>Visibility/prominence</b>	The dense evergreen hedging around the unit's edges serve to screen views into the area from the surrounding road network and properties. The quite distinctive patterning of the triangle as a consequence of its shape, reinforced by the vegetation patterns and contrasting density of development in comparison to the surrounds, makes it a distinctive element in views from the elevated surrounds.