BEFORE AN EXPERT PANEL
SOUTHLAND WIND FARM PROJECT

Under the	**FAST-TRACK APPROVALS ACT 2024**
In the matter of	an application for resource consents, a concession, wildlife approvals, an archaeological authority and approvals relating to complex freshwater fisheries activities in relation to the Southland Wind Farm project
By	**CONTACT ENERGY LIMITED**
	Applicant

JOINT STATEMENT OF EXPERTS: LANDSCAPE, VISUAL, AND NATURAL CHARACTER EFFECTS

29 January 2026

INTRODUCTION

1. Minute 5 of the Expert Panel dated 21 January 2026 recorded:

> *"Having reviewed the applicant's response to the landscape-related comments, the Panel has identified several outstanding matters that they would like the applicant's and Southland District Council's landscape experts to address in a focused online expert conferencing session (…)"*

2. The matters to be addressed at the expert conferencing session are set out at paragraphs 4 to 8 of Minute 5 (with paragraphs 9 to 12 relating to preparation for the conferencing session, including the provision of further graphic information).

3. The conferencing session took place online on 29 January 2026 and was attended by the following experts:

   (a) Brad Coombs (BC);

   (b) Shannon Bray (SB); and

   (c) Rhys Girvan (RG).

4. For the sake of clarity, where there are differences in opinions, the initials of each expert are recorded next to each relevant comment and discussed in further detail following this section.

5. The conferencing session was facilitated by Panel members Rob van Voorthuysen and Bridget Gilbert, and attended by Keely Paler from the EPA in a scribe context.

CODE OF CONDUCT

6. The experts confirm that we have read the Environment Court Code of Conduct 2023 and agree to comply with it. The experts confirm that the issues addressed in this Joint Statement are within our area of expertise, unless stated otherwise.

PARA 4 OF MINUTE 5: NATURAL CHARACTER VALUES AND EFFECTS

7. In identifying natural character aspects, there are some differences in response to what contributes to the experiential natural character attributes of the Jedburgh Plateau as summarised below:

Assessment of Existing Experiential Natural Character Values of Jedburgh Plateau identified by Mr Coombs and Mr Bray:

8. We consider that the key experiential natural character values are:

   (a) Legibility of natural landform, classic cuesta landform with the Jedburgh plateau forming part of the gentle dipslope in contrast to the scarp

   (b) Legibility of the plateau as a part of a bold, large scale cuesta landform

   (c) Legibility of hydrological processes and formation, network of bog and fen wetlands that follow subtle topographical patterns within a wider pattern of watercourses across the dipslope

   (d) High biophysical values within the wetland systems (assessed as 'Very High' value in ecological terms, with lesser ('Moderate') ecological values found in induced bog wetlands)

   (e) Broader context of weather-exposed and grazed emergent scrub vegetation

9. The natural character values are materially compromised by:

   (a) Historical burning/deforestation and long-term grazing

   (b) Extensive pest-animal browsing, with visible animal tracks, animal remains, and strongly defined browsing lines.

   (c) Exotic weed species such as gorse and grasses

   (d) Fragmentation of wetland systems rather than a continuous wetland complex

   (e) An overall ecologically suppressed system that is not flourishing

   (f) Presence of farm tracks, fences and a communication shed with solar panels located at the high point of the plateau.

10. Combined, there is a mixed experiential impression of natural character – at a broader scale the landform is bold and legible, and the vegetation

appears to be in a state of natural succession. However, on the ground there is clear evidence of persistent human and animal disturbance and extensive weed-species infiltration. Although there is high natural character in individual wetlands, the plateau does not express uninterrupted natural character, with low stature vegetation, in contrast to the adjacent scarp, which is covered with large/mature dense native vegetation.

11. Experiential values on the plateau are generally limited to very few people who have access – in reality this being the landowner and farm workers.

Comparative Assessment of Mr Girvan

12. The existing experiential aspects of natural character within the Jedburgh Plateau are considered to be moderate-high primarily expressed through:

    (a) A prevailing sense of natural landform expressing a mosaic of wetland systems containing high and very high ecological value.

    (b) Strong prevalence of native vegetation contiguous with adjoining native forest and appears capable of recovery. While signs of grazing and pockets of exotic vegetation are apparent this occurs in the context of very limited demarcation of land management.

    (c) Negligible apparent built modification including no obvious linear elements such as fencing and overt demarcation in land management practices.

    (d) Some tracks are apparent within the northern edge of the defined plateau although these typically become more apparent to the north of what is defined as the Jedburgh Plateau

    (e) Strong sense of wildness and remoteness which is readily differentiated from more intensive and accessible pastoral land use more typically encountered throughout much of Southland.

13. In summary, the values can be evaluated as follows:

Aspect	Experiential Evaluation
Perceived Naturalness	Moderate – clearly degraded, natural elements present but suppressed (BC, SB) Moderate-high - A prevailing sense of natural landform elements expressing evident wet-ground systems amongst a mosaic of predominantly native and some exotic vegetation with signs of modification capable of recovery (RG).

Landform experience	A prevailing sense of unmodified landforms supporting natural wetland patterns. Some limited tracking along the northern edge (RG)
Vegetation Experience	Patchy, mixed native/exotic mosaic, clear signs of grazing, clipping disturbance (BC, SB) Vegetation beyond the margins of wetlands appears predominantly native (mānuka and inaka dominated[1]) interspersed with areas of pasture and weeds. Signs of grazing are apparent (RG)
Wetland Experience	Locally high, strongest contributor to natural character, but fragmented and in many places, modified (BC, SB) More limited fragmentation resulting from limited tracking and cohesive vegetation mosaic within the and beyond the margins of evident wetland areas (RG)
Sense of Wildness	Low, strong cues of human and animal modification and activity (BC, SB) Moderate-High – Limited cues of human activity with an overriding sense of wildness and remoteness which is readily differentiated from more intensive pastoral land use (RG)
Natural Trajectory	Clear signs natural landscape is being suppressed from developing into more natural, successional forest. Limited ability to recover without intervention (BC, SB, RG)
Overall Experiential	Moderate to low, with pockets of high in some wetland areas but not cohesive (BC,SB) Moderate-High – when considered together the above factors collectively contribute to perceptions of naturalness and limited modification consistent with moderate to high levels of natural character (RG).

Effects on Experiential Natural Character Values

14. We agree the key effects of the Project on this baseline are as follows:

(a) Turbines will add engineered vertical elements, with some footprint disturbance to existing wetlands (2% of wetland habitat disturbed) and limited vegetation clearance, in relation to the overall scale of the site and the landform.

(b) The placement of turbines avoids the more intact areas that have higher experiential values (such as the scarp the Pahautea forest and the Southern Rātā-Kāmahi gully). Turbine platforms are spatially discrete and not large enough to diminish the experience of the wider mosaic of natural wetlands or the scale of the landform.

[1] Nick Goldwater and Dr Kelvin Lloyd, Southland Wind Farm Technical Assessment #5: Terrestrial And Wetland Ecology para 88.

(c) New access roads will introduce engineered forms, including cut/fill edgelines, increasing cues of human intervention and resulting in a clearer sense of accessibility and human presence. However, these roads have been designed to avoid wetland areas as much as practicable.

(d) The proposal has limited, if any, effects on the legibility of the broader landform due to the sheer scale of it.

(e) The ecological offsetting and enhancement measures will benefit natural processes and succession growth, not only on the plateau, but over a wider area.

15. In summary, the effects on values can be evaluated as follows:

Aspect	Effects Evaluation
Perceived Naturalness	Low-Moderate: new linear features and tall engineered structures, but contained and still allowing a very broad coverage of existing natural elements. (SB,BC)
Landform Experience	Moderate: more evident earthworks, and the construction and ongoing use of accessways, hardstands and turbine platforms seen beyond wetland margins (RG),
Vegetation Experience	Low: Limited loss due to construction and earthworks, potential longer-term change through enhancement programmes.
Wetland Experience	Low: Little change to most wetland features, slight loss in areas intersecting with roads and turbine platforms. 2% of wetland habitats affected.
Sense of Wildness	Low: Turbines and more visibly present roads reinforce existing human activity (SB,BC) Moderate-High: increased presence of access and operational, turbines will reduce perceptions of naturalness and isolation (RG)
Natural Trajectory	Likely positive through ecological offsetting and enhancement
Overall Experiential	Moderate localised effects at some wetland edges, but low effects more broadly across the plateau. Positive experiential effects outside of the plateau. (SB,BC) Moderate overall effects: more overt sense of human modification experienced in the context of existing natural and more vegetated wetland context that appears capable of recovery (RG)

Conclusions of overall effects on Experiential Natural Character Attributes by Mr Bray and Mr Coombs

16. The localised areas of higher experiential naturalness — the fen and (natural) bog wetlands — will experience the most relevant effects. Where roading and turbine platforms intersect with wetland margins, these interventions will introduce earthworks and landform change into places that are presently experienced as more natural.

17. These effects are limited (to 2% of the wetland habitat) and the broader experiential outcome is substantially influenced by the proposed ecological enhancement package, including pest animal and plant control across an area of 1400ha – including the entire plateau and the Southern Rātā-Kāmahi gully, as well as targeted ground-based pest control within the Plateau Fauna Enhancement Area. Enrichment planting will also be undertaken within the 245ha Jedburgh Station Ecological Enhancement Area as well as discrete areas on the Plateau, totalling approximately 1.6ha. These measures are expected to improve wetland function and vegetation condition within the site over time, increasing the perceptible naturalness of the wetland mosaic and strengthening natural processes that are currently suppressed by grazing and browsing.

18. While the turbines will be visible as large scale engineered structures, the long-term experiential natural character of the Jedburgh Plateau is likely to be maintained or enhanced overall, with localised adverse effects offset by broader ecological and experiential gains.

Conclusions of overall effects on Experiential Natural Character Attributes by Mr Girvan:

19. Within the Jedburgh Plateau, the proposal will require evident earthworks, and the construction and ongoing use of accessways, hardstands and turbine platforms, with associated vehicle activity and operational presence. Experientially, these works introduce potential for more apparent and engineered landform modification including new linear and platform elements adjoining wetlands, and a more overt sense of human intervention including tracking and built elements in contextual areas currently read as comparatively unbuilt and isolated.

20. During construction, there will be temporary but potentially pronounced effects on remoteness and isolation (disturbance, activity). Once

operational, turbines will add an experience of prominent vertical and dynamic built elements and reduce perceptions of naturalness and isolation, particularly where infrastructure is experienced in close proximity (e.g., along access routes and at platforms). It is agreed that degradation occurring to the wetlands as physical impacts and as a result of pest-animal grazing will become more limited.

21. In particular, Mr Girvan remains unsure the extent to which ongoing degradation which may result from continued or replaced pest-animal grazing with stock which may impact opportunities for natural regeneration.

PARA 5 OF MINUTE 5: ASSOCIATIVE LANDSCAPE VALUES

22. All experts confirm that they have considered the comments provided by landowners and the West Catlins Preservation Society.

Existing Values:

23. The following associative values are agreed between the landscape experts:

    (a) Landscape identity strongly anchored as a legible part of the broader Southland Syncline and its associated steep scarp landform.

    (b) The pastoral valley floor and foothills which contrast with the visible scarp are a long-established rural landscape with clear patterns of farming, shelterbelts, tracks, and forestry edges.

    (c) The contrast between the steeper vegetated scarp and the open productive working valley provides spatial definition and orientation for local residents.

    (d) The scarp is experienced as the distinctive ‘slopedown’ landform in longer distance views from the west and as a broad scale scarp to the edge of the cuesta landform from the south and the east.

    (e) Distinctive but not uniquely memorable skyline, defined more by the sharpness of contrast between landform and landcover which culminate along the skyline.

    (f) Community sense of place is tied primarily to the scarp profile and skyline, the forest cover along its face, the pastoral matrix at its base

and its longstanding relationship with adjoining landuse identity (farming, forestry, rural industry in a pattern of broad natural landcover).

Potential Effects on Associative Values:

24. The potential effects of the project on identified associative values are:

Matters Agreed between the landscape experts:

(a) No turbines, roading or infrastructure are proposed on the scarp, so its defining associative values remain unchanged. Identity elements relating to the scarp, forest edge on the scarp, and valley floor are not affected, as the project avoids these areas entirely.

(b) Turbines are located on the dip-slope and plateau, an area not central to local place attachment.

(c) Turbines reflect the natural meteorological process of strong winds at the site which is also reflected in the wind-shorn vegetation in the wider area.

(d) Crispness of the land/sky boundary remains unchanged, albeit interrupted by the turbines. But turbines are notably set back so they have reduced impact on the legibility and prominence of the scarp and skyline features, particularly in relation to the highpoints of Mokoreta, Puke Mimihau and The Cairn, as well as the ‘slopedown’ feature when viewed form the west.

(e) Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku have confirmed their view that the cultural and te taiao effects relevant to them have been appropriately avoided, remedied, mitigated, offset and compensated by the Project and therefore have not been discussed further as part of associative values during expert conferencing.

Matters Disagreed or reservations with reasons

(a) The addition of infrastructure fits within the existing productive landscape values (SB,BC)

(b) While turbines become new associative cues, they sit within and on top of an already “managed and productive rural landscape setting”, rather than displacing it (SB, BC).

(c) The scarp provides the landform plinth to the turbines rather than being part of the windfarm (SB,BC).

(d) While Mr Girvan agrees that turbines will become new associative cues, he considers they would erode some of the perceived naturalness that contributes to local memorability inherent along the visible skyline and vegetated cuesta feature (RG).

Summary:

25. The SWF will introduce visible, dynamic modern infrastructure. However the activity is strongly associated with widespread production, energy, forestry, farming and rural industry activities that are prevalent across the broad landscape. The associative values connected with the legibility, form, landcover and definition of the scarp are maintained, except for the interruption of the skyline in places. The skyline is distinctive but not uniquely memorable and is not valued for any specific imagery or forms.

26. In this context, effects on associative values are assessed as low (SB, BD) and moderate (RG) respectively. Sense of place and identity have the ability to be retained albeit with the additional presence of a wind farm.

PARA 6 OF MINUTE 5: PRIVATE RESIDENCES

27. Mr Coombs did not visit any private residences. While he had access to the private visual simulations prepared by Mr Botha and he found them helpful to confirm some of the conclusions on visual effects that he had reached, he did not rely unduly on those simulations for the broad assessment of visual effects on properties in the Housing Inventory, which as explained in Mr Coombs' evidence is deliberately conservative. Mr Coombs visited all of the viewpoints and public roads as set out in his evidence and the visual simulations document.

28. Mr Bray did not visit any private properties. He visited very nearly all roads within 5km of the proposal where there are potential views of the proposal (having reviewed a ZTV analysis undertaken by my team), and reviewed the extensive appendix to Mr Coombs evidence through use of aerial imagery, street views and my own locality visit. Like Mr Coombs, he had access to the visuals prepared by Mr Botha and found them a useful additional tool, but did not rely unduly on these to form any conclusions.

29. Mr Girvan did not visit any private property nor rely on the visual modelling prepared by Mr Botha to undertake his peer review.

30. Mr Botha's methodology is described in a memo **appended** to this statement.

PARA 7 OF MINUTE 5: PROPOSED LNCMP CONDITION

31. The following table addresses paragraph 7 of Minute 5, following Mr Coombs' and Mr Bray's review of Management Plan conditions in relation to suggested additional conditions from Rhys Girvan:

SDC LNCMP Suggested Condition	Where addressed in existing proposed conditions
Require a Landscape and Natural Character Management Plan (LNCMP) for the parts of the Slopedown / Mokoreta – Pukemimihau (candidate ONF) occupied by the SWF, prepared by a suitably qualified landscape architect in consultation with the ecology team.	Integrated management plan framework required by conditions MP1-MP3, require preparation of management plans, which largely address the requirements of a separate LNCMP. In particular: • Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (CM1) (which includes an Earthworks Management Plan (EMP) (CM3)) • Terrestrial and Wetland Ecological Management Plan (TEMP) (EC1) (which includes a Vegetation Management Plan (VMP) (EC3) and Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Management Plan (HREP) (EC47-49)) • Riparian Offsetting Management Plan (EC43A) All of these management plans include outcomes that achieve the purpose of a LNCMP. The suggested condition by SDC relates specifically to the ONF candidate site, whereas the current Management Plan conditions relate to the entire project site as well as areas of land outside of the site, including areas of conservation land.
Delineate landscape and natural character management areas, using the same base mapping and management units as the Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Management Plan (J07) where practicable	• EC4A(a) – Verified vegetation mapping to confirm areas of significant indigenous vegetation within, and adjacent to, the final Project Footprint • EC4A(b)(iii) - Identify areas of vegetation that are to be subjected to specified management actions

	• EC4B(a) – Confirm whether any modifications can be made to the Project Footprint to avoid or minimise adverse effects on the identified indigenous vegetation habitat types • HREP establishes mapped management units (EC53), including the Jedburgh Station Ecological Enhancement Area (JSEEA) (EC51), Plateau Fauna Enhancement Area (EC54), Invertebrate enhancement planting areas which are located on the Plateau (EC51), the Jedburgh Station Pest Control Area (EC54), as well as the Copper Tussock Enhancement and Skink Protection Area (CTESPA) (EC51) and Davidson Road Wetland Restoration Site (EC51).
Set objectives aimed at: • maintaining an enduring transition between the working rural landscape and the coherent natural feature of the scarp / southern rātā–kāmahi forest / high natural character areas • retaining or enhancing apparent naturalness of landform, vegetation patterns and hydrological features on the dip slope • avoiding obvious fragmentation or	Consider this is primarily addressed through the objectives of the TEMP and the associated management plans, particularly the VMP and HREP; and the CEMP, particularly the EMP • EMP outcomes 1-6 (CM3) include minimising the earthworks area and volume to the extent practicable, avoid and minimise impacts on wetlands and areas of high/very high ecological value, ensure fill disposal sites are contoured to be consistent with the adjacent topography • EC2(a) – TEMP objective is to outline the procedures to address the effects of the Project on identified terrestrial and wetland ecological values, including the measures to avoid where practicable, or minimise adverse effects on ecological and biodiversity values and the expected ecological outcomes • EC1(a) – TEMP purpose includes to detail the ecological management programme that will be implemented to avoid, remedy, and mitigate the impacts on terrestrial and wetland ecological values during and after the construction phase of the Southland Wind Farm • EC7–EC8 – create hard limits on vegetation removal to prevent fragmentation

truncation of the candidate ONF	• EC5(c) – Include in the VMP methods for delineating and managing areas of vegetation and habitat types, including any 'Threatened' or 'At Risk' species and high value trees, including those habitats identified in Table 3 of Condition EC7 that need to be avoided or minimised • EC7 – Developing mechanisms to ensure that effects on the identified vegetation and habitat types are avoided/minimised and offsetting or compensating for any residual loss through the Habitat Restoration and Enhancement Plan • EC9 – Rehabilitation planting for all sites where vegetation clearance has occurred to enable construction, including surplus fill disposal sites (refer to section 3.3.3 of the draft VMP) • HREP (EC48) – requires net indigenous biodiversity gain or net positive outcomes, including protection of natural features, restoration and enhancement planting (EC52), pest control (EC52 and EC54) which will contribute to enhancing naturalness and vegetation patterns • CM12 – requires water balance neutrality on the Plateau (retains natural hydrological expression) All of these measures will contribute to achieving the outcomes sought in the proposed LNCMP.
Require a Landform Design Statement for all permanent earthworks associated with turbine platforms, access roads and drainage.	The EMP (CM3) essentially functions as a landform design statement for earthworks – requiring naturalistic contouring (CM3(1-6)), minimising earthworks and impacts on wetlands, high/very high value vegetation, streams, fill disposal criteria (noting the sites on the Jedburgh Plateau have been confirmed (CM3(d)(v)), erosion and sediment control measures (CM3(a)), and rehabilitation and revegetation following completion of earthworks (CM3(h))
Earthworks principles: • minimise extent of landform disturbance • follow and reinforce existing landform	These principles are addressed in the conditions as follows: • CM3(1) – minimise extent of earthworks (described in detail in Section 1 of Part B of the draft EMP)

grain, avoiding long straight benches • use rounded/rolled batters and fills tied into natural slopes • configure surplus fill as landform restoration features that support natural drainage	• CM3(5) - ensure that fill disposal sites are contoured to be consistent with the adjacent topography • CM3(d)(iv) - disposal sites shall be contoured to avoid water impoundment or ponding on and around the fill site • CM3(d)(viii) – disposal sites shall be rehabilitated with like for like vegetation, and to minimise the potential for sediment loss and maintain appropriate soil biota • CM3(f) – details of ground stabilisation measures, in accordance with CM5(d) and (e) • CM3(h) – rehabilitation and revegetation of disturbed worked areas • CM12 – water management system to maintain natural drainage on the Jedburgh Plateau • Fill disposal site types and how they will be contoured to the pre-existing ground profile/slopes, described in detail in Section 2.2 of Part B of the Draft EMP **Suggested edit to wording of CM3(5) (above):** • *"Ensure that fill disposal sites are contoured to avoid overt linear terracing and appear consistent with the adjacent topography, and that no fill disposal occurs within wetlands, streams or areas of high or very high ecological value"*.
Require permanent stock exclusion from mapped wetland complexes, seepage areas and areas of indigenous vegetation in southern rātā–kāmahi forest gully.	• HREP (EC51) establishes permanent stock and ungulate exclusion fencing around: o 245ha Jedburgh Station Ecological Enhancement Area o Approximate 15ha Davidson Road Wetland restoration site o 8ha Copper Tussock Enhancement and Skink Protection Area

	• Riparian Offsetting Management Plan (EC43) includes fencing and stock exclusion around all offsetting riparian sites Refer to Mr Coombs' and Mr Bray's response to comments regarding permanent stock exclusion.
Where grazing continues adjacent, specify grazing intensity and seasonal constraints.	Not relevant to effects of the wind farm (SB, BC)
Require periodic monitoring (every 3–5 years) of wetland condition, indigenous vegetation condition, and landscape mitigation performance.	• EC11B – requires wetland monitoring pre and post construction (refer to Section 4 of the draft VMP) • EC11 – annual post-vegetation clearance monitoring, maintenance and rehabilitation report for five years following completion of construction (refer to Section 4 of the draft VMP) • EC58 – biodiversity outcome monitoring programme, every three years for 12 years and subsequently and years 15, 20 and 25 (described in Section 10 of the draft HREP) • CM27 – annual reporting covering requirements of the CEMP, TEMP, HREP and rehabilitation progress • WF26(e) – reporting on visual mitigation measures
Include an adaptive management clause allowing Council to require adjustments if monitoring shows degradation.	• EC58/58A – adaptive management in the event the outcomes of the HREP are not being achieved (Section 10.5 of the draft HREP) • G11 – s128 review of conditions / management plans in the event of unanticipated adverse effects • MP10-MP11 – minor and material amendments to management plans if required

Matters agreed or reservations with reasons

32. All experts agree that a condition requiring a new LNCMP is not required due to the clarifying the existing management plan conditions.

33. Mr Girvan maintains a residual concern remains regarding the extent to which the conditions may enable ongoing grazing on the Jedburgh Plateau, and potentially into the adjoining rātā–kāmahi gully via wind farm access, and therefore implications this may have for the anticipated restoration trajectory of natural character given limited understanding about what is permitted.

PARA 8 OF MINUTE 5: BASIS OF ASSESSMENT

34. Mr Girvan has confirmed he applied a standard RMA effects assessment methodology, albeit in the context of a peer review (not a full parallel assessment). In this context he reviewed the findings of the Isthmus and Wayfinder Assessments and where he concurred as credible, stated this to be the case. As a focussed appraisal, where he differed in professional opinion, he provided the rational and set our independent conclusions as necessary.

35. For completeness, Mr Coombs and Mr Bray confirm that they have undertaken their effects assessment in the same manner as they would for a standard RMA assessment.

PARA 10 OF MINUTE 5: CANDIDATE ONF MAPPING

36. Please refer to maps attached that have been prepared by Garren Soutar of Contact Energy with information provided by Brad Coombs and Rhys Girvan. The maps have been reviewed by the landscape experts.

37. Regardless of whether the area is a candidate ONF or not, all experts agree that the proposal adequately manages landscape and natural character values within the site and its context.

Contextual Matters to note

38. Vegetation mapping has only been undertaken for the wind farm site. As such, the maps do not identify ecological values present beyond the wind farm site (such as on the scarp and within the associated conservation land, which is outside the wind farm site).

39. Note too that, to improve legibility of the figures, only the 'very high' and 'high' ecological value areas are shown in the maps, and not the 'moderate' or lower-value areas identified by Wildlands (apart from the moderate value wetlands, which are shown). If the Panel would like images showing that additional information, they can be provided.

SIGNATURES OF EXPERTS

Brad Coombs	Shannon Bray	Rhys Girvan