

## Appendix 1 – Marcus Langman Planning

Title	Response to Minute 6 – Ayrburn Screen Hub
Recipient	Expert Panel appointed to consider the Ayrburn Screen Hub
Author	Marcus Langman Planning Consultant For Queenstown Lakes District Council
Date	16 January 2025

### Introduction

1. My full name is Marcus Hayden Langman. I have set out my experience in the comments provided to the Expert Panel in a memorandum dated 12 December 2025. As noted in my initial memorandum, my comments are prepared in accordance with the Environment Court’s Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses as specified in the Environment Court’s Practice Note 2023.
  
2. The purpose of this memorandum is to provide responses to questions of the Expert Panel set out in Minute 6, specifically with regard to my comments provided on the application for Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**).
  
3. In preparing this response, I have reviewed the following documents in addition to those specified in my peer review comments:
  - a. Comments by Jan Andersson;
  - b. Comments by Jane and Halford Shaw;
  - c. Comments by David Kidd;
  - d. Legal submissions by Jayne McDonald on behalf of David Kidd;
  - e. Comments by Geoff Van Deursen;
  - f. Comments by Robyn and Nick Hart;
  - g. Comments by James Hadley
  - h. Comments by Paul Dougherty;

- i. Comments by Rebecca Hadley;
- j. Comments by Neil Green and Suzie Bognar;
- k. Comments by Greg and Lianne Collings;
- l. Comments by Graham Smith and Catherine Taylor;
- m. Comments by Peter and Stephanie Goulston;
- n. Minutes 4 and 6 of the Expert Panel.

### **Relevance of Silverlight Studios' consents**

4. The Expert Panel noted in Minute 6 that it had requested the relevance of the Silverlight Studios application in Minute 4 if the consents are still live for that proposal.<sup>1</sup> It noted:

*He has answered our first question, confirming that those consents will not lapse until 2029, but not the second – given that those consents are still live, what relevance if any do those consents have to our consideration of the applications before us? We request that he do so.*

5. I briefly noted the assessment of the Silverlight Studios as urban development in comments on the proposal.<sup>2</sup> In my opinion, while there are notable differences between the two proposals, it is my view that decision-makers should apply the consideration of whether the proposals are urban development in an equitable manner, taking into account both the similarities and differences between the two proposals. In my opinion, the proposal needs to be considered on its individual circumstances.
6. While a finding on whether the site is urban or not may not impact the outcome of the decision, I consider it is important in terms of precedent for future applications under the district plan that similar activities are properly defined as urban (or not) for the application of relevant objectives and policies in the plan. It also assists with understanding the nature of adverse effects from the proposal and the way they will be experienced or perceived in the receiving environment. I acknowledge that the gateway pathway under s104D is not a relevant matter for the Expert Panel under the FTAA.

---

<sup>1</sup> Minute 4 at para [13] and Minute 6 at para [7]

<sup>2</sup> Comments from Marcus Langman for QLDC - Planning review of substantive application under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2004 at para 35

7. I have turned my mind further following the request from the Panel whether there are any further implications. As a consented development, the Silverlight Studios forms part of the existing environment. If implemented, it is my understanding that this will add to studio space in the wider Queenstown area (along with studio facilities at Remarkables Park). This may have implications in terms of supply of available studios, but I am not an expert in the film industry or economics, so the effect of more studio space is unknown. I observe that it may increase competitiveness between studio locations, and it may provide alternative locations during peak times. However, these factors arise only if both studio consents are implemented.
8. I also note that the form of development at the Silverlight Studios location is a different proposition to the Ayrburn Screen Hub, and includes a number of “villages” for film set production. The evidence of Ms Hampson also describes the difference in business models between Silverlight and the Ayrburn Screen Hub.<sup>3</sup>
9. In my opinion, the relevance of the Silverlight proposal has little material impact on the Ayrburn proposal, other than it could provide for competing screen production facilities if implemented, and that this may impact on whether the Ayrburn Screen Hub ends up primarily operating and providing for film production activities, or its alternative use as visitor accommodation. It could result in the economic benefits not being realised in full. I defer to the economic and film experts on the economic impacts of supply should the Silverlight Studios development eventuate.

#### Consideration of noise issues

10. The Expert Panel has noted concerns raised by adjacent residents regarding the robustness of the assessment in the applicant’s noise report of the existing noise environment and potential adverse effects if the project proceeds. I have reviewed the comments from those parties.
11. In Minute 6, the Panel has noted and asked the following questions:

*In his report, Mr Langman has addressed acoustic issues relatively briefly, effectively relying on the applicant’s acoustic assessment. The Panel queries whether the material provided by the adjacent residents causes either Mr Langman or the Council generally to reconsider the view he expresses at paragraph 51 of his report.*

---

<sup>3</sup>

Evidence of Nathalie Hampson for Jan Andersson and David Kidd at para 68-75

12. I note that I am not a noise expert, and QLDC has not undertaken a peer review of noise matters, noting that the applicant has indicated compliance with the permitted noise standards in the plan.<sup>4</sup> I have reviewed the comments made by the following submitters regarding noise issues:
- a. Comments by Jan Andersson (para 20-25)
  - b. Comments by Jane and Halford Shaw (para 19-35, para 43-47) (L(max))
  - c. Comments by David Kidd (para 41, para 44-49, para 51, para 54)
  - d. Legal submissions by Jayne McDonald on behalf of David Kidd (para 6.12-6.18, para 7.2(c))
  - e. Comments by Geoff Van Deursen (pages 5-10)
  - f. Comments by Robyn and Nick Hart (pages 4-6)
  - g. Comments by James Hadley (pages 42-43)
  - h. Comments by Paul Dougherty (para 13-14, para 29.4, para 39.5, para 43-51)
  - i. Comments by Rebecca Hadley (pages 11-12, pages 42-44, page 53)
  - j. Comments by Neil Green and Suzie Bognar (para 12(a), para 18-39, para 47(c))
  - k. Comments by Greg and Lianne Collings (section 2.3, section 3.2, section 4-5)
  - l. Comments by Graham Smith and Catherine Taylor (para 1-13, para 24-26)
  - m. Comments by Peter and Stephanie Goulston (page 1)
13. My initial view was that, given proposed compliance with the noise standards in the proposed district plan (**PDP**), that the issue with noise could be considered to fall within “the permitted baseline”. A consent authority, or in this case, the decision-maker, has the option to disregard an effect that is permitted by a rule in a plan under s 104(2) of the Resource Management Act. In my opinion, given the matters raised by the commenters, it is my opinion that the Panel should consider not disregarding them, and they could inform an appropriate set of conditions should consent be granted.
14. I acknowledge that the type of development proposed is not one that is generally anticipated in a rural area, and acknowledge that there is the potential for special audible characteristics to be experienced which has the impact of heightening awareness (and potential irritability) of noises. In addition to that, I also acknowledge the broad impact of cumulative noise effects over time, and in combination with other noise effects experienced by commenters.

---

<sup>4</sup> Refer Ayrburn Screen Hub Assessment of Noise Effects by Marshall Day Acoustics, 7 August 2025 at 7.0 Recommended conditions of consent

15. I do not have the expertise to comment on mitigation, or recommended conditions in relation to noise in the manner sought by the submitters, without information from a noise expert. Given the noise matters raised by submitters, a peer review of the Marshall Day assessment could be sought by the Panel under s 67(1)(b) of the Fast-track Approvals Act, with a focus on any recommendations from the peer review report should the Expert Panel be minded to grant the application, addressing:

- a. Construction noise;
- b. Operational noise;
- c. Special audible characteristics arising from construction and operation activities
- d. Cumulative effects with existing consented activities, and in combination with activities over time (along with effects on wellbeing);
- e. Whether there should be an upper limit Lmax sound level; and
- f. Whether any alternative mitigation measures (through recommendations on conditions) would be beneficial for reducing adverse effects on neighbouring property owners (including, but not limited, to bunding, vegetation, setbacks, screening, and specific filming activities (including at night)).

16. Specific consideration should be given as to whether conditions are required to address backlot noise mitigation (as referred to in 5.4.4 of the applicant's noise report), or whether this should form part of an Operation Noise Management Plan as provided for in the conditions of consent.

17. I consider this would assist the Expert Panel, as the decision-maker on the proposal, in both confirming the scale of adverse effects, and appropriate mitigation measures should consent be granted.

Peer Reviewer Name: Marcus Langman

Planning Consultant

Date: 26 January 2026