



Fast Track Ayrburn Screen Hub Application (FTAA-2508-1093) Submission in Opposition

From Greg Collins [redacted]
Date Tue 2025-12-16 8:24 PM
To Substantive <substantive@fasttrack.govt.nz>
Cc Lianne Collins [redacted]

📎 1 attachment (238 KB)
Appendix B Ayrburn Screen Hub Application (FTAA-2508-1093) Greg and Lianne Collins.pdf;

Subject: Fast Track Ayrburn Screen Hub Application (FTAA-2508-1093) Submission in Opposition

1. Contact Details			
Please ensure that you have authority to comment on the application on behalf of those named on this form.			
First name	Greg and Lianne		
Last name	Collins		
Postal address	[redacted]		
Home phone / Mobile phone	[redacted]	Work phone	[redacted]
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

Submission in opposition Ayrburn Screen Hub (FTAA-2508-1093)
Greg and Lianne Collins

16 December 2025

Executive Summary

This submission is made in opposition to the Ayrburn Screen Hub application (FTAA-2508-1093).

We oppose the application for the following reasons:

- The proposal introduces an industrial-scale screen production facility and a large commercial accommodation component into a rural amenity area that has, through repeated planning processes and Environment Court decisions over many years, been found unsuitable for intensive development.
- The proposed development footprint extends to our rear boundary via the inclusion of the public bike and walking track and adjoining green space, placing high-intensity activity within immediate proximity and direct view of our home.
- The scale, intensity, and operational characteristics of the Screen Hub far exceed what the District Plan envisages for this location and will result in permanent loss of rural residential amenity through noise, lighting, traffic, visual dominance, and prolonged construction effects.
- The application relies on projected economic benefits that have not been independently verified, are not enforceable, and do not demonstrate why this sensitive rural location is required over more appropriately zoned land within the district.
- The cumulative effects of the Screen Hub, when combined with existing Ayrburn hospitality, event activity, construction, and traffic, have not been adequately assessed and cannot be effectively mitigated through conditions.
- Environmental and water-quality benefits cited in support of the proposal largely reflect obligations already associated with the wider Ayrburn Precinct and do not justify the introduction of a new industrial activity.

Taken together, the adverse effects of the proposal are certain, significant, and enduring, while the claimed benefits are speculative and uncertain. For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Expert Panel decline the application as the proposal does not meet the threshold required under the Fast-Track Approvals Act.

2. Our Home, Our Family, and Our Setting

2.1 Who We Are

We are the owners of 523 Speargrass Flat Road. We moved to this property in 2010 and have raised our family of five here over the past 15 years.

We chose this location for its rural character, openness, and quiet. Our home is where we live, work, and spend time together every day. Outdoor living forms a central part of how we use our property, with doors and windows open for much of the year and regular use of our backyard and deck.

When we purchased this property, Ayrburn was a working farm. There was no indication that the land could be subject to large-scale commercial or industrial development beyond farming and rural use. The planning framework at the time, and since, reinforced that understanding.

2.2 Proximity to the Proposal

The physical relationship between our home and the proposal is critical.

From our backyard:

- Approximately 10 metres of grass separates our rear boundary from the public bike and walking track installed by Ayrburn.
- Beyond the track, the Screen Hub development footprint extends directly to the next paddock, with the proposed Screen Hub boundary approximately 100 metres from our home.
- The proposed development would be clearly visible from our backyard, rear deck, main living areas, and multiple bedrooms.

The Screen Hub land extends to and includes the space immediately beyond the track, meaning the proposal effectively reaches the edge of our backyard environment. This creates an ongoing risk of further encroachment and intensification over time.

Appendix B illustrates this relationship.

2.3 Experience of Existing Effects

We are already experiencing significant impacts from the Ayrburn precinct.

Noise regularly travels across the site and into our home, including music, voices, and operational sounds well outside the hours identified in existing consents. These limits are treated as optional in practice, with no meaningful enforcement or consequences. This experience provides a realistic indication of how future conditions would operate.

Construction noise has been a constant feature for years, including frequent industrial beeping from earthmoving machinery and regular chainsaw use associated with precinct and site operations. These sounds are audible inside our house with the windows shut.

A public bike and walking track was installed by Ayrburn approximately 18 months ago along the rear of our property without consultation or prior notice. We became aware only when construction began. This resulted in a sudden and complete loss of privacy and introduced security concerns, including unprovoked abuse directed at our family by users of the track. Our children no longer feel comfortable relaxing in the backyard.

The track and adjoining green space is intermittently maintained. Berms are currently overgrown, re-plantings appear under-watered, and weather events have left broken branches along the path. This reinforces our concern that buffers and mitigation areas are treated as expendable rather than actively managed.

3. Grounds for Opposition

3.1 Inconsistency with the Planning Framework

This land has been the subject of extensive planning scrutiny over many years. Through multiple processes involving QLDC, commissioners, and the Environment Court, intensive development has been consistently rejected.

The Fast-Track process does not negate the relevance of that history. Approving this proposal would effectively overturn long-established planning outcomes and undermine confidence in the District Plan.

3.2 Unacceptable Effects on Rural Amenity

The correct assessment baseline is the level of activity anticipated by the zoning of this land, namely a small number of rural residential dwellings.

By comparison, the proposed Screen Hub and associated accommodation introduce:

- industrial-scale noise from workshops, backlot activity, vehicles, and servicing up to 24 hours a day;
- visitor accommodation noise that is unassessed and uncontrolled in practice;
- persistent artificial lighting in an otherwise dark rural environment;
- increased traffic volumes and early-morning and late-night movements;
- prolonged construction activity extending several more years.

These effects are materially greater than those associated with rural living and cannot be mitigated through conditions alone.

3.3 Economic Case and Fast-Track Threshold

While we are not economic experts, it is evident from the application material that the economic case has not been independently verified. The modelling relies on assumptions about demand, production volumes, and employment that remain untested.

There is no mechanism to require delivery of these benefits, nor any remedy available to affected residents if they do not eventuate.

We also note that environmental enhancements, including sediment control and water quality improvements, are already obligations associated with the wider Ayrburn precinct. Presenting these measures as benefits of the Screen Hub risks overstating their relevance to this proposal.

4. Cumulative and Precedent Effects

The Ayrburn precinct already hosts hospitality, events, and commercial activity. The addition of an industrial film facility and large-scale accommodation significantly compounds those effects.

Approval would set a precedent for further non-rural activities within rural amenity areas and signal that established planning constraints can be bypassed through re-branding and re-application.

5. Conclusion

This proposal represents an industrial-scale development in a location that has repeatedly been found unsuitable for activity of this nature.

The adverse effects on residential amenity are immediate, certain, and enduring. By contrast, the benefits advanced in support of the application are uncertain, unverified, and not capable of being enforced or assured over time.

When assessed as required, the scale and permanence of the harm clearly outweigh the speculative advantages relied upon to justify approval through the Fast-Track process.

We make this submission as long-term residents of Speargrass Flat and as a family who have lived at [REDACTED] since 2011. We have raised our family of five here, having chosen this location deliberately for its rural outlook, privacy, and quiet character.

The cumulative effect of repeated attempts to introduce increasingly intensive development into this area has been exhausting for our family and many of our neighbours. The use of the Fast-Track pathway in this instance has further undermined confidence that the planning framework intended to protect this location is being meaningfully applied.

We are confident that concerns about loss of rural amenity, erosion of privacy, and the ability of families to reasonably enjoy their homes are widely shared across the community, including by residents who fall outside the narrow definition of “adjacent” properties.

For these reasons, we respectfully request that the Expert Panel decline the Ayrburn Screen Hub application.

6. Closing Rebuttal

The Applicant has framed this proposal as a choice between regional progress and local opposition. That framing is misleading.

This submission does not oppose film production, employment, or economic activity in principle. It questions whether an industrial-scale screen facility and high-density accommodation are appropriately located within a rural amenity area that has, over many years, been found unsuitable for such development.

The Panel is being asked to accept permanent local impacts in exchange for benefits that are projected rather than assured. That imbalance is central to this case.

The Fast-Track pathway exists to enable genuinely necessary infrastructure in appropriate locations, not to displace long-settled planning outcomes or transfer commercial risk onto neighbouring families.

For these reasons, we maintain that the application does not satisfy the requirements of the Fast-Track Approvals Act and that the appropriate outcome is refusal.

Appendix A – Personal Statement

We have lived at [REDACTED] since 2010 and raised our family here. This has been our long-term home, chosen for its rural outlook, quiet, and sense of space.

Over time, the nature of activity at Ayrburn has changed significantly. What was once a working farm has progressively intensified, often without meaningful engagement with neighbouring residents. The installation of a public track directly behind our home without consultation marked a turning point in our enjoyment of the property and our sense of privacy and security.

The cumulative effect of ongoing noise, construction, and loss of privacy has already altered how we live in our home. The Screen Hub proposal would formalise and greatly intensify those impacts.

We are not opposed to change or progress. We are asking that change occurs in appropriate locations and in a way that respects the planning framework and the people who live here.

Appendix B attached - View across backyard towards screen hub location