

BEFORE THE PANEL CONVENER

UNDER the Fast Track Approvals Act 2024 ("**the FTAA**")

IN THE MATTER of an application by Ridgeburn Limited for approvals under the FTAA for a referred project, Ridgeburn

**MEMORANDUM OF COUNSEL ON BEHALF OF THE APPLICANT
RE MINUTE 5 OF THE PANEL CONVENER**

15 JULY 2026

**ELLIS GOULD
LAWYERS
AUCKLAND**

Level 31 Vero Centre
48 Shortland Street, Auckland
Tel: [REDACTED]
PO Box 1509, DX CP22003
AUCKLAND

**Counsel Instructed
Jeremy Brabant
Barrister**
Level 7, 50 Albert Street, Auckland Central
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

REF: Alex Devine [REDACTED]

MAY IT PLEASE THE CONVENER:

1. This memorandum is filed on behalf of Ridgeburn Limited ("**Applicant**"). It responds to paragraph 13 of Minute 5 of the Panel Convener dated 1 July 2026 ("**Minute**") which directs that:
 - (a) *The applicant, having conferred with the local authorities and administering agencies, will:*
 - (i) *scope the information gaps and the timeframe for production of further information;*
 - (ii) *detail any arrangements to meet with the local authorities and administering agencies as part of the above process.*
 - (iii) *giving reasons, identify any matters on which the applicant does not agree to produce further information.*
 - (b) *Kā Rūnaka and the Applicant will file an agreed, amended set of conditions.*
2. In addition, this memorandum provides further commentary on two matters discussed at the first Panel Convener Conference held on 30 June 2026 ("**Conference**"), namely consultation and the identification of key issues requiring resolution.

Scope of Information Gaps and Timeframe for Production

3. Information requests have been received from Queenstown Lakes District Council ("**QLDC**"), Otago Regional Council ("**ORC**") and the Department of Conservation ("**DOC**").
4. **Attachment A** to this memorandum identifies the information requests raised by the relevant parties and records:
 - (a) Whether the Applicant intends to provide further information in response to those requests, and, if so, the anticipated timing of that response; or
 - (b) Whether the matters raised are considered to reflect differences of expert opinion that are more appropriately addressed through the

substantive process (e.g.: via responses to comments, any expert caucusing or ultimately determined by the Panel).

5. While a number of the information requests are not considered by the Applicant to reflect genuine information gaps, the Applicant nevertheless intends to respond to them at this stage in an effort to narrow the issues in dispute and make constructive use of the time allocated for the further information process.
6. Given the detail provided in **Attachment A**, this section of the memorandum simply summarises the information sought by the parties and the Applicant's proposed response.
7. In all cases, the Applicant proposes to respond to these matters by 10 August 2026.

Otago Regional Council

8. Broadly, ORC's requests fall into three categories:
 - (a) Design and technical matters, including wastewater disposal, groundwater, air discharge effects, ecology, wetlands, flood hazards, stormwater management, dust management and sediment controls;
 - (b) Further policy and statutory assessment, including assessment against GD05, the NPS-FM, the Regional Plan: Water for Otago, the Regional Plan: Air for Otago, section 127B RMA and the Water Conservation (Kawarau) Order 1997; and
 - (c) Consenting and regulatory matters, including potential additional approvals, proposed consent conditions and provision (by ORC) of additional information regarding public transport.
9. The Applicant proposes to address these matters through updates to the relevant expert reports by 10 August 2026, with the exception of the hydraulic modelling validation, which will be completed as soon as practicable following receipt of the relevant information from ORC. Given that the

requested validation reflects a difference of professional opinion regarding the level of supporting information required, rather than a genuine information gap, the Applicant does not consider that this matter should delay the appointment of a Panel.

Queenstown Lakes District Council

10. QLDC has issued three sets of information requests. The first was contained in QLDC's memorandum of counsel filed for the Conference, the second was provided following the Conference and the third relates to the scope of the Integrated Transport Assessment ("**ITA**") in accordance with the Minute. The first and second requests are addressed in detail in **Attachment A**, while the ITA-related requests are addressed in **Attachment B**. This section provides a summary of the information sought and the Applicant's proposed response.
11. **Information Requests 1 and 2** – Broadly, QLDC's requests can be categorised as follows:
 - (a) Design and technical matters, including transport, wastewater, stormwater, natural hazards, ecology, landscape, urban design and recreation matters;
 - (b) Strategic planning and assessment matters, including infrastructure affordability and governance, the long-term management of privately provided infrastructure and services, the achievement of a well-functioning urban environment, future transport and development connectivity, public access, open space and recreation provision, social and community infrastructure and natural hazards; and
 - (c) Implementation and management matters, including infrastructure ownership and maintenance, public access arrangements, recreational facilities, consent requirements and the long-term operation of services and infrastructure.
12. The Applicant proposes to respond to the majority of the matters raised by QLDC through updated expert reporting and supplementary information to be

provided as part of the current further information process. However, the Applicant does not consider that all matters identified by QLDC constitute genuine information gaps. In several instances, the matters raised reflect differences of professional opinion regarding the scope of assessment required, the adequacy of information already provided or broader strategic planning considerations that are more appropriately addressed through response to comments, expert conferencing, legal submissions or determination by the Panel. In those cases, the Applicant does not propose to provide further substantive information, although it may provide clarification where this is considered helpful to narrow the issues in dispute.

13. **ITA Scope** – QLDC and the New Zealand Transport Agency (“**NZTA**”) have provided a proposed scope for a revised ITA, which has been reviewed by the Applicant's transport expert, Mr Carr. Mr Carr's response to the proposed ITA scope is set out at **Attachment B**.
14. In short, the proposed ITA scope seeks information that goes beyond what is reasonably necessary to assess the transport effects of the proposal. The Applicant's focus is on providing information that is material to understanding and evaluating those effects. In contrast, QLDC/NZTA's proposed scope seeks a level of detail that is disproportionate to the scale and nature of the Project, extends into matters more appropriately addressed by other technical disciplines and requires assessment of projects that are not consented and therefore do not form part of the receiving environment (amongst other things). This reinforces the Applicant's view that many of the matters raised go to the merits of the proposal and are more appropriately addressed through the substantive assessment process if necessary.
15. Given the format of the proposed scope, it has not been possible to simply accept or reject the proposed scope on an item-by-item basis. Rather, the response identifies narratively those areas which are considered appropriate for inclusion within an ITA (and have generally already been included), areas which are agreed in part (i.e.: overarching topic is agreed, but not the level of detail or geographic area) and those areas which are not agreed as being appropriate for an ITA.

16. It is proposed that further technical discussions be held with QLDC and NZTA in order to better understand the rationale for the requests, identify any genuine information gaps, and narrow the areas of disagreement. The Applicant considers that a collaborative gap analysis would assist in identifying any additional transport information that is necessary for the Panel's assessment.
17. For completeness, the Applicant records its view that the scope of the ITA undertaken for Ridgeburn is consistent with the approach and the assessment approach accepted for comparable large-scale developments.¹ It does not accept QLDC/NZTA's proposition that because the proposal represents an out of sequence development, a regional scale model must be prepared.
18. Finally, we note that QLDC's memorandum for the Conference suggests that the Minister's referral decision required the Applicant to engage with QLDC and reach agreement on transport-related matters. The Applicant disagrees with this characterisation. The referral decision requires the preparation of a transport infrastructure assessment that identifies the existing capacity of the local road network and State Highway 6, any upgrades required to accommodate the development's traffic, and any funding required to deliver those upgrades. The ITA addresses those matters. The referral decision also records that the assessment is to include details of any discussions held and any agreements reached between the Applicant, QLDC and NZTA. It does not, however, require such discussions to occur, nor does it require agreement to be reached. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant engaged with the relevant transport authorities, particularly NZTA, and the feedback received through that process informed the ITA as lodged.

Department of Conservation

19. Broadly, DOC's requests can be categorised as follows:

¹ For example, Homestead Bay and Sunfield.

- (a) Ecological and technical matters, including lizard management, freshwater ecology, wetland hydrology, wastewater-related effects on freshwater values, monitoring programmes and proposed mitigation measures;
 - (b) Assessment matters, including application of the mitigation hierarchy, assessment methodologies, ecological monitoring, adaptive management measures and the long-term protection and management of ecological values; and
 - (c) Conditions and implementation matters, including the content of management plans, monitoring and reporting requirements, certification processes, Wildlife Act approval requirements and the form and drafting of proposed consent conditions.
20. The Applicant proposes to respond to the majority of DOC's requests through updated ecological reporting, management plans, supporting technical information and, where appropriate, revised conditions. However, the Applicant does not consider all of the matters raised by DOC to constitute genuine information gaps. In several instances, the requests are considered to reflect differences of professional opinion regarding the level of information required, ecological assessment methodologies, management approaches, or the drafting and implementation of conditions and management plans. Those matters are more appropriately addressed through ongoing engagement with DOC, refinement of conditions, expert evidence, submissions, or ultimately determination by the Panel.

Engagement

21. In light of the discussions at the first Panel Convener Conference and the content of the memoranda filed by the various parties, the Applicant considers it appropriate to outline in more detail its view of consultation undertaken to date. It does not consider that the information provided by some of the parties accurately reflects the level of information provided and discussions that have occurred to date.

22. As the project is a referral project rather than a listed project, engagement and consultation also occurred at referral stage pursuant to section 29 FTAA, which required the Applicant to undertake pre-lodgement engagement and consultation with the following local and administering agencies and hapū:
- (a) QLDC;
 - (b) ORC;
 - (c) DOC;
 - (d) The Ministry for Culture and Heritage and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (“**HNZPT**”);
 - (e) The Ministry for the Environment; and
 - (f) Kā Rūnaka.²
23. Although not required by the FTAA, the Applicant also consulted with:
- (a) NZTA;
 - (b) The Queenstown Trails Trust;
 - (c) Adjoining landowners and occupiers
24. The approach and extent of the Applicant’s **pre-lodgement consultation** with these parties is set out in section 7 of the [substantive application](#), with further detail provided in Volume C ([Consultation Summary Report](#)) and Appendix 44 ([Schedule of Consultation with Māori](#)). An overview of **post lodgement consultation** was included at [Appendix A](#) to the Applicant’s pre-Conference memorandum dated 29 June 2026. Further updates **following the Conference** are included in **Attachment C** to this memorandum.

² Te Rūnanga o Moeraki, Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki, Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou, Hokonui Rūnanga, Waihōpai Rūnanga, Te Rūnanga o Awarua and Te Rūnanga o Ōraka-Aparima (collectively, Kā Rūnaka) represent mana whenua in the Tāhuna (Queenstown) area.

25. A high level summary of consultation to date follows.

Otago Regional Council

26. Prior to lodgement of the application, the Applicant engaged with ORC through referral-stage consultation, meetings with ORC representatives from the consents, compliance, science and transport teams, and ongoing correspondence regarding public transport, servicing and ecological matters. Through these discussions, ORC identified a range of matters for consideration, including wastewater treatment and disposal, stormwater management, water quality effects, hydrogeological constraints, ecological effects, public transport provision, and the need for supporting technical assessments. Subsequent engagement focused on the proposed public transport approach, including park-and-ride facilities, bus routing, network efficiency, and accessibility considerations, with further correspondence undertaken to refine route configuration and service design options. Detailed meetings were also held with ORC's science, compliance and ecology officers to discuss wastewater treatment processes, system resilience, nutrient management, water supply investigations, stormwater management, hydrological processes, monitoring requirements and consent conditions, as well as terrestrial ecology matters. This included acknowledgement from ORC that ecological values had been identified early and largely avoided through the site layout and that the proposed approach to excluding wetlands and intermittent streams was consistent with the effects management hierarchy.
27. Following lodgement of the application, the Applicant continued to correspond with ORC regarding further information requests, requests for meetings and site visits, and held discussions regarding the scope of information required to support ORC's assessment of the proposal. Through this engagement, ORC identified matters requiring further consideration across a range of technical disciplines, including public transport, groundwater, ecology, flood hazards, wastewater, air quality and consent conditions. Following receipt of ORC's information requests, the Applicant sought to meet with ORC to clarify the matters raised, obtain relevant information to assist with technical assessments, facilitate site visits for ORC

staff and experts and establish a programme of technical meetings to discuss the identified issues. The Applicant also advised that these discussions would assist in confirming and refining the scope of information required before updated technical reports were finalised.

28. Following the Conference, an initial planner-level meeting was held between the Applicant and ORC to discuss the further information requests and the process for responding to them. During that meeting, the Applicant confirmed its intention to respond to all RFI items, provided an updated RFI tracking table and records of previous technical meetings, identified priority topics for further discussion, and reiterated its willingness to continue engaging with ORC, including through technical meetings. The Applicant has advised ORC that it remains available to discuss the further information requests and any information required to address particular matters. While ORC indicated that technical meetings would be arranged, no technical meetings had been scheduled at this stage.
29. A site visit involving ORC and various specialists is being undertaken today (15 July 2026).

Queenstown Lakes District Council

30. The Applicant disagrees with QLDC's suggestion that engagement has been minimal.
31. Prior to lodgement, the Applicant engaged with QLDC through referral-stage consultation, pre-application meetings, transport-specific workshops, planning and infrastructure meetings and ongoing correspondence. Through these discussions, QLDC identified a range of matters for consideration, including transport effects (such as upgrades to Morven Ferry Road, traffic constraints in the wider Lake Hayes Estate area, integration with the cycle trail network, alternative transport options, network capacity, safety and cumulative effects), local employment opportunities, landscape and visual effects, consistency with relevant planning objectives and policies, public transport assumptions, three waters servicing, stormwater management and

long-term infrastructure performance. The consultation also included discussion of transport assessment methodologies, modelling assumptions, growth projections, mitigation measures and proposed infrastructure solutions. Unsurprisingly, most of the discussions were focused around transport and infrastructure matters.

32. Following lodgement of the application, the Applicant contacted QLDC seeking to continue engagement throughout the substantive process, including through meetings to discuss matters identified by QLDC, opportunities to resolve issues at an early stage and potential areas of alignment such as the workshopping of draft consent conditions. A post-lodgement meeting was held in June 2026 to discuss ongoing consultation, information requirements, and clarifications relating to the application, following which regular weekly catch-up meetings were set up. Further engagement occurred through meetings with QLDC planning and landscape officers and a site visit attended by QLDC's landscape architect and representatives of the Applicant, during which information requirements and matters requiring clarification were discussed. Prior to the site visit, QLDC requested additional plans and mapping, which were provided by the Applicant.
33. Following the Conference and Minute 5, the Applicant sought to continue engagement with QLDC by proposing that the scheduled weekly meeting on 3 July 2026 be extended to discuss the matters raised in QLDC's memorandum and during the Convenor Conference. QLDC declined that request, advising that its immediate priority was responding to the Panel Convenor's directions and finalising its list of information gaps and RFI topics, and that a meeting at that stage would be premature. Following receipt of QLDC's RFI, the Applicant again sought engagement, requesting an initial planner-to-planner meeting to discuss the identified information gaps, areas of agreement and disagreement, and the need for any technical meetings (as was undertaken with ORC). QLDC declined that request, advising that it considered it preferable to first receive the Applicant's response to Minute 5 before determining the need for, and structure of, any future meetings.

34. While QLDC subsequently proposed a meeting to discuss the number, structure and attendees for future technical discussions, QLDC has requested that it be scheduled following lodgement of this memorandum. Further discussions on the ITA scope are also proposed as outlined in paragraph 16 above.
35. The Applicant arranged a site visit for QLDC's planning, urban design and ecology experts which took place on 14 July 2026.

Department of Conservation

36. The Applicant had an initial meeting with DOC prior to lodgement of the substantive application. This was followed by the provision of draft technical material, and ongoing correspondence regarding ecological assessment and management matters. Discussions focused on the proposed ecological survey methodology, lizard management approach, and relevant approval pathways, including the anticipated need for Wildlife Act authorisations and approvals associated with a proposed water pipeline easement across conservation land. The Applicant subsequently provided draft ecological material, including the Ecological Impact Assessment and Lizard Management Plan, for DOC's review. DOC, through its technical advisors, provided feedback relating to lizard values, effects assessment, proposed mitigation and monitoring measures, release site protection, and proposed Wildlife Act conditions. These matters informed the development of the ecological assessments and management measures lodged with the application.
37. Following lodgement of the application, the Applicant sought to continue engagement, including by inviting discussion on any matters identified by DOC and opportunities to resolve issues early.
38. Following the Conference, the Applicant met with DOC to discuss, and where possible, reach agreement on information required to address DOC's information requests. During that meeting, DOC advised that its position remained broadly consistent with its pre-lodgement advice and indicated that it would provide a memorandum setting out its comments on lizard

assessment matters, wetland management and proposed conditions. Discussion focused on the adequacy of the lizard assessments, the suitability and carrying capacity of the proposed release sites, the relationship between the proposed ecological management plans, wetland management requirements, and associated weed and pest management measures. It was agreed that the Applicant would review DOC's memorandum once received, continue refining the proposed management plans and conditions, and engage in further discussions to address the identified information gaps.

39. DOC supplied a draft request for further information for the Applicant's consideration on 13 July 2026, with a final version being issued today (15 July 2026). The Applicant is now reviewing this with intention of continuing to engage with DOC in the manner outlined in paragraph 38 above.

The Ministry for Culture and Heritage and Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

40. Engagement with HNZPT commenced following referral of the project, including a meeting in November 2025 to discuss HNZPT's interests and information requirements. A draft Archaeological Assessment was subsequently provided to HNZPT in December 2025 for review prior to lodgement. HNZPT referred the assessment to its archaeological advisor for technical review and advised that it would provide further comment if any issues were identified.
41. Following lodgement of the application, the Applicant wrote to HNZPT confirming lodgement and inviting HNZPT to identify any further information requirements or queries arising from its review of the application.
42. Since the Conference, HNZPT has confirmed there are no information gaps in relation to the archaeological authority application. Discussions are to continue regarding the Archaeological Management Plan ("**AMP**") and draft consent conditions. HNZPT indicated that it intended to provide tracked changes to the proposed conditions and feedback on the AMP, with a view to progressing discussion on an agreed or largely agreed set of conditions for

consideration by the Panel. A meeting is proposed for the week of 27 July 2027 to discuss the proposed conditions and feedback on AMP.

The New Zealand Transport Agency

43. While not required to engage with NZTA pursuant to the FTAA, the Applicant has done so. This included circulating the draft transport assessment material, written correspondence, and a series of meetings to discuss transport effects and mitigation measures associated with the proposal.
44. NZTA reviewed the draft Transport Assessment and identified a number of matters requiring further assessment, including traffic effects west of Lake Hayes, daily traffic generation, intersection performance, site access design, active mode connections, speed environment assumptions and public transport provision. Subsequent meetings focused on clarifying the scope of transport assessment and modelling, including baseline assumptions for Ladies Mile and the wider corridor, demand and capacity effects on the State Highway network, intersection design, slow vehicle lane requirements, nearby accesses, and active transport connections. Further engagement also addressed public transport assumptions, park-and-ride provision, mode shift assumptions, cumulative effects, and concept design options for the Arrowsmith–Lake Hayes Road intersection, with NZTA providing feedback on network effects, mitigation measures and future transport planning considerations.
45. A meeting was held with NZTA following lodgement to discuss proposed roading upgrades and NZTA’s initial review of the application.
46. As indicated above in paragraph 16, further discussions between the Applicant and NZTA/QLDC on the ITA scope are proposed.

The Queenstown Trails Trust

47. While not a requirement of the FTAA, the Applicant sought and received feedback from the Queenstown Trails Trust (“**QTT**”) in relation to the Project. QTT confirmed that it neither supports nor opposes the application, but

identified opportunities to enhance public access, active transport connectivity, and recreational outcomes through the development. QTT's feedback has informed the approach to active transport and recreational connectivity within the Project.

Adjoining landowners and occupiers

48. While not a requirement of the FTAA, the Applicant sought to discuss the proposal with owners and occupiers of the site and adjoining landholdings prior to lodgement. Engagement was undertaken primarily through written correspondence, with adjoining landowners and occupiers contacted to confirm property ownership and occupancy details, and to provide an opportunity to comment on the proposed development. Responses were received from a number of parties during January 2026. Concerns raised by adjoining parties include the scale and density of development, transport and traffic effects, and associated infrastructure capacity; specific site-related matters were also identified, including the presence of an irrigation race supplying neighbouring properties, with requests that this infrastructure remain undisturbed.

Kā Rūnaka

49. As noted by Mr Williams at the Convener Conference, there has been constructive engagement between the Applicant and Kā Rūnaka throughout the process. Indeed, Mr Williams observed that, having been involved in a number of comparable projects, the Applicant's approach to engagement was the best he had encountered to date.

Identification of Issues

50. At the Conference, the Panel Convener indicated that she wished to see a greater level of detail regarding the issues. Accordingly, this memorandum also addresses those matters.
51. The Applicant's pre-Conference Memorandum identified:

- (a) Landscape, traffic, economic benefits and strategic planning as key areas in which there would likely be differences of opinions between the relevant subject matter experts and thus be of particular focus of or central to the Expert Panel's consideration of the Project.
- (b) The issues likely to require resolution as being:

The issues that have arisen during pre-lodgement and post-lodgement consultation and engagement generally relate to strategic planning, landscape and transport issues. We anticipate that these are likely to be central to the Expert Panel's consideration of the Project. Specifically:

- (a) The Site being located within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and the Rural Zone, and the relevance of this to the urban nature of the project.*
- (b) The presence of the outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature overlays associated with Morven Hill and the Kawarau River corridor, which adjoin and, in some instances, cross, the project site and the impact of the project on these.*
- (c) The appropriateness of the proposed offsite transport upgrades to accommodate development traffic on an already constrained transport network.*

- 52. In our view, the further information requests and memoranda received from QLDC, ORC and DOC generally reinforce that these are the core issues which will be the focus of the Expert Panel's consideration, with a number of subsidiary issues and related considerations that sit within those broader issues. However, they also identify a further area where there appears to be a divergence of professional opinion, namely the adequacy of the proposed wastewater treatment and disposal methodology and its associated effects. A revised issues list is set out below which captured subsidiary matters as well as a new 'core' issue regarding wastewater.
- 53. By contrast, many of the other matters raised by ORC, QLDC and DOC relate to the provision of further technical information, refinement of management plans, consent conditions, monitoring frameworks, and clarification of assessment methodologies. While these matters are important, the Applicant considers that they are capable of being substantially addressed through the

further information process and ongoing expert engagement and are therefore less likely to require resolution by the Panel.

54. At this point in time, the Applicant considers it is possible that a number of the issues relating to stormwater management, flood hazards and ecology are capable of being narrowed, or potentially resolved, through the provision of further information and continued expert discussions.
55. In that context, the Applicant's revised issues list is as follows
 - (a) The Site being located within the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone and the Rural Zone, and the relevance of this to the urban nature of the project. This issue may lead to consideration of the following matters raised by other parties:
 - (i) Infrastructure affordability and governance, and the long-term management of privately provided infrastructure and services;
 - (ii) Relevance of future transport and development connectivity, public access arrangements, open space and recreation provision and whether the proposal delivers a well-functioning urban environment; and
 - (iii) Consistency with relevant planning objectives and policies and spatial planning documentation and the relevance of this.
 - (b) The presence of the outstanding Natural Landscape and Outstanding Natural Feature overlays associated with Morven Hill and the Kawarau River corridor, which adjoin and, in some instances, cross, the project site and the impact of the project on these and any other relevant landscape values.
 - (c) The appropriateness of the proposed offsite transport upgrades to accommodate development traffic on an already constrained transport network. This issue is likely to lead to consideration of the following matters:

- (i) The appropriate extent of assessment; and
 - (ii) The extent to which the Applicant is required to address or mitigate wider network issues.
- (d) The adequacy of the proposed wastewater treatment and disposal methodology and its associated effects, including consideration of:
- (i) The suitability of the soils and hillslopes for disposal;
 - (ii) The location of relevant infrastructure relative to public open spaces, walking trails and dwellings;
 - (iii) Implications for groundwater quality and matters relating to groundwater abstraction;
 - (iv) Potential odour effects, including appropriate separation distances and implications of any site specific meteorological conditions.

Conditions

56. Minute 5 directed that Kā Rūnaka and the Applicant file an updated set of conditions. A set of conditions have been agreed with Kā Rūnaka in contemplation of a side agreement also being entered into. A copy of the condition set incorporating those agreed conditions is provided at **Attachment D**.³

DATED this 15th day of July 2026



Jeremy Brabant / Alex Devine
Counsel for Ridgeburn Limited

³ Noting there have been no other changes to conditions regarding other agencies comments yet. These will be incorporated into the 10 August 2026 response.

Attachment A – Information Request Response Table

Information Gap Response Schedule

This document has been prepared in accordance with paragraph 13 of Minute 5 of the Panel Convenor, dated 1 July 2026, relating to the Ridgeburn application (FTAA-2603-1186). Paragraph 13 requires the Applicant, having conferred with the relevant local authorities and administering agencies, to identify the information gaps and anticipated timeframes for the provision of further information. The tables contained in this document summarise the information requests received from Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC), Otago Regional Council (ORC), and the Department of Conservation (DOC), and set out the Applicant's response to each item. Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT) has confirmed that there are no information gaps in relation to the archaeological authority application, and accordingly no response table has been included.

While the Applicant acknowledges the matters raised by the relevant authorities, it does not necessarily accept that each item constitutes an "information gap". In some instances, the matters raised reflect a difference of professional opinion regarding the level of information provided, rather than an absence of information. Nevertheless, in an attempt to narrow matters in contention, the Applicant has identified where further information will be provided in conjunction with other material being prepared. Where no further information is proposed, this reflects the Applicant's view that additional information is neither warranted nor necessary.

Table 1: Further information response ORC.

#	Item	Applicant Response
<i>Note</i>	At this stage, the Council considers there is significant uncertainty associated with the effects arising from the discharge of treated wastewater at the site. As reported in the Wastewater Discharge Technical Peer Review dated 24 June 2026: <i>The limited thickness, and poor soil development at the site means there is a high potential for wastewater to drain rapidly through the soil profile, and travel rapidly down the schist surface, potentially emerging as springs and seeps at the base of the hill, coincident with residential properties.</i>	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
1.	Please provide aerial imagery to support the Wastewater Plans contained in Appendix 29 of the substantive application.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
2.	The Wastewater Treatment Plant Design Report ¹ states that ' <i>Treated effluent will be discharged to land-based rapid infiltration beds</i> '. That statement appears to be incorrect, as wastewater is proposed to be discharged via subsurface drip irrigation or spray irrigation. Please clarify the nature of the treatment system design and proposed disposal methodology.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
3.	It is standard industry practice, and directly relevant to an assessment of the application under section 105 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), to present an assessment of alternative options for the disposal of wastewater to land. There is no explanation in the Wastewater Disposal Assessment ² as to why spray irrigation to Morven Hill, and subsurface dripline to the Residential Terraces are the most suitable options for this site. Please provide an assessment of alternatives that considers both the physical setting as well as land disposal engineering aspects, and describes why the chosen disposal options were selected.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
4.	The Wastewater Disposal Assessment is heavily reliant on regional scale soils assessment and literature references to local soil characteristics rather than presenting site-specific soil physical and chemical data. A site specific soil mapping and assessment is Council standard practice and considered necessary to enable a robust assessment of potential effects. Please provide a site specific soil mapping and assessment.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
5.	Throughout both the Wastewater Disposal Assessment and Substantive Application the soils are described as both a loess and a loam. These are different, and while it is feasible that a loess soil caps the schist derived loam, the soils are not described or mapped in this way. Please update assessments and the application to ensure consistent descriptions are provided throughout.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
6.	The Council considers the investigation of Morven Hills soils and suitability for wastewater disposal provided in the application is inadequate. Please provide a comprehensive and site-specific assessment of the Morven Hill soils by a suitably qualified Soil Scientist. This assessment should include depth of soil maps and identify likely drainage pathways on the slope.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
7.	The slope characteristics of Morven Hill are not discussed in the Wastewater Disposal Assessment. Given the steepness of this land, please provide an assessment of the suitability of the hillslopes for wastewater disposal. This assessment should demonstrate how wastewater will interact with the shallow soil and steepness.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
8.	Based on preliminary assessments, it is estimated that the slope of the Morven Hill disposal area is at least 25 degrees and much of it over 30 degrees. The AS/NZS 1547:2012 states that spray irrigation is only suitable on slopes up to 10 degrees and subsurface irrigation up to 30 degrees. Please provide justification for the proposed departure from the recommendations made in the AS/NZS 1547:2012.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
9.	The steepness of the slope may influence the ability for irrigation infrastructure to be installed and maintained. Please provide further information on how this will occur.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
10.	No estimates of drainage below the root zone have been presented. Please provide a soil moisture balance model (incorporating nutrient losses as discussed below) to inform the seasonal management of wastewater disposal, including supporting the adoption of a deficit or non-deficit irrigation regime.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
11.	To assist with quantifying the effects on groundwater quality, please provide a nutrient balance and nutrient loss model.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
12.	Please provide a site specific investigation of groundwater levels and quality at the site to provide adequate baseline data and to quantify the effects on groundwater quality, particularly the quality of the Morven aquifer.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
13.	There is no design report detailing the design of either the subsurface or spray irrigation areas in the application. Please provide a preliminary irrigation design that is peer reviewed by an independent wastewater engineer experienced in the design of land application systems.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
14.	Please provide a description of the staging of the irrigation infrastructure, given the staged approach to development of the wastewater treatment plant.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
15.	Please provide the assessment of stream depletion of the Kowarau River arising from the proposed groundwater abstraction. This should include all adopted input parameters, assumptions and methodology used in the assessment.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
16.	The water quality assessment proposed in the Water Supply Servicing Strategy3 requires water quality assessment to be based on single samples. While the report concludes that the observed quality can be managed using standard treatment processes, a single sample is unlikely to fully represent aquifer conditions. The report also does not clearly state how long the bores were pumped prior to sampling. Given the degree of hydraulic connectivity to the river, consideration of Kowarau River water quality is warranted. It should also be acknowledged that the abstraction is downstream of the Queenstown wastewater discharge at the Shotover confluence, and any implications should be addressed.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
17.	The annual allocation has been calculated by multiplying the peak daily demand by 365 days. This approach requires further justification, as it is unlikely that peak demand would occur continuously throughout the year.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
18.	Further explanation is also needed to clarify the relationship between the proposed water take and wastewater generation. The wastewater design flow (890 m ³ /day, with a maximum of 1,204 m ³ /day) is significantly lower than the proposed maximum water take of 2,006 m ³ /day. While approximately three days of storage is proposed, the alignment with annual allocation remains unclear.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
19.	Meteorology for the Discharge to Air Assessment ⁴ has been taken from Queenstown airport. Given the complex terrain present near the proposed development site, it is considered this may not represent the frequency of impact in the location of the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) and the bike paths well. Site specific meteorology should be developed for each area of the site that has differing terrain impacts and emission sources and the Discharge to Air Assessment should be updated accordingly.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
20.	Published guidance and industry practice typically identify separation distances for WWTPs in the order of 100–300 metres or greater (depending on scale and treatment type) to manage odour effects, reflecting the inherent uncertainty in odour generation and dispersion. The location of the proposed WWTP and disposal areas places sensitive receptors in very close proximity to potential odour sources, with residential dwellings within approximately 47 metres of the plant. The substantially reduced separation distances in this case increase the sensitivity of the receiving environment and reduce the margin for error, which in turn warrants a more detailed and quantitative assessment approach (e.g. dispersion modelling and	Quantitative assessment is not considered appropriate in this instance. A technical response to this item will be provided by 10 August 2026.

#	Item	Applicant Response
	explicit consideration of worst-case conditions) to demonstrate that adverse effects can be avoided. Please provide further justification for the selection of a qualitative assessment methodology referred to in Section 4.2 of the Discharge to Air Assessment including how this approach aligns with IAQM guidance requirements to demonstrate that the level of assessment is proportionate to the level of risk, given the proximity of sensitive receptors, complexity of the terrain and the potential for upset conditions.	
21.	Given the lack of appropriate site-specific meteorological data there is potential that effects under calm and very low wind speed conditions, particularly under inversion conditions, are not being well described in the Discharge to Air Assessment. Under these meteorological conditions there is the potential for odour to pool and/or disperse very slowly resulting in elevated odour concentration in the vicinity of the WWTP. Using the updated meteorology sought by question (5), please re-assess calm/very low wind speed condition effects. Please also provide an assessment of the potential impacts inversions may have on odour.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
22.	Please provide further justification for why Table 6 of the Discharge to Air Assessment uses maximum frequency from a segment rather than cumulative frequencies from all segments, particularly for bike paths and sensitive receptors along the eastern edge of the spray irrigation area.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
23.	The Preliminary and Detailed Site Investigations ⁵ refer to a steep gully with a history of fly tipping. While physical interaction with the waste may be limited during construction and operational use of the subdivision, the environmental risk from the waste material is	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
	unknown. The contents, volume and age of the waste is largely unknown and given the long history of the farming land use, there is a potential for a significant amount of waste material. Wastewater discharge plans show the wastewater drip lines extend to the edge of the bank at the top of the steep gully. Please provide an assessment of the potential environmental risk from waste within the fly tipping area.	
24.	The Preliminary and Detailed Site Investigations identify an offal pit on site which had been used for disposal of offal and general farm waste. The area was not able to be inspected during the investigations due to access restrictions. The area is proposed to be used for the discharge of wastewater to land, following the works. Therefore, the use of investigation/remediation criteria should be protective of groundwater as well as human health, due to the risk of mobilisation of contaminants through the wastewater discharge. Please provide an updated Remedial Action Plan/Contaminated Site Management Plan with appropriate investigation and remediation criteria for this area.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
25.	An Underground Storage Tank is understood to be present on site. Please provide an updated Remedial Action Plan/Contaminated Site Management Plan that references the Ministry for the Environment Petroleum Hydrocarbon Guidelines given their relevance for fuel tank investigations. This investigation should include assessment of the risk to groundwater from and historic leaks from the tank.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
26.	Please provide plot data and maps of plot locations relied on to delineate wetlands at the site.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
27.	There are a number of inaccuracies identified in the Engineering Drawings. Please provide updated versions of the Engineering Drawings as indicated in Section 4.2 of the Wetlands Technical Review prepared by SLR (dated 22 June 2026).	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
28.	The Ecological Impact Assessment ⁶ and substantive application does not demonstrate how the effects management hierarchy as defined in subpart 3 of the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2020 (NPSFM) has been applied in relation to works in close proximity to wetlands. Please provide an assessment that demonstrates how the effects management hierarchy has been applied.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
29.	Clarification on the proposed extent of works within the 10-metre setback of wetlands A, B and C is required: (a) Drawing 4048-0-4002-B shows stormwater being directed to wetland A, however the Ecological Assessment (at page 34) notes that “no works will occur within any of the wetlands”. (b) The piped irrigation route passing under wetland B (drawing 4048-0-4005) appears to have been excluded from discussion of potential works within the wetland’s 10 metre setback, and it is unclear how these works will be undertaken without affecting the wetland. (c) It is stated that “No works will occur within 10 m of wetland C” (EIA, page 34) but drawing 4048-0-4005 indicates a stormwater pipe encroaching into the setback.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
	In each case, please provide further detail on construction methodologies and any proposed avoidance, remediation, or mitigation measures to ensure adverse effects on the wetlands are appropriately avoided or minimised.	
30	The Ecological Impact Assessment and draft conditions propose the adoption of a range of management plans that relate to wetlands. To ensure the full effects of monitoring and management of wetlands can be assessed please provide draft versions of these management plans for review: a) Mammalian Pest Control Plan; b) Weed Control Management Plan; c) Planting Plan; d) Planting Maintenance Plan; and e) Wetland Monitoring and Management Plan. Alternatively, please demonstrate how clause 21.1 of the Panel Convenor's Practice and Procedure Guidance has been considered for each of the management plans listed above, and update the proposed consent conditions as necessary to address the matters listed in clause 21.1.	A Mammalian Pest Control Plan is provided with the application and appended to the Ecological Assessment at Appendix 14. The following draft plans will be provided by 10 August 2026: a) Weed Control Management Plan; b) Planting Plan; c) Planting Maintenance Plan; and d) Wetland Monitoring and Management Plan.

#	Item	Applicant Response
31.	The Ecological Impact Assessment reports that the ecological values of the site were determined in general accordance with the Ecological Impact Assessment Guidelines for Use in New Zealand (EIANZ). Due to water courses at the site being collectively assigned 'low' ecological value, there are limited design details and designed principles incorporated into the proposed realigned stream channels which comprise offset measures for stream reclamation. Please provide further information on the values assigned to the intermittent streams, in line with the EIANZ approach.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
32.	Regulation 57 of the Resource Management National Environment Standards for Freshwater Regulations 2020 (NES-FW) requires an assessment of the functional need for the proposed reclamation and application of the effects management hierarchy as set out in the NPSFM. Please provide an assessment of the functional need for proposed reclamation of the river bed and an assessment that demonstrates how the effects management hierarchy has been applied.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
33.	We consider the proposed constructed channels are more accurately described as an offset for the proposed reclamation of river bed. On that basis, please provide a detailed analysis of the proposed offset and offset design including against the principles for aquatic offsetting as set out in Appendix 6 of the NPSFM.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
34.	Please clarify where Watercourse 3 will discharge to following the proposed development.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
35.	Catchment change and effects of stormwater management in relation to wetland hydrology is discussed in the Ecological Impact Assessment, but the same approach has not been applied to the site streams. How will stream flows, even intermittent flows, and stream	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
	flow diversity be maintained following development, given that these streams will be connected to the stormwater system?	
36.	Proposed condition (2) of the stream works consent states that the reclamation and diversion of the intermittent watercourses should be undertaken in accordance with the Ecological Impact Assessment and Engineering Drawings. However, the Ecological Impact Assessment does not include specific design guidance for the new channels to provide habitat for aquatic fauna that may utilise the watercourses. The new channels should provide, ideally, a net gain in values and should function in the long term. Please provide an updated Ecological Impact Assessment that addresses this deficiency or provided further detail in the proposed consent conditions.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
37.	Please provide an assessment that clearly describes the existing hydrological regime at the site and how the proposed diversion of stormwater at the site will impact the hydrological regime of onsite intermittent streams or whether attenuating additional runoff may have a detrimental effect on downstream users. This assessment should address the matters set out in Section 3.2.1 of the Diversion of Water/Defence Against Water Technical Peer Review dated 24 June 2026.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
38.	For a greenfield development of this scale, Council considers the application does not demonstrate that the residual level of hazard is appropriate or that key infrastructure will remain functional during flood events. In this context, a more conservative approach to hazard avoidance is considered appropriate, with development located outside areas classified as H2 or higher. Please provide further justification that demonstrates the residual level of hazard proposed is appropriate.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
39.	Please provide updated flood hazard mapping at a resolution sufficient to assess the effects at an individual lot or road level scale.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
40.	The hydraulic modelling appears to adopt an appropriate methodology and provides a useful basis for understanding flood behaviour across the site. However, there are a number of uncertainties as outlined in Section 3.2.3 of the Diversion of Water/Defence Against Water Technical Peer Review dated 24 June 2026. Please provide further clarity and supporting information on the identified matters to ensure that the predicted flood events and hazard mapping are representative and that the proposed stormwater management approach will perform as intended across the range of design scenarios.	The Applicant does not consider this matter to constitute an information gap. Rather, it reflects a difference of professional opinion regarding the level of supporting information required, noting that the hydraulic modelling has adopted a conservative methodology and provides an appropriate basis for assessing flood behaviour across the site. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant will provide further clarification addressing the matters raised in the peer review. This response is dependent on receipt of historical flood hazard information requested from ORC on 1 July 2026 to assist with validation of the hydraulic modelling against available historical records. The further information will be provided as soon as practicable following receipt of that information from ORC. As this matter reflects a difference of professional opinion rather than an information gap, the Applicant does not consider that the provision of the further information described above should delay the appointment of a Panel.
41.	The dust management section in the draft EMP is limited and will require further development to ensure dust can be managed as proposed. Please provide the further information identified in Section	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
	10.2 of the Technical Audit of EMP, ESCP and associated documents dated 18 June 2026.	
42.	It is noted at Section 10.2 of the EMP that 'water will be obtained from a suitable source for the water cart until permanent supply is established onsite'. Given the scale of earthworks proposed, where is it intended that water for dust suppression will be sourced from?	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
43.	To ensure that the proposed sediment controls are suitable, please provide updated ESCP sheets that include overland flow arrows that correlate to the contours shown.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
44.	Some dirty water diversion drains appear to have a very steep gradient. How will scour and high velocities be managed in these diversion drains?	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
45.	It is understood that there are works associated with establishment of a water reservoir that will require excavations into the toe of Morven Hill. These works do not appear to have been incorporated into the ESCP. Please provide further justification for why these works have not been incorporated into the ESCP.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
46.	If Stage 6 occurs a significant period of time after Stages 1-5, how will site access be managed? Will there need to be a new stabilised construction site entrance, if the main road into the subdivision has already been sealed in this location? How will this be managed for the other Stages?	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
47.	The minimum sizing criteria may be incorrect for a number of ponds. Auckland Regional Council's Erosion and Sediment Control Guide for Land Disturbing Activities in the Auckland Region (GD05) recommends minimum 300 cubic metres storage per catchment hectare where slope length exceeds 200 metres. Only 200 cubic metres per hectare storage has been provided in a number of	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
	instances where the calculated slope length exceeds 200 metres. This may mean the minimum pond volumes for these ponds need to be recalculated, along with pond dimensions. As an alternative, provide justification for why 200 cubic metres per hectare storage is an acceptable departure from GD05.	
48.	The default inlet batter gradient is reported as 1:2 for all ponds in the calculation sheets. This differs from the pond details which indicate 1:3, which is also recommended under GD05. Please provide justification for why this is an acceptable departure from GD05.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
49.	GD05 recommends level spreaders should be 0.1 to 0.2 metres above the emergency spillway invert. The level spreader relative level (RL) for all ponds is shown as 0.2 metres below the emergency spillway invert. Please provide further justification for why this is an acceptable departure from GD05.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
50.	Will all dirty water diversions that drain into a sediment retention pond be the same max dimension? Does the “worst case” DWD sizing detail provided on page 44 of Appendix B to the EMP apply to all dirty water diversions across the site?	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
51.	With respect to Pond 2C identified in Appendix B to the EMP, the corresponding ESCP indicates an average slope of 7% however the design calculation for the pond indicates an average slope of only ~3%. Please provide further clarification.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
52.	A high level assessment of the NPS-FM is provided in the substantive application. Please provide a detailed assessment of the proposal against the relevant provisions of the NPS-FM.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
53.	There is no assessment of the relevant provisions of the Regional Plan: Water for Otago (RPW) or the Regional Plan: Air for Otago (RPA). Please provide a detailed assessment of the proposal against the relevant provisions of the RPW and RPA.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
54.	A duration of 35 years is sought for the water permit to abstract groundwater for potable supply. RMA section 127B is a relevant consideration for determining a duration for water permits in the Otago Region. Please provide an assessment against RMA section 127B.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
55.	There is no assessment of The Water Conservation (Kawarau) Order 1997 (WCO) contained in the application. Please provide an assessment of the relevant aspects of the proposal against the WCO.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
56.	ORC does not accept that conditions as currently proposed by the applicant are appropriate for addressing the adverse environmental effects of the proposal.	Noted and will be updated if necessary following further information.
57.	Based on the information provided in the substantive application, there are additional approvals ORC has identified which may be required. In ORC's view it will be important for the applicant to provide clarity on these matters and how it proposes to address them, such as by amending and resubmitting its application to seek consent for these additional activities, supported by an effects assessment, or by explaining why it does not require consent for these activities.	Noted. Further assessment has been undertaken, and an updated rules table will be provided by 10 August 2026 to address this item. If completed earlier, it will be provided to ORC as soon as practicable. As an initial indication, the assessment has identified one additional rule trigger: Bore construction – Controlled Activity under Rule 14.1.1.1.
58.	As previously advised, it is considered that there are a number of additional approvals that may be required for the following activities. Please clarify whether the application seeks approvals for these activities and if they are sought please provide the necessary	Noted. Further assessment has been undertaken, and an updated rules table will be provided by 10 August 2026 to address this item. If completed earlier, it will be provided to ORC as soon as practicable.

#	Item	Applicant Response
	information or a process for providing the necessary information or alternatively explain why resource consent for these activities is not required: • A water permit to undertake construction phase dewatering; • A discharge permit to discharge construction phase dewatered water; • A water permit to divert water for the purpose of land drainage under Rule 12.3.2.2; • A discharge permit to discharge land drainage water; • A discharge permit to discharge water (excluding stormwater) or any contaminant from an industrial or trade premise to land under Rule 12.B.4.1; • A land use consent to create a bore for the purpose of land drainage and construction phase dewatering; • A landuse consent to install culverts under the NES-FW; • A discharge permit to discharge contaminants arising from the disturbance of contaminated land (hazardous waste) under Rule 5.6.1 of the RPW; • A discharge permit to discharge contaminants entrained in water such as sediment within 10 metres of a natural inland wetland under Rule 12.C.1.1 of the RPW; and • A discharge permit to discharge dust to air during construction.	As an initial indication, the assessment has identified one additional rule trigger: Bore construction – Controlled Activity under Rule 14.1.1.1.
59.	Public transport-related feedback on the substantive application from Council's Transport Team is attached to this letter.	A meeting with ORC's Public Transport team was requested on 1 July 2026 and is yet to be arranged. The matters raised in the feedback letter does not identify any information gaps. These are matters of professional opinion that are more effectively addressed at the comments stage.

Table 2: Further information QLDC.

#	Item	Applicant Response
Transport		
1.	This matter will be addressed and clarified separately on Wednesday, 8 July 2026 in accordance with responding to the direction in the Panel Convener Memorandum dated 24 June 2026.	Refer to the attached transport response regarding the proposed scope of assessment. Expert reporting consistent with that scope will be provided by 10 August 2026. The recommended ITA scope provided by QLDC states that <i>“consistent with NZTA and Auckland Transport guidance, the proposal is assessed as a major out-of-sequence development, requiring an extensive ITA that considers the extent of assessment necessary to evaluate scenarios where anticipated transport interventions, public transport services, or mode-shift outcomes are delayed, modified, or not realised”</i>. We do not agree with the conclusions drawn from these two documents with respect to out of sequence development. Firstly, the NZTA Integrated transport assessment guidelines November 2010 do not address out of sequence development at all. Neither do NZTA’s updated and current ITA Guidelines. They focus on evaluating the traffic effects of a proposal on the environment, not the timing of development. The current NZTA ITA Guidance does address development contributions and development agreements, noting at page 20 that <i>“there may be scope to enter into a private development agreement between the applicant and relevant road controlling authority as a means of delivering infrastructure that is required (in part or whole) because of a development proposal. This</i>

#	Item	Applicant Response
		<i>can provide flexibility where infrastructure delivery is required ahead of programmed works or outside standard funding arrangements.”¹ We agree.</i> Similarly, the Auckland Transport ITA Guidance treats out of sequence development as a funding issue, not a merits one. Page 47 of the Auckland Transport Guidance specifically addresses out of sequence development. It states: “<i>If the development is out of sequence with the FDS then the applicant should assess the effects and provide an explanation as to how any funding gap is proposed to be addressed by the applicant.</i>” We agree that the effects should be assessed and that funding should be considered where a development need to undertake works to mitigate its effects. That is what is proposed in this case. In short, neither ITA guidance document says that because development is out-of-sequence a regional scale model must be prepared. For large scale development, the same methodology applies regardless. By requesting a regional scale assessment in this case, QLDC/NZTA are requiring a higher standard of assessment for development not identified in the Spatial Plan. This would imply that the Council completed a regional scale transport assessment for the Spatial Plan, which would then justify a simpler assessment for Homestead Bay (for example) compared to Ridgeburn. This position is not supported by the evidence. The Council did not complete a regional scale transport assessment for the Spatial Plan and only high level

¹ <https://www.nzta.govt.nz/assets/resources/planning-policy-manual/docs/planning-policy-manual-integrated-transport-assessment-guide-june-2026.pdf>.

#	Item	Applicant Response
		qualitative analysis was undertaken. This is confirmed by the evaluation report that supports it.² The same level of assessment should apply to all greenfield development regardless of whether it is out of sequence or not. The assessment would appropriately focus on the likely transport effects on the environment and concentrate on an area that effects can be attributed to the development, rather than an assessment of wider network effects arising from all present and future growth.
Economics		
2.	The cost of establishing infrastructure, maintenance and continued operation of self-sufficient infrastructure on the site is not quantified, nor is it addressed in the Economic Assessment in relation to ongoing costs and affordability, nor is there an understanding of the effects on rates for sites established in the area.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
3.	The proposed levies to support the infrastructure entity and/or Residents Association are not properly assessed. Without quantification of ongoing costs as part of private delivery of infrastructure and services, the benefits arising in relation to affordable housing provision are unknown. QLDC seeks that that quantification of ongoing costs is provided.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

² https://www.qldc.govt.nz/media/k3vfv0zy/7a-queenstown-lakes-spatial-plan-scenario-report_mar21.pdf (see section 3.3).

#	Item	Applicant Response
4.	The application includes contrary descriptions of the land application system for the treated effluent, in respect of: • BPO report references rapid infiltration beds. • WGA report references surface irrigation on Morven Hill with subsurface irrigation as a backup. • McKenzie report references subsurface irrigation as the only option QLDC seeks one description of the land application system, and consistent assessment across technical reports.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
Wastewater		
5.	If an above-ground non-trenched spray irrigation system is to be utilised on Morven Hill, QLDC seeks information about the functionality of the system in freezing conditions given its location on a steep southeast facing hillside.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
6.	QLDC seeks information about how any above ground (non-trenched) spray irrigation will be managed as ecological planting and shrubland on Morven Hill grows over time.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
7.	QLDC seeks information on the management of treated wastewater disposal areas and their compatibility with proposed public open spaces and walking trails, including an assessment of potential human health effects and risks. This should include consideration of the proposed spray irrigation field on Morven Hill and the associated walking trail to the summit, as well as wastewater disposal areas located within or adjacent to identified recreation areas. The assessment should also address the measures proposed to manage	This is provided in the application (refer to Appendix 38 – Wastewater Disposal Effects Assessment and Discharge to Air Assessment (PDP) (Appendix 39)) which considers setbacks from residential areas, recreational paths, and walking/ cycling trails. Section 7.2.4 Risks to Human Health states that:

#	Item	Applicant Response
	public access and ensure that users are appropriately excluded from wastewater disposal areas where necessary.	<i>"The spray areas on Morven Hill are not proposed within recreation or areas intended for human traffic. As a surface application method, targeted micro-spray irrigation on Morven Hill presents potential exposure pathways via direct contact. However, risks are minimised through:</i> <i>• Use of low-pressure micro-sprayers targeted at plant bases to reduce aerosolization:</i> <i>• A spray drift assessment will inform spray height and droplet size for design criteria</i> <i>• Exclusion of public access during application periods via signage and fencing if required</i> <i>• Setbacks from residential areas and recreational paths</i> <i>• High-level UV disinfection ensuring low pathogen concentrations:</i> <i>• The proposed WWTP incorporates a continuous UV disinfection stage to ensure the production of a high-quality effluent. This treatment stage addresses the disinfection requirement under Section M4 of the AS/NZS 1547 for the surface spray method.</i> <i>• The proposed planting strategy with targeted application is also expected to limit direct contact. Risks to human health are expected to be suitably low and can be managed to less than minor levels."</i> <i>The Discharge to Air Assessment states that:</i>

#	Item	Applicant Response
		<i>"A minimum setback distance of 50 m from residential boundaries and any other recreational area including the bike path up Morven Hill will be applied. If a 50 m setback cannot be applied from the bike path to spray irrigation fields, then this area should only be irrigated at off peak time (i.e. night time when less people are out)".</i>
Stormwater		
8.	The proposal captures and redirects runoff that currently follows existing overland flow paths. However, it does not address the resilience and adequacy of the proposed stormwater management system.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
9.	The extent to which changes in upstream land use and catchment hydrology have been considered in the design and assessment of the stormwater management system. QLDC therefore seeks further information on these matters.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
10.	The McKenzie report states flow exceedance pathways exist, but provides little evidence that: • Finished floor levels remain protected if pipes, culverts or ponds fail. • Safe conveyance exists during events larger than design storms. There is a risk that the system performs in modelled conditions but creates local flooding under blockage, partial failure, or construction tolerances. The report notes: • 50% blockage for diversion and Pond 1 network. • 10% blockage for box culverts.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
	However, there is no discussion of blockage at inlet structures capturing catchment runoff. This is particularly important because domed grates are proposed to capture significant external catchments, and the risk is that debris blockage creates flow diversion into lots. QLDC seeks that further details are provided to demonstrate flood risks are appropriately mitigated under the NPS-NH 2025 hazard mitigation framework taking this into account.	
11.	The McKenzie report has a discrepancy with respect to the change in discharge to 136 Morven Ferry Road. Table 2 details an increase of 0.43 m³/second, contrary to Section 5.5 which states there is no increase in flow to this address. QLDC seeks that further details are provided to detail: • Flood depth change at 136 Morven Ferry Road. • Confirmation no adverse effect occurs	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
12.	There is no evidence of treatment sizing or that the proposed treatment devices are sufficiently sized to meet the discharge water quality standards. QLDC seeks that further details are provided to demonstrate water contamination risks are appropriately mitigated.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
13.	It is not clear what the intended ownership and future maintenance of stormwater infrastructure outside of the development site is, given no vesting of infrastructure is proposed to Council. QLDC seeks that this is clarified and any necessary easements identified.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
14.	No independent review of the proposed stormwater management system has been undertaken, only of the modelling used. Given the flooding risks and amount of infrastructure required to mitigate it, QLDC seeks that the application includes an independent review of the proposed stormwater systems.	The Applicant does not consider this matter to constitute an information gap, but rather a difference of professional opinion regarding the level of supporting information required. The proposed stormwater management system has been designed by

#	Item	Applicant Response
		suitably qualified experts and is supported by the technical assessments accompanying the application. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant is open to commissioning a peer review. Once complete, the information will be provided to QLDC as soon as practicable. As this matter reflects a difference of professional opinion rather than an information gap, the Applicant does not consider that the provision of the further information described above should delay the appointment of a Panel.
Natural Hazards		
15.	Except for flooding, the application does not include an assessment in accordance with the National Policy Statement Natural Hazards, 2025. This is necessary information.	Refer to page 151 of the AEE as lodged where this assessment is provided, noting that Section 9.9 provides assessment of each hazard: <i>“The assessment in section 9.9 of the report above outlines the effects relating to the various natural hazards and concludes the following with respect to the natural hazards that the NPSNH manages:</i> <i>• Flooding: A detailed flood hazard assessment has been undertaken (Appendix 30) that has assessed potential effects on and off-site using a range of scenarios, including a 5% and 1% AEP event, consistent with the requirements of Policy 6 of the NPSNH. Conditions of consent ensure that potential risks will be appropriately managed and that freeboard levels for buildings are maintained. On this basis, any natural hazard risk</i>

#	Item	Applicant Response
		<i>associated with flooding, is appropriately avoided or mitigated.</i> <i>• Landslips/rockfall: The geotechnical investigation report (Appendix 15) identifies areas where the required Factor of Safety will or may be achieved. Areas closer to Morven Hill require further investigation at the detailed design phase to confirm the mitigation measures. This is required by the conditions of consent and ensures that potential risks will be appropriately managed.</i> <i>• Coastal erosion, inundation and tsunami: these hazards are not present on the site.</i> <i>• Active faults: these hazards are not present on the site.</i> <i>• Liquefaction: The geotechnical investigation report (Appendix 15) confirms that the site is low.</i> <i>For the reasons given above, in our opinion, the proposal is consistent with the objectives and policies of the NPSNH."</i> Notwithstanding this, further analysis will be undertaken by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
16.	Given that the potable water bore supply is located on the flat river terrace of the Kowarau River, information is necessary on the resilience of the potable water supply in the event of any type flooding from the Kowarau River.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
Ecology		

#	Item	Applicant Response
17.	While primarily a matter for DoC, it is noted that there are gaps and conflicts between the Ecological Report recommendations and Draft Lizard Management Plan and the outcomes that may be achieved by the Draft Lizard Management Plan.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
18.	The Draft Lizard Management Plan requires vegetation clearance during the breeding season of birds (Oct - Feb) which the ecological assessment recommends avoiding. This would require nest surveys throughout the clearance period, some species breed slightly earlier e.g. Tui (Sep - Feb) and Grey Warbler (Aug - Feb), both are likely to be present along the Kawarau River escarpment. QLDC seeks clarification of when vegetation clearance will take place. It appears constructed ponds v and vi will be incorporated into the stormwater basin in the upper section of wetland B. The habitat will "no longer be available". QLDC notes that here are no photos of Pond vii and it is difficult to see in the Appendix 28 McKenzie & Co Earthworks Finished Contours Plan Sheet 4 whether Pond vii is incorporated into the pond at the head of wetland B. However, McKenzie & Co Earthworks Cut to Fill Sheet 4 (drawing 4048-0-2L05) indicates Ponds v, vi and vii will all be incorporated into the earthworks footprint and reclaimed with v and vi going into the new stormwater pond while Pond viii will be lost under the subdivision. QLDC seeks that the application clearly clarifies the status of the ponds consistently between Appendix 1-4 and 28 and ensure that photos are provided for Pond vii.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
19.	QLDC seeks information around how trapping will occur and be maintained in perpetuity, particularly around areas that are subject to wastewater disposal.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
Landscape		
20	QLDC seeks an assessment of: a) landscape effects associated with the proposed earthworks. b) landscape, including visual amenity effects, for adjacent sites. c) A rating of overall landscape effects, supported by a thorough evaluation in terms of the physical, perceptual and associative landscape values (and factoring in the PDP spatial strategy for the area which articulates the community's vision for the area), as is required by Te Tangi o te Manu (Aotearoo New Zealand, Lonscape Assessment Guidetines). This should include clear explanations and reasoning in support of the assessor's opinions. d) Legible mapping of the ONF boundaries (both Morvern Hill and the Kawarau ONFs) on the proposed masterplan, the annotated photographs, cross sections and the cut and fill/earthworks plans. e) Visual simulations from key vantage points. For example: the Crown Range lookouts, Morven Ferry Road, and Queenstown Trail where a public place. It is expected that this will require the construction of a digital terrain model (DTM) of the proposed site levels, onto which the roading, buildings and landscape treatment is 'placed', to create a 'development model'. The development model is required to assess visual amenity effects in light of the reliance on intervening vegetation off site, at least some of which, is unlikely to be protected. Whether intervening vegetation is protected, should be identified. f) Plant growth assumptions with respect to 'mature' mitigation and enhancement planting, and advice with respect to the rating and duration of adverse effects ratings while such planting is 'maturing'.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item noting in some instances the Applicant considers these matters are already addressed in the landscape assessment provided with the application

#	Item	Applicant Response
Urban Design		
21.	QLDC seeks a pedestrian shed analysis to a future bus route and the proposed village centre including CPTED assessment and consideration of gradients and road layout to get a better understanding of the walkability of the proposed development.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
22.	It is not clear how the development will be future proofed for connections to further adjacent development if approved. QLDC seeks an analysis is undertaken of how the development could connect by roading (including allowing for efficient and logical bus routes) to adjoining development if they also become urban development sites in the future. This analysis should look at whether the current roading hierarchy, including the internal road network, is appropriate to accommodate this long-term potential future.	The Applicant does not consider this matter to constitute an information gap, but rather a difference of professional opinion regarding the scope of assessment required. The application seeks approval for the Ridgeburn development as proposed and does not assume or rely upon the future urbanisation of adjoining rural land. The proposed transport network has been designed to appropriately service the development and provide for safe and efficient operation in accordance with the Integrated Transport Assessment provided with the application.
23.	QLDC seeks information on the following matters: • Confirmation (or otherwise) that public will have access to the "public places" and any legal mechanisms required to achieve access -this is related to para 25, below. • Confirmation (or otherwise) that public buses will have access rights through the development, and if so, who is proposed to be liable to construct and maintain bus stops on private roads. • An explanation of rights to access the roading network to connect possible future urban developments on adjacent land and any mechanisms or proposed conditions that achieve, control or will hinder such access.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
24.	QLDC considers there is inadequate analysis of how the proposal achieves a well-functioning urban environment including demonstration of accessibility for people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces and open spaces, including by	Refer to Section 10.1.1 (National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020) Page 147-149 of the Assessment of

#	Item	Applicant Response
	public or active transport, or how the proposal contributes to a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions. QLDC seeks a full assessment of the proposal that addresses these matters.	Environmental Effects submitted with the application where this matter is addressed.
Recreation		
25.	The application material is unclear as to whether any of the proposed open space and recreation areas are intended to be vested in Council or retained in private ownership. In addition, no public access easements appear to be proposed	No open space and recreation areas are intended to be vested in Council. Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
26.	QLDC seeks information and clarification as to whether any flat and usable portions of the proposed public open space areas, including the proposed community park and sports fields, are encumbered by wastewater or stormwater infrastructure (or both).	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
27.	The application is unclear about the human health effects for a lot of the recreation activities that may occur on the lots or adjoining trails as a result of the wastewater infrastructure. The application is unclear on what will occur if monitoring shows standards are not being met. QLDC seeks an assessment on the appropriateness of wastewater disposal in relation to recreational assets and how potential adverse effects are to be avoided or mitigated.	The potential human health effects associated with recreational use adjoining the wastewater disposal areas, including the Morven Hill bike path and trails, are assessed in Appendix 38 – Wastewater Disposal Assessment and Appendix 39 - Discharge to Air Assessment. Appendix 38 identifies the potential health risk associated with aerosolised pathogens from spray irrigation and recommends a suite of mitigation measures, including irrigation wind cut-offs (greater than 7.5 m/s), non-misting spray heads, a maximum spray height of 0.5 m, fencing and signage, and setback distances from residential areas and recreational assets. The assessment specifically recommends a minimum 50 m setback from recreational areas, including the Morven Hill bike path, or where this cannot be achieved, irrigation adjacent to the bike path would occur only during off-peak night-time hours.

#	Item	Applicant Response
		Appendix 39 also specifically addresses the spray irrigation field adjoining the Morven Hill bike path. It recommends a 50 m setback from the bike path, or a reduced 10 m setback where irrigation is restricted to off-peak night-time periods, together with fencing, signage, low-height non-misting nozzles, wind-speed cut-offs and operational measures to prevent odour generation. In relation to human health, Appendix 38 concludes that the combination of advanced wastewater treatment (including ultrafiltration and UV disinfection), separation distances, subsurface attenuation and operational controls is not expected to result in adverse microbiological effects or an increased human health risk from incidental contact within the development. The report also provides a comprehensive monitoring and adaptive management programme, including effluent quality monitoring, groundwater and surface water monitoring, operational controls and contingency measures should monitoring triggers be exceeded.
28.	As currently proposed, the open spaces and recreation areas do not meet the QLDC criteria for acceptable Local, Community or Sportsground Parks, are not suitable for year-round use and cannot accommodate fit for purpose public community buildings. QLDC considers that there is a gap in the information in that no assessment has been made against the Council's Future Parks and Reserves Provisions Plan2021 and Parks and Open Space Strategy 2021.	No open space or recreation areas are proposed to be vested in Queenstown Lakes District Council, the application has not been assessed against the Council's Future Parks and Reserves Provision Plan 2021 or Parks and Open Space Strategy 2021. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant will provide further commentary on these documents within updated expert reporting by 10 August 2026.
29.	How asset management plans and maintenance will be undertaken to ensure that private roading is well maintained and does not become a liability (and cost imposition on future residents). This applies to WW, SW and water supply.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
Social		
30	QLDC notes that the proposal does not include any information on education services or any analysis on where or how social and community services will be provided for; for the proposed community.	The provision of education and wider social and community services is outside the Applicant's control and is managed by the relevant government agencies and private providers in response to population growth. The application provides sufficient information regarding the proposed development, including the provision of neighbourhood-scale commercial, community and recreational facilities and connections to the existing urban area.
31.	Given its remote location for a relatively large and new proposed population, QLDC seeks a Social Impact Assessment from a suitably qualified practitioner for the proposed development and an explanation as to how any recommendations arising from the assessment are incorporated into the proposed development.	An SIA is not considered necessary. The Ridgeburn site cannot reasonably be characterised as remote in the context of the Queenstown urban area. It is located approximately 6 km from Arrowtown, 12 km from Frankton, and 5-6 km from the future Ladies Mile urban area, which is identified in the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Masterplan as accommodating a future town centre, community facilities, sports hub, and primary and secondary schools. The site is also approximately 4.6 km from Arrowtown School and 8.8 km from Wakatipu High School, with existing school bus services operating along Morven Ferry Road. Moreover, the Applicant is not aware of any comparable residential development progressing under the Fast-track Approvals Act that has been required to prepare a standalone Social Impact Assessment. The only Fast-track projects that have included Social Impact Assessments relate to fundamentally different forms of development, including the Waihi North Project (mining), Auckland Prison Capacity Increase, and Taranaki VTM (offshore seabed

#	Item	Applicant Response
		mining). Accordingly, the Applicant does not consider the absence of a Social Impact Assessment constitutes an information gap.
Additional Consents		
32.	Depending on the final detailed design of the wastewater spray irrigation, taking into account functionality in freezing conditions (Morven Hill ONF) and potable water supplies (Kawarau River ONF), QLDC considers that additional earthworks consents may be required for undergrounding of pipework in an ONF under Rule 25.5.2.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

Table 3: Further information DOC.

#	Item	Applicant Response
Wildlife Approval for lizards		
1.	Assessment of lizard release sites An assessment of the effects of releasing lizards on current populations of lizards at Morven Hill is required. To assess this, baseline release-site survey results are required, including habitat area/quality, expected capacity, rationale for allocation of species/numbers to each release area, and a trigger for using alternative release areas if capture numbers exceed expectations. Clarity on whether southern grass skink habitat occurs on Morven Hill is also required	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
2.	Mitigation hierarchy	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
	Clarification on which lizard habitats are avoided, which cannot be avoided with reasoning why not, and what actions are proposed to minimise effects is required	
3.	Assessment of effects An assessment of the effectiveness of plantings and pest control and the effect of herbicides on lizards is required.	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.
4.	Lizard Management plan The LMP lacks clear contingency responses for low salvage success, high mortality, unexpected species, unsuitable weather windows, release-site failure, predator-control failure, or excessive capture numbers. A contingency table with triggers, actions, responsibilities, and reporting requirements could address this. A lizard monitoring programme is required, e.g. monitoring years, methods, performance measures, success criteria, and adaptive management triggers. <i>Please note further lizard issues under the discussion of conditions below.</i> <u>Freshwater</u> Blue text below is taken from our Summary of Consultation provided in March 2026. The comments below respond to how the issues raised have been addressed. <i>The narrative descriptions are generally sufficient to evaluate the ecological value assessments in the EclA. However, more information is required on fish in the water race and invertebrates in the intermittent standing waters, such as the constructed ponds</i>	The Applicant does not consider this matter to constitute an information gap, but rather a difference of professional opinion regarding the level of supporting information required. Notwithstanding this, the Applicant is open to providing a contingency table on this point. As this matter reflects a difference of professional opinion rather than an information gap, the Applicant does not consider that the provision of the further information described above should delay the appointment of a Panel.

#	Item	Applicant Response
	<i>(especially to determine whether endangered tadpole shrimps may be present).</i>	
5.	Data on fish in the Morvern ferry Race In regard to the Morvern Ferry Race, additional comments since pre-lodgement consultation have been made stating that fish are unlikely to be present, but apart from a check of the NZ Freshwater Fish Database (which yielded no records), there are still no actual data on fish in the race. Unless the water race is recently constructed and has well-designed fish screens on the intake, it is likely that some fish live in the race, possibly including koaro and longfin eel (both At Risk – Declining). However, fish diversity will very likely be low. Therefore, even if some fish are present in the race, its ecological value is likely to remain low. With respect to At Risk species potentially present, it is noted that a Fish Management Plan (FMP) is recommended to salvage any such fish. The FMP appears adequate to salvage most fish that may be present.	The Applicant does not consider this matter to constitute an information gap, but rather a difference of professional opinion regarding the level of supporting information required. Fish are not subject to Wildlife Act control, and a Fish Management Plan is appended to the Ecological Assessment provided with the application which is considered to be sufficient to manage impacts regardless of fish species.
6.	Possible presence of tadpole shrimps in the constructed ponds The possible presence of tadpole shrimps in the constructed ponds has been acknowledged, though the likelihood of this species occurring is considered very low and no provisions for detecting them (for example, eDNA sampling) are offered. eDNA sampling is still recommended as it is relatively simple and cheap, and it will resolve the question of whether tadpole shrimps are present.	The Applicant does not consider this matter to constitute an information gap, but rather a difference of professional opinion regarding the level of supporting information required, as it does not relate to a Wildlife Act approval and is not required to assess the effects of the proposal. The Ecological Assessment submitted with the application addresses the potential presence of tadpole shrimp and assesses the likelihood of their occurrence.
7.	Risk of nutrients and microbial pathogens from land application of waste water degrading the water quality of sensitive waterbodies <i>More information is required on the risk of nutrients and microbial pathogens infiltrating into groundwater and degrading the water quality of sensitive waterbodies, in particular the Kawarau River.</i>	Expert reporting will be updated by 10 August 2026 to address this item.

#	Item	Applicant Response
	With regard to phosphorus, the updated EclA says “Estimated phosphorus loading exceeds the expected potential annual native planting uptake rate (WGA 2026). However, phosphorus is less mobile than nitrogen and is expected to be attenuated through adsorption to soil particles and retention within soils and strata.” It is of concern that phosphorus loading will exceed plant uptake. While it is true that phosphorus tends to bind to soil particles, nevertheless both the phosphorus and the soil particles it is bound to can be exported to streams during rainfall events via surface runoff. This occurs commonly in pasture catchments, and is well documented in the scientific literature. Since the Ridgeburn Development has a moderately wet climate (889 mm of rain/snowfall per year), surface runoff events are expected to occur several times per year. Phosphorus export to the Arrow River from spray irrigation of treated wastewater appears to be the most significant concern remaining with regard to effects of this development on freshwater. The Arrow River discharges to the Kawarau River, which has a water conservation order (1997). This identifies waters to be protected including the Kawarau River mainstem from Scrubby Stream to Lake Wakatipu control gates.	
Wetlands		
8.	Hydrological information on the wetlands is lacking There are four wetlands identified within the proposed activity area. Normal practice would be to clearly delineate the spatial extent of each wetland and assign wetland typologies using an accepted framework, such as Johnson and Gerbeaux (2004). This information is needed to understand the wetland types affected, the hydrological drivers that maintain them, and whether the proposal could result in any loss of wetland extent or function.	The Applicant does not consider this matter to constitute an information gap, but rather a difference of professional opinion regarding the level of supporting information required. Notwithstanding this, the EclA will be updated to include the wetland types and provide further clarification of the hydrological assessment. As outlined in the EclA, the development will not result in any material change to the hydrology of Wetland C. The contributing catchment will remain substantially the same, with

#	Item	Applicant Response
	Wetland C is identified in the EclA as an ephemeral wetland. It is less clear whether Wetlands B and D should also be considered ephemeral, although the application describes them as having intermittent or seasonally variable hydrology. Ephemeral wetlands are recognised as a naturally uncommon ecosystem and are classified as Critically Endangered by Holdaway et al. (2012). This does not appear to have been reflected in the ecological values assessment. The proposed avoidance of direct works within Wetland C and establishment of a planted buffer are positive measures. However, for an ephemeral wetland, maintaining hydrological function is critical. The current assessment does not provide enough wetland-specific information on catchment extent, flow paths, or seasonal hydrology to support a confident conclusion that Wetland C will not be adversely affected. Understanding the hydrology is important because the ecological function of an ephemeral wetland is controlled less by annual water volume alone, and more by the timing, frequency, duration, and depth of inundation. The distinctive values of ephemeral wetlands depend on the balance between water inputs and drying processes. It is considered that avoidance of hydrological effects on Wetland C would require avoiding development activities within the ephemeral wetland catchment, unless the applicant can demonstrate that the wetland's hydrological regime will be maintained. This is important because the wetland's hydrology supports a critically endangered naturally uncommon ecosystem. Filling this information gap would require continuous monitoring of water levels over as long a period of time as possible (ideally a year or more) prior to development, and then continuing this monitoring post-development to ensure the current hydrological regime is maintained.	only a negligible change (approximately 0.5%). Surface water will continue to enter the wetland from its existing catchment, with flows formalised through the stormwater network rather than occurring as overland flow. The stormwater network will control discharge energy, and no changes to groundwater inputs are anticipated. The avoidance of adverse effects on Wetland C does not require avoidance of development, but rather avoidance of changes to the wetland's hydrology. Given that the volume and timing of water entering the wetland, including its hydroperiod, are not expected to materially change, continuous pre-development water level monitoring is not considered necessary. Such monitoring would typically only be required where significant changes to the contributing catchment or hydrological regime are proposed. These matters have already been considered in the EclA and will be clarified further in the updated assessment. As this matter reflects a difference of professional opinion rather than an information gap, the Applicant does not consider that the provision of the further information described above should delay the appointment of a Panel.

#	Item	Applicant Response
	The application reports only minor catchment changes for Wetland C. However, the reports do not provide a Wetland C-specific assessment of how the proposed stormwater design, earthworks, and altered flow paths will affect the wetland's hydroperiod. It is therefore unclear whether the existing wet/dry regime will be maintained. The information provided also does not clearly show what activities will occur within Wetland C's contributing catchment or what the potential impacts on wetland hydrology might be. The Appendix 28 stormwater drawings suggest that residential development and roading may occur within the Wetland C catchment area. If that is correct, this could represent a potentially substantial alteration to the catchment processes that currently support the wetland's uncommon ephemeral values.	
9.	Native planting and enhancement proposed for wetlands We refer to the summary of consultation provided to the applicant pre-lodgement. The application should address how the natural wetlands areas proposed for restoration are to be protected in perpetuity. More detail on the native plantings/enhancement proposed for wetlands and riparian margins, as well as proposed conditions addressing wetland management, including objectives, measures, targets/plantings and monitoring, are required to assess the effects on wetlands.	The Applicant does not consider this matter to constitute an information gap, but rather a difference of professional opinion regarding the level of supporting information required. The application includes information on the proposed native planting and enhancement of wetlands and riparian margins. Further detail regarding wetland management and long-term protection is provided through the Landscape Plans, Wetland Management Plan and the proposed consent conditions. The applicant will continue to discuss conditions with DOC. As this matter reflects a difference of professional opinion rather than an information gap, the Applicant does not consider that the provision of the conditions described above should delay the appointment of a Panel.

#	Item	Applicant Response
Conditions Points 10-15		
10.	It is considered that some of the proposed draft conditions are broad and should be more specific in terms of objectives, targets and monitoring/reporting requirements. The certification process should also be clearly set out in conditions including timeframes and identification of the relevant regulator undertaking the review and certification.	The Applicant does not consider this matter to constitute an information gap, but rather a difference of professional opinion regarding the level of supporting information required. The Applicant will continue to discuss conditions with DOC. As this matter reflects a difference of professional opinion rather than an information gap, the Applicant does not consider that the provision of the conditions described above should delay the appointment of a Panel.
Wildlife Act Authority		
16.	More detail on planned control and monitoring of rodents at release sites is required. Certification of the lizard management plan for the purposes of the Wildlife Approval is required to be undertaken by DOC as opposed to the Regional Council.	The Applicant does not consider this matter to constitute an information gap, but rather a difference of professional opinion regarding the level of supporting information required. The Applicant will continue to discuss conditions with DOC and provide a revised set of conditions on 10 August 2026. As this matter reflects a difference of professional opinion rather than an information gap, the Applicant does not consider that the provision of the conditions described above should delay the appointment of a Panel.

Attachment B – Response to QLDC/NZTA’s proposed ITA Scope



RIDGEBURN

ARROWTOWN JUNCTION

Response to Memorandum of Counsel



CARRIAGEWAY
CONSULTING

traffic engineering | transport planning



Table of Contents

Main Report		Page
1	Introduction	1
1.1	Overview	1
1.2	Report Structure	1
2	Executive Summary	2
3	MoC Section 1: Basis for this Scope: Methodology	3
4	MoC Section 2: Purpose	4
5	MoC Section 3: Extent of Assessment Required	5
6	MoC Section 4: Strategic and Policy Context	7
7	MoC Section 5: Regional Policy and Strategic Outcomes Assessment	8
8	MoC Section 6: Study Area	11
9	MoC Section 7: Existing Transport Environment	12
10	MoC Section 8: Development Description	13
11	MoC Section 9: Trip Generation and Travel Demand	14
12	MoC Section 10: Mode Shift Deliverability Assessment	15
13	MoC Section 11: Transport Model Requirements	16
14	MoC Section 12: Public Transport Feasibility Assessment	17
15	MoC Section 13: Park and Ride Assessment	18
16	MoC Section 14: Active Modes Assessment	19
17	MoC Section 15: Morven Ferry Road and Arrow Junction Road Assessment	20
18	MoC Section 16: Road Safety Assessment	21
19	MoC Section 17: Construction Traffic Assessment	22
20	MoC Section 18: Network Resilience and Emergency Access	23
21	MoC Section 19: Infrastructure Funding Responsibility Assessment	24
22	MoC Section 20: Mitigation, Staging and Delivery Framework	25
23	MoC Section 21: Transport Risk Assessment	26
24	MoC Section 22: Residual Effects	27
25	Summary	28

CCL file reference	15145 response to qldc memo final
Status	Final
Issued	15 July 2026



1. Introduction

1.1. Overview

- 1.1.1. This report has been prepared to respond to the Memorandum of Counsel (**MoC**) for Queenstown Lakes District Council (**QLDC**) relating to the application made by Ridgeburn Limited under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (**FTAA**).
- 1.1.2. Specifically, the MoC sets out the scope for an Integrated Transport Assessment that (**ITA**) has been agreed by QLDC and the New Zealand Transport Agency (**NZTA**). This report responds to the technical areas identified by QLDC and NZTA and whether, in the opinion of the author, those are reasonable and appropriate.
- 1.1.3. This report has been prepared by Mr Andy Carr, in accordance with the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note (2023). Mr Carr's qualifications and experience were summarised in Appendix A of the Transportation Assessment Reports previously produced and submitted as part of the substantive application.

1.2. Report Structure

- 1.2.1. This report has structured in the same manner as the MoC with each section reflecting the headings used.
- 1.2.2. As the MoC does not include paragraph numbering, the relevant section of the MoC has been cut-and-paste into this report to assist the reader in instances where it might not be clear as to which of the points raised in the Memorandum are being addressed. The response to the matters raised then follows immediately afterwards.
- 1.2.3. The responses have been provided on the basis of an assessment of whether the requested items will assist decision-makers in understanding the transportation effects of the proposal.
- 1.2.4. Two ITAs have been produced for the application, one relating to the internal roading network and the other relating to effects on the external transportation networks. For ease of reading, this report simply refers to 'ITA', but with an appropriate reference provided.



2. Executive Summary

- 2.1. Of the various technical areas identified in the MoC, many are identified in this report as being appropriate for inclusion in the ITA. In the majority of these cases they have already been included in the ITA produced for this application.
- 2.2. In other cases, and for a range of reasons, matters raised in the MoC are agreed in part only or are not agreed.
- 2.3. In light of the range of responses, it is considered that discussions with QLDC/NZTA would be of benefit. This will likely enable some resolution of the areas of disagreement and where agreement cannot be reached, will mean that the extent of differences can be narrowed.
- 2.4. As the MoC includes all suggested topics for inclusion in the ITA, it is also suggested that in moving forwards a gap analysis would be of most use, that is, identification and scoping of those ITA areas where additional/supplementary information is sought. This can again be produced collaboratively through discussions with QLDC/NZTA.

3. MoC Section 1: Basis for this Scope: Methodology

- 3.1. It is agreed that the NZTA Research Report 422 and the Auckland Transport Guidelines provide a degree of structure and indicate the typical contents for an ITA. However these are necessarily 'overarching' guidance documents:
- NZTA Research Report 422 relates to research undertaken nationally at the start of the adoption of the ITA process in 2010;
 - The Auckland Transport Guidelines) relates specifically the preparation of ITAs within and relating to activities within the Auckland context.
- 3.2. Consequently, neither guide takes into account specific matters relating to Queenstown Lakes District and its particular transportation and land-use context.
- 3.3. Accordingly, the approach taken in the submitted ITAs was also informed by the consenting process for two large sites adjacent to state highways and which had the recent involvement of both QLDC and NZTA, being:
- Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation
 - A variation to the Proposed District Plan led by QLDC, which rezoned land zoned Rural, Rural Lifestyle and Large Lot Residential at State Highway 6 to higher residential capacities of around 2,400 units, a new town centre and other commercial development¹ and
 - Homestead Bay
 - A development under the FTAA, for 2,800 residences plus 11,000sqm of commercial activity on the western side of State Highway 6.
- 3.4. Both of these sites approximately twice the size of the Ridgeburn proposal (which is proposed to have around 1,200 residences), and it was therefore considered that the matters addressed in those ITAs, and including issues such as the geographic area for assessment, use of different travel modes and the like, provided a sound and reasonable basis for determining the scope of the Ridgeburn ITA.
- 3.5. Accordingly, it is considered that the scope of the ITA should not only be cognisant of the generalised guides noted in the MoC but should also recognise the level of detail that was provided for other recent developments within the district, and which was considered by the decision-makers in those cases to be both appropriate and sufficient for an assessment of the transportation-related effects.
- 3.6. The ITA has been produced to focus on the matters that are considered to be relevant to this particular application rather than to simply meet all elements of all guides.
- 3.7. The MoC considers that the ITA should be classified as 'extensive'. Irrespective of the particular label that is applied, it is considered that the key issue is to address the topics that are addressed within the ITA. Consequently, the focus is of this response on these matters.

¹ https://www.qldc.govt.nz/media/xdjhxtoi/qldc_ladies-mile-notification_a4-factsheet_apr23-web.pdf

4. MoC Section 2: Purpose

- 4.1. It is agreed that the purpose of the report should be to provide the Expert Panel with sufficient information to determine whether the proposal represents efficient, safe, accessible, and sustainable transport outcomes.
- 4.2. It is not agreed that the assessment should extend to encompass the whole of the Whakatipu Basin or the regional transport network. As with all developments, the effects will be focussed in the immediate area of the site, and as distance from (any) site increases, the effects diminish. This matter is discussed further below with regard to the suggestion for transport modelling to be used.
- 4.3. Network 'resilience' is also not agreed as a topic that should be considered. NZTA defines resilience as *"keeping roads open and the transport system available so people and businesses can rely on the transport system to get to where they want to go despite unplanned events or disruptions"* noting that *"natural hazards can include storms, earthquakes, tsunamis, volcanic eruptions and climate-related hazards"*².
- 4.4. In this case, the transportation movements generated by the site will very quickly move onto the vested public road network, where it can and should be expected that the road controlling authorities (QLDC and NZTA) have deemed that an appropriate level of resilience is provided. It is therefore not necessary to re-evaluate those transport links as part of this proposal.
- 4.5. It is further observed that matters relating to the resilience of the public road network can only be effectively managed and implemented by public agencies rather than by any individual developer.
- 4.6. That said, the resilience of the *internal* site roading network is agreed as a matter that could be included (and for clarity, has not been addressed thus far).

² <https://www.nzta.govt.nz/partners/maintenance-and-operations/highways-information-portal/technical-disciplines/resilience>

5. MoC Section 3: Extent of Assessment Required

Therefore, the extent of assessment required is determined by the degree to which the proposal:

- Requires transport infrastructure that is not currently programmed or funded.
- Relies on public transport services that are not currently operating or funded.
- Relies on future mode-shift outcomes that have not yet been demonstrated.
- Accelerates the need for strategic transport investment.
- Creates dependencies on NZTA, QLDC, ORC, or other third parties.
- Generates transport effects extending well beyond the site and local road network.
- Creates risks associated with infrastructure delivery timing, funding and implementation.

5.1. This extent of assessment presented in the ITA thus far:

- a. Requires transport infrastructure that is not currently programmed or funded.
 - The ITA already includes assessment and discussion for the widening of Morven Ferry Road, the provision of a roundabout at the State Highway 6 / Morven Ferry Road intersection and improvements to the currently-congested State Highway 6 / Arrowtown – Lake Hayes Road. Measures in these locations are proposed to be funded wholly by the Applicant.
 - Following discussions with NZTA on 23 June 2026, a request was made for further sensitivity testing at the State Highway 6 / Arrow Junction Road / McDonnell Road intersection, which the Applicant agreed to undertake.
 - It is not considered that assessment beyond these three intersections is justified on the basis of scale and nature of effects expected to be associated with the proposal.
- b. Relies on public transport services that are not currently operating or funded.
 - Public transport services are operated through Otago Regional Council (**ORC**) with whom there has been consultation. This identified that there were merits in servicing the site via a bus route but also that ORC cannot confirm bus routes for a development site that is not yet consented.
 - It could reasonably be surmised that a large new population (such as would occur at Ridgeburn) would lead to increases in demand for public transport, and therefore would justify the provision of future public transport services. The ITA identified how a relatively small deviation in an existing bus service could achieve this rather than a brand new service having to be provided.
- c. Relies on future mode-shift outcomes that have not yet been demonstrated.
 - The ITA takes a conservative approach of allowing for 10% public transport use. By way of comparison, Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation allowed for 22.2% and 30.5% public transport use³, and Homestead Bay allowed for 10% as the 'low' public transport use scenario (and up to 50% PT use as an "aspirational" public transport use)⁴.
- d. Accelerates the need for strategic transport investment.
 - It is unclear what this specifically refers to, as the assessment relies on current timings of investment. Specific areas have been identified where improvement measures are required and these are proposed to be funded by the Applicant.

³ Section 6.2.3, Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Masterplan Transport Strategy

⁴ Section 5.2 of the WSP Transportation Analysis, Appendix GG to the application



- e. Creates dependencies on NZTA, QLDC, ORC, or other third parties.
 - In practice it is inevitable that all developments have some degree of dependency because these three entities are the existing transportation network providers. However through the assessment carried out to date, and the proposal by the Applicant to fund the identified schemes (Morven Ferry Road upgrade, State Highway 6 / Morven Ferry Road roundabout and State Highway 6 / Arrowtown – Lake Hayes Road intersection improvements), the extent of dependencies has been minimised.
- f. Generates transport effects extending well beyond the site and local road network.
 - The effects of the proposal have been assessed as far as State Highway 6 / Arrowtown – Lake Hayes Road intersection which is 3.5km west of the site, and the State Highway 6 / McDonnell Road intersection which is 2.2km east of the site. This is considered to be appropriate and broadly consistent with standard professional transportation assessment practice.
- g. Creates risks associated with infrastructure delivery timing, funding and implementation.
 - No areas have been identified where such risks are created.



6. MoC Section 4: Strategic and Policy Context

- 6.1. While it is relevant to assess overarching strategic transport documents, these documents sit within a wider strategic planning context. As such it is considered that an assessment of alignment with all parts of those documents does not fit within an ITA in and of itself, but is better addressed within the appropriate context and thus through a broader assessment of planning matters. However the ITA can address the relevant transport-related aspects of overarching strategies.



7. MoC Section 5: Regional Policy and Strategic Outcomes Assessment

- 7.1. The MoC seeks that the ITA includes an evaluation of economic matters, with this split according to the type of road user (public transport, freight, tourism, etc) and on different routes (Queenstown to Cromwell, Cromwell to Gibbston, etc)
- 7.2. Economic assessment is not typically included in ITAs for specific land-use development applications, as it requires qualifications and experience that are outside the field of traffic engineering and transport planning. While the economic matters listed may or may not have merit, it is considered that they do not belong in a development-related ITA.

Particular consideration should also be given to the cumulative effects of (additional) development-generated traffic on the SH6 corridor between Lake Hayes, the Shotover Bridge, and Frankton. This assessment should take account of existing and anticipated developments that will rely on the same strategic transport infrastructure, including the recently approved Simplicity Living referral (approximately 1,100 residential units), the Homestead Bay development, which is reliant on the BP Intersection, and other listed projects under the Fast-Track Approvals Act, including the NZSki Doolans Basin expansion, the Gibbston development, and additional developments within the Gibbston area, such as the Waitiri Project (that is currently at the referral stage).

Collectively, these developments are likely to generate additional travel demand within a corridor already experiencing significant capacity constraints, with the potential for resulting congestion effects to extend beyond the immediate network and give rise to broader economic impacts.

- 7.3. It is understood that the receiving environment does not include projects that are at the referral stage, but are not yet approved.
- 7.4. No assessment has been identified for the Homestead Bay FTAA development which assessed the 'BP intersection', nor in fact, details of the roading network to the north of the Kawarau River. Rather, the assessment⁵ extended to the four intersections in the immediate vicinity of that site, and noted that expected traffic flows exceeded the capacities of other intersections and the Kawarau Bridge.
- 7.5. It is agreed though that development which could take place as of right should be taken into account. This has already been allowed for in the ITA by using the QLDC transportation model to forecast the extent of traffic growth on the State Highway 6 corridor for a future 'design year' of 2035. This growth calculates traffic volumes based on the expected uptake of land over this time period.
- 7.6. Rule 29.4.11 (High Traffic Generating Activities) of the Proposed District Plan is also relevant in this regard. The outcome of this Rule is that irrespective of the land zoning, development of any site is a Restricted Discretionary Activity above particular thresholds, with an assessment required of transport matters including integration with the existing transport networks. For example, although the Te Pūhahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation assessed the effects of around 2,400 residential units, only 50 units are a Permitted Activity and beyond this, an assessment of transport-related effects and appropriate mitigation is required (and any resource consent application made can be declined on the basis of adverse transportation effects).

⁵ Sections 3.3 to 3.5 of the WSP Transportation Analysis, Appendix GG to the application



- 7.7. It is also important that if/when any confirmed development is taken into account, any associated mitigation measures are also included.

Safety and Security

The ITA shall assess:

- Safe System outcomes.
- Vulnerable road user safety.
- Public transport safety.
- Construction traffic safety.
- Network resilience.
- Emergency access.
- Personal security associated with transport facilities.

- 7.8. Road safety is agreed to be an important matter, and is already addressed within the ITA.
- 7.9. Construction traffic is only able to use vested roading network once a Construction Traffic Management Plan (**CTMP**) is produced and approved by NZTA and QLDC. The safe operation of the roading network is a key aspect of any CTMP, which takes into account details such as the timing and volume of construction traffic, which are not presently known. Consequently, it is not agreed that safety matters arising from construction traffic should form part of the ITA as it is addressed through a separate and subsequent approvals process.
- 7.10. Network resilience is addressed above but since the generated trips utilise the vested roading network, it is not considered that an assessment of resilience is required for the external transport networks. Resilience can however be assessed for the internal roading network.
- 7.11. It is not considered that emergency access or personal security should form part of the ITA. Emergency access partly lies within the area of 'resilience', but in practice, when emergency services are travelling to an event, drivers are required to move to the side of the road. Personal security is a matter that lies within the realms of urban and architectural design expertise.

Accessibility outcomes shall be assessed for:

- Private vehicle travel.
- Public transport.
- Walking.
- Cycling and other users (such as, horse riders)

- 7.12. Accessibility for equestrians is a highly unusual request (unless a site is in the immediate vicinity of large stables, which is not the case here) and it is not considered it should be included in the ITA in this instance. Accessibility by private travel, public transport, walking and cycling are relevant and are already included in the ITA.

Sustainability

The ITA shall assess:

- Vehicle kilometres travelled.
- Transport emissions.
- Energy consumption.
- Public transport viability.
- Active mode opportunities.
- Efficient use of existing infrastructure.
- Long-term infrastructure servicing requirements.
- Consistency with sustainable growth objectives.



- 7.13. Vehicle Kilometres Travelled is not an effect that needs to be avoided, remedied or mitigated but is a metric of transport activity. It is an intangible aggregate value calculated by multiplying two things together (vehicle volumes and kilometres travelled), but neither of these reflect occupancies of vehicles or efficiencies of vehicles.
- 7.14. Neither emissions nor energy consumption are issues that are required to be assessed in a typical ITA. In practice they are specialist fields that lie outside traffic engineering and especially in relation to a development-related ITA. At a high level though, Ridgeburn includes both residential and employment activities to enable people to work from home (or work closer to home, including replacement trips that would otherwise be made from residential areas in Cromwell, Wānaka other locations). For those who do travel further to work, public transport will be available.
- 7.15. It is therefore not considered that these three matters should be included in the ITA.
- 7.16. The ITA addresses public transport (and it is also noted above in paragraph 4.1b), which shows that a deviation of an existing service is viable. While further work could be carried out (such as a detailed business case), much of the information needed for this is not available and it would appear from consultation with ORC that further assessment is limited as the development has not been approved. The matter of public transport is discussed in Section 12 of this report.
- 7.17. It is agreed that active travel opportunities should form part of the scope, and they are presently discussed in the ITA submitted.
- 7.18. With regard to the use and servicing of the transportation infrastructure, the ITA adopts an approach of assessing efficiency (queues and delays) for a design year of 2035. This is considered reasonable and represents an appropriate future timeframe.
- 7.19. Sustainable growth encompasses a much wider range of disciplines than just transportation and therefore requires a multi-disciplinary approach. It is therefore not considered that it should form a specific part of the ITA.



8. MoC Section 6: Study Area

The primary study area shall include:

- Morven Ferry Road.
- Arrow Junction Road.
- McDonnell Road.
- SH6 (particularly East of Shotover Bridge) and SH6A
- All side-road intersections connecting to SH6.

- 8.1. Towards the east, the ITA already includes the three locations identified.
- 8.2. Towards the west, the MoC seeks that the study area extends to State Highway 6A, which is more than 11km from the site. This is not accepted as being reasonable for the extent of development proposed and extends the area further than was required for the (much larger) Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation and Homestead Bay FTAA assessments.
- 8.3. Towards the west, the assessment addresses the effects State Highway 6 / Arrowtown – Lake Hayes Road intersection. Further west though, it is considered that any assessment is more likely to be dispersed in terms of effects and thus assessment is not justified.

9. MoC Section 7: Existing Transport Environment

The ITA shall establish existing conditions relating to:

- Traffic volumes.
- Intersection performance.
- Travel times.
- Travel time reliability.
- Queue lengths.
- Freight movements.
- Public transport performance.
- Walking and cycling infrastructure.
- Parking demand.
- Network resilience.
- Safety performance and crash history.

- 9.1. Traffic volumes, intersection performance, queue lengths, walking and cycling infrastructure, and safety performance and crash history are already included in the ITA. Travel times (with regard to delays at intersections at peak times) are also included. Freight movements are taken into account for the intersection assessments.
- 9.2. Existing parking demand is not considered to be relevant as the site is greenfield and there is minimal on-street parking on Morven Ferry Road. Matters relating to resilience are discussed previously, but it is not considered that they are relevant.

10. MoC Section 8: Development Description

The ITA shall describe:

- Proposed land uses.
- Population and dwelling yields.
- Visitor accommodation.
- Education activities.
- Employment generation.
- Development staging.
- Internal street network.
- Active transport facilities.
- Parking provision.
- Public transport facilities.
- Construction programme.

- 10.1. A description of the development is included in the ITA which addresses the bulk of these matters.
- 10.2. Development staging is included in other application documents. The construction programme cannot be included at this stage because this requires details of construction methodologies and timings that are not currently available (and would not typically be available for any development until after consents are secured).

11. MoC Section 9: Trip Generation and Travel Demand

Sensitivity testing shall be undertaken for:

- Internal trip capture.
- Pass-by trips.
- Remote working.
- Carpooling.
- Reduced vehicle ownership.
- Public transport uptake.
- Walking and cycling mode share.
- Visitor travel demand.

- 11.1. The ITA specifically addresses internal (and linked) trips, pass-by trips, visitor travel demand and public transport, walking and cycling uptake.
- 11.2. It is acknowledged that remote working, carpooling and reduced vehicle ownership may be relevant. These have not been taken into account in the analysis thus far, but if they were to be adopted, they would tend to reduce the external traffic generation, and thus further confirm that the analysis presented in the ITA is conservatively robust.

12. MoC Section 10: Mode Shift Deliverability Assessment

The ITA shall explicitly test whether proposed behavioural assumptions are realistically achievable. The assessment shall include:

Assumption	Evidence Required
Public transport use	Comparable developments and ORC feedback
Walking mode share	Walking catchment analysis
Cycling mode share	Network quality assessment
Internal trip capture	Land-use interaction analysis
Reduced vehicle ownership	Demographic and market evidence
Carpooling uptake	Evidence from comparable locations

The assessment shall test:

- Optimistic scenario.
- Expected scenario.
- Conservative scenario.
- No mode shift scenario.
- No public transport scenario

- 12.1. The extent of public transport use was drawn from the lower estimates at the Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation and Homestead Bay assessments, and are therefore already compared against similar developments in the ITA using a conservative scenario.
- 12.2. The site is more than 1km from likely external attractors for walking, and matters associated with connectivity via cycling is already addressed in the ITA. Similarly the extent of internal trips is discussed in the ITA.
- 12.3. While scenario testing can be helpful, the approach adopted thus far is considered to reflect a 'conservative' set of factors. A scenario with no public transport and no mode shift is not considered to reflect a reasonable or expected outcome, since major settlements in the Whakatipu Basin of the scale proposed at Ridgeburn are (and will increasingly be) served by public transport. Undertaking tests with 'expected' or 'optimistic' scenarios will simply show a lower level of effect compared to the analysis set out in the ITA.



13. MoC Section 11: Transport Model Requirements

- 13.1. The MoC seeks the development of a transportation model which extends from Cromwell to Frankton, and requires inputs for uptake of land (committed, permitted and anticipated), for the current year, 2035 and 2045. The model should also allow for different uptakes of public transport, variations in roading scheme delivery, and different scenarios for economic growth.
- 13.2. Transport models can be useful tools where there is a complex network with considerable route choice available or where a development might be large enough to have regionally significant effects. It is considered that neither of these are relevant for Ridgeburn. The model described would extend further to the east than the Council's own transportation model used for strategic (district-wide) transport planning, and it is considered it is highly unlikely to reveal any details that would assist in decision-making for this development under the FTAA.
- 13.3. The request sets out a range of model attributes that would be very difficult to achieve in practice. A model that could address any regional accessibility issues would be too broad to also assess detailed queue formation and propagation, and travel time reliability.
- 13.4. Practically speaking, the requested model would take up to a year to build and require a level of detail that is excessive for a development of this scale and nature.
- 13.5. The suggestion of constructing an extensive transport model for assessment of Ridgeburn is therefore not accepted.
- 13.6. It should be noted though that the existing QLDC model has been used to assess expected traffic volumes on State Highway 6 in the vicinity of the site. The approach taken has been to identify the growth on the highway to the design year of 2035 and then add this growth onto the traffic flows observed in 2025. This approach therefore takes into account the expected uptake of land and extent of development expected within the QLDC's current modelling framework for the next ten years.

14. MoC Section 12: Public Transport Feasibility Assessment

- 14.1. The ITA discusses the ability to divert an existing bus service into the site and sets out that infrastructure is provided for this, but the MoC seeks an in-depth evaluation of this. At face value this appears to be more akin to the development of a detailed public transport business case which would typically be undertaken by the agency responsible for managing and operating the district's public transport network (in this case, ORC).
- 14.2. Much of the detail needed for such an assessment is not available as it lies with ORC. Matters such as fleet and driver requirements, operating costs forecasts of patronage and economic matters are considered well beyond the scope of a developed-focussed ITA. Accordingly, the topics listed are not supported as part of the ITA process.
- 14.3. The MoC sets out that there should be documented engagement with ORC. There has already been engagement with ORC and results of this are included in the application.



15. MoC Section 13: Park and Ride Assessment

The ITA shall assess:

- Proposed Park and Ride facilities.
- Alternative locations near SH6.
- Ladies Mile opportunities.
- Capacity requirements.
- Operational requirements.
- Funding arrangements.
- Long-term management responsibilities.

- 15.1. Park and Ride facilities are assessed in the ITA already in terms of location, operation and capacity.
- 15.2. Given that they are located within the site, it is not considered that an evaluation of alternative locations is reasonable, nor is having to consider alternative locations at Ladies Mile, which is several kilometres away and outside the site. Funding and long-term management are not matters that are considered within the ITA.



16. MoC Section 14: Active Modes Assessment

The ITA shall assess:

- Internal walking and cycling facilities.
- Trail network integration.
- Arrow Junction Road connections.
- Arrowtown Trail crossings.
- Safety and comfort.
- Accessibility to public transport.
- End-of-trip facilities.

16.1. The ITA addresses walking and cycling facilities within the site and connectivity to external routes, as well as access to public transport access, with, for example, the provision of cycle parking at the proposed Park and Ride site.

16.2. It is therefore considered that while these are relevant issues, they are already assessed.

17. MoC Section 15: Morven Ferry Road and Arrow Junction Road Assessment

A detailed assessment shall evaluate:

- Road geometry.
- Pavement condition.
- Capacity.
- Safety.
- Heavy vehicle suitability.
- Construction traffic effects.
- Maintenance implications.
- Walking and cycling provision.

- 17.1. The proposal includes provision for Morven Ferry Road to be substantially upgraded to allow for the expected additional traffic flow. As such, the matters above are already addressed in the application, other than pavement condition (which is irrelevant as the road is to be reconstructed and subject to subsequent engineering approvals) and construction traffic effects (which cannot be assessed at this time as discussed in Section 18 of this report).
- 17.2. The ITA sets out that the route via Arrow Junction Road will not be attractive to drivers since it is slower than using Morven Ferry Road, and requires turning at the State Highway 6 / Arrow Junction Road rather than at the State Highway 6 / Morven Ferry Road roundabout, which is the more difficult turn. Consequently, very little traffic is expected to use Arrow Junction Road, and the assessment set out above is therefore largely not required. That said, the road geometry of the road and its safety record are already discussed in the ITA in the context of the walking and cycling route that is provided along the road.

18. MoC Section 16: Road Safety Assessment

- 18.1. The MoC sets out that a Safe System Assessment should be undertaken for the length of State Highway 6 between McDonnell Road and State Highway 6A, plus “all” side roads.
- 18.2. A Safe System Assessment looks at three general areas: exposure to crashes (typically traffic flows), likelihood of crashes (geometry, speeds, sight distances) and severity (largely related to speed)⁶. It gives a score out of 4 to various factors associated with each of these categories. However, the highest score for ‘exposure’ is given to a road that carries more than 10,000 vehicles per day, which is already the case for State Highway 6 without the development and thus the score will not change when the development traffic is added.
- 18.3. The majority of the roading network remains with the same geometry and thus there is considered to be no change in ‘likelihood’. Through consultation, NZTA has set out that it is not in a position to reduce speeds, which is the primary factor affecting crash severity.
- 18.4. Finally, a Safe System Assessment simply quantifies road safety risk with a total score out of 448. It does not identify or result in conclusions that a scheme is ‘good’ or ‘bad’ as this is still a matter of professional engineering judgement. As such, it is not considered that this exercise will reveal any information that would be of assistance within the FTAA approval process. The ITA already includes an assessment of road safety matters, and it is not considered necessary to undertake anything further.

⁶ Table 4.4, Austroads Research Report AP-R509-16



19. MoC Section 17: Construction Traffic Assessment

- 19.1. In common with the vast majority of developments, construction methodologies are presently not known, meaning that a detailed assessment of construction traffic cannot be undertaken.
- 19.2. However this level of detail is not relevant for an ITA, as the movement of construction traffic cannot occur until a Temporary Traffic Management Plan (**TTMP**) is approved by the road controlling authority (in this case, both Council and NZTA). This is a separate process to the Resource Management Act and FTAA, and occurs under the Code of Practice for Temporary Traffic Management (**CoPTTM**), and its successor, the New Zealand Guide to Temporary Traffic Management (**NZGTTM**).
- 19.3. In practice, this means that when some activity is being undertaken (such as a large construction project) where the normal conditions of a road are varied (such as would occur with a greater number of construction vehicles) then CoPTTM/NZGTTM applies and there is a requirement to have a TTMP approved in advance. The TTMP includes the details that the MoC seeks to have included in the ITA, because at the time of the TTMP, those details are known.



20. MoC Section 18: Network Resilience and Emergency Access

- 20.1. Matters such as incident management, evacuation capability, and dependence on the state highway network are matters that affect the whole of the Whakatipu Basin and are not specific to this site. Respectfully, the majority of existing residential development in the Whakatipu Basin is dependent on the use of State Highway 6, and so it is unclear as to why it is sought that this site in particular should include an evaluation of the resilience of the state highway.
- 20.2. It is not agreed that network resilience and emergency access are relevant matters for the ITA associated with the Ridgeburn development.





21. MoC Section 19: Infrastructure Funding Responsibility Assessment

- 21.1. The application sets out that the identified improvement schemes (Morven Ferry Road widening, State Highway 6 / Morven Ferry Road roundabout, and State Highway 6 / Arrowtown – Lake Hayes Road intersection) will be funded by the developer. As such, setting out the costs is not relevant and there are no funding gaps.
- 21.2. The triggers for these schemes are already set out in the ITA, and the works are wholly within the legal road reserve meaning that consents are not required. Irrespective of this, the need for consents is a planning matter which does not properly belong in an ITA.
- 21.3. The MoC references that infrastructure should be identified that “*supports multiple growth areas*” and that is “*required for wider network operation*”. These do not appear to be effects arising from the proposed development but related to the operation of the wider public network.



22. MoC Section 20: Mitigation, Staging and Delivery Framework

- 22.1. In large part, this section of the MoC appears to replicate the provisions of the infrastructure funding responsibilities. However, to recap, the required mitigation measures are set out in the ITA, together with concept design, delivery triggers and their timing. Funding for these is provided by the Applicant.

23. MoC Section 21: Transport Risk Assessment

- 23.1. The MoC presents a populated table of risks which is assumed to be indicative rather than prescriptive. However it is important to note that a number of these are not relevant, such as *“required SH6 upgrades unfunded”* (the Applicant is to fund them), *“Morven Ferry Road unable to accommodate forecast demand”* (it is to be upgraded to a standard better than the state highway), and *“regional economic costs exceed forecast benefits”* (which is an economic assessment rather than a traffic / transportation matter).
- 23.2. A further example is *“public transport patronage below forecast”* which is shown as having a ‘high’ likelihood. However the expected use of public transport allowed for at Ridgeburn is lower than allowed for at the (already approved Te Pūtahi Ladies Mile Plan Variation and the Homestead Bay FTAA site).
- 23.3. Ultimately, it is not clear what the purpose of this risk assessment is, and so it is not agreed as being part of the ITA.



24. MoC Section 22: Residual Effects

- 24.1. The topics listed under this heading will have all been addressed through the assessments described previously in this report. It is therefore not considered necessary to address them again in the ITA.





25. Summary

- 25.1. There are many technical areas identified in the MoC as being appropriate for inclusion in the ITA, but which have already been included in the ITA that has been produced to date for this application. As such, these are matters where it is agreed that they are appropriate to include.
- 25.2. A number of matters identified in the MoC are agreed in part. These are generally areas where the overarching topic is agreed but the MoC seeks a level of detail that is in excess of what is reasonably required for the FTAA consenting process, or where the geographic area over which the assessment sought is considered excessive.
- 25.3. Finally, some matters are not agreed as being appropriate for the ITA. These are generally technical areas which do not relate to traffic engineering / transport planning associated with the application, or where the request will not lead to outcomes that assist the FTAA decision-maker(s).
- 25.4. In light of this range of responses, it is considered that there would be benefit in undertaking discussions with QLDC/NZTA to ensure that their underlying thinking and rationale is understood. This will not only be an opportunity for QLDC/NZTA to become better appraised of the contents of the ITA submitted, but will likely enable some resolution of the areas of disagreement. Where agreement cannot be reached, it will mean that the extent of differences can be narrowed.
- 25.5. Moving forwards, since the ITA already addresses many of the items in the MoC, it is considered that a gap analysis (that is, identification and scoping of those areas where additional or supplementary information is sought) would be of use. This can again be produced collaboratively with QLDC/NZTA.

Carriageway Consulting Limited
July 2026



CARRIAGEWAY
CONSULTING

traffic engineering | transport planning

A. PO Box 29623, Riccarton, Christchurch, 8440 P. 03 377 7010 E. office@carriageway.co.nz

Attachment C –Further Summary of Consultation

Post-Lodgement Consultation Summary

The following tables summarise consultation undertaken following lodgement of the Ridgeburn substantive application and are intended to be read alongside Volume C – Consultation Summary Report submitted with the application. Separate tables have been prepared for consultation with Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC), Otago Regional Council (ORC), the Department of Conservation (DOC), Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT), and the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA).

This document also records the meetings requested by the Applicant to facilitate discussion of the matters identified by the relevant authorities as information gaps.

Table 1: Schedule of Consultation QLDC.

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
Pre-lodgement Substantive Application QLDC		
1.	As part of the referral application process, the Applicant undertook consultation with Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) in accordance with the FTAA. This engagement was undertaken to introduce the Ridgeburn Mixed Use Development, obtain preliminary feedback, and identify key planning, infrastructure, and design considerations relevant to the proposal. Consultation with QLDC included a pre-application meeting with Council officers. Key matters raised by QLDC during the referral consultation included: • the need to address transport effects, including upgrades to Morven Ferry Road and • consideration of traffic constraints in the wider Lake Hayes Estate area; • ensuring safe integration of the development with the existing cycle trail network; • investigation of alternative transport options; • provision of local employment opportunities, including interest in shared or co-working spaces; • assessment of landscape effects, with an expectation that any landscape assessment may	Pre-referral application

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
	• be subject to peer review; and • the need to consider relevant planning objectives and policies, including those relating to development outside identified urban growth boundaries.	
2.	Transport methodology/ modelling meeting: A meeting was held with QLDC's transport team to discuss the proposed transport assessment methodology, including survey approach, modelling inputs, and potential access arrangements. QLDC raised matters relating to network capacity, safety, and integration with the QLDC transport model, and emphasized the need for robust data inputs and consideration of cumulative effects.	28 October 2025
3.	QLDC and Ridgeburn Limited - Check in meeting: A meeting was held with QLDC organised by Brent Pearce (Strategy and Infrastructure Planning Manager). A Detailed Transport meeting was set up following this meeting.	10 November 2025
4.	Detailed Transport meeting: A follow-up meeting was held to present the draft integrated transport assessment which was subsequently lodged with the application. Discussion focused on modelling assumptions, trip generation and distribution, and preliminary mitigation measures. QLDC sought clarity on growth assumptions and the extent to which mitigation measures are within the Applicant's control, and emphasized the need to address wider network constraints, including interim measures where public transport is not yet established.	5 December 2025
5.	A broader planning and infrastructure meeting was held with QLDC staff to present the updated masterplan and servicing strategy. This included the integrated development approach, landscape-led design, and proposed infrastructure solutions. The three waters servicing strategy was presented, outlining a self-sufficient approach to water supply, wastewater treatment, and stormwater management. Transport connections, including bus facilities and active transport links, were also outlined. QLDC provided verbal feedback on transport modelling, alignment with Council infrastructure standards and Code of Practice requirements, public transport assumptions, landscape and visual effects beyond the site, and aspects of water servicing, stormwater discharge, and long-term infrastructure performance.	16 December 2025

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
Post Lodgement Substantive Application QLDC		
6.	Email to QLDC seeking to continue constructive engagement throughout the substantive process and requested a meeting following the acceptance period (from 2 June) to discuss any matters QLDC considered would be helpful, including opportunities to resolve issues early and explore areas of alignment, such as workshopping draft consent conditions.	19 May 2026
7.	Email to QLDC Planning Fast Track Contact (Onur Oktem) - The Applicant requested that QLDC advise whether there were any completeness issues or additional information requirements that had been identified which the Applicant could assist to resolve.	25 May 2026
8.	Post lodgement meeting held with QLDC planners to discuss ongoing consultation, if there were any information requirements the applicant could resolve, and any clarifications on the substantive application.	16 June 2026
9.	Various emails regarding setting up regular weekly catchups between QLDC and the Applicant.	17 June 2026
10.	Meeting held with QLDC Landscape Architect, Consultant Planner and Internal Planner (Marcus Langman, and Onur Oktem) to discuss the site visit, information requirements, and any clarifications on the substantive application	22 June 2026
11.	A site visit was undertaken with QLDC's Landscape Architect (Bridget Gilbert), the Applicant's planner and the Applicant. Council's Consultant planner (Marcus Langman) had intended to attend but was unable to do so after his flight was diverted. Two pieces of further information were requested by the Council prior to the site visit: a) A geolocated plan from the applicant's team showing the development layout (including all elements within the ONF areas), the viewpoint locations, and ONF boundaries; and b) A geolocated plan from the applicant's team showing cut and fill mapping alongside the ONF boundaries. This information was provided to the Council.	25 June 2026

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
12.	Following the issue of Minute 5, the Applicant proposed extending the regular weekly meeting with QLDC which was scheduled for 3 July to one hour to discuss Council's memorandum and the matters raised during the Convenor's conference. QLDC declined the request and cancelled the scheduled meeting. In its response dated 1 July, QLDC advised that its immediate priority was responding to the Panel Convenor's directions and preparing a detailed list of information gaps and RFI topics, which it intended to provide by 6 July. QLDC considered that a meeting at that stage would be premature, as neither party had yet had sufficient opportunity to work through the matters identified in Minute 5. Council also noted that the information gaps had been informed by a range of technical experts who had not yet met to consider the Panel's directions, meaning Council staff were not yet in a position to provide detailed technical explanations. QLDC therefore considered it would be more productive to meet after the RFI topics had been issued, once the Applicant had an opportunity to review them and discuss any questions or clarifications.	1 July 2026
13.	The Applicant requested an initial planner-to-planner meeting, once the QLDC's RFI had been received, to discuss the identified information gaps, areas of agreement or disagreement, and to identify any technical meetings that may be required in accordance with paragraph 13 of Minute 5 of the Panel Convenor. The Applicant also offered to facilitate a further site visit for QLDC's planner. QLDC declined the request, advising that it considered it more appropriate to first receive the Applicant's response to Minute 5 before determining the need for, and structure of, any meetings. QLDC noted that its planners were not the subject matter experts for the technical matters raised in the RFI and were therefore not in a position to discuss the substance of the information requests beyond what was set out in the RFI. Instead, QLDC proposed a Teams meeting during the week of 13 July (following receipt of the applicant's response to Minute 5) to discuss and confirm the number, structure and attendees for any future technical meetings, with this process to be reported to the Panel Convenor at the second conference. QLDC also confirmed the availability of its planning, urban design and ecology experts to undertake a site visit on 14–16 July, subject to access arrangements being confirmed.	2 July 2026
14.	Site visit undertaken with QLDC (Marcus Langman (Planning), Bruce Harland (Urban Design), and Dawn Palmer (Ecology)).	14 July 2026

Table 2: Schedule of Consultation ORC.

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
Pre-lodgement Substantive Application ORC		
1.	As part of the referral application process, the Applicant undertook consultation with Otago Regional Council (ORC) to introduce the Ridgeburn proposal and obtain initial feedback on regional matters, including discharges, water quality, stormwater management, and ecological effects. Engagement with ORC was initiated by correspondence dated 11 April 2025, seeking a meeting to discuss the proposal. ORC confirmed availability and a meeting was subsequently held on 8 May 2025 with representatives from consents, compliance, science, and transport teams. At this meeting, the Applicant presented an overview of the proposed development, including the servicing strategy, anticipated discharges, and infrastructure requirements. ORC provided preliminary feedback on matters within its jurisdiction, including wastewater treatment and disposal, stormwater management, water quality effects, and the need for appropriate technical assessments to support the application. This referral stage engagement assisted in identifying the key regional consenting considerations and informed the scope and development of the Project's technical assessments.	Pre-referral application
2.	A meeting was held with ORC's transport team to present the proposed public transport approach, including a park and ride facility, internal road layout capable of accommodating bus circulation, and potential diversion of the existing No. 2 bus route. ORC provided constructive feedback, noting that the park and ride concept is appropriate for the site and that diversion of the existing route appears feasible in principle, subject to further assessment of network efficiency and demand. ORC provided constructive feedback, noting that the park and ride concept is appropriate for the site and that diversion of the existing route appears feasible in principle, subject to further assessment of network efficiency and demand. ORC also identified design considerations including the need for reliable access via State Highway 6, provision for a bus termination point, and ensuring accessibility of bus stops	6 November 2025
3.	Following this meeting, further correspondence was undertaken with ORC transport officers to refine the proposal. This included provision of a detailed public transport options assessment and ongoing discussion regarding route configuration, including loop versus return routes, stop pairing, and operational efficiency. ORC	Various

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
	provided feedback on service design, including the potential benefits of routes that allow buses to turn around and return along the same alignment, and the importance of aligning service options with long-term network planning and frequency assumptions. This iterative exchange of information informed the development of a flexible public transport approach that can respond to future service provision	
4.	A detailed meeting was held with ORC science and compliance officers to discuss the servicing components of the Project, with a focus on compliance frameworks, operational requirements, and the drafting of enforceable consent conditions. This meeting enabled direct engagement between ORC officers and the Applicant's technical specialists across wastewater, hydrogeology, water supply, stormwater, and engineering. Key matters discussed included wastewater treatment processes, system resilience and sludge management, and the iterative development of disposal options having regard to hydrogeological constraints and potential effects on the Kaware River. ORC also raised the potential for reuse of treated wastewater and encouraged consideration of sustainable nutrient management approaches. Water supply investigations and preliminary water quality results were discussed, with ORC emphasising the need for comprehensive monitoring, including parameters such as arsenic, and appropriate consent coverage for all associated discharges. Stormwater management and hydrological processes were also addressed, including upstream flow interception, attenuation, and management of downstream effects. ORC emphasised the importance of robust, enforceable consent conditions, including monitoring, reporting, and adaptive management	9 December 2025
5.	A separate meeting was held with ORC ecology and science officers on 15 December 2025 to discuss terrestrial ecology matters. This meeting confirmed that ecological values have been identified early and largely avoided through the site layout, with development focused on modified pasture areas. Wetlands and intermittent streams have been excluded from development, which ORC acknowledged as consistent with the effects management hierarchy.	15 December 2025
Post Lodgement Substantive Application ORC		
6.	Email to ORC seeking to continue constructive engagement throughout the substantive process and requested a meeting following the acceptance period (from 2 June) to discuss any matters ORC considered would be helpful, including opportunities to resolve issues early and explore areas of alignment, such as workshopping draft consent conditions.	19 May 2026

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
7.	Email ORC issued a further information request resulting from specialist expert reviews. ORC offered to meet the Applicant's consultants to discuss further information points, as needed. The Applicant's consultants responded to ORC's further information request, advising that the Applicant team would work through the matters raised and requesting meetings in due course to discuss the relevant issues.	26 June 2026
8.	Email Following receipt of ORC's initial information requests, the Applicant sought to engage with ORC to clarify the matters raised and streamline the further information process. This included requesting an initial planner-level meeting, seeking historical flood hazard information to assist with technical assessments, offering to facilitate a site visit for ORC staff and experts, and proposing a programme of technical meetings covering public transport, groundwater, ecology, flood hazard, wastewater, air quality and conditions. The Applicant advised that these meetings would assist in confirming the scope of further information before updated technical reports were finalised. While these requests were made, no technical meetings with ORC have been convened to date.	6 June 2026
9.	Initial planner-level Meeting The Applicant confirmed that at that stage and subject to expert meetings and ORC providing required information its intention was to respond to all RFI items, regardless of whether they represented information gaps or differences in professional opinion. The Applicant advised that an updated RFI tracking table would be provided to assist ORC and support its response to Minute 5 and supplied minutes from previous technical meetings relating to public transport, science, ecology and compliance. The Applicant also identified the Diversion of Water/Defence Against Water and Air Quality meetings as priority discussions, confirmed that the rules table would be circulated for comment once available, and reiterated its commitment to ongoing collaborative engagement throughout the process. The Applicant has remained available to participate in technical meetings to discuss responses to the further information requests and information required to respond to certain points. While ORC indicated that these meetings would be arranged, no technical meetings have been scheduled at this stage.	7 July 2026

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
10.	Site visit undertaken with ORC and various specialists.	15 July 2026

Table 3: Schedule of Consultation DOC.

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
Pre-lodgement Substantive Application DOC		
1.	An initial meeting was held with DOC in October 2025 to discuss the proposed ecological survey methodology, lizard management approach, and relevant approval pathways. That discussion focused on the proposed lizard survey, the anticipated need for a Wildlife Act authorisation for lizard salvage and relocation, and a separate approval process for a potential water pipeline easement across conservation land. DOC also provided guidance on application documentation, including the need for both full and redacted versions of the Lizard Management Plan where sensitive ecological information is included.	October 2025
2.	Following that meeting, draft material was circulated to DOC for review prior to lodgement, including the draft Ecological Impact Assessment and draft Lizard Management Plan. DOC acknowledged the early engagement and referred the draft lizard material to its technical advisors for review. Further written feedback was then received through DOC's technical advisor in relation to lizard values, effects assessment, mitigation, monitoring, release site protection, and the adequacy of the proposed Wildlife Act conditions. The feedback was incorporated into the Ecological Report which was submitted with the application.	Various between October 2025- Lodgement
Post Lodgement Substantive Application DOC		
3.	Email to DOC confirming lodgement of the application seeking to continue constructive engagement throughout the substantive process and requested a meeting following the acceptance period (from 2 June) to discuss any matters DOC considered would be helpful, including opportunities to resolve issues early and explore areas of alignment, such as workshopping draft consent conditions.	19 May 2026
4.	A meeting was held with DOC following the Panel Convenor's direction for the parties to discuss and, where possible, reach agreement on information required to address identified information gaps. DOC confirmed that its position remained consistent with its pre-lodgement advice and advised that a detailed memorandum would	9 July 2026

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
	be provided setting out comments on the lizard assessment, wetland matters and proposed conditions. Discussion focused on the adequacy of the lizard assessments, particularly the suitability and carrying capacity of the proposed Morven Hill release site, the need to clarify management across the four proposed release sites, and the relationship between the Lizard Management Plan and Pest Management Plan. DOC also identified outstanding matters relating to wetland management, including the need for a Wetland Management and Monitoring Plan and appropriate weed and pest management within wetland areas. It was agreed that the applicant would review DOC's memorandum once received, continue refining the ecological management plans and conditions, and undertake further discussions with DOC to resolve information gaps ahead of the Panel Convenor response.	
5.	An email was sent to DOC requesting the further information request that DOC had advised would be provided prior to the meeting on 9 July 2026. DOC confirmed that the request would be detailed and would be circulated on the afternoon of 9 July 2026 or the morning of 13 July 2026. A Draft Further Information request was provided on 13 July 2026, with the final provided on 15 July 2026.	13 July 2026

Table 4: Schedule of Consultation HNZPT.

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
Pre-lodgement Substantive Application HNZPT		
1.	Engagement was initiated following the referral process, with HNZPT confirming the relevant contact for the Otago/Southland fast-track process and expressing willingness to engage on the development of the substantive application. A meeting was subsequently held in early November 2025 to discuss HNZPT's interests and information requirements.	November 2025
2.	A draft Archaeological Assessment was provided to HNZPT on 9 December 2025 for review prior to lodgement of the substantive application. HNZPT acknowledged receipt of the draft assessment and confirmed that it had been referred internally to their archaeological advisor for technical review. HNZPT indicated that they would provide further comment if any issues were identified.	9 December 2025

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
Post Lodgement Substantive Application HNZPT		
3.	Email to HNZPT - lodgement of the application was confirmed by the Applicant's consultants. They also invited HNZPT to contact them should they require any further information during the assessment process or have any questions regarding the application as lodged.	14 May 2026
4.	Email from HNZPT, confirming there are no information gaps in relation to the archaeological authority application. HNZPT advised that discussions will continue regarding the Archaeological Management Plan (AMP) and draft conditions, with the aim of reaching an agreed (or largely agreed) set of conditions for the Panel. HNZPT indicated it expects to provide tracked changes to the draft conditions and feedback on the AMP following 21 July 2026, with a meeting proposed for the week commencing 27 July 2026.	8 July 2026

Table 5: Schedule of Consultation NZTA

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
Pre-lodgement Substantive Application NZTA		
1.	Following circulation of the draft Transport Assessment in December 2025, NZTA provided written feedback identifying a number of matters requiring further assessment. These included the extent of transport effects west of Lake Hayes, daily traffic generation, the performance of intersections beyond those immediately adjacent to the site, site access design, active mode connections, and the appropriateness of assumptions relating to the speed environment and public transport.	6 January 2026
2.	A meeting was held with NZTA to discuss its written feedback and clarify the scope of further transport assessment and modelling. The discussion focused on baseline assumptions for Ladies Mile and the wider corridor, demand and capacity effects on the State Highway network, speed environment issues, intersection design, slow vehicle lane requirements, nearby accesses including Bendemeer, and active mode connections. NZTA also confirmed that, while wider network upgrades such as bridge capacity improvements addressed broader network matters,	22 January 2026

#	Item	Date/ Timeframe
	further assessment was required to understand Ridgeburn's contribution to corridor effects and the extent of any appropriate mitigation.	
3.	A meeting to discuss NZTA's review the updated transport analysis and modelling. Discussions addressed public transport assumptions, park-and-ride provision, mode shift assumptions, cumulative effects, and concept design options for the Arrowtown–Lake Hayes Road intersection. NZTA raised concerns regarding the use of a seagull treatment in a higher-speed environment, the implications for adjacent accesses and road reserve width, and indicated a preference for further consideration of a roundabout solution. NZTA also emphasised the importance of ensuring that the assessment baseline appropriately reflected the future transport environment across the corridor, including other anticipated development.	20 February 2026
Post-Lodgement Substantive Application NZTA		
4.	The Applicant's consultants emailed NZTA to request a meeting regarding the application as lodged, and proposed upgrades.	19 June 2026
5.	Online meeting held with NZTA and the Applicant's consultants to discuss proposed roading upgrades and NZTA's initial review of the application. The applicant's consultant Chris Rossiter is the same as QLDC's transport consultant.	25 June 2026

Attachment D – Conditions (new conditions identified in green highlight)

This consent authorises the subdivision of the site into residential, commercial, reserve, roading and infrastructure lots and land use for the development of commercial, retail and residential buildings, a visitor and worker accommodation building, and associated bulk earthworks. In addition, the consent enables supporting infrastructure, including on-site water supply, wastewater treatment, and stormwater management systems. It authorises works undertaken in proximity to wetlands under the National Environmental Standards for Freshwater 2020 and disturbance of contaminated soils under the National Environmental Standard for the Assessment and Management of Soil Contaminants to Protect Human Health. It authorises the handling or incidental harm of indigenous lizards under the Wildlife Act 1953 and the modification or destruction of recorded archaeological sites (F41/62 and F41/890), and, as a precaution, the modification of any potential archaeological areas across the site should they be discovered during construction under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014.

The draft conditions have been prepared using the Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC) and Otago Regional Council (ORC) standard conditions as a foundation. In developing these, consideration has also been given to the structure, staging approach, and drafting style adopted in the recently approved Homestead Bay FTAA decision.¹ The conditions also reflect the requirements of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024, in particular section 83, which requires that any condition imposed by the Panel be no more onerous than necessary to address the matter for which it is imposed, and section 84A, which empowers the Panel to impose conditions to ensure that infrastructure within, or relied upon by, the project area is adequate to support the project.

Under clause 18 Schedule 5 of the FTAA and sections 108 and 108AA of the RMA, this consent is subject to the following conditions:

¹ <https://www.fasttrack.govt.nz/projects/homestead-bay>

Glossary of Terms

Acronym	Definition
CMP	Construction Management Plan
CSMP	Contaminated Site Management Plan
Council	Queenstown Lakes District Council
DSI	Detailed Site Investigation
EMP	Environmental Management Plan
ESCP	Erosion and Sediment Control Management Plan
FHEMP	Flood Hazard Emergency Management Plan
FTAA	Fast-track Approvals Act 2024
MPCP	Mammalian Pest Control Plan
NZQA	New Zealand Qualifications Authority
Waka Kotahi NZTA	Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency
NZS	New Zealand Standard
ONMP	Operational Noise Management Plan
ORC	Otago Regional Council
QLDC	Queenstown Lakes District Council
RAP	Remediation Action Plan
RMA	Resource Management Act 1991
RMM	Rough Milne Mitchell Landscape Architects
SNZ PAS 4509:2008	New Zealand Fire Service for Firefighting Water Supplies (Code of Practice 4509:2008)
SQEP	Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person
WWTP	Wastewater Treatment Plant
Papatipu Rūnanga	The seven Papatipu Rūnanga whose members hold Mana Whenua status within the region: Te Rūnanga o Moeraki, Kāti Huirapa Rūnaka ki Puketeraki, Te Rūnanga o Ōtākou, Hokonui Rūnanga, Waihōpai Rūnaka, Te Rūnanga o Awarua and Te Rūnanga o Ōraka-Aparima

1.0 Subdivision

General

- (1) The consent holder must undertake the works in general accordance with the information and plans submitted with the application and formally approved by the Environmental Protection Authority on **XX XXXX 2026** and contained at **Appendix 1**. In the event that any of the provisions of the following documents conflict with the requirements of these conditions of consent, these conditions of consent prevail.

Monitoring

- (2) The Consent Holder is liable for costs associated with the monitoring of this resource consent under Section 35 of the RMA.

Staging

- (3) This subdivision may be staged as follows:
 - Stage 1: Lots 6000-6009 (super lots), 1-132 & 145-156 (residential lots), 2000-2006, 2008-2019, 2055-2057 (parking), 3000-3008 (private open space lots), 4000-4006 (private road lots), 5000-5005 (private accessway lots), infrastructure lots 7000-7003;
 - Stage 1A: Stage 1A: Units 1–36 (principal units), 1C–36C (car park units), 1A–36A (terrace/patio units), 2B, 4B, 6B, 8B, 10B, 12B, 14B, 16B, 18B, 20B, 22B, 24B, 26B, 28B, 30B, 32B, 34B, 36B (stairs), 1B, 3B, 5B, 7B, 9B, 11B, 13B, 15B, 17B, 19B, 21B, 23B, 25B, 27B, 29B, 31B, 33B, 35B (storage)
 - Stage 2: Lots 200–226, 300–415 & 500 (residential lots), 3200-3203 (private open space lots), 4200-4203 (private road lots), 5200–5206 (private accessway lots);
 - Stage 3: Lots 501-608 & 1600-1704 (residential lots), 3300-3304 (private open space lots), 4300-4305 (private road lots), 5300-5306 (private accessway lots);
 - Stage 4: Lots 700-892 & 1000-1142 (residential lots), 3400-3402 (private open space lots), 4400-4407 (private road lots), 5400–5402 (private accessway lots);
 - Stage 5: Lots 1200-1256 & 1800-1806 (residential lots), 3500 & 3501 (private open space lots), 4500-4509 (private road lots), 5500-5505 (private accessway lots);
 - Stage 6: Units 51–57 (principal units), 56C (car parking unit), 52A, 56A, 56B, 57A (outdoor space units).

Except for Stage 1 and 1A, which must be undertaken first, the subsequent stages may be carried out in the sequence shown or concurrently. All necessary subdivision works (including engineering acceptance, servicing, provision of formed legal access, and any other works required to satisfy the conditions of this consent) shall be completed for each stage prior to certification being issued under Sections 223 and 224(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991.

The conditions of this consent, including engineering acceptance, shall apply only to the extent that they are relevant to each particular stage proposed. Any balance lots created shall either be serviced in accordance with these conditions or held together in one title with a serviced lot.

Certification of plans

- (4) The Consent Holder must follow the process set out below for the certification of any plans, documents, designs or specifications (hereafter referred to as documents) requiring written certification from the QLDC:
- (a) Documents must be submitted to the QLDC in electronic form;
 - (b) Subject to (c) below, works to which the documents relate must not commence until the Consent Holder has received written certification from the QLDC. However, if the Consent Holder has not received a response from the QLDC within 20 working days of the date of the submission under (a) above, the documents are deemed to be certified;
 - (c) If the Consent Holder receives a written request for further information or changes to documents from the QLDC then they are to be re-submitted to the QLDC under (a) above;
 - (d) Where the certified documents are management plans, these may be amended at the request of the Consent Holder at any time subject to written re-certification undertaken in accordance with (a) to (c) above;
 - (e) Where the submitted document is required to be certified by multiple authorities and has already been certified (or re-certified) by another authority, the QLDC review will be restricted to only those matters that have not yet been considered that are governed by a territorial authority;
 - (f) The written certification process is confined to confirming that the documents adequately give effect to the relevant conditions;
 - (g) Once certified, all works on the site must be undertaken in accordance with the certified documents.

Prior to commencement of works

- (5) Prior to any disturbance of land in a stage containing the clay target shooting area, fuel storage areas, aboveground storage tank, stockyards, sheep spray race, and livestock shed identified in the DSI completed by Springline dated 28 January 2026, the Consent Holder shall:
- (a) submit a RAP to the QLDC which is in general accordance with the RAP submitted as part of the application, titled, Remedial Action Plan & Contaminated Site Management Plan, dated 28 January 2026, Revision B and prepared by Springline. The RAP is to ensure that all areas of the stage are suitable for their intended use at the completion of the earthworks; and
 - (b) submit a CSMP to the QLDC which is in general accordance with the RAP submitted as part of the application, titled, Remedial Action Plan & Contaminated Site Management Plan, dated 28 January 2026, Revision B and prepared by Springline. The CSMP is to ensure that the health of on-site workers, the on-site environment and the receiving environment are protected from the effects of contaminants.

These reports are to be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced contaminated land practitioner and are to be in accordance with the Contaminated Land Management Guidelines No. 1 Reporting on Contaminated Sites in New Zealand (Ministry for the Environment, 2011).

- (6) Prior to commencement of any works within each stage of the subdivision, the Consent Holder shall:
- (a) Submit an EMP for that stage by a suitably qualified person for certification by QLDC. The EMP shall be in accordance with the principles and requirements of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans 2019 and specifically shall address the following environmental elements as specified in the guidelines:

- i. Administrative Requirements
 - Daily inspections of specific erosion and sediment control measures as required by GD05 (such as sediment retention ponds)
 - Weekly site inspections
 - Monthly environmental reporting
 - Pre and post rainfall inspection as required by GD05
 - Independent audit by Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person
 - Notification and management of environmental incidents
 - Records and registers
 - Environmental roles and responsibilities of personnel (including nomination of Principal Contractor)
 - Site induction
- ii. Operational Requirements
 - Erosion and sedimentation (including Erosion and Sediment Control Plan) (to be prepared by a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person)
 - Water quality
 - Dust management in accordance with the recommendations of The Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing Environmental Effects of Dust Emissions (MfE, 2016)
 - Cultural heritage
 - Noise (to be prepared by a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person)
 - Vibration (to be prepared by a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person)
 - Indigenous vegetation clearance
 - Chemical and fuel management
 - Waste management
 - Avifauna Incidental Discovery Protocol for earthworks during the avifauna breeding season.
- iii. Sufficient detail to address the following matters:
 - Assessment of soil characteristics within earthworks catchments and the necessity for additional erosion and sediment control practices;
 - Specific erosion and sediment control works (locations, dimensions, capacity etc);
 - Supporting calculations and design drawings;
 - Catchment boundaries and contour information;
 - Details of construction methods;
 - Timing and duration of construction and operation of control works;

- Processes in place if unexpected contaminated land is encountered;
 - Contingency measures for snow and/ or frost events (in relation to chemical treatment)
 - Measures to avoid silt and/or sediment tracking onto roads and then to water for the duration of the earthworks, such as:
 - Providing stabilised entry and exit point(s) for vehicles;
 - Providing wheel wash facilities; and
 - Cleaning road surfaces using street-sweepers immediately where sediment has been tracked onto the road.
 - Details relating to the management of exposed areas;
 - Monitoring and maintenance requirements; and
 - Details relating to the management of long-term stockpiling (over 28 days).
- (b) Submit an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) for that stage prepared by a suitably qualified person for certification by QLDC. This plan shall be a sub-plan of the overarching EMP and must be prepared in accordance with the requirements outlined on pages 13 – 18 in Queenstown Lakes District Council’s Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans 2019. These plans must be updated when:
- i. The construction program moves from one Stage to another; or
 - ii. Any significant changes have been made to the construction methodology since the original plan was accepted for that Stage; or
 - iii. There has been an Environmental Incident and investigations have found that the management measures are inadequate.
- (c) Submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) for that stage prepared by a suitably qualified person for certification by QLDC. This plan shall include details of the following:
- i. Details of the site manager, including their contact details cell phone, email, postal address;
 - ii. The location of a large notice board on the site that clearly identifies the name, telephone number and address for service of the site manager;
 - iii. Measures to be adopted to maintain the land in a tidy condition in terms of disposal / storage of rubbish, storage and unloading of building materials and similar construction activities;
 - iv. Suitable measures to prevent deposition of any debris on surrounding roads by vehicles moving to and from the site. In the event that any material is deposited on any roads, the Consent Holder shall take immediate action, at their expense, to clean the roads;
 - v. Access controls
 - vi. Site parking arrangements.
 - vii. Safety fencing, and site perimeter security.
 - viii. Maintenance of land stability at the site boundaries.

- ix. Directions for advising adjoining landowners and occupiers of planned construction activities.
 - x. Handling and addressing of complaints.
- (7) The consent holder shall obtain and implement a traffic management plan approved by the Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency or its network management consultant, Aspiring Highways prior to undertaking any works within or adjacent to the State Highway that affects the normal operating conditions of the road reserve through disruption, inconvenience or delay. The Traffic Management Plan shall be prepared by a certified Temporary Traffic Management Planner (TTMP) as validated either by a current CoPTTM certification or a relevant NZQA framework registered qualification, unit standard or micro credential. All contractors obligated to implement temporary traffic management plans shall employ a qualified Site Traffic Management Supervisor (STMS) to manage the site in accordance with the requirements of the Waka Kotahi NZTA's 'Traffic Control Devices Manual Part 8: Code of practice for temporary traffic management'. The STMS shall implement the Traffic Management Plan. A copy of the approved plan shall be submitted to the Manager of Resource Management Engineering at Council prior to works commencing.
- (8) Prior to works commencing to pipe the water race, within any onsite ponds, or intermittent streams, a Fish Management Plan is to be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional and submitted to QLDC for review and certification. The Fish Management Plan is to include handling of fish, potential release site locations for fish and biosecurity considerations.
- (9) A MPCP must be prepared to address the management of pests at the site and must be submitted to QLDC for certification prior to the commencement of any works authorised by these consents. The MPCP must set out the procedures to be implemented by the Consent Holder to achieve the objective set out below, and, as a minimum, specify:
- (a) Target pest species;
 - (b) pest reduction methods, which will include descriptions of spatial configuration of bait lines and baiting and/or trapping details including types of baits/traps and frequency of baiting/servicing.
- The objective of the MPCP is to achieve pest control for all target species (mice, rats, stoats, ferrets, weasels, feral cats, rabbits, hares, pigs and deer).
- (10) Prior works commencing the consent holder must prepare a Weed Control Management Plan (WCMP) for Council certification. The purpose of the WCMP is to control unwanted weeds and plant disease that could impact the growth of 'revegetation planting on Morven Hill and the river escarpment' as illustrated on the Landscape Design Document Part Two, 'Landscape Masterplan page 05' Revision A.04, prepared by RMM and dated 6 March 2026.
- (11) Prior to the commencement of works for each stage a Planting Plan prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced landscape architect must be provided to Council for certification for the relevant stage. The purpose of the Planting Plan is to provide detail of 'revegetation planting on Morven Hill and the river escarpment' and 'planting within a network of reserves throughout the Ridgeburn Development' as illustrated on the Landscape Design Document Two, 'Landscape Masterplan page 05' Revision A.04, prepared by RMM and dated 6 March 2026 which is to be carried out by the consent holder. The Planting Plan shall as a minimum include the following:

- (a) A plan of the planted areas detailing proposed plant species, plant sourcing, plant sizes at time of planting, plant locations, density of planting and timing of planting, height and density upon maturity;
 - (b) Identification of the ecological covenant areas;
 - (c) A programme of establishment and post establishment protection and maintenance (e.g., planting method, fertilising, weed removal / spraying, replacement of dead or poorly performing plants, watering, length of maintenance programme); and
 - (d) Details of weed management.
- (12) Prior to the commencement of works for each stage a Planting Maintenance Plan prepared by a suitably qualified and experience landscape architect must be provided to Council for certification for the relevant stage. The purpose of the Planting Maintenance Plan is to provide clear direction to the consent holder and future lot owners as to how to maintain and manage the 'revegetation planting on Morven Hill and the river escarpment' and 'planting within a network of reserves throughout the Ridgeburn Development' illustrated the Landscape Design Document Two, 'Landscape Masterplan page 05' Revision A.04, prepared by RMM and dated 6 March 2026 on an ongoing basis so as to ensure the planting is retained. The plan shall provide details of ongoing maintenance and monitoring requirements including (but not limited to):
- (a) A plan of the planted areas detailing plant species and process for replacement of dead or poorly performing plants, noting that any replacements must be eco-sourced.
- (13) Prior to commencement of construction activities (as defined by NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics – Construction Noise) on-site, the consent holder shall submit for the approval of the Principal Engineer: Resource Management, a detailed Construction Noise Management Plan in accordance with Annex E of NZS 6803:1999.
- (14) All works must be undertaken in accordance with the certified plans listed in Conditions 5 - 13 and these plans shall be accessible on site at all times during work under this consent.
- (15) As part of preparing the EMP, ESCP, CMP, WCMP, Planting Plan, Planting Maintenance Plan and the fish management plan the consent holder must consult with Papatipu Rūnanga to develop monitoring and reporting measures informed by Mātauranga Māori principles and practices, at the discretion of Papatipu Rūnanga. Any outcomes arising from this consultation must be documented and included in the relevant plan.

Engineering Approvals

- (16) All physical development works, including retaining walls, documentation and other consent obligations shall be carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's policies and standards, being QLDC's Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice adopted on 17th April 2025 and subsequent amendments to that document up to the date of issue of any resource consent.

Advice Note: The current standards are available on Council's website via the following link: <https://www.qldc.govt.nz>.

- (17) At least 7 days prior to commencing excavations for each stage, the consent holder shall provide the Manager of Resource Management Engineering at Council with the name of a suitably qualified geo-professional as defined in Section 1.7 of QLDC's Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice who is familiar with the Kirk Roberts Consulting geotechnical report dated 17 March 2026, Kirk Roberts Consulting reference: 2555087 who shall supervise the earthworks procedure and

retaining wall construction, in accordance with the report recommendations. Should the site conditions be found unsuitable for the proposed excavation/construction methods, then a suitably qualified and experienced engineer shall submit to the Manager of Resource Management Engineering at Council new designs/work methodologies for the works prior to further work being undertaken, with the exception of any necessary works required to stabilise the site in the interim.

- (18) At least 7 days prior to commencing excavations in any given stage, the consent holder shall provide the QLDC with the name of a suitably qualified professional as defined in Section 1.7.2 of QLDC's Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice 2025 and who shall supervise and monitor any earthworks. This engineer shall be responsible for providing a Geotechnical Completion Report and Schedule 2A certificate, including fill certification, for all lots within the subdivision as required under Condition 16.
- (19) Prior to commencing any work for each stage, the consent holder shall provide an Engineering NZ PS1 Producer Statement for any permanent retaining walls within the lot which exceed 1.5m in height or are subject to additional surcharge loads.

Engineering Review and Acceptance

- (20) Prior to commencing works on the site for each stage, with the exception of earthworks including associated controls approved through the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) process within this consent, the consent holder shall obtain 'Engineering Review and Acceptance' from the Queenstown Lakes District Council for development works in accordance with the relevant stage to be undertaken and information requirements specified below.
- (a) The application shall include all development items listed below unless a 'partial' review approach has been approved in writing by the Manager of Resource Management Engineering at Council.
- (b) The 'Engineering Review and Acceptance' application(s) shall be submitted to the Manager of Resource Management Engineering at Council for review, prior to acceptance being issued. At Council's discretion, specific designs may be subject to a Peer Review, organised by the Council at the applicant's cost.
- (c) The 'Engineering Review and Acceptance' application(s) shall include copies of all specifications, calculations, design plans and Schedule 1A design certificates as is considered by Council to be both necessary and adequate for the relevant stage, in accordance with Condition (15), to detail the following requirements in Conditions (20d-20l):

Transport

- (d) All roads, paths and intersections shall be constructed in general accordance with the Engineering Drawings (Roding) prepared by McKenzie & Co drawings numbered 3000-3015, 3100-3146 and 3900-3901 and dated 6 March 2026.
- (e) The consent-holder shall demonstrate for each stage that:
- i. The expected operating speed (shown on the Engineering Drawings (Roding) prepared by McKenzie & Co drawings numbered 3000-3015, 3100-3146 and 3900-3901 and dated 6 March 2026 on each road will be achieved;
 - ii. The appropriate Safe Intersection Sight Distances and Approach Sight Distances are achieved at all intersections, allowing for a reaction time of 1.5 seconds;
 - iii. Appropriate Stopping Sight Distances are achieved on all roads, allowing for a reaction time of 1.5 seconds;

- iv. Appropriate sight distances are achieved at all pedestrian crossing locations;
- v. All traffic signs and road markings will comply with the NZTA Traffic Control Devices Manual;
- vi. The number of mobility spaces in each car parking area within the Commercial Precinct (Stage 6) must be a minimum of:
 - o Workers accommodation / visitor accommodation: 3 mobility spaces; and
 - o Bar / pizzeria: 1 space.
- vii. The number of cycle parking spaces at the Commercial Precinct meets Rule 29.5.12 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan;
- viii. The number of coach parking spaces for the worker accommodation / visitor accommodation meets Rule 29.5.1 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan;
- ix. The dimensions of car parking spaces and aisles meet either Rule 29.5.1 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan or Standard AS/NZS2890.1:2004 ('Parking Facilities Part 1: Off-Street Car Parking');
- x. The internal dimensions of garages and the distance between the garage doors and the roadway meet Rule 29.5.7 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan;
- xi. A minimum queuing space of 18m be provided at the southernmost access to the commercial precinct;
- xii. Intersections achieve the provisions of the Traffic Control Devices Manual Part 4;
- xiii. Driveways are formed to meet Rules 29.5.14 and 29.5.16 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan;
- xiv. Driveways have sight distances that meet Rule 29.5.17 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan, extrapolated as appropriate for the expected operating speed of the frontage road;
- xv. The separation distance between driveways and intersections meet Rule 29.5.21 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan, interpolated as appropriate for the expected operating speed of the frontage road;
- xvi. An 8.8m service vehicle and a B85 car are able to pass each other on curved sections of roads allowing for 0.3 clearance from the edge of the seal/kerb and 0.6m clearance from each other;
- xvii. An 8.8m service vehicle and a B85 car are able to pass each other at intersections allowing for 0.3 clearance from the edge of the seal/kerb and 0.6m clearance from each other. For clarity, this may include one driver waiting for the other vehicle to pass;
- xviii. All cul-de-sacs are provided with a suitable turning head as per Figures 3.3 and 3.4 of Standard NZS4404:2010 ('Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure');
- xix. Should any of the above matters (e)(i)-(xviii) not be achieved, an assessment from a suitably qualified and experienced traffic engineer shall be provided which confirms that the non-compliance(s) will not result in unacceptable safety and/or efficiency effects.

- xx. Provide the final location of the park and ride area which is to be in the approximate location shown on the Engineering Drawings (Rooding) prepared by McKenzie & Co drawings numbered 3000-3012, 3600-3615 & 3700-3777, 3800, 3801, 3802, 3803, 3804, 3805, 3806, 3809, 3810, 3900 and 3901 and dated 6 March 2026. The park and ride area must include at least 70 carparks.
- xxi. Detailed design for all roading shall illustrate how traffic calming measures have integrated pedestrian facilities, parking layout, and streetscapes into the overall design to achieve the target operating speed. The detailed design shall be prepared in consultation with an independent qualified person and a report submitted by this person confirming the designs achieve the target operation speed.

Water

- (f) Detailed plans and specifications shall be supplied for the following to the extent that is required for each stage:
 - i. The construction of two potable production bores within Lot 7002 and 7003 with associated infrastructure and buildings.
 - ii. A rising main and (if required) booster pumps to convey raw water to the water treatment plant and reservoir within Lot 7000.
 - iii. A water treatment plant (WTP) within Lot 7000. This plant shall be designed to ensure on-going compliance with the requirements of the Water Services Act 2021 and Water Services (Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand) Regulations 2022 and Aesthetic Values or Drinking Water Notice 2022.
 - iv. A minimum of two water reservoir tanks shall be installed within future Lot 7000 as part of Stage 1, with provision made for a third tank in Stage 2. Supporting information must demonstrate that the reservoir(s) are suitably sized to service the number of reticulated lots within each relevant stage.
 - v. A reticulated network from the water reservoir to the reticulated lots and any necessary booster pump infrastructure and / or pressure reducing valves to achieve QLDC level of service flows and pressures to the reticulated lots.
 - vi. For all stages after Stage 1, detailed plans and specifications for any bulk water treatment and supply infrastructure or works required for the provision of the potable water supply for each specific stage.
- (g) The Consent Holder shall monitor the water consumption and the number of lots occupied for the completed stages until the completion of Stage 5. In the event that an application is made for Engineering Review and Acceptance to service a stage with a lesser per household water supply than detailed in the GWE Consulting Engineers Technical Memo dated 24 February 2026, this shall be supported by a Monitoring Report detailing the water consumption records.
- (h) For all stages, the water design shall ensure that potable water is able to be provided to each residential and commercial lot, which shall be by:
 - i. The provision of a minimum 63mmOD potable water supply ridermain within the road frontage to all Residential Lots. This bulk lateral shall be terminated with a valve and capped just prior to the boundary of each stage, and a 20mm id lateral for future

construction water extended off this bulk feed with an Acuflo GM900 toby valve installed at the boundary.

Note: As per the QLDC Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice, suitable bulk meter and backflow prevention will be installed at time of future development of these lots.

- ii. The provision of a minimum 20mm id potable water supply lateral to the Residential Lots 1-162, 200-226, 300-415, 500, 501-608, 700-892, 1000-1142, 1200-1526 and 1800-1806 or otherwise approved by council, to allow smaller connections should the detail design require them. This shall include a toby valve installed at the boundary.
- iii. The provision of a minimum 100mm potable water supply lateral to Commercial Lot 6000. This bulk lateral shall be terminated with a valve and be capped just prior to the boundary, and a 20mm id lateral for future construction water extended off this bulk lateral and into the site with an Acuflo GM900 toby installed at the boundary.

Note: As per the QLDC Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice, suitable bulk meter and backflow prevention will be installed at time of future development of these lots.

- iv. The provision of a minimum 20mm id potable water supply lateral to the Commercial Units PU1-PU6, AU2A, AU6B and AU6C. This shall include an Acuflo GM900 toby valve installed at the boundary.
- v. The above 20mm id lateral connections to each lot shall include water meters at the lot boundary as agreed with the Incorporated Society (or equivalent legal body).
- vi. Where the toby valve box is to be placed within a trafficable area, a trafficable lid/box shall be included.
- vii. Being treated to consistently comply with the requirements of the Water Services Act 2021 and Water Services (Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand) Regulations 2022 and Aesthetic Values for Drinking Water Notice 2022 (or superseding legislation, standards, and notices). For all surface water or ground water takes this shall include the results of chemical test results no more than 3 years old and bacterial test results no more than 3 months old at the time of submitting the test results. The testing must be carried out by a recognised laboratory (refer to Water Services Act 2021 subpart 11) and be accompanied by a laboratory report with non-compliances highlighted and outlining any necessary means of remedial treatment.
- viii. The provision of fire hydrants with adequate pressure and flow to service and maintain each residential lot with a minimum Class FW2 fire risk and each commercial/school lot with a FW3 fire risk in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Code of Practice for Fire Fighting Water Supplies 2008. Any lesser risk must be approved in writing by the Fire Service NZ and supplied to QLDC

Wastewater

- (i) Detailed plans and specification shall be supplied for the following:

- i. A wastewater treatment plant within Lot 7001 in general accordance with the performance specifications in the BPO Ridgeburn Wastewater Treatment Plant Design Report dated 18 March 2026.
- ii. The wastewater treatment plant shall include suitable emergency storage and/or generator backup and shall be connected to suitable monitoring system, to be approved by Council, to protect the wastewater treatment plant against any system failure and/or overloading. The wastewater treatment plant design shall also include a water supply connection and provision of a vehicle crossing and access driveway from the private road network and set down area to allow for ongoing maintenance access by heavy vehicles (if required).
- iii. For all stages, detailed plans and specifications for any wastewater treatment and disposal infrastructure or works, including land treatment areas required for the disposal of treated effluent from each specific stage. This shall include details of:
- iv. Identification of sufficient land treatment area in accordance with the WGA Ridgeburn Development Wastewater Disposal Options and Effects Report dated 11 March 2026.
- v. Details of the vegetation management regime for the land treatment areas in (i).
- vi. Locations of the sub-surface drip irrigation system within the nominated land treatment area.
- vii. Locations of the spray irrigation within the nominated land treatment area.
- viii. The Consent Holder shall monitor the following until the completion of Stage 6:
- ix. The quantity of wastewater generation from and the number of lots occupied for the preceding stages;
- x. The wastewater quality discharged from the wastewater treatment plant;
- xi. In the event that an application for Engineering Review and Acceptance is submitted proposing to service a stage utilising a lesser per household wastewater generation assumption than the QLDC Code of Practice 2025, this shall be supported by a Monitoring Report with the above information. A wet weather peaking factor will be required to be included in the demand calculations;
- xii. The provision of a foul sewer connection from each residential and commercial lot to the wastewater treatment plant in accordance with Council's standards and connection policy. These connections shall be installed with an invert suitable to drain the full buildable area within each lot while maintaining minimum grade and pipe cover.
- xiii. Where these connections are via a pressure sewer, they should include a boundary kit in accordance with the QLDC pressure sewer policy.
- xiv. The provision of a wastewater boundary kit to the boundary of all recreational reserve areas that include toilet facilities.

Stormwater

- (j) The provision of a stormwater collection and disposal system which shall provide both primary and secondary protection for roads and future development within the lots, in accordance with Council's standards and connection policy. This shall include:
- i. The provision of a reticulated primary system to collect and dispose of stormwater under the 5% AEP storm event from all road surfaces and all potential impervious areas within each residential, commercial and recreation reserve lot. This shall include attenuation and detention measures in accordance with the Engineering Infrastructure Report prepared by McKenzie & Co dated 25 February 2026. The detention systems shall be easily accessible for maintenance.
 - ii. Collected runoff shall discharge to pipe network and vegetated swales before entering the wetland detention ponds.
 - iii. The provision of a secondary stormwater protection system consisting of secondary flow paths to cater for the 1% AEP storm event to ensure that there is no inundation of those floor levels within the lots, in accordance with the Engineering Infrastructure Report prepared by McKenzie & Co dated 25 February 2026.
 - iv. A copy of the full stormwater model and report outlining the parameters used shall be provided.
 - v. A pre-development and post-development contour plan shall be provided with the stormwater design.
 - vi. All proposed habitable buildings must be located outside of the 100-year flood extent with appropriate freeboards applied in accordance with the QLDC Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice, specifically:
 - o Habitable dwellings (including garages) – 0.5m minimum freeboard height above the 1% AEP flood level
 - o Commercial and industrial buildings – 0.3 minimum freeboard height above the 1% AEP flood level
 - o Non-habitable residential buildings and detached garages 0.2m minimum freeboard height above the 1% AEP flood level.

Design

- (k) Prior to commencement of construction of any of the following infrastructure, details of the design of the following utility buildings and reservoirs (and ancillary buildings and structures) are to be provided to QLDC for certification:
- i. Bore sheds
 - ii. Water treatment plant
 - iii. Wastewater treatment plant
 - iv. Wastewater treatment plant office
 - v. Reservoirs
- (l) The designs are to meet the following standards:

- i. All above-ground utility buildings and reservoirs are to be clad in external cladding materials finished in the range of browns, greys and black with a light reflectance value of 20% or less.
- ii. The formation of the water reservoir platform is to be of sufficient space to allow for the construction of a fourth reservoir in the future with appropriate circulation space for access and servicing.

Certification

- (m) The provision of Design Certificates for all engineering infrastructure works associated with this subdivision submitted by a suitably qualified design professional (for clarification this shall include all Roads, Water, Wastewater, Stormwater). The certificates shall be in the format of the Queenstown Lakes District Council – Land Development & Subdivision Code of Practice 2025 Schedule 1A Certificate.
- (n) The provision of a Design Certificate submitted by a suitably qualified design professional for the Wastewater Pump Station/s, Water Treatment Plant, Wastewater Treatment Plant, and Water Reservoir. The certificates shall be in the format of Engineering NZ Producer Statement PS1.

Environmental Controls

- (21) Prior to commencing ground-disturbing activities for each stage, the Consent Holder shall nominate an Environmental Representative for the works program in accordance with the requirements detailed on pages 9 and 10 of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans.
- (22) Prior to commencing ground disturbing activities for each stage, the Consent Holder shall ensure that all staff (including all sub-contractors) involved in, or supervising, works onsite have attended an Environmental Site Induction in accordance with the requirements detailed on page 8 of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans.
- (23) The QLDC are to be notified 15 days in advance of soil contamination remediation works commencing.
- (24) Prior to bulk earthworks operations (and vegetation clearance) for the initial stage or any subsequent new stage of works, the Consent Holder must install erosion and sediment controls in accordance with the ESCP as well as provide As-built documentation for these controls by Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person.

Accidental Discovery Protocol

- (25) Prior to commencing excavation work for each stage, the Consent Holder shall ensure that all persons involved in, or supervising works on-site are familiar with the Accidental Discovery Protocol established under Condition 25 below. The Accidental Discovery Protocol shall be clearly displayed and accessible on site at all times during work under this consent.
- (26) In the event that an unidentified archaeological site is located during works, the following will apply:
 - (a) Work must cease immediately at that place and within 20 metres around the site. The area must be secured from further disturbance.
 - (b) The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Regional Archaeologist and the Otago Regional Council must be notified immediately.
 - (c) If the site is of Māori origin, the Consent Holder must also notify the appropriate iwi groups or kaitiaki representative of the discovery and ensure site access to enable appropriate cultural

procedures and tikanga to be undertaken, as long as all statutory requirements under legislation are met (Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, Protected Objects Act 1975).

- (d) If human remains (koiwi tangata) are uncovered the Consent Holder must advise the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Regional Archaeologist, NZ Police, the Otago Regional Council and the appropriate iwi groups or kaitiaki representative and the above process under (c) will apply. Remains are not to be disturbed or moved until future actions have been agreed by all parties.
- (e) Works affecting the archaeological site must not resume until Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga gives written approval for work to continue. An application for an Archaeological Authority and further assessment by an archaeologist may be required.
- (f) Where iwi so request, any information recorded as the result of the find such as a description of location and content, must be provided for their records.

Transport

- (27) Prior to works commencing in each stage the consent holder shall engage independent, suitably qualified and experienced traffic engineer to carry out a detailed design safety audit for the relevant stage in accordance with Section 3.2.7 of the Councils Code of Practice 2025.
- (28) Prior to works commencing in each stage the consent holder shall engage an independent, suitably qualified and experienced traffic engineer to review of all traffic signs and road markings within the stage to ensure they have been provided in accordance with the NZTA Traffic Control Devices Manual or otherwise agreed with NZTA.

During construction

- (29) Throughout the duration of works the Consent Holder shall develop and document a process of periodically reviewing the EMP as outlined on page 6 of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans 2019. No ground disturbing activities shall commence in any subsequent stage of development until an EMP has been certified by QLDC. All works shall be undertaken in accordance with the most current version of the EMP as certified by QLDC.
- (30) Throughout the duration of works the current EMP shall be accessible on site at all times during work under this consent and the Consent Holder shall establish and implement document version control.
- (31) Throughout the duration of works, the Consent Holder shall undertake and document weekly and Pre and Post-Rain Event site inspections as outlined on pages 10 and 11 of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans.
- (32) Throughout the duration of works, a SQEP shall monitor the site monthly to ensure that the site is complying with its EMP, identify any new environmental risks arising that could cause an environmental effect and suggest alternative solutions that will result in more effective and efficient management. This must include a specific audit by the SQEP of the effectiveness of the ESCP. The outcome of these inspections should be included in the Monthly Environmental Report referred to Condition 32 below.
- (33) Throughout the duration of works Consent Holder shall complete and submit exception reporting to QLDC in the form of a monthly environmental report. The monthly environmental report shall be submitted to QLDC's Regulatory Department within five (5) working days of the end of each month.
- (34) Throughout the duration of works in accordance with page 9 of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans, where any Environmental Incident

where the EMP has failed leading to any adverse environmental effects offsite occurs the Consent Holder shall:

- (a) Report to QLDC details of any Environmental Incident within 12 hours of becoming aware of the incident.
 - (b) Provide an Environmental Incident Report to QLDC within 10 working days of the incident occurring as per the requirements outlined in Section 3.3.1 of Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans.
- (35) Throughout the duration of works environmental records are to be collated onsite and shall be made available to QLDC upon request; immediately if the request is made by a QLDC official onsite and within 24 hours if requested by a QLDC officer offsite. Records and registers to be managed onsite shall be in accordance with the requirements outlined on page 14 of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans.
- (36) Hours of operation for earthworks shall be:
- (a) Monday to Friday (inclusive): 7am to 7pm;
 - (b) Saturday 7.30am-6pm;
 - (c) Sundays and Public Holidays: No Activity.
- (37) All recommendations of the DSI and any RAP and Contaminated Site Management Plan shall be implemented during any disturbance of the HAIL sites identified in the Detailed Site Investigations under Condition 5.
- (38) Only cleanfill material shall be deposited at the site. Cleanfill material is defined as material that when buried/placed will have no adverse effect on people or the environment, and includes virgin natural materials such as clay, soil and rock, and other inert materials such as concrete or brick that are free of:
- (a) combustible, putrescible, degradable or leachable components;
 - (b) hazardous substances;
 - (c) products or materials derived from hazardous waste treatment, hazardous waste stabilisation or hazardous waste disposal practices;
 - (d) materials that may present a risk to human or animal health such as medical and veterinary waste, asbestos or radioactive substances;
 - (e) liquid waste.
- Acceptable materials include bricks, pavers, masonry blocks, ceramics, un-reinforced concrete, reinforced concrete where any protruding steel is cut off at the concrete face, fibre cement building products, road sub-base, tiles and virgin soils (including rock, sand, gravel, clay) - provided they are uncontaminated. Any other materials will require the prior written approval of Council prior to disposal at the site. Topsoil shall be used for final cover only.
- (39) Contaminated soil to be removed from the site is required to be disposed of at a suitably licenced facility.
- (40) On completion of any earthworks associated with the water reservoir(s) and prior to the placement of any tanks or associated infrastructure, the consent holder shall provide to Manager of Resource Management Engineering at Council a geotechnical completion report from a suitably qualified geo-

professional that confirms that the completed platform and associated batter slopes are stable and appropriate for the anticipated tanks.

- (41) All tree felling works are to be undertaken between the months of August to February to avoid disruption of nesting birds.

Prior to s223 certification

- (42) Prior to the QLDC signing the Title Plan pursuant to Section 223 of the Resource Management Act 1991, the consent holder shall complete the following:

(a) All necessary easements shall be shown in the Memorandum of Easements attached to the Title Plan and shall be duly granted or reserved.

(b) The following amalgamations shall be registered with Land Information New Zealand (CSN XXXXX):

That lots 58 & 2055 be held in the same record of title

That lots 59 & 2056 be held in the same record of title

That lots 60 & 2057 be held in the same record of title

That lots 64 & 2010 be held in the same record of title

That lots 65 & 2009 be held in the same record of title

That lots 66 & 2008 be held in the same record of title

That lots 79 & 2011 be held in the same record of title

That lots 80 & 2012 be held in the same record of title

That lots 81 & 2014 be held in the same record of title

That lots 82 & 2015 be held in the same record of title

That lots 83 & 2013 be held in the same record of title

That lots 84 & 2016 be held in the same record of title

That lots 85 & 2017 be held in the same record of title

That lots 86 & 2018 be held in the same record of title

That lots 76 & 2000 be held in the same record of title

That lots 77 & 2003 be held in the same record of title

That lots 78 & 2004 be held in the same record of title

That lots 87 & 2005 be held in the same record of title

That lots 88 & 2006 be held in the same record of title

That lots 89 & 2002 be held in the same record of title

That lots 90 & 2001 be held in the same record of title

The above numbered carpark allotments may at the consent holders discretion be amalgamated with a different numbered residential unit allotment from that shown, on the basis that no parking allotments created shall sit un-amalgamated with a residential unit allotment.

- (43) The names of all roads requiring naming in accordance with QLDC's Road Naming Policy must be shown on the survey plan.

[Note: the road naming application should be submitted to the Manager Resource Management Engineer at QLDC and should be lodged prior to the application for the section 223 certificate].

Prior to s224c certification

General

- (44) Prior to certification pursuant to section 224(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991, the consent holder shall complete the following works as applicable to each stage of the subdivision:
- (a) Implementation of the Plans approved under Conditions 5 – 13 above which apply to that specific stage.
 - (b) The completion and implementation of all works detailed in Condition (19) above which apply to that specific stage.
- (45) Prior to certification pursuant to section 224(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991, the consent holder shall submit ‘as-built’ plans and information required to detail all engineering works completed in relation to or in association with this subdivision at the consent holder’s cost. This information shall be formatted in accordance with Council’s ‘as-built’ standards and shall include all Roads, Water, Irrigation, Wastewater, Stormwater reticulation.

Residential Society

- (46) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate for the subdivision Stage 1, the consent holder must prepare the necessary documentation to create a society, body corporate, association or other body acceptable to the Council (hereafter referred to as the “Residential Society”) for the ownership and management of the Common allotments identified below:

Stage 1

Private Open Space Lots: 3000–3008

Private Road Lots: 4000–4006

Private Accessway Lots: 5000–5005

Infrastructure Lots: 7000–7003

Stage 2

Private Open Space Lots: 3200–3203

Private Road Lots: 4200–4203

Private Accessway Lots: 5200–5206

Stage 3

Private Open Space Lots: 3300–3304

Private Road Lots: 4300–4305

Private Accessway Lots: 5300–5306

Stage 4

Private Open Space Lots: 3400–3402

Private Road Lots: 4400–4407

Private Accessway Lots: 5400–5402

Stage 5

Private Open Space Lots: 3500 & 3501

Private Road Lots: 4500–4509

Private Accessway Lots: 5500–5505

- (47) The consent holder shall provide written evidence to Council that the Residential Society includes the following items:
- (a) The ownership and management responsibilities of the Residential Society, including the operation, maintenance, repair and renewal of the Common Infrastructure within the development, except where otherwise provided for under Condition 49;
 - (b) That the membership of the Residential Society is compulsory for all owners of residential lots within each stage of the development as secured through consent notices and covenants registered on the record of title of each residential lot;
 - (c) Mechanisms for the raising of funds from members to adequately finance the operation, maintenance, repair and renewal of the Common Infrastructure; and
 - (d) Decision making and dispute resolution requirements.
- (48) All costs associated with the establishment and maintenance of the Residents Society (or equivalent legal body) must be borne by the Consent Holder.
- (49) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate for the subdivision Stage 1 a copy of the document(s) describing the functions, powers, duties and liabilities of the Incorporated Society (or equivalent legal body) must be provided to QLDC for certification that the infrastructure and assets will be properly maintained over time. The document(s) must evidence each of the requirements above and that the ongoing operation, maintenance and repair obligations of this condition will be adequately provided for.
- (50) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate for Stage 1, the consent holder must prepare the necessary documentation and provide to QLDC confirming that either:
- (a) a separate utility entity is established to own, maintain, and operate the infrastructure assets being the Water and Wastewater Treatment Plant, disposable fields, reticulated pipes and related servicing network; or,
 - (b) the infrastructure assets are owned by the Developer or the Residents Association and leased (under a registered lease) to a separate utility entity, which is responsible for maintaining and operating those assets.

Transport and Recreational Trails

- (51) Prior to s224c being issued for Stage 6 Cycle trail enhancements as outlined in the (Paths and Trails Network, Page 21/21 Architectural Masterplan prepared by Novak Middleton) in Condition 1 must be completed and the following must be undertaken:
- (a) The consent holder shall enter into a maintenance agreement under s207A of the Local Government Act 2002 Amendment Act (LGA) as per clause 7.4.11.2 of the QLDC LDSCoP 2020, with the QLDC Parks and Reserves Department, with the obligation being upon the consent holder to fulfil the requirements detailed in (b) below. The maintenance period shall be three (3) years from the date of the maintenance agreement.

- (b) The consent holder shall maintain trails marked Paths and Trails Network, Page A2 21/21 Architectural Masterplan on the Public Trails Plan contained in the Architectural Masterplan during the maintenance period.
- (52) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate for each stage any road signage shall be installed in accordance with Council's signage specifications and all necessary road markings completed on all public roads in accordance with MOTSAM and the TCD Manual.
- (53) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate for each stage, road names shall be approved and road name signs installed in accordance with Council's Road Naming Policy.
- (54) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate for each stage, the consent holder shall engage an independent and suitably qualified traffic engineer to carry out a post-construction road safety audit in general accordance with the NZTA Manual "Road Safety Audit Procedures for Projects" and section 3.2.7 of QLDC's Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice 2025. This shall include confirmation that appropriate traffic signs and road markings within the relevant stage have been installed in accordance with the New Zealand Transport Agency's Traffic control devices manual. The consent holder shall undertake works in compliance with any recommendations of the road safety audit at their own cost. A copy of this report and confirmation that the recommendations have been complied with shall be submitted to QLDC for review and acceptance.
- (55) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate for each stage, the consent holder shall remedy any damage to all existing road surfaces and berms adjoining the development at Morven Ferry Road that result from work carried out for this consent.

Utilities

- (56) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate for each stage, written confirmation shall be provided from the electricity network supplier responsible for the area, that provision of a minimum single phase 15kva underground electricity supply has been made available to the boundaries of each residential and commercial lot within the relevant stage and that all the network supplier's requirements for making such means of supply available have been met.
- (57) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate for each stage written confirmation shall be provided from the telecommunications network supplier responsible for the area, that provision of underground telephone services has been made available to the boundaries of each residential and commercial lot within the relevant stage and that all the network supplier's requirements for making such means of supply available have been met.

Infrastructure

- (58) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate for each stage hydrant testing shall be carried out to confirm that there are sufficient hydrants with adequate pressure and flow to service the lots created with a minimum Class FW2 fire supply for residential lots and FW3 for commercial lots in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Code of Practice for Firefighting Water Supplies 2008 for the relevant stage of the subdivision. Any lesser risk must be approved in writing by Fire Service NZ, Dunedin Office. The testing shall be carried out over the peak period of an average day. All related costs shall be borne by the consent holder.
- (59) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate for each stage the Consent Holder must submit Completion Certificates for all engineering works completed in relation to or in association with the relevant

stage of subdivision. The certificates shall be in the format of the Queenstown Lakes District Council – Land Development & Subdivision Code of Practice 2025 Schedule 1B and 1C Certificate.

- (60) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate for each stage the consent holder shall submit Completion Certificates from both the Contractor and Approved Certifier for the Water Treatment Plant, Wastewater Treatment Plant, and Water Reservoir, as completed in relation to or in association with the relevant stage of subdivision. The certificates shall be in the format of Engineering NZ Producer Statement PS3 and PS4.

Earthworks and Natural Hazards

- (61) At the completion of onsite earthworks for each stage, the geo-professional identified under Condition 18 shall incorporate the results of ground bearing test results for each residential and commercial allotment (regardless of whether affected by development cut and fill earthworks) and include these with fill certification in accordance with NZS 4431:1989, a Geotechnical Completion Report and Schedule 2A certificate covering all lots within the relevant stage of the subdivision. In the event the Schedule 2A includes limitations or remedial works against any lot(s) the Schedule 2A shall also include a geotechnical summary table identifying requirements against each relevant lot in the subdivision for reference by future lot owners. Any remedial works outlined on the Schedule 2A that requires works across lot boundaries shall be undertaken by the consent holder prior to 224(c) certification being issued.
- (62) At the completion of onsite earthworks for each stage, the geo-professional identified under Condition 18 shall provide certification in accordance with NZS 4431:1989 for all areas of fill within the relevant stage on which future buildings are to be founded. Noting any future residential subdivision of this land will require the provision of a Geotechnical Completion Report and Schedule 2A certificate.
- (63) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate the consent holder must provide to QLDC evidence of the completion of all alluvial fan debris flow and flood hazard mitigation and rockfall mitigation works for that stage in accordance with the Kirk Roberts Consulting geotechnical report dated 17 March 2026, reference: 2555087.
- (64) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate the consent holder shall submit an Engineering NZ PS4 Producer Statement for any permanent retaining walls within the lot which exceed 1.5m in height or are subject to additional surcharge loads.
- (65) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate the consent holder must provide to QLDC evidence that exposed earthwork areas shall be top-soiled and grassed/revegetated or otherwise permanently stabilised.

Landscaping

- (66) With exception to the landscaping within the allotments as outlined in the document titled Typologies (pages 80-86), prepared by RMM, prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate the consent holder must fully implement all works relevant to subdivision stage, as shown on the Planting Plan approved by condition 13.
- (a) The consent holder is responsible for the establishment and maintenance of all new planting as detailed within the Landscape Plans referenced under Condition 1, until a minimum survival rate of the plants being 90% of the original density through the entire planting area(s) has been

achieved over a minimum 5 year defects liability period commencing on the date that Section 224(c) certificate is issued.

- (b) Once all new planting is established, the Residential Society is responsible for the ongoing maintenance and ongoing eradication of pest plants and animals.

Waste

(67) Prior to the issue of a s224(c) certificate for a subdivision stage, the consent holder shall prepare a Waste Management Plan for all residential lots within that stage. The Waste Management Plan shall be submitted to QLDC for certification and shall:

- (a) Identify the private waste collection service(s) to be used;
- (b) Detail how waste and recycling will be stored on-site in a manner that is safe, sanitary, and does not create a nuisance; and
- (c) Identify the proposed waste collection point(s) and demonstrate that they are accessible, safe, and do not adversely affect traffic, pedestrian access, or neighbouring properties.
- (d) The certified Waste Management Plan must be implemented prior to the occupation of any residential units on the lots within the relevant stage and maintained thereafter by the Residential Society.

Affordable Housing

(68) Prior to the issue of the s224(c) certificate for Stage 1, the Consent Holder shall provide written confirmation to the Queenstown Lakes District Council identifying which of Lots 1–132, 142–156, and PU1–PU36 (Stage 1A) are to be maintained as affordable rental housing lots in accordance with Condition 70.

- (a) The confirmation shall demonstrate that:
 - i. A minimum of 75% of the identified lots are to be retained as affordable rental housing;
 - ii. The remaining 25% of the identified lots are to be sold as an affordable housing lot in accordance with Condition 71,

(69) Prior to the issue of the s224(c) certificate for Stage 1, the consent holder shall confirm in writing to the Queenstown Lakes District Council whether Condition 70 or Condition 72 will be relied upon to meet ongoing affordable housing for a minimum period of 10 years.

- (a) Where the consent holder elects to rely on Condition 72, the consent holder shall provide written confirmation from the Queenstown Lakes Community Housing Trust (QLCHT), or another Community Housing Provider registered with the Community Housing Regulatory Authority, confirming that an agreement has been entered into with the consent holder for the delivery of affordable housing including that:
 - i. Construction and retention of no less than 135 of the residential units consented within the subdivision as community housing on sites nominated by the Consent Holder; and
 - ii. The provider to manage the community housing on behalf of the Consent Holder for a minimum period of 10 years.

(70) As an alternative to Condition 68, Prior to the issue of the s224(c) certificate for Stage 1, the Consent Holder shall provide written confirmation to the Queenstown Lakes District Council identifying which of Lots 1–132, 142–156, and PU1–PU36 (Stage 1A) are to be maintained as affordable rental housing lots in accordance with Condition 71.

- (a) The confirmation shall demonstrate that:
 - i. A minimum of 75% of the identified lots are to be retained as affordable rental housing; and
 - ii. The remaining 25% of the identified lots are to be either:
 - o Offered to an Papatipu Rūnanga; or
 - o Sold as an affordable housing lot in accordance with Condition 72,

Registration of Consent Notices and Covenants

(71) The following conditions of the consent shall be complied with in perpetuity and shall be registered on the relevant Titles, by way of Consent Notice pursuant to s.221 of the Act.

- (a) In the event that the Schedule 2A certificate issued under Condition 61 contains limitations or remedial works required, then a consent notice shall be registered on the relevant Records of Title detailing requirements for the lot owner(s). This shall include any specific slope stability set back areas.
 - i. A consent notice condition pursuant to s.221 of the Resource Management Act 1991 shall be registered on the Records of Title for the relevant lots providing for the performance of any ongoing requirements for protection of emergency stormwater flow paths or minimum floor levels for buildings, where deemed necessary by Council to satisfy Condition 19(j)(vi) above. The final wording of the consent notice instrument shall be checked and approved by the Council's solicitors at the consent holder's expense prior to registration to ensure that all of the Council's interests and liabilities are adequately protected.
 - ii. In the event that the Engineering Acceptance issued under Condition 19 contains ongoing conditions or requirements associated with the installation, ownership, monitoring and/or maintenance of any infrastructure subject to Engineering Acceptance, then at Council's discretion, a consent notice (or other alternative legal instrument acceptable to Council) shall be registered on the relevant Records of Title detailing these requirements for the lot owner(s). The final form and wording of the document shall be checked and approved by Council's solicitors at the consent holder's expense prior to registration to ensure that all of the Council's interests and liabilities are adequately protected. The applicant shall liaise with the Subdivision Planner and/or Manager of Resource Management Engineering at Council in respect of the above. All costs, including costs that relate to the checking of the legal instrument by Council's solicitors and registration of the document, shall be borne by the applicant.

[Note: This condition is intended to provide for the imposition of a legal instrument for the performance of any ongoing requirements associated with the ownership, monitoring and maintenance of any infrastructure within this development that have arisen through the detailed engineering design and acceptance process, to avoid the need for a consent variation pursuant to s.127 of the Resource Management Act].

Residential Lots

- iii. All fixed lighting within the residential lots 1-132, 142-156, PU1-PU36 (Stage 1A), 200-226, 300-415, 500, 501-608, 1600-1704, 700-892, 1000-1142, 1200-1256, 1800-1806

shall be directed in a downward direction and away from adjacent roads and properties.

Commercial Lots

- iv. The use of all buildings established within the Commercial Precinct being Lot 6000, Principal Unit 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,6 and 7 and accessory units AU2A, AU6A, AU6B, AU6C, must in general accordance with the Commercial Precinct document prepared by Novak Middleton and dated 10 March 2026; and generally described as follows:
- Supermarket building – for supermarket and associated retail activities;
 - Retail building – for retail and service activities;
 - Shearing shed – for food and beverage and associated retail activities;
 - Business Centre building – for office and commercial business activities;
 - Gym/ Hall building – for gymnasium, fitness and indoor recreation activities;
 - Daycare building – for an early childhood education / childcare facility;
 - Worker / Visitor Accommodation building, for hotel, visitor accommodation, or worker accommodation purposes;
 - Any external lighting within the Commercial Precinct being Lot 6000, Principle Unit 1, 2, 3, 4, 5,6 and 7 and accessory units AU2A, AU6A, AU6B, AU6C, must shall not create light spill more than 3 lux (horizontal and vertical) of light to any other , measured at any point within the boundary of the other site.

Resident's Society

- v. Membership of the Residential Society shall be compulsory for all owners of lots within the development. This obligation shall be secured on the record title of each residential lot 1-162, 200-226, 300-415, 500, 501-608, 1600-1704, 700-892, 1000-1142, 1200-1256, 1800-1806 by way of consent notice and covenant in gross in favour of the Residential Society.
- vi. The Residential Society shall ensure that all planting established as part of this consent is maintained in perpetuity. Maintenance shall include the replacement of any dead or failing plants, weed control, and the ongoing monitoring and eradication of pest plants and pest animals to ensure the long-term health and establishment of the planted areas.
- vii. All replacement planting shall be of the same species and size as originally specified in the approved Landscape Plans, unless otherwise agreed in writing by the Council.

Affordable housing

(72) Pursuant to s221 of the RMA, a consent notice shall be registered against the Certificate of Title of Lots (if any) identified in Condition 67(b)(ii) to be sold as affordable housing lots to ensure that the following condition be complied with on a continuing basis:

- i. This lot is deemed to be for the provision of an affordable dwelling. Before any dwelling is occupied, or title to that dwelling is transferred, the consent holder shall provide to

QLDC Monitoring and Enforcement Team a statutory declaration from the purchaser of the affordable dwelling that the purchaser meets all the following criteria:

- The purchaser's gross household income, as at the date of the declaration, does not exceed 120% of the Queenstown median household income;
- The purchaser has paid a price for the affordable dwelling which is not more than that specified in **Table 1** below for the relevant Lot.

Table 1: More Affordable Purchase Prices

Property Type	Purchase Price
One Bedroom with carpad (Lots X to X)	\$599,000
Two-bedroom home with a garage (Lots X to X)	\$899,000
Three-bedroom home with garage (Lots X to X)	\$999,000
Two-bedroom with rear yard / front patio (Lots X to X)	\$779,000
Dual -Key with car park (Lots X to X)	\$749,000

- ii. The purchaser has the legal right to and intends to own and occupy the affordable dwelling exclusively as their residence for not less than 2 years after gaining title to the dwelling;
- iii. The purchaser is a natural person and is purchasing the affordable dwelling in their own name and not in the name of any other person.
- iv. The consent notice shall specify that it ceases to have effect 2 years after the date of transfer of title to the first purchaser.

(73) Pursuant to s221 of the RMA, a consent notice shall be registered against the Certificate of Title of Lots identified in Condition 67(a) to be retained as 'Affordable rental housing lots' to ensure that the following conditions be complied with on a continuing basis:

- (a) This lot is deemed to be for the provision of an affordable rental for a period of 10 years commencing on the date the dwelling on the lot is first occupied ("Rental Period"). The lot will be retained by the Consent Holder for this purpose for the duration of the Rental Period.
 - (i) For the first 12 months following the dwelling first being occupied ("Initial Rent Period"), the maximum weekly rent charged for that dwelling shall not exceed the applicable "More Affordable Rent (90%)" specified in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Estimated more Affordable Rents

Property Type	"More Affordable" Rent (90%)
One Bedroom with carpad (Lots X to X)	\$540
Two-bedroom home with a garage (Lots X to X)	\$702
Three-bedroom home with garage (Lots X to X)	\$878
Two-bedroom with rear yard / front patio (Lots X to X)	\$675
Dual - Key with car park (Lots X to X)	\$666

- (ii) From the first anniversary of the commencement of the Initial Rent Period, and on each subsequent anniversary, the maximum weekly rent for each dwelling may be reviewed once per year only, and any increase shall be limited to the proportional change in the relevant MBIE median weekly rent series for the Queenstown Lakes District. Any adjustment in maximum weekly rent shall be calculated as follows:

Reviewed Rent = Previous Maximum Rent × (Latest District Median Rent ÷ Base District Median Rent)

Where:

- Latest District Median Rent is the most recently published MBIE median weekly rent for the Queenstown Lakes District at the time of review; and
 - Base District Median Rent is the MBIE median weekly rent for the Queenstown Lakes District as at the commencement of the Initial Rent Period (or, for subsequent reviews, the median rent used for the immediately preceding review).
- (b) Before any dwelling is occupied, and yearly thereafter, the consent holder shall provide to the QLDC Monitoring and Enforcement Team:
- i. A statutory declaration from the consent holder that the following criteria are met:
 - The rent being paid by the tenant is 90% of market rent as calculated in accordance with Condition a(i) above.
 - ii. A statutory declaration from the tenant that the tenant meets all the following criteria:
 - The household has at least one member, who is a New Zealand Resident or Citizen.
 - The dwelling is being used exclusively as the household's Primary Residence.
 - The tenant does not own or have shares, in any property or land, elsewhere in New Zealand.
 - The tenant's total household income from all sources is no more than 120% of the Queenstown Lakes District's median household income. Median household income shall be determined by reference to Statistics New Zealand latest data, and as necessary, adjusted annually by the average wage inflation rate.
- (c) Before title to the dwelling is transferred for the first time following the expiry of the Rental Period, the consent holder shall provide to the QLDC Monitoring and Enforcement Team a statutory declaration from the purchaser of the affordable dwelling that the purchaser meets all the following criteria:
- i. The purchaser's gross household income, as at the date of the declaration, does not exceed 120% of the Queenstown median household income;
 - ii. The purchaser has the legal right to and intends to own and occupy the affordable dwelling exclusively as their residence for not less than 2 years after gaining title to the dwelling;
 - iii. The purchaser is a natural person and is purchasing the affordable dwelling in their own name and not in the name of any other person.

- iv. The purchaser has paid a price for the affordable dwelling which is not more than that specified in Table 2 below for the relevant Lot, adjusted in accordance with Table 3 below.

Table 2: More Affordable Purchase Prices

Property Type	Purchase Price
One Bedroom with carpad (Lots X to X)	\$599,000
Two-bedroom home with a garage (Lots X to X)	\$899,000
Three-bedroom home with garage (Lots X to X)	\$999,000
Two-bedroom with rear yard / front patio (Lots X to X)	\$779,000
Dual -Key with car park (Lots X to X)	\$749,000

Table 3: Adjustment in maximum purchase price

Calculation
Any adjustment in maximum purchase price shall be calculated as follows: $\text{Maximum Purchase Price} = \text{More Affordable Purchase Price} \times (\text{Latest District Price Index} \div \text{Base District Price Index})$

Where:

- o More Affordable Purchase Price is the price applicable to the relevant lot as specified in Table 2;
- o Latest District Price Index is the most recently published QV's House Price Index for Queenstown Lakes District for the Queenstown Lakes District at the time of sale; and
- o Base District Price Index is the QV's House Price Index for Queenstown Lakes District for the Queenstown Lakes District as at the commencement of the Rental Period.

If the QV House Price Index is no longer available or is not kept up to date at the time of the sale, a comparable public index will be used. If no such index is available for the Queenstown Lakes District, then the developer will obtain sales data and assess the market movements themselves using the Sales Price Appraisal Ratio (SPAR), which is the method recommended by the RBNZ.

(d) The consent notice shall specify that:

- i. Conditions 73 (a)-(b) cease to have effect 10 years after the date the dwelling is first occupied.
- ii. Condition 73 (c) ceases to have effect two years after the date of transfer of title to the first purchaser following the conclusion of the Rental Period.

Alternative Conditions for Affordable Lots

(74) As an alternative to Condition 72, pursuant to s221 of the RMA, a consent notice shall be registered against the Certificate of Title of Lots [XXXX] to ensure that the following conditions be complied with on a continuing basis:

- (a) This lot is deemed to be for the provision of an affordable rental for a period of 10 years commencing on the date the dwelling on the lot is first occupied ("Rental Period").
- (b) Before title to the dwelling is transferred for the first time following the expiry of the Rental Period, the consent holder shall provide to the QLDC Monitoring and Enforcement Team a statutory declaration from the purchaser of the affordable dwelling that the purchaser meets all the following criteria:
 - i. The purchaser's gross household income, as at the date of the declaration, does not exceed 120% of the Queenstown median household income;
- (c) The purchaser has the legal right to and intends to own and occupy the affordable dwelling exclusively as their residence for not less than 2 years after gaining title to the dwelling;
- (d) The purchaser is a natural person and is purchasing the affordable dwelling in their own name and not in the name of any other person.
- (e) The purchaser has paid a price for the affordable dwelling which is not more than that specified in Table 3 below for the relevant Lot, adjusted in accordance with Table 4 below.

Table 3: MORE AFFORDABLE PURCHASE PRICES

Property Type	Purchase Price
One Bedroom with carpad (Lots X to X)	\$599,000
Two-bedroom home with a garage (Lots X to X)	\$899,000
Three-bedroom home with garage (Lots X to X)	\$999,000
Two-bedroom with rear yard / front patio (Lots X to X)	\$779,000
Dual -Key with car park (Lots X to X)	\$749,000

Table 4: Adjustment in maximum purchase price

Calculation
Any adjustment in maximum purchase price shall be calculated as follows: Maximum Purchase Price = More Affordable Purchase Price × (Latest District Price Index ÷ Base District Price Index)

Where:

- o More Affordable Purchase Price is the price applicable to the relevant lot as specified in Table 2;

- Latest District Price Index is the most recently published QV's House Price Index for Queenstown Lakes District for the Queenstown Lakes District at the time of sale; and
- Base District Price Index is the QV's House Price Index for Queenstown Lakes District for the Queenstown Lakes District as at the commencement of the Rental Period.
- If the QV House Price Index is no longer available or is not kept up to date at the time of the sale, a comparable public index will be used. If no such index is available for the Queenstown Lakes District, then the developer will obtain sales data and assess the market movements themselves using the Sales Price Appraisal Ratio (SPAR), which is the method recommended by the RBNZ.

The consent notice shall specify that this condition ceases to have effect.

2.0 Land Use Consent

- (1) The consent holder must undertake the works in general accordance with the information and plans submitted with the application and formally approved by the Environmental Protection Authority on XX XXXX 2026, and contained at **Appendix 1**. In the event that any of the provisions of the following documents conflict with the requirements of these conditions of consent, these conditions of consent prevail.
- (2) This consent shall not be exercised and no work or activity associated with it may be commenced or continued until the following charges have been paid in full: all charges fixed in accordance with section 36(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 and any finalised, additional charges under section 36(3) of the Act.
- (3) The consent holder is liable for costs associated with the monitoring of this resource consent under Section 35 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

General

- (4) All engineering works shall be carried out in accordance with the Queenstown Lakes District Council's policies and standards, being QLDC's Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice adopted on 8 October 2020 and subsequent amendments to that document up to the date of issue of any resource consent.

Note: The current standards are available on Council's website via the following link:
<https://www.qldc.govt.nz>

- (5) This land use consent may be staged as follows in accordance with Scheme Plan prepared by Mckenzie Co drawing no. 4048-0-1000 and dated 18 March 2026:
 - (a) Stage 1: Lots 6000-6009 (super lots), 1-132 & 145-156 (residential lots), 2000-2006, 2008-2019, 2055-2057 (parking), 3000-3008 (private open space lots), 4000-4006 (private road lots), 5000-5005 (private accessway lots), infrastructure lots 7000-7003;
 - (b) Stage 1A: Stage 1A: Units 1–36 (principal units), 1C–36C (car park units), 1A–36A (terrace/patio units), 2B, 4B, 6B, 8B, 10B, 12B, 14B, 16B, 18B, 20B, 22B, 24B, 26B, 28B, 30B, 32B, 34B, 36B (stairs), 1B, 3B, 5B, 7B, 9B, 11B, 13B, 15B, 17B, 19B, 21B, 23B, 25B, 27B, 29B, 31B, 33B, 35B (storage)
 - (c) Stage 2: Lots 200–226, 300–415 & 500 (residential lots), 3200-3203 (private open space lots), 4200-4203 (private road lots), 5200–5206 (private accessway lots);
 - (d) Stage 3: Lots 501-608 & 1600-1704 (residential lots), 3300-3304 (private open space lots), 4300-4305 (private road lots), 5300-5306 (private accessway lots);
 - (e) Stage 4: Lots 700-892 & 1000-1142 (residential lots), 3400-3402 (private open space lots), 4400-4407 (private road lots), 5400–5402 (private accessway lots);
 - (f) Stage 5: Lots 1200-1256 & 1800-1806 (residential lots), 3500 & 3501 (private open space lots), 4500-4509 (private road lots), 5500-5505 (private accessway lots);
 - (g) Stage 6: Units 51–57 (principal units), 56C (car parking unit), 52A, 56A, 56B, 57A (outdoor space units).
 - (h) The stages set out above may be progressed in the order shown or on a concurrent basis. All necessary works (including engineering acceptance, servicing, provision of formed legal access,

and any other works required to satisfy the conditions of this consent) shall be completed for each stage prior to the occupation of the development.

- (i) The conditions of this consent, including engineering acceptance, shall apply only to the extent that they are relevant to each particular stage proposed. Any balance lots created shall either be serviced in accordance with these conditions or held together in one title with a serviced lot.

Certification of plans

- (6) The Consent Holder must follow the process set out below for the certification of any plans, documents, designs or specifications (hereafter referred to as documents) requiring written certification from the QLDC:
 - (a) Documents must be submitted to the QLDC in electronic form;
 - (b) Subject to (c) below, works to which the documents relate must not commence until the Consent Holder has received written certification from the QLDC. However, if the Consent Holder has not received a response from the QLDC within 20 working days of the date of the submission under (a) above, the documents are deemed to be certified;
 - (c) If the Consent Holder receives a written request for further information or changes to documents from the QLDC then they are to be re-submitted to the QLDC under (a) above;
 - (d) Where the certified documents are management plans, these may be amended at the request of the Consent Holder at any time subject to written re-certification undertaken in accordance with (a) to (c) above;
 - (e) Where the submitted document is required to be certified by multiple authorities and has already been certified (or re-certified) by another authority, the QLDC review will be restricted to only those matters that have not yet been considered that are governed by a territorial authority;
 - (f) The written certification process is confined to confirming that the documents adequately give effect to the relevant conditions;
 - (g) Once certified, all works on the site must be undertaken in accordance with the certified documents.

Prior to commencement of works

- (7) Prior to any disturbance of land in a stage containing the clay target shooting area, fuel storage areas, aboveground storage tank, stockyards, sheep spray race, and livestock shed identified in the DSI completed by Springline dated 28 January 2026, the Consent Holder shall:
 - (a) submit a RAP to the QLDC which is in general accordance with the RAP submitted as part of the application, titled, Remedial Action Plan & Contaminated Site Management Plan, dated 28 January 2026, Revision B and prepared by Springline. The RAP is to ensure that all areas of the stage are suitable for their intended use at the completion of the earthworks; and
 - (b) submit a CSMP to the QLDC which is in general accordance with the RAP submitted as part of the application, titled, Remedial Action Plan & Contaminated Site Management Plan, dated 28 January 2026, Revision B and prepared by Springline. The CSMP is to ensure that the health of on-site workers, the on-site environment and the receiving environment are protected from the effects of contaminants.

These reports are to be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced contaminated land practitioner and are to be in accordance with the Contaminated Land Management Guidelines No. 1 Reporting on Contaminated Sites in New Zealand (Ministry for the Environment, 2011).

(8) Prior to commencement of any works within each stage of the subdivision, the Consent Holder shall:

(a) Submit an EMP for that stage by a suitably qualified person for certification by QLDC. The EMP shall be in accordance with the principles and requirements of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans 2019 and specifically shall address the following environmental elements as specified in the guidelines:

(b) Administrative Requirements

- Daily inspections of specific erosion and sediment control measures as required by GD05 (such as sediment retention ponds)
- Weekly site inspections
- Monthly environmental reporting
- Pre and post rainfall inspection as required by GD05
- Independent audit by Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person
- Notification and management of environmental incidents
- Records and registers
- Environmental roles and responsibilities of personnel (including nomination of Principal Contractor)
- Site induction

(c) Operational Requirements

- Erosion and sedimentation (including Erosion and Sediment Control Plan) (to be prepared by a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person)
- Water quality
- Dust management in accordance with the recommendations of The Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing Environmental Effects of Dust Emissions (MfE, 2016)
- Cultural heritage
- Noise (to be prepared by a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person)
- Vibration (to be prepared by a Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person)
- Indigenous vegetation clearance
- Chemical and fuel management
- Waste management
- Avifauna Incidental Discovery Protocol for earthworks during the avifauna breeding season.

(d) Sufficient detail to address the following matters:

- Assessment of soil characteristics within earthworks catchments and the necessity for additional erosion and sediment control practices;
- Specific erosion and sediment control works (locations, dimensions, capacity etc);

- Supporting calculations and design drawings;
 - Catchment boundaries and contour information;
 - Details of construction methods;
 - Timing and duration of construction and operation of control works;
 - Processes in place if unexpected contaminated land is encountered;
 - Contingency measures for snow and/ or frost events (in relation to chemical treatment)
 - Measures to avoid silt and/or sediment tracking onto roads and then to water for the duration of the earthworks, such as:
 - Providing stabilised entry and exit point(s) for vehicles;
 - Providing wheel wash facilities; and
 - Cleaning road surfaces using street-sweepers immediately where sediment has been tracked onto the road.
 - Details relating to the management of exposed areas;
 - Monitoring and maintenance requirements; and
 - Details relating to the management of long-term stockpiling (over 28 days).
- (e) Submit an Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) for that stage prepared by a suitably qualified person for certification by QLDC. This plan shall be a sub-plan of the overarching EMP and must be prepared in accordance with the requirements outlined on pages 13 – 18 in Queenstown Lakes District Council’s Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans 2019. These plans must be updated when:
- i. The construction program moves from one Stage to another; or
- (f) Any significant changes have been made to the construction methodology since the original plan was accepted for that Stage; or
- (g) There has been an Environmental Incident and investigations have found that the management measures are inadequate.
- (h) Submit a Construction Management Plan (CMP) for that stage prepared by a suitably qualified person for certification by QLDC. This plan shall include details of the following:
- i. Details of the site manager, including their contact details cell phone, email, postal address;
 - (i) The location of a large notice board on the site that clearly identifies the name, telephone number and address for service of the site manager;
 - (j) Measures to be adopted to maintain the land in a tidy condition in terms of disposal / storage of rubbish, storage and unloading of building materials and similar construction activities;
 - (k) Suitable measures to prevent deposition of any debris on surrounding roads by vehicles moving to and from the site. In the event that any material is deposited on any roads, the Consent Holder shall take immediate action, at their expense, to clean the roads;
 - (l) Access controls
 - (m) Site parking arrangements.

- (n) Safety fencing, and site perimeter security.
 - (o) Maintenance of land stability at the site boundaries.
 - (p) Directions for advising adjoining landowners and occupiers of planned construction activities.
 - (q) Handling and addressing of complaints.
- (9) The consent holder shall obtain and implement a traffic management plan approved by the Waka Kotahi New Zealand Transport Agency or its network management consultant, Aspiring Highways prior to undertaking any works within or adjacent to the State Highway that affects the normal operating conditions of the road reserve through disruption, inconvenience or delay. The Traffic Management Plan shall be prepared by a certified Temporary Traffic Management Planner (TTMP) as validated either by a current CoPTTM certification or a relevant NZQA framework registered qualification, unit standard or micro credential. All contractors obligated to implement temporary traffic management plans shall employ a qualified Site Traffic Management Supervisor (STMS) to manage the site in accordance with the requirements of the Waka Kotahi NZTA's 'Traffic Control Devices Manual Part 8: Code of practice for temporary traffic management'. The STMS shall implement the Traffic Management Plan. A copy of the approved plan shall be submitted to the Manager of Resource Management Engineering at Council prior to works commencing.
- (10) Prior to works commencing to pipe the water race, within any onsite ponds, or intermittent streams, a Fish Management Plan is to be prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced professional and submitted to QLDC for review and certification. The Fish Management Plan is to include handling of fish, potential release site locations for fish and biosecurity considerations.
- (11) A MPCP must be prepared to address the management of pests at the site and must be submitted to QLDC for certification prior to the commencement of any works authorised by these consents. The MPCP must set out the procedures to be implemented by the Consent Holder to achieve the objective set out below, and, as a minimum, specify:
- (a) Target pest species;
 - (b) pest reduction methods, which will include descriptions of spatial configuration of bait lines and baiting and/or trapping details including types of baits/traps and frequency of baiting/servicing.
- The objective of the MPCP is to achieve pest control for all target species (mice, rats, stoats, ferrets, weasels, feral cats, rabbits, hares, pigs and deer).
- (12) Prior works commencing the consent holder must prepare a Weed Control Management Plan (WCMP) for Council certification. The purpose of the WCMP is to control unwanted weeds and plant disease that could impact the growth of 'revegetation planting on Morven Hill and the river escarpment' as illustrated on the Landscape Design Document Part Two, 'Landscape Masterplan page 05' Revision A.04, prepared by RMM and dated 6 March 2026.
- (13) Prior to the commencement of works for each stage a Planting Plan prepared by a suitably qualified and experienced landscape architect must be provided to Council for certification for the relevant stage. The purpose of the Planting Plan is to provide detail of 'revegetation planting on Morven Hill and the river escarpment' and 'planting within a network of reserves throughout the Ridgeburn Development' as illustrated on the Landscape Design Document Two, 'Landscape Masterplan page 05' Revision A.04, prepared by RMM and dated 6 March 2026 which is to be carried out by the consent holder. The Planting Plan shall as a minimum include the following:

- (a) A plan of the planted areas detailing proposed plant species, plant sourcing, plant sizes at time of planting, plant locations, density of planting and timing of planting, height and density upon maturity;
 - (b) Identification of the ecological covenant areas;
 - (c) A programme of establishment and post establishment protection and maintenance (e.g., planting method, fertilising, weed removal / spraying, replacement of dead or poorly performing plants, watering, length of maintenance programme); and
 - (d) Details of weed management.
- (14) Prior to the commencement of works for each stage a Planting Maintenance Plan prepared by a suitably qualified and experience landscape architect must be provided to Council for certification for the relevant stage. The purpose of the Planting Maintenance Plan is to provide clear direction to the consent holder and future lot owners as to how to maintain and manage the 'revegetation planting on Morven Hill and the river escarpment' and 'planting within a network of reserves throughout the Ridgeburn Development' illustrated the Landscape Design Document Two, 'Landscape Masterplan page 05' Revision A.04, prepared by RMM and dated 6 March 2026 on an ongoing basis so as to ensure the planting is retained. The plan shall provide details of ongoing maintenance and monitoring requirements including (but not limited to):
- (a) A plan of the planted areas detailing plant species and process for replacement of dead or poorly performing plants, noting that any replacements must be eco-sourced.
- (15) Prior to commencement of construction activities (as defined by NZS 6803:1999 Acoustics – Construction Noise) on-site, the consent holder shall submit for the approval of the Principal Engineer: Resource Management, a detailed Construction Noise Management Plan in accordance with Annex E of NZS 6803:1999.
- (16) All works must be undertaken in accordance with the certified plans listed in Conditions 7 – 15 and these plans shall be accessible on site at all times during work under this consent.
- (17) As part of preparing the EMP, ESCP, CMP, WCMP, Planting Plan, Planting Maintenance Plan and the fish management plan the consent holder must consult with Papatipu Rūnanga to develop monitoring and reporting measures informed by Mātauranga Māori principles and practices, at the discretion of Papatipu Rūnanga. Any outcomes arising from this consultation must be documented and included in the relevant plan.
- (18) Prior to works commencing in each stage assessment must be undertaken by a suitably qualified rock art specialist to identify any Māori Rock Art within the project area. Where Māori Rock Art is identified, it must be protected and managed in accordance with a Rock Art Management Plan reviewed and approved by Papatipu Rūnanga, and a copy of the approved agreement must be provided to QLDC prior to the commencement of works in the relevant area.
- (19) Prior to works commencing in each stage Māori cultural artwork to be incorporated within the development must be identified by the Consent Holder. Confirmation must be provided to the QLDC that the extent, location, and design of cultural artwork within the development has been reviewed and approved by Papatipu Rūnanga.

Engineering Approvals

- (20) All physical development works, including retaining walls, documentation and other consent obligations shall be carried out in accordance with the requirements of the Queenstown Lakes

District Council's policies and standards, being QLDC's Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice adopted on 17th April 2025 and subsequent amendments to that document up to the date of issue of any resource consent.

Advice Note: The current standards are available on Council's website via the following link: <https://www.qldc.govt.nz>

- (21) At least 7 days prior to commencing excavations for each stage, the consent holder shall provide the Manager of Resource Management Engineering at Council with the name of a suitably qualified geo-professional as defined in Section 1.7 of QLDC's Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice who is familiar with the Kirk Roberts Consulting geotechnical report dated 17 March 2026, Kirk Roberts Consulting reference: 2555087 who shall supervise the earthworks procedure and retaining wall construction, in accordance with the report recommendations. Should the site conditions be found unsuitable for the proposed excavation/construction methods, then a suitably qualified and experienced engineer shall submit to the Manager of Resource Management Engineering at Council new designs/work methodologies for the works prior to further work being undertaken, with the exception of any necessary works required to stabilise the site in the interim.
- (22) At least 7 days prior to commencing excavations in any given stage, the consent holder shall provide the QLDC with the name of a suitably qualified professional as defined in Section 1.7.2 of QLDC's Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice 2025 and who shall supervise and monitor any earthworks. This engineer shall be responsible for providing a Geotechnical Completion Report and Schedule 2A certificate, including fill certification, for all lots within the subdivision as required under Condition 16.
- (23) Prior to commencing any work for each stage, the consent holder shall provide an Engineering NZ PS1 Producer Statement for any permanent retaining walls within the lot which exceed 1.5m in height or are subject to additional surcharge loads.

Engineering Review and Acceptance

- (24) Prior to commencing works on the site for each stage, with the exception of earthworks including associated controls approved through the Environmental Management Plan (EMP) process within this consent, the consent holder shall obtain 'Engineering Review and Acceptance' from the Queenstown Lakes District Council for development works in accordance with the relevant stage to be undertaken and information requirements specified below.
- (a) The application shall include all development items listed below unless a 'partial' review approach has been approved in writing by the Manager of Resource Management Engineering at Council.
- (b) The 'Engineering Review and Acceptance' application(s) shall be submitted to the Manager of Resource Management Engineering at Council for review, prior to acceptance being issued. At Council's discretion, specific designs may be subject to a Peer Review, organised by the Council at the applicant's cost.
- (c) The 'Engineering Review and Acceptance' application(s) shall include copies of all specifications, calculations, design plans and Schedule 1A design certificates as is considered by Council to be both necessary and adequate for the relevant stage, in accordance with Condition (15), to detail the following requirements in Conditions (21d-21l):

Transport

- (d) All roads, paths and intersections shall be constructed in general accordance with the Engineering Drawings (Roading) prepared by McKenzie & Co drawings numbered 3000-3015, 3100-3146 and 3900-3901 and dated 6 March 2026.
- (e) The consent-holder shall demonstrate for each stage that:
- i. The expected operating speed (shown on the Engineering Drawings (Roading) prepared by McKenzie & Co drawings numbered 3000-3015, 3100-3146 and 3900-3901 and dated 6 March 2026 on each road will be achieved;
 - ii. The appropriate Safe Intersection Sight Distances and Approach Sight Distances are achieved at all intersections, allowing for a reaction time of 1.5 seconds;
 - iii. Appropriate Stopping Sight Distances are achieved on all roads, allowing for a reaction time of 1.5 seconds;
 - iv. Appropriate sight distances are achieved at all pedestrian crossing locations;
 - v. All traffic signs and road markings will comply with the NZTA Traffic Control Devices Manual;
 - vi. The number of mobility spaces in each car parking area within the Commercial Precinct (Stage 6) must be a minimum of:
 - vii. Workers accommodation / visitor accommodation: 3 mobility spaces; and
 - o Bar / pizzeria: 1 space.
 - viii. The number of cycle parking spaces at the Commercial Precinct meets Rule 29.5.12 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan;
 - ix. The number of coach parking spaces for the worker accommodation / visitor accommodation meets Rule 29.5.1 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan;
 - x. The dimensions of car parking spaces and aisles meet either Rule 29.5.1 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan or Standard AS/NZS2890.1:2004 ('Parking Facilities Part 1: Off-Street Car Parking');
 - xi. The internal dimensions of garages and the distance between the garage doors and the roadway meet Rule 29.5.7 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan;
 - xii. A minimum queuing space of 18m be provided at the southernmost access to the commercial precinct;
 - xiii. Intersections achieve the provisions of the Traffic Control Devices Manual Part 4;
 - xiv. Driveways are formed to meet Rules 29.5.14 and 29.5.16 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan;
 - xv. Driveways have sight distances that meet Rule 29.5.17 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan, extrapolated as appropriate for the expected operating speed of the frontage road;
 - xvi. The separation distance between driveways and intersections meet Rule 29.5.21 of the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan, interpolated as appropriate for the expected operating speed of the frontage road;

- xvii. An 8.8m service vehicle and a B85 car are able to pass each other on curved sections of roads allowing for 0.3 clearance from the edge of the seal/kerb and 0.6m clearance from each other;
- xviii. An 8.8m service vehicle and a B85 car are able to pass each other at intersections allowing for 0.3 clearance from the edge of the seal/kerb and 0.6m clearance from each other. For clarity, this may include one driver waiting for the other vehicle to pass;
- xix. All cul-de-sacs are provided with a suitable turning head as per Figures 3.3 and 3.4 of Standard NZS4404:2010 ('Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure');
- xx. Should any of the above matters (e)(i)-(xviii) not be achieved, an assessment from a suitably qualified and experienced traffic engineer shall be provided which confirms that the non-compliance(s) will not result in unacceptable safety and/or efficiency effects.
- xxi. Provide the final location of the park and ride area which is to be in the approximate location shown on the Engineering Drawings (Roding) prepared by McKenzie & Co drawings numbered 3000-3012, 3600-3615 & 3700-3777, 3800, 3801, 3802, 3803, 3804, 3805, 3806, 3809, 3810, 3900 and 3901 and dated 6 March 2026.
 - o The park and ride area must include at least 70 carparks.
- xxii. Detailed design for all roading shall illustrate how traffic calming measures have integrated pedestrian facilities, parking layout, and streetscapes into the overall design to achieve the target operating speed. The detailed design shall be prepared in consultation with an independent qualified person and a report submitted by this person confirming the designs achieve the target operation speed.

Water

- (f) Detailed plans and specifications shall be supplied for the following to the extent that is required for each stage:
 - i. The construction of two potable production bores within Lot 7002 and 7003 with associated infrastructure and buildings.
 - ii. A rising main and (if required) booster pumps to convey raw water to the water treatment plant and reservoir within Lot 7000.
 - iii. A water treatment plant (WTP) within Lot 7000. This plant shall be designed to ensure on-going compliance with the requirements of the Water Services Act 2021 and Water Services (Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand) Regulations 2022 and Aesthetic Values or Drinking Water Notice 2022.
 - iv. A minimum of two water reservoir tanks shall be installed within future Lot 7000 as part of Stage 1, with provision made for a third tank in Stage 2. Supporting information must demonstrate that the reservoir(s) are suitably sized to service the number of reticulated lots within each relevant stage.
 - v. A reticulated network from the water reservoir to the reticulated lots and any necessary booster pump infrastructure and / or pressure reducing valves to achieve QLDC level of service flows and pressures to the reticulated lots.

- vi. For all stages after Stage 1, detailed plans and specifications for any bulk water treatment and supply infrastructure or works required for the provision of the potable water supply for each specific stage.
 - vii. The Consent Holder shall monitor the water consumption and the number of lots occupied for the completed stages until the completion of Stage 5. In the event that an application is made for Engineering Review and Acceptance to service a stage with a lesser per household water supply than detailed in the GWE Consulting Engineers Technical Memo dated 24 February 2026, this shall be supported by a Monitoring Report detailing the water consumption records.
- (g) For all stages, the water design shall ensure that potable water is able to be provided to each residential and commercial lot, which shall be by:
- i. The provision of a minimum 63mmOD potable water supply ridermain within the road frontage to all Residential Lots. This bulk lateral shall be terminated with a valve and capped just prior to the boundary of each stage, and a 20mm id lateral for future construction water extended off this bulk feed with an Acuflo GM900 toby valve installed at the boundary.
Note: As per the QLDC Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice, suitable bulk meter and backflow prevention will be installed at time of future development of these lots.
 - ii. The provision of a minimum 20mm id potable water supply lateral to the Residential Lots 1-162, 200-226, 300-415, 500, 501-608, 700-892, 1000-1142, 1200-1526 and 1800-1806 or otherwise approved by council, to allow smaller connections should the detail design require them. This shall include a toby valve installed at the boundary.
 - iii. The provision of a minimum 100mm potable water supply lateral to Commercial Lot 6000. This bulk lateral shall be terminated with a valve and be capped just prior to the boundary, and a 20mm id lateral for future construction water extended off this bulk lateral and into the site with an Acuflo GM900 toby installed at the boundary.
Note: As per the QLDC Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice, suitable bulk meter and backflow prevention will be installed at time of future development of these lots.
 - iv. The provision of a minimum 20mm id potable water supply lateral to the Commercial Units PU1-PU6, AU2A, AU6B and AU6C. This shall include an Acuflo GM900 toby valve installed at the boundary.
 - v. The above 20mm id lateral connections to each lot shall include water meters at the lot boundary as agreed with the Incorporated Society (or equivalent legal body).
 - vi. Where the toby valve box is to be placed within a trafficable area, a trafficable lid/box shall be included.
 - vii. Being treated to consistently comply with the requirements of the Water Services Act 2021 and Water Services (Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand) Regulations 2022 and Aesthetic Values for Drinking Water Notice 2022 (or superseding legislation, standards, and notices). For all surface water or ground water takes this shall include

the results of chemical test results no more than 3 years old and bacterial test results no more than 3 months old at the time of submitting the test results. The testing must be carried out by a recognised laboratory (refer to Water Services Act 2021 subpart 11) and be accompanied by a laboratory report with non-compliances highlighted and outlining any necessary means of remedial treatment.

- viii. The provision of fire hydrants with adequate pressure and flow to service and maintain each residential lot with a minimum Class FW2 fire risk and each commercial/school lot with a FW3 fire risk in accordance with the NZ Fire Service Code of Practice for Fire Fighting Water Supplies 2008. Any lesser risk must be approved in writing by the Fire Service NZ and supplied to QLDC.

Wastewater

(h) Detailed plans and specification shall be supplied for the following:

- i. A wastewater treatment plant within Lot 7001 in general accordance with the performance specifications in the BPO Ridgeburn Wastewater Treatment Plant Design Report dated 18 March 2026.
- ii. The wastewater treatment plant shall include suitable emergency storage and/or generator backup and shall be connected to suitable monitoring system, to be approved by Council, to protect the wastewater treatment plant against any system failure and/or overloading. The wastewater treatment plant design shall also include a water supply connection and provision of a vehicle crossing and access driveway from the private road network and set down area to allow for ongoing maintenance access by heavy vehicles (if required).
- iii. For all stages, detailed plans and specifications for any wastewater treatment and disposal infrastructure or works, including land treatment areas required for the disposal of treated effluent from each specific stage. This shall include details of:
- iv. Identification of sufficient land treatment area in accordance with the WGA Ridgeburn Development Wastewater Disposal Options and Effects Report dated 11 March 2026.
- v. Details of the vegetation management regime for the land treatment areas in (i).
- vi. Locations of the sub-surface drip irrigation system within the nominated land treatment area.
- vii. Locations of the spray irrigation within the nominated land treatment area.
- viii. The Consent Holder shall monitor the following until the completion of Stage 6:
- ix. The quantity of wastewater generation from and the number of lots occupied for the preceding stages;
- x. The wastewater quality discharged from the wastewater treatment plant;
- xi. In the event that an application for Engineering Review and Acceptance is submitted proposing to service a stage utilising a lesser per household wastewater generation assumption than the QLDC Code of Practice 2025, this shall be supported by a Monitoring Report with the above information. A wet weather peaking factor will be required to be included in the demand calculations;

- xii. The provision of a foul sewer connection from each residential and commercial lot to the wastewater treatment plant in accordance with Council's standards and connection policy. These connections shall be installed with an invert suitable to drain the full buildable area within each lot while maintaining minimum grade and pipe cover.
- xiii. Where these connections are via a pressure sewer, they should include a boundary kit in accordance with the QLDC pressure sewer policy.
- xiv. The provision of a wastewater boundary kit to the boundary of all recreational reserve areas that include toilet facilities.

Stormwater

- (i) The provision of a stormwater collection and disposal system which shall provide both primary and secondary protection for roads and future development within the lots, in accordance with Council's standards and connection policy. This shall include:
 - i. The provision of a reticulated primary system to collect and dispose of stormwater under the 5% AEP storm event from all road surfaces and all potential impervious areas within each residential, commercial and recreation reserve lot. This shall include attenuation and detention measures in accordance with the Engineering Infrastructure Report prepared by McKenzie & Co dated 25 February 2026. The detention systems shall be easily accessible for maintenance.
 - ii. Collected runoff shall discharge to pipe network and vegetated swales before entering the wetland detention ponds.
 - iii. The provision of a secondary stormwater protection system consisting of secondary flow paths to cater for the 1% AEP storm event to ensure that there is no inundation of those floor levels within the lots, in accordance with the Engineering Infrastructure Report prepared by McKenzie & Co dated 25 February 2026.
 - iv. A copy of the full stormwater model and report outlining the parameters used shall be provided.
 - v. A pre-development and post-development contour plan shall be provided with the stormwater design.
 - vi. All proposed habitable buildings must be located outside of the 100-year flood extent with appropriate freeboards applied in accordance with the QLDC Land Development and Subdivision Code of Practice, specifically:
 - Habitable dwellings (including garages) – 0.5m minimum freeboard height above the 1% AEP flood level
 - Commercial and industrial buildings – 0.3 minimum freeboard height above the 1% AEP flood level
 - Non-habitable residential buildings and detached garages 0.2m minimum freeboard height above the 1% AEP flood level.

Design

- (j) Prior to commencement of construction of any of the following infrastructure, details of the design of the following utility buildings and reservoirs (and ancillary buildings and structures) are to be provided to QLDC for certification:
 - Bore sheds
 - Water treatment plant
 - Wastewater treatment plant
 - Wastewater treatment plant office
 - Reservoirs
- (k) The designs are to meet the following standards:
 - i. All above-ground utility buildings and reservoirs are to be clad in external cladding materials finished in the range of browns, greys and black with a light reflectance value of 20% or less.
- (l) The formation of the water reservoir platform is to be of sufficient space to allow for the construction of a fourth reservoir in the future with appropriate circulation space for access and servicing.

Certification

- (m) The provision of Design Certificates for all engineering infrastructure works associated with this subdivision submitted by a suitably qualified design professional (for clarification this shall include all Roads, Water, Wastewater, Stormwater). The certificates shall be in the format of the Queenstown Lakes District Council – Land Development & Subdivision Code of Practice 2025 Schedule 1A Certificate.
- (n) The provision of a Design Certificate submitted by a suitably qualified design professional for the Wastewater Pump Station/s, Water Treatment Plant, Wastewater Treatment Plant, and Water Reservoir. The certificates shall be in the format of Engineering NZ Producer Statement PS1.

Environmental Controls

- (25) Prior to commencing ground-disturbing activities for each stage, the Consent Holder shall nominate an Environmental Representative for the works program in accordance with the requirements detailed on pages 9 and 10 of the Queenstown Lakes District Council’s Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans.
- (26) Prior to commencing ground disturbing activities for each stage, the Consent Holder shall ensure that all staff (including all sub-contractors) involved in, or supervising, works onsite have attended an Environmental Site Induction in accordance with the requirements detailed on page 8 of the Queenstown Lakes District Council’s Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans.
- (27) The QLDC are to be notified 15 days in advance of soil contamination remediation works commencing.
- (28) Prior to bulk earthworks operations (and vegetation clearance) for the initial stage or any subsequent new stage of works, the Consent Holder must install erosion and sediment controls in accordance with the ESCP as well as provide As-built documentation for these controls by Suitably Qualified and Experienced Person.

Accidental Discovery Protocol

- (29) Prior to commencing excavation work for each stage, the Consent Holder shall ensure that all persons involved in, or supervising works on-site are familiar with the Accidental Discovery Protocol established under Condition 27 below. The Accidental Discovery Protocol shall be clearly displayed and accessible on site at all times during work under this consent.
- (30) In the event that an unidentified archaeological site is located during works, the following will apply:
- (a) Work must cease immediately at that place and within 20 metres around the site. The area must be secured from further disturbance.
 - (b) The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Regional Archaeologist and the Otago Regional Council must be notified immediately.
 - (c) If the site is of Māori origin, the Consent Holder must also notify the appropriate iwi groups or kaitiaki representative of the discovery and ensure site access to enable appropriate cultural procedures and tikanga to be undertaken, as long as all statutory requirements under legislation are met (Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014, Protected Objects Act 1975).
 - (d) If human remains (koiwi tangata) are uncovered the Consent Holder must advise the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Regional Archaeologist, NZ Police, the Otago Regional Council and the appropriate iwi groups or kaitiaki representative and the above process under (c) will apply. Remains are not to be disturbed or moved until future actions have been agreed by all parties.
 - (e) Works affecting the archaeological site must not resume until Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga gives written approval for work to continue. An application for an Archaeological Authority and further assessment by an archaeologist may be required.
 - (f) Where iwi so request, any information recorded as the result of the find such as a description of location and content, must be provided for their records.

Transport

- (31) Prior to works commencing in each stage the consent holder shall engage independent, suitably qualified and experienced traffic engineer to carry out a detailed design safety audit for the relevant stage in accordance with Section 3.2.7 of the Councils Code of Practice 2025.
- (32) Prior to works commencing in each stage the consent holder shall engage an independent, suitably qualified and experienced traffic engineer to review of all traffic signs and road markings within the stage to ensure they have been provided in accordance with the NZTA Traffic Control Devices Manual or otherwise agreed with NZTA.

During construction

- (33) Throughout the duration of works the Consent Holder shall develop and document a process of periodically reviewing the EMP as outlined on page 6 of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans 2019. No ground disturbing activities shall commence in any subsequent stage of development until an EMP has been certified by QLDC. All works shall be undertaken in accordance with the most current version of the EMP as certified by QLDC.
- (34) Throughout the duration of works the current EMP shall be accessible on site at all times during work under this consent and the Consent Holder shall establish and implement document version control.
- (35) Throughout the duration of works, the Consent Holder shall undertake and document weekly and Pre and Post-Rain Event site inspections as outlined on pages 10 and 11 of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans.

- (36) Throughout the duration of works, a SQEP shall monitor the site monthly to ensure that the site is complying with its EMP, identify any new environmental risks arising that could cause an environmental effect and suggest alternative solutions that will result in more effective and efficient management. This must include a specific audit by the SQEP of the effectiveness of the ESCP. The outcome of these inspections should be included in the Monthly Environmental Report referred to Condition 34 below.
- (37) Throughout the duration of works Consent Holder shall complete and submit exception reporting to QLDC in the form of a monthly environmental report. The monthly environmental report shall be submitted to QLDC's Regulatory Department within five (5) working days of the end of each month.
- (38) Throughout the duration of works in accordance with page 9 of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans, where any Environmental Incident where the EMP has failed leading to any adverse environmental effects offsite occurs the Consent Holder shall:
- (a) Report to QLDC details of any Environmental Incident within 12 hours of becoming aware of the incident.
 - (b) Provide an Environmental Incident Report to QLDC within 10 working days of the incident occurring as per the requirements outlined in Section 3.3.1 of Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans.
- (39) Throughout the duration of works environmental records are to be collated onsite and shall be made available to QLDC upon request; immediately if the request is made by a QLDC official onsite and within 24 hours if requested by a QLDC officer offsite. Records and registers to be managed onsite shall be in accordance with the requirements outlined on page 14 of the Queenstown Lakes District Council's Guidelines for Environmental Management Plans.
- (40) Hours of operation for earthworks shall be:
- Monday to Friday (inclusive): 7am to 7pm;
 - Saturday 7.30am-6pm;
 - Sundays and Public Holidays: No Activity.
- (41) All recommendations of the DSI and any RAP and Contaminated Site Management Plan shall be implemented during any disturbance of the HAIL sites identified in the Detailed Site Investigations under Condition 7.
- (42) Only cleanfill material shall be deposited at the site. Cleanfill material is defined as material that when buried/placed will have no adverse effect on people or the environment, and includes virgin natural materials such as clay, soil and rock, and other inert materials such as concrete or brick that are free of:
- (a) combustible, putrescible, degradable or leachable components;
 - (b) hazardous substances;
 - (c) products or materials derived from hazardous waste treatment, hazardous waste stabilisation or hazardous waste disposal practices;
 - (d) materials that may present a risk to human or animal health such as medical and veterinary waste, asbestos or radioactive substances;
 - (e) liquid waste.

Acceptable materials include bricks, pavers, masonry blocks, ceramics, un-reinforced concrete, reinforced concrete where any protruding steel is cut off at the concrete face, fibre cement building products, road sub-base, tiles and virgin soils (including rock, sand, gravel, clay) - provided they are uncontaminated. Any other materials will require the prior written approval of Council prior to disposal at the site. Topsoil shall be used for final cover only.

- (43) Contaminated soil to be removed from the site is required to be disposed of at a suitably licenced facility.
- (44) On completion of any earthworks associated with the water reservoir(s) and prior to the placement of any tanks or associated infrastructure, the consent holder shall provide to Manager of Resource Management Engineering at Council a geotechnical completion report from a suitably qualified geotechnical professional that confirms that the completed platform and associated batter slopes are stable and appropriate for the anticipated tanks.
- (45) All tree felling works are to be undertaken between the months of August to February to avoid disruption of nesting birds.
- (46) The loading and stockpiling of earth and other materials shall be confined to the subject site.
- (47) No earthworks, temporary or permanent, are to breach the boundaries of the subject site. With the specific exception of earthworks required to install infrastructure services connections to the existing networks. This includes works along Morven Ferry Road and Queenstown Trails improvements approved by QLDC and works along State Highway 6 approved by NZTA.

At the time of building

- (48) Prior to the lodgement of any application for building consent for a building within the development, the Consent Holder shall provide certification from the Ridgeburn Review Panel to QLDC confirming that the proposed development meets the specifications of the Novak Middleton Architectural Masterplan and Design Documents dated 6 March 2026 and referenced in Condition 1 and is aligned with the intended design outcomes.
- (49) The Ridgeburn Design Review Panel shall:
 - (a) Comprise a minimum of two members;
 - (b) Include at least one professional advisor who is independent of the Consent Holder and any lot developer (where different); and
 - (c) Include, at a minimum, one member who is either:
 - (d) A full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute (NZPI); or
 - (e) A Registered Urban Designer with the Urban Designers Institute of Aotearoa (UDIA).
- (50) The certification provided by the Design Review Panel shall include written confirmation from the professional advisor that they:
 - (a) Meet the qualification requirements set out in this condition; and
 - (b) Are independent of the Consent Holder and any lot developer (where different).

Prior to the occupation of the development

- (51) Prior to the occupation of the development for the relevant stage the consent holder shall complete the following:

- (a) The completion and implementation of all reviewed and accepted works detailed in Condition (7-19) above.
 - (b) All road signage shall be installed in accordance with Council's signage specifications and all necessary road markings completed on all private accesses (if required);
 - (c) The consent holder shall clearly and permanently mark out all parking spaces within the car parking areas within the relevant stage;
 - (d) The vehicle parking and access driveway areas within the relevant stage shall be formed and sealed in accordance with Council standards;
 - (e) Any power supply and telecommunications connections to the residential units within the relevant stage shall be underground from existing reticulation and in accordance with any requirements/standards of the network provider;
 - (f) All earth worked and/or exposed areas shall be top-soiled and grassed, revegetated, or otherwise stabilised.
- (52) The Consent Holder shall ensure that the upgrade of Morven Ferry Road as shown in the engineering drawings prepared by McKenzie & Co and referenced in Condition 1 is completed to the satisfaction of QLDC prior to the construction or occupation of any residential unit within Stage 1 (180 residential units).
- (53) The Consent Holder shall ensure that the Morven Road / State Highway 6 roundabout as shown in the engineering drawings prepared by McKenzie & Co and referenced in Condition 1, or other agreement, is completed to the satisfaction of the QLDC, in consultation with NZTA, prior to the occupation of any residential unit beyond 321 residential units within the development (being the cumulative total of Stages 1–3).
- (54) The Consent Holder shall ensure that the upgrade of the Lake Hayes Road / State Highway 6 (Seagull) intersection, as shown in the engineering drawings prepared by McKenzie & Co, Plan 4048-0-0-3015, dated 5 March 2026 and referenced in Condition 1, or other agreement with NZTA, is completed to the satisfaction of NZTA at a timing that is agreed between the Consent Holder and NZTA.
- (55) Prior to the occupation or use of any building or development authorised by this consent, the Section 224(c) certificate for the associated stage of the subdivision consent shall be issued by the Council. Evidence of the issued Section 224(c) certificate shall be provided to QLDC confirming that all subdivision conditions have been satisfied.
- (56) Prior to the occupation of any residential buildings within Lots 1-132, 142-156, PU1-PU36 (Stage 1A), 200-226, 300-415, 500, 501-608, 1600-1704, 700-892, 1000-1142, 1200-1256, 1800-1806 the consent holder must establish all landscaping within the applicable allotment as outlined in the document titled Typologies (pages 80-86), Prepared by RMM.

Operational

- (57) The hours of operation for activities within the building authorised by this consent within the commercial precinct shall be limited to the following:
- (a) Supermarket: 7:00am to 10:00pm, seven days per week;
 - (b) Business Hub: 6:00am to 7:00pm, Monday to Friday;

- (c) Gym / fitness facility: 6:00am to 8:00pm, seven days per week;
 - (d) Daycare / early childhood education facility: 8:00am to 5:00pm, Monday to Friday;
 - (e) Other retail activities 8:00am to 5:00pm, Monday to Sunday;
 - (f) Visitor accommodation/ workers accommodation: 24 hours per day. Any associated outdoor guest areas shall close by 10:00pm;
 - (g) Restaurant and/or bar: 10:00am to 10:00pm, seven days per week.
- (58) Prior to the occupation of the supermarket, a 2-metre-high solid boundary fence shall be installed around the perimeter of the supermarket loading and service area to mitigate noise effects from deliveries and loading activities. The location, extent, and construction specifications of the fence shall be certified by a suitably qualified acoustic engineer as being sufficient to achieve the required noise mitigation. The fence shall be maintained in good condition thereafter.
- (59) Deliveries and loading activity for the supermarket shall only occur during the identified daytime hours.
- (60) Compliance within noise standards must be achieved at any point within the notional boundary of a residential unit existing, or consented, prior to 1 January 2025.

Advice Note: The noise limits specified above are consistent with the applicable rules in the Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan and would apply irrespective of this consent. They are included here for clarity and ease of reference.

Heritage

- (61) A Heritage Temporary Protection Plan (HTPP) for the heritage buildings identified in the Origin Report dated 5 March 2026 and titled: *Heritage Value Appraisal and Advice: Proposed Ridgeburn Development, 122 Morven Ferry Road RD 1 Queenstown, 9371 (Lot 2 DP 601937)* shall be developed by the Consent Holder's appointed Heritage Professional prior to any works on site commencing and can be updated by them at any time. The purpose of the HTPP is to ensure that the heritage fabric of the buildings is suitably protected from the effects of the approved works to the greatest extent practicable. The following is required to fulfil this condition:
- (a) Identification of potential risks to heritage fabric associated with works (for example: construction vibration, packing between the temporary stabilisation props and heritage fabric, moisture ingress, hot works, damage from machinery and wrapping of fabric).
 - (b) A description of mitigating measures to be implemented to reduce risk of damage to heritage fabric; and
 - (c) Identification of who is responsible for providing expert oversight of the matter (e.g. stone mason, heritage professional, engineer).
- (62) The HTPP shall be submitted to the Council via email to RCMonitoring@qldc.govt.nz prior to any works occurring on site. The HTPP is to be implemented at all times.
- (63) During the construction process the Consent Holder's appointed Heritage Professional is to monitor the construction works and the HTPP. This monitoring is to be undertaken by way of site visits at key points in the construction process. At least 5 working days prior to the commencement of

construction, a construction programme identifying key dates/milestones for monitoring is to be submitted to Council via email to (email address).

(64) At least 20 working days prior to works commencing on the Heritage Buildings identified in the Origin Report Origin Report dated 5 March 2026 and titled: *Heritage Value Appraisal and Advice: Proposed Ridgeburn Development, 122 Morven Ferry Road RD 1 Queenstown, 9371 (Lot 2 DP 601937)*, the consent holder shall provide a final Heritage Construction Management Plan (Heritage CMP) prepared by appropriately qualified personnel for the relevant building to the Manager Resource Consents for review and acceptance detailing the construction methodology for adaption of that building. The Council shall respond within 10 working days of receiving the Heritage CMP. The objective of the final Heritage CMP is to manage the construction process to avoid or mitigate potential impacts on built heritage. The Heritage CMP shall include as a minimum:

- (a) Pre-start meeting requirements with contractors;
- (b) The methods for site preparation, working practices and use of machinery;
- (c) The methods for avoiding damage or protecting heritage fabric from damage that may potentially occur during construction;
- (d) Identification of the portions of the buildings that need to be temporarily deconstructed, including discussion of reasons for temporary relocation, methods for temporary removal, relocation and storage;
- (e) Communication processes;
- (f) The manual methods for monitoring potential risk of damage from construction activities;
- (g) The processes for remediation of accidental damage to the buildings arising from the works and any associated activities;
- (h) Provision for the Heritage CMP to be adapted as site conditions change or unexpected situations arise.

Lapse of Consent

(65) In accordance with clause 87(2)(b) and clause 26 Schedule 5 FTAA, this consent shall lapse ten (10) years after the date it commences unless the consent is given effect to within that ten-year period.

Advice Notes:

- (1) There is repetition of some conditions in the land use consent and the subdivision consent. When a condition is satisfied in one it will be noted as having been satisfied in the other.

3.0 Water Permit

3.1 Take and use of groundwater

Consent Duration

- (1) The duration of this consent shall be 35 years from the date of commencement.

General

- (2) This consent authorises the take and use of groundwater from two bores at map references NZTM 1271608 / 5008548 (BH04) and NZTM 1271404 / 5008426 (BH05) at 122 Morven Ferry Road, Arrow Junction, for the purpose of community water supply and firefighting supply associated with the Ridgeburn development.

Advice Note: It is the responsibility of the Consent Holder to ensure that the water abstracted under this resource consent is of suitable quality for its intended use. Where water is to be used for human consumption, the Consent Holder should have the water tested prior to use and should discuss the water testing and treatment requirements with a representative of Taumata Arowai and consider the Water Services (Drinking Water Standards for New Zealand) Regulations 2022 (or any successor).

- (3) The activities authorised by this consent must be carried out in accordance with the plans and all information submitted with the application. If there are any inconsistencies between the above information and the conditions of this consent, the conditions of this consent will prevail.
- (4) The rate and quantity of abstraction from the combined bores referenced under Condition (2) must not exceed:
- (a) 23 litres per second;
 - (b) 2,006 cubic metres per day; and
 - (c) 732,190 cubic metres in each 12-month period, commencing 1 July of any year and ending 30 June of the following year.
- (5) The Consent Holder must notify the Otago Regional Council in writing of the commencement date of the taking of groundwater no less than 10 working days prior to the first exercise of this consent.

Metering and Telemetry

- (6) The Consent Holder must:
- (a) Prior to the first exercise of this consent, install a suitable water meter on the delivery line between the bores and the water treatment plant to record the combined groundwater take, within an error accuracy range of +/- 5% over the meter's nominal flow range and a telemetry compatible datalogger that time stamps a pulse from the flow meter at least once every 15 minutes and that has the capacity to hold at least 12 months data of water taken.
 - (b) The water meter must record the hourly volume to an uncertainty of no greater than 1 percent.
 - (c) Data must be provided by an Otago Regional Council-approved data host to the Otago Regional Council once daily in 15-minute period volumes by means of telemetry. The Consent Holder must ensure data compatibility with the Otago Regional Council's time-series database and conform with the Otago Regional Council's data standards.
 - (d) The water meter, datalogger and telemetry unit (water measuring system) must be installed by an Otago Regional Council-approved installer, and it must be installed and maintained according to the manufacturer's specifications and instructions. There must be enough space in the pipe to allow for verification of the accuracy of the meter under part (e) of this condition.
 - (e) Within 20 working days of the installation of the water measuring system and within 20 working days of any subsequent replacement of any part of the water measuring system, the water meter must be verified for accuracy.

- i. If a mechanical insert water meter or clamp on ultrasonic meter is installed it must be verified for accuracy each and every year from the first exercise of this consent.
- (f) If an electromagnetic or built-in ultrasonic flow meter is installed it must be verified for accuracy every five years from the first exercise of this consent.
- (g) Each verification must be undertaken by a Consent Authority approved operator and a Water Measuring Device Verification form (Form RS1) must be completed and submitted to the Consent Authority within 5 working days of the verification being performed, and at any time upon request.
- (h) The Consent Holder must have a measuring device reverified by a Consent Authority approved operator within 30 working days if a measuring device does not meet the verification requirements. The reverification must include an explanation of what changes were undertaken to the measuring device prior to any subsequent test(s).
- (i) The Consent Holder must verify the correct pulse rate output is used if a correction is completed and submit this to the Consent Authority within 5 working days of the correction.
- (j) The Consent Holder must ensure the full operation of the water measuring system at all times during the exercise of this consent. All malfunctions of the water meter and/or datalogger and/or telemetry unit during the exercise of this consent must be reported to the Consent Authority within 5 working days of observation. Appropriate repairs must be performed within 30 working days of observation of the malfunction or within a timeframe agreed with the Consent Authority.
- (k) Once the malfunction has been remedied, a copy of the calibration record, Water Measuring Device Verification form (Form RS1) with photographic evidence and any non-transferred data must be submitted to the Consent Authority within 5 working days of the completion of repairs. Photographs must be in colour and be no smaller than 200 X 150 millimetres in size and be in JPEG form.

Monitoring and Compliance

- (7) Prior to first exercise of this consent, the Consent Holder must obtain certification of a Water Safety Plan from Taumata Arowai as required under the Water Services Act 2021.
- (8) The Consent Holder must prepare and submit an Annual Compliance Report to the Otago Regional Council by 1 September each year (covering the period 1 July to 30 June). The report must include (as a minimum):
 - (a) Documentation of the volumes and flow rates abstracted from the bores;
 - (b) Confirmation that the groundwater abstraction has been undertaken in compliance with the conditions of this consent, or identification of any exceedances of the conditions of this consent;
 - (c) Any management or mitigation measures taken in response to any exceedances of the conditions of this consent;
 - (d) A summary of source-water quality monitoring results; and
 - (e) Confirmation of bore maintenance and security.
- (9) Where information is required to be provided to Otago Regional Council under the conditions of this consent, this information is to be provided in writing to compliance@orc.govt.nz and the email heading is to reference the consent number and the condition(s) the information relates to.

3.2 Diversion of stormwater

Consent Duration

- (1) The duration of this consent shall be 35 years from the date of commencement.

General

- (2) The diversion of stormwater must be undertaken with the Stormwater Mitigation Report and Stormwater Drawings referenced under Appendix 1.
- (3) The diversion of stormwater must not cause flooding, erosion, land instability, sedimentation or property damage of any other person's property.

4.0 Works within the beds of lakes and rivers

4.1 Reclamation and diversion of intermittent streams

Consent Duration

- (1) The duration of this consent shall be 15 years from the date of commencement.

General

- (2) The reclamation and diversion of the two intermittent streams must be undertaken in accordance with the Ecological Impact Assessment and Engineering Drawings referenced under Appendix 1.
- (3) Prior to the commencement of any works relating to the reclamation and diversion of the two intermittent streams, the Consent Holder must prepare and submit a final Fish Management Plan (FMP) to Otago Regional Council for certification. The FMP must be based on the draft FMP referenced under Appendix 1, must be prepared by a SQEP and must include as a minimum:
- (a) Identification of all freshwater habitats within the works area to be disturbed, including intermittent streams, ponds, and the irrigation race;
 - (b) Procedures for fish salvage and relocation from works areas prior to disturbance;
 - (c) Timing of fish salvage and relocation activities;
 - (d) Procedures for installation and maintenance of temporary fish exclusion devices where required to prevent fish entering works areas;
 - (e) Methods for fish capture;
 - (f) Procedures for partial dewatering of ponds where required prior to fish salvage;
 - (g) Identification of approved relocation sites;
 - (h) Procedures for handling and transportation of fish to minimise stress and mortality;
 - (i) Requirements for recording fish species and numbers captured; and
 - (j) Preparation of a post-relocation report summarising the fish salvage works, including species captured, numbers relocated, and relocation locations.
- (4) All works authorised by this consent must be undertaken in accordance with the approved Fish Management Plan.
- (5) The freshwater ecologist must be onsite during the dewatering process to ensure that any remaining native fish that are not caught during de-fishing are salvaged.
- (6) The Consent Holder must provide a Fish Salvage Report detailing the relocation site, the species and number of freshwater fauna relocated prior to and during dewatering, to the Council within 10 working days of completion of the native fish capture and relocation. These results must be uploaded into NIWA's New Zealand native freshwater Fish database.

5.0 Wastewater Discharge Permit

5.1 Discharge of Treated Wastewater to Land

Consent Duration

- (1) The duration of this consent shall be 35 years from the date of commencement.

General

- (2) The activities authorised by this consent must be undertaken in accordance with the plans and all information submitted with the application. If there are any inconsistencies between the application information and the conditions of this consent, the conditions of this consent will prevail.
- (3) The discharge authorised by this consent shall only consist of treated domestic and commercial wastewater from the Ridgeburn development.
- (4) The Consent Holder must notify the Otago Regional Council (ORC) in writing of the commencement date of the discharge authorised by this consent no less than 10 working days prior to the first exercise of this consent.

Pre-Commencement Monitoring

- (5) At least 12 months prior to the first discharge authorised by this consent, the Consent Holder must install a telemetered climate monitoring station enabling hourly recording of rainfall, wind, soil moisture and potential evapotranspiration.
- (6) At least 12 months prior to the first discharge authorised by this consent, the Consent Holder shall prepare a Baseline Monitoring Plan to establish baseline conditions for groundwater, surface water and soil across areas relevant to the treated wastewater discharge. The programme shall be outlined in a report prepared by a SQEP and submitted to Council for certification. The Baseline Monitoring Plan shall include:
- (a) Groundwater levels and quality at locations suitable to monitor:
 - i. Up-gradient and down-gradient conditions in the perennial wetland catchment;
 - (b) Up-gradient and down-gradient conditions in the seasonal wetland catchment;
 - (c) Down-gradient conditions in the northern catchment; and
 - (d) Down-gradient conditions in the alluvial ribbon aquifer catchment.
 - (e) Surface water levels and quality at locations suitable to monitor:
 - i. On-site wetlands (the perennial wetland and the three seasonal wetlands);
 - (f) One Morven Hill runoff site for each defined catchment;
 - (g) Downgradient perennial wetland catchment;
 - (h) Downgradient seasonal wetland catchment; and
 - (i) Morven Ferry Road outfall.
 - (j) Soil moisture: Morven Hill spray irrigation area and residential subsurface irrigation area.

- (k) At a minimum, the parameters for laboratory analysis shall include Total Nitrogen (TN), Total Phosphorus (TP), Ammoniacal Nitrogen (NH₃-N), E. coli, pH, conductivity (water); Olsen P, exchangeable sodium (soils).
- (7) Baseline monitoring shall be undertaken in accordance with the certified Baseline Monitoring Plan and for a minimum of 12 months.
- (8) Within one month of completing the Baseline Monitoring, a report documenting the Baseline Monitoring Results Report including recommended consent compliance trigger levels shall be submitted to ORC for certification.

Management Plans

- (9) At least 15 working days prior to the first discharge of treated wastewater to land, the Consent Holder must prepare a Wastewater Treatment Plant Operational Management Plan (WWTP OMP) and submit it to the Otago Regional Council for certification. The WWTP OMP must include:
 - (a) A full description of the treatment process;
 - (b) Management procedures for key components of the system;
 - (c) Key operational matters (including weekly and monthly maintenance checks);
 - (d) Monitoring and reporting;
 - (e) Contingency plans for breakdowns, spills, and malfunctions;
 - (f) Odour mitigation;
 - (g) Complaints management;
 - (h) Establishment of internal trigger points to initiate internal traceback and corrective actions;
 - (i) Procedures for reviews and improvements; and
 - (j) Emergency contacts.
- (10) At least 15 working days prior to the first discharge of treated wastewater to land, the Consent Holder must prepare and submit a Wastewater Land Application Management Plan (WLAMP) to Otago Regional Council for certification. The WLAMP shall include:
 - (a) A description of the spray irrigation system on Morven Hill and reserve sub-surface dripline irrigation system in the residential areas;
 - (b) Irrigation scheduling, rates and loading limits;
 - (c) Soil moisture and climate-based scheduling protocols;
 - (d) Procedures to prevent adverse treated wastewater ponding, surface runoff, seepage and spray drift;
 - (e) Rotation and use of reserve areas on Morven Hills and residential areas for maintenance and nutrient loading management;
 - (f) Continuous operational monitoring (climate and soil moisture);
 - (g) Ongoing environmental monitoring (vegetation, soil, surface water, and groundwater);
 - (h) Setbacks from wetlands, surface water, and domestic/community supply bores;
 - (i) Management responses for environmental and human health protection; and
 - (j) Reporting and review procedures.

- (11) The WWTP and land application system must be maintained and operated in accordance with the certified WWTP OMP and WLAMP. Any amendments to the WWTP OMP and WLAMP must be re-certified by ORC.

Flow Meter

- (12) A flow meter and telemetry-compatible datalogger must be installed at the point where treated wastewater is discharged to the land application system.
- (13) The flow meter must record wastewater discharge volumes at 15-minute intervals and have an accuracy of $\pm 5\%$ over its operating range.
- (14) Calibration of the flow meter must take place every 5 years by a SQEP with records included in the Annual Report required under Condition 25.

Maximum Discharge Volume

- (15) The Consent Holder shall ensure that the volume of treated wastewater discharged from the WWTP does not exceed the discharge limits specified in Table 1, based on 95 percentile compliance across the preceding 12-month period in accordance with the *National Wastewater Standards November 2025*.
- (16) Should the daily discharge volume exceed the volume specified in Table 1, the ORC shall be notified within 5 working days, together with the reasons for the exceedance and a description of any corrective measures applied.

Table 1: Maximum Discharge Flow Limits

Development Phases	Maximum Daily Flow (m ³ /day) 95 Percentile over 12 months
Phase 1	178
Phase 2	373
Phase 3	570
Phase 4	766
Phase 5	963
Phase 6	1,204

Advice Note: The above limits apply to the full development build out of each phase.

Effluent Quality Standards

- (17) The Consent Holder must ensure that all treated wastewater discharged from the WWTP complies with the following effluent quality standards:
- (a) The treated wastewater must comply with the maximum mass load limits specified in Table 2. Compliance with the limits in Table 2 shall be assessed with a single weekly 24 hour flow-proportional composite sample.

Table 2: Maximum Concentration Limits

Parameter	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Phase 5	Completion
cBOD (mg/L)	N/A	15	15	9	9	9

TSS (mg/L)	N/A	10	10	10	10	10
TP (mg/L)	N/A	10	10	8	8	8
TN (mg/L)	N/A	25	10	10	10	10
NH ₃ -N (mg/L)	N/A	10	8	8	8	8
<i>E. coli</i> (cfu/100 mL)	10	10	10	10	10	10

Advice Note: Phase 1 does not require maximum concentration limits. Phase 1 not only covers the biological startup phase of the WWTP, but it will also cover a period when there will be minimal volumes from typical residential occupancy, the loads will be small, concentrated to the working hours of the day and dependent on the number of contractors working on site on any given day. Saturdays and Sundays will likely have effectively zero load. As such, concentrations are likely to be highly variable yet still within the limits of the mass load. As phase 1 reaches its conclusion, the background residential load will stabilise this, hence concentrations can be applied to phase 2.

Land Application System

- (18) Treated wastewater shall be discharged to land via a subsurface irrigation land application system, comprising of the following:
- (a) Dripper lines shall be installed for the residential irrigation reserve areas in accordance with the certified WLAMP.
 - (b) Primary spray irrigation areas including reserve areas across Morven Hill to be designed, monitored, and managed to prevent adverse ponding, surface runoff, seepage, and spray drift in accordance with the certified WLAMP.
 - (c) The land application system shall include sufficient reserve area to receive treated wastewater for maintenance, irrigation rotation, and nutrient loading management in accordance with the certified WLAMP.

Treated Wastewater Loading Limits

- (19) Unless otherwise approved by the certified WLAMP, the application of treated wastewater to land in the surface irrigation areas shall:
- (a) Not exceed a hydraulic loading of 3.5 mm/day when evapotranspiration is below 3 mm/day;
 - (b) Not exceed a hydraulic loading of 6.5 mm/day when evapotranspiration is above 3 mm/day; and
 - (c) Not exceed a hydraulic loading of 2.3 mm/day on an average annual basis across the Morven Hill primary and reserve spray irrigation areas.
- (20) Unless otherwise approved by the certified WLAMP, the application of treated wastewater to land in the reserve residential subsurface irrigation areas shall:
- (a) Not exceed a hydraulic loading of 3.5 mm/day, with the following reductions in application rates in accordance with slope adjustment (<10% slope: no reduction, 10 to 20% slope: 20% reduction, 30 to 30% slope: 50% reduction); and
 - (b) Not exceed a hydraulic loading of 2.8 mm/day on an average annual basis.
- (21) Annual nutrient loading to the treated wastewater disposal areas, measured on an annual basis, shall not exceed the loading rates presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Treated Wastewater Disposal Areas Maximum Annual Nutrient Loading Rates

Parameter	Maximum Annual Load (kg/ha/yr)	
	Morven Hill spray irrigation areas	subsurface dripline irrigation areas
Total Nitrogen	54.3	67.2
Total Phosphorus	66.7	82.6

(22) The irrigation of treated wastewater to the disposal areas shall not result in or increase either:

- (a) Surface water run-off from the irrigation areas; or
- (b) Surface water ponding within the irrigation areas.

Monitoring

(23) On a weekly basis, a single 24 hour flow proportional composite sample shall be collected and dispatched to a IENZ registered laboratory for the purpose of compliance analysis.

(24) Following completion of the required Baseline Monitoring required under pre-commencement monitoring consent conditions, the Consent Holder must implement ongoing environmental monitoring and operation monitoring in accordance with the certified WLAMP. The ongoing environmental monitoring and operation monitoring must include:

- (a) Operational soil moisture and climate monitoring;
- (b) Ongoing environmental monitoring of vegetation, soil, surface water, and groundwater; and
- (c) Sampling locations, monitoring frequency, and monitored parameters appropriate to monitor compliance with parameter trigger levels designated under the certified WLAMP.

Reporting

(25) The Consent Holder must prepare an Annual Monitoring Report covering the previous 12-month period for 1 July to 30 June and submit it to the ORC by 31 August each year. The Annual Monitoring Report must include:

- (a) Compliance summary;
- (b) Treated wastewater disposal volumes and weekly flow-proportional composite sampling results including quarterly compliance progress reporting;
- (c) All operational and ongoing environmental monitoring results with interpretation summary;
- (d) Nutrient management, loading, and vegetation health summary;
- (e) Trigger level exceedances and summary of management actions undertaken;
- (f) Complaints, malfunctions, events outside of normal operation, and remedial actions undertaken; and
- (g) Proposed WWTP OMP and WLAMP amendments if required.

(26) The Consent Holder shall provide the ORC with quarterly interim reports documenting:

- (a) Compliance with the maximum treated wastewater concentration limits as presented in Table 2, and
- (b) Progress toward the maximum annual nutrient loading to the treated wastewater disposal areas.

6.0 Land Use Consent (ORC)

6.1 Residential earthworks, including earthworks on contaminated land and, earthworks within 10m and 100m of a natural inland wetland

Consent Duration

- (1) The duration of this consent shall be 15 years from the date of commencement.

Pre-Commencement

- (2) The Consent Holder must notify the Otago Regional Council in writing of the commencement date of earthworks not less than 15 working days prior to the commencement of works within each stage of the subdivision. The prestart notification must include the following information:
- (a) The start date of the works;
 - (b) Photographs of the area/s where works is to be undertaken – photographs must be in colour and no smaller than 200 x 150 millimetres in size and be in JPEG form; and
 - (c) Advise who the Environmental Representative for the works programme is and provide contact details to the Otago Regional Council.
- (3) Prior to commencing any work on site, the Consent Holder must ensure that all staff (including all sub-contractors) involved in, or supervising, works onsite have attended an Environmental Site Induction. Matters to be discussed include:
- (a) Timeframes for key stages of the works authorised under this consent;
 - (b) Resource consent conditions;
 - (c) Erosion and Sediment Control Plan;
 - (d) Environmental Management Plan;
 - (e) Lizard Management Plan;
 - (f) Remedial Action Plan; and
 - (g) Contaminated Site Management Plan
- (4) Within 10 working days following implementation and completion of the specific erosion and sediment control works, and prior to the commencement of earthworks activity on the subject site, a SQEP must provide written certification to the Council that the erosion and sediment control measures have been constructed and completed in general accordance with the certified ESCP(s). Written certification must be in the form of a report or any other form acceptable to the Council.

Management Plans

- (5) At least 15 working days prior to the commencement of earthworks activities for each stage the Consent Holder must submit a finalised Environmental Management Plan (EMP) and Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) for review and certification by the Otago Regional Council, based on the documents referenced under Appendix 1. The ESCP must be in accordance with Auckland Council's Guideline Document 2016/005 (GD05) and must be prepared by a SQEP.
- (6) At least 15 working days prior to the commencement of earthworks for each stage, the Consent Holder must submit a finalised Remedial Action Plan (RAP) and Contaminated Site Management

Plan (CSMP) for review and acceptance by the Otago Regional Council. The RAP and CSMP must be in accordance with the Ministry for the Environment's Contaminated Land Management Guidelines No. 5 (revised 2021) and must be prepared by a SQEP.

- (a) The RAP must include the following:
 - i. Remedial methodology and excavation strategy;
 - (b) Soil handling and segregation procedures;
 - (c) Validation sampling methodology; and
 - (d) Disposal procedures for contaminated soils.
 - (e) The CSMP must include the following:
 - i. Site induction and contamination awareness procedures;
 - (f) Dust management procedures;
 - (g) Stockpile management;
 - (h) Contaminated soil handling procedures; and
 - (i) Unexpected contamination discovery protocol.
- (7) At least 15 working days prior to the commencement of any vegetation clearance, earthworks, or other works that may disturb potential lizard habitat within the site, the Consent Holder must submit a final Lizard Management Plan (LMP) to the Otago Regional Council for certification. The LMP must be prepared by a SQEP and must include, as a minimum:
- (a) Identification and mapping of potential lizard habitat within the works area;
 - (b) Procedures for undertaking lizard surveys and salvage prior to works,
 - (c) Timing of lizard salvage and relocation activities prior to vegetation clearance or earthworks within identified lizard habitat;
 - (d) Procedures for capturing, handling, and relocating lizards in accordance with current best practice guidelines;
 - (e) Identification of approved relocation sites, including confirmation that relocation habitats are suitable and protected from further disturbance;
 - (f) Procedures for minimising harm to lizards during vegetation clearance and earthworks; and
 - (g) Requirements for recording species and numbers of lizards captured and relocated.

General

- (8) For the duration of the earthworks subject of this consent:
- (a) All machinery must be clean, free of contaminants and in good repair, prior to entering the site;
 - (b) No construction materials may be left in a position where they could be carried away by storms, floods, waves or other natural events;
 - (c) The Consent Holder must take all practicable measures to prevent spills of hazardous substances being discharged into water or onto land in a manner that may enter water. Such measures may include, but not be limited to:
 - i. All practicable measures must be undertaken to prevent oil and fuel leaks from vehicles and machinery;

- (d) Fuel storage tanks and machinery must be maintained at all times to prevent leakage of oil and other contaminants;
- (e) No refuelling of machinery or equipment within 10 metres of any surface water body;
- (f) There must be no storage of fuel within 10 metres of any surface water body;
- (g) A spill kit, that is capable of absorbing the quantity of oil and petroleum products that may leak or be spilt must be kept on-site at all times.
- (h) The Consent Holder must inform the Otago Regional Council immediately and no later than 12 hours of an oil spill and must provide the following information:
 - i. The date, time, location and estimated volume of the spill;
- (i) The cause of the spill;
- (j) Clean up procedures undertaken;
- (k) Details of the steps taken to control and remediate the effects of the spill on the receiving environment;
- (l) An assessment of any potential effects of the spill; and
- (m) Measures to be undertaken to prevent a recurrence.
- (n) All machinery, fencing, signs, chemicals, rubbish, debris and other materials must be removed upon completion of the earthworks within 10 working days.
- (o) The Consent Holder must undertake all practicable measures to ensure no dust is generated onsite which causes an offensive or objectionable effect at or beyond the legal boundary of the properties in the opinion of an authorised officer of the Otago Regional Council, including visible emissions. Dust management shall be consistent with the recommendations in the Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing the Environmental Effects of Dust Emissions (MfE, 2016).

Ecology

- (9) No earthworks, vegetation clearance, or land disturbance shall occur within any natural inland wetland.
- (10) Earthworks and vegetation clearance within 10 m of wetlands A, B and D shall be limited to the areas depicted within the Engineering Drawings referenced under Appendix 1.
- (11) At least 15 working days prior to the commencement of earthworks, the consent holder shall submit to the Otago Regional Council for certification a Wetland Monitoring and Management Plan (WMMP). The purpose of the WMMP is to:
 - (a) Manage earthworks within 100m of natural inland wetlands to ensure that there is no net loss of its extent and no net loss of any value of the natural inland wetland; and
 - (b) Monitor the natural inland wetlands to ensure the earthworks do not affect the hydrology of the wetland.
- (12) All earthworks within 100m of wetlands on the site must be undertaken in accordance with the certified WMMP.
- (13) All vegetation clearance and earthworks within areas identified as potential lizard habitat shall be undertaken in accordance with the certified LMP.
- (14) Vegetation clearance shall occur outside the bird breeding season (October to February inclusive). If vegetation clearance is required during this period, the area shall first be inspected by a suitably

qualified ecologist to identify any active native bird nests. If an active nest is identified, vegetation clearance within 10m of the nest shall be delayed until chicks have fledged.

Contaminated Land

- (15) The disturbance of contaminated land must be carried out in accordance with the approved RAP and CSMP. No earthworks shall commence until the pre-construction measures specified in the RAP and CSMP have been implemented.
- (16) All works involving the disturbance, excavation, handling, or disposal of contaminated soils shall be undertaken under the supervision of a SQEP. The SQEP shall provide advice on contaminated soil management during earthworks, and undertake inspections and sampling as required.
- (17) Site sourced and imported material used to fill any excavation must:
- (a) Meet the definition of cleanfill; or
 - (b) Not be sourced from any site listed as a HAIL site, unless the material has been tested by a SQEP and confirmed as meeting the definition of cleanfill or being appropriate for the intended land use.
- (18) All contaminated soils shall be managed to prevent the migration of contaminants off-site. This must include the following measures as a minimum:
- (a) Contaminated soil stockpiles shall be kept to a minimum;
 - (b) Stockpiles shall be located away from stormwater pathways and surface water bodies;
 - (c) Stockpiles shall be placed on an impermeable surface or geotextile where practicable; and
 - (d) Stockpiles shall be covered when inactive.
- (19) Any contaminated soil removed from the site shall be transported to and disposed of at an appropriately authorised disposal facility. The consent holder shall maintain records of soil volumes removed from the site, and disposal locations.
- (20) If previously unidentified contaminated material is encountered during earthworks:
- (a) All works in the vicinity shall cease immediately;
 - (b) The affected area shall be secured to prevent disturbance or runoff;
 - (c) A SQEP shall be engaged to inspect the material and determine appropriate management measures;
 - (d) Otago Regional Council must be notified; and
 - (e) Earthworks shall not recommence in the affected area until the SQEP confirms appropriate management measures have been implemented.
- (21) Within three months of completion of the remediation works, the consent holder shall provide a Site Validation Report prepared by a SQEP to the Otago Regional Council. The report shall include:
- (a) Summary of the works undertaken;
 - (b) A statement confirming whether the disturbance works have been completed in accordance with the RAP;
 - (c) The location and dimensions of the excavations carried out, including a relevant site plan;
 - (d) Records of any unexpected contamination encountered during the works, if applicable;
 - (e) Locations and dimensions of any contaminated soil remaining on-site;

- (f) A summary of sampling and analysis undertaken for validation sampling, and for unexpected contamination (if applicable), tabulated analytical results including laboratory transcripts, and interpretation of the results in the context of the relevant soil guideline values;
- (g) Copies of disposal dockets for material removed from site, if any; and
- (h) Any complaints received by the Consent Holder and/or breaches of the procedures set out in the RAP.

Complaints

- (22) The Consent Holder must maintain a record of any environmental complaints received in relation to the exercise of this consent. The register must include, but not be limited to:
 - (a) The date, time, location and nature of the complaint;
 - (b) The name, phone number, and address of the complainant, unless the complainant elects not to supply this information;
 - (c) Action taken by Consent Holder to remedy the situation and any policies or methods put in place to avoid or mitigate the problem occurring again.

Accidental Discovery Protocols

- (23) In the event that archaeological material, kōiwi tangata (human remains), or other taonga are discovered during earthworks, the Consent Holder must ensure the following Accidental Discovery Protocol is followed:
 - (a) All works within 10 metres of the discovery must cease immediately.
 - (b) The area of the discovery must be secured to prevent further disturbance.
 - (c) The Consent Holder must notify the following parties as soon as practicable:
 - i. The Otago Regional Council;
 - (d) The relevant iwi authority; and
 - (e) Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.
 - (f) If the discovery includes human remains, the New Zealand Police must also be notified immediately.
 - (g) Works in the vicinity of the discovery must not recommence until:
 - i. The relevant authorities have inspected the discovery; and
 - (h) Written or verbal approval has been provided by Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (and iwi where relevant) to resume works.
 - (i) Any taonga recovered must be handled and managed in accordance with tikanga Māori and the advice of the relevant iwi authority.

7.0 Air Discharge Permit

7.1 Discharge odour to air from a wastewater treatment plant and associated land irrigation

Consent Duration

- (1) The duration of this consent shall be 35 years from the date of commencement.

General

- (2) The activities authorised by this consent must be undertaken in accordance with the plans and all information submitted with the application. If there are any inconsistencies between the application information and the conditions of this consent, the conditions of this consent will prevail.

Odour

- (3) There must be no noxious, dangerous, offensive, or objectionable odour to the extent that it causes an adverse effect at or beyond the boundary of the site.

Advice Note: The determination of an offensive or objectionable effect must take into account the FIDOL factors and be made based on the guidance provided in the Ministry for the Environment Good Practice Guide for Assessing and Managing Odour (2016).

- (4) At least 15 working days prior to the commencement of the WWTP, the consent holder must prepare and submit a Final Odour Management Plan (OMP) to Otago Regional Council for certification. The purpose of the OMP is to outline an odour management strategy for the operation of the WWTP and associated land irrigation. The OMP must include the following detail:
- (a) Identification of all point sources for discharges of contaminants into air, including a map and schematic diagram showing the location of each source;
 - (b) Procedures to minimise discharges of contaminants into air; and
 - (c) Procedures for the receipt, recording and handling of air quality complaints received.
- (5) The WWTP and associated land irrigation must be undertaken in accordance with the certified OMP for the duration of this consent.
- (6) The Consent Holder must engage a suitably qualified and experienced person to undertake odour observations of the wastewater treatment plant at the following times:
- (a) No more than six months following first operation of the wastewater treatment plant; and
 - (b) No more than six months following the connection of the final subdivision lot to the wastewater treatment plant; and
 - (c) Following any plant upgrades or changes.

Following the odour observations, the observer will prepare a report to summarise their findings and provide recommendations for any improvements.

Advice Note: In each situation, the purpose of the odour observations are to determine whether the odour management practices set out in the OMP are effective in achieving the objective of that plan.

- (7) Where the odour observations recommend changes to odour management processes or equipment:

- (a) Improvements to the on site odour management shall be implemented as soon as practicable and no more than 12 months after the recommendations are made; and
 - (b) Amendments must be made to the OMP to give effect to these recommendations. The updated OMP must be submitted to the Otago Regional Council for certification and thereafter be implemented.
- (8) An odour extraction system must be installed. The purpose of the odour extraction system is to extract air from the screening and grit removal, equalisation tank, waste activated sludge tank, dewatering and centrifuge building and irrigation tank to a biofilter.
- (9) The biofilter design, operation and maintenance must consider the following measures:
- (a) How process air will continue to be treated during remediation of the biofilter;
 - (b) The leachate removal system must be designed to prevent flooding and anaerobic conditions in the beds;
 - (c) Whether inclusion of compost and lime or crushed seashells in the media is required to seed microbial populations and maintain an appropriate pH;
 - (d) Regular monitoring of compaction, cracking, increased organic growth, odour, pressure drop across the beds, temperature and moisture within the biofilters;
 - (e) Biofilter remediation works must be carried out when sensitive receptors are not downwind where practicable;
 - (f) Old biofilter media should be disposed of offsite at an authorised facility to receive the material; and
 - (g) Access to the biofilter should be unimpeded to decrease the period of biofilter remediation operations.
- (10) A backup generator must be installed at the wastewater treatment plant with sufficient capacity to prevent generation of offensive or objectionable odour beyond the boundary of the site during network power outages.

Spray Drift

- (11) Spray drift from spray irrigation fields must:
- (a) Not cause adverse effects that are noxious, dangerous, or offensive; and
 - (b) Be minimised as far as practicable.
- (12) The spray irrigation area must be fenced off, with clear signage in English and Māori to prevent access.
- (13) Prior to commencement of irrigation, a meteorological monitoring station should be installed within the land application area or a representative established meteorological monitoring site will be used to track wind speeds.

Advice Note: Any meteorological monitoring station used to inform windspeeds shall be installed, maintained and calibrated in accordance with the manufacturers recommendations.

- (14) Spray irrigation must cease:
- (a) During winds greater than 7.5 metres per second; or
 - (b) When wind speeds are less than 0.5 metres per second; and
 - (c) The irrigation area is upgradient of sensitive receptors.

Advice Note: For condition (14)(b) and (c), the intent is to prevent irrigation from occurring in mornings when katabatic winds may result in spray drift travelling downhill toward residential properties, this is before 8 am in Summer months and 9 am in winter months. Sensitive receptors include but are not limited to residential properties immediately downhill from the irrigation sites.

(15) The spray Irrigation design must include the following detail:

- (a) Irrigation system design and nozzle selection must consider particle size distribution to increase droplet sizes and direct spray flat or downward where practicable and reduce spray drift.
- (b) Non-misting heads must be selected.
- (c) Maximum droplet release height from the spray irrigation must be 0.5 m above ground level.
- (d) A minimum setback distance of 50 m from residential boundaries and any other recreational area including the bike path up Morven Hill will be applied. If a 50 m setback cannot be applied from the bike path to spray irrigation fields, then this area within the setback must only be irrigated at off peak time.

Advice Note: Off peak time refers to nighttime when less people are outside and using the bike path

Complaints

(16) The Consent Holder must maintain a record of any complaints it receives in relation to odour discharges from the site. The record of complaints must include, at a minimum:

- (a) The date, time, location and nature of the complaint;
- (b) The name, phone number, and address of the complainant, unless the complainant elects not to supply this information;
- (c) Weather conditions at the time of the alleged event including a description of the wind speed and wind direction when the complainant detected the odour;
- (d) Wastewater treatment plant and disposal system operating conditions at the time of the complaint, including any malfunctioning or breakdown of equipment;
- (e) The most likely cause of the odour;
- (f) Investigations undertaken by the Consent Holder in regard to the complaint and any corrective action undertaken by the Consent Holder to remedy, or mitigate the odour detected by the complainant; and
- (g) Measures put in place to prevent the occurrence of a similar incident.

(17) The Consent Holder must notify the Otago Regional Council of any complaints received that relate to the exercise of this permit within 3 working days of a complaint being received.

8.0 Archaeological Authority

Prior to Works Commencing

- (1) The authority holder must ensure that all contractors, subcontractors, and site personnel undertaking earthworks are briefed on site by the s45 approved archaeologist, or a person appointed by them to carry out the briefing on their behalf, prior to works commencing. The briefing shall cover:
 - (a) The presence of recorded archaeological sites F41/62 and F41/890;
 - (b) The potential for additional unrecorded archaeological features, including but not limited to:
 - i. Historic mining features (sluicing scars, tailings) adjacent to the Kowarau River;
 - (c) Subsurface remains associated with the 19th century farmstead complex;
 - (d) Subsurface remains at Steele's Hut;
 - (e) How to identify archaeological evidence;
 - (f) The archaeological work required under this authority;
 - (g) The On-Call Protocol and stand-down procedures; and
 - (h) Contractors' responsibilities to notify the s45 approved archaeologist immediately if archaeological evidence is encountered.
- (2) Prior to the start of any on-site archaeological work, the authority holder must ensure that Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga is advised of the date when work will begin. This advice must be provided at least 2 working days before work starts. The authority holder must also ensure that Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga is advised of the completion of the on-site archaeological work, within 5 working days of completion.

Archaeological Management Plan

- (3) The authority must be exercised in accordance with the Archaeological Management Plan (titled "Morven Ferry, Arrow Junction Archaeological Management Plan", prepared by Origin Consultants, rev A) attached to this authority. Monitoring and investigation shall be undertaken in accordance with the procedures and monitoring methodology outlined in the Archaeological Management Plan. Any amendments to the Archaeological Management Plan must receive the prior written approval of Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga.
- (4) Earthworks shall be monitored by the s45 approved archaeologist (or a suitably qualified archaeologist appointed by them) in accordance with the Archaeological Management Plan, in the following areas:
 - (a) Archaeological site F41/62 – Farmstead Complex
 - (b) Archaeological site F41/890 – Steele's Hut
 - (c) Kowarau River Terrace

Archaeological finds

- (5) Any archaeological evidence encountered during the exercise of this authority must be investigated, recorded and analysed in accordance with archaeological practice.

Accidental Discovery

- (6) If any kōiwi (human remains) are encountered, all work should cease within 5 metres of the discovery. The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Archaeologist, New Zealand Police and Aukaha must be advised immediately in accordance with Guidelines for Kōiwi Tangata/Human Remains (AGS8 2010) and no further work in the area may take place until future actions have been agreed by all parties.
- (7) The authority holder must ensure that if any possible taonga or Māori artefacts, or sites of Māori origin are encountered, all work should cease within 20 metres of the discovery. The Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Archaeologist, Aukaha and Te Ao Marama must be advised immediately and no further work in the area may take place until they have responded.

Completion of On-Site Archaeological Works

- (8) That within 20 working days of the completion of the on-site archaeological work associated with this authority, NZAA Site Records must be updated in ArchSite based on current archaeological practice.
- (9) Within 12 months of the completion of the on-site archaeological work, the authority holder shall ensure that a final report, following the Archaeological Report Guideline (AGS12 2023), is submitted to Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga for inclusion in the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Archaeological Reports Digital Library, as follows:
 - (a) One hard copy and one digital copy of the final report are to be sent to the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Senior Archaeologist.
 - (b) Digital copies of the final report must also be sent to: the NZAA Central Filekeeper, Auckland Museum, Auckland Council, and Tangata Whenua.

9.0 Wildlife Authority

General

- (1) The Approval Holder is only authorised to release wildlife that are listed in Schedule 1(1) using methods described in the application including the Lizard Management Plan titled “Draft Lizard Management Plan title, Ridgeburn, Morven Ferry Road” and dated January 2026.

Salvage Relocation and Habitat Enhancement

- (1) The Approval Holder must perform actions as set out in the contingencies/adaptive management sections of the Lizard Management Plan titled “Draft Lizard Management Plan title, Ridgeburn, Morven Ferry Road” and dated January 2026 to ensure adequate mitigation of effects has been achieved.
- (2) DOC Operations Manager(s) [name and contact] are to be contacted immediately for further advice if wildlife other than those listed in Schedule 1(1) are located within the footprint of the development or within the release site. A separate application to kill non-authorised species will be required.

Lizard Capture and Handling

- (3) Lizards must only be handled by Authorised Personnel, or under the direct supervision of the Authorised Personnel.
- (4) Lizard capture, handling and relocation must be undertaken between the 1st October and 30 April when lizards are most active.
- (5) Capture and handling of lizards must involve only techniques that minimise the risk of infection or injury to the animal.
- (6) Capture and handling methods shall follow those described in the Herpetofauna inventory and monitoring toolbox <http://www.doc.govt.nz/our-work/biodiversity-inventory-and-monitoring/herpetofauna/>.
- (7) The Approval Holder must ensure all live capture traps are covered to protect lizards from exposure and minimise stress. Damp leaf litter or other material must be provided to reduce desiccation risk and the bottom of the pit-fall trap must be perforated to allow drainage of water.
- (8) The Approval Holder must ensure all live capture traps, (e.g. pitfall traps and G-minnow traps), are checked at least every 24 hours.
- (9) The Approval Holder must sterilise any instruments that come in contact with the lizards and/or are used to collect or measure lizards between each location. A separate holding bag must be used for each animal. All gear should be thoroughly cleaned and dried between sites.
- (10) The Approval Holder must ensure lizards are temporarily held individually in a suitable container (e.g. breathable cloth bag) and held out of direct sunlight to minimise the risk of overheating, stress and death.

Death of Wildlife Associated with Salvage Activities

- (11) If any lizards should die during the authorised activities of catch, transfer or liberate, the Approval Holder must:
 - (a) Inform the Director-General; chill the body if it can be delivered within 72 hours, or freeze the body if delivery will take longer than 72 hours; and

- (b) Send the body to Massey University Wildlife Post Mortem Service for necropsy along with details of the animal's history; and
- (c) Pay for any costs incurred in investigation of the death of any lizard; and
- (d) If required by the Director-General, cease the Authorised Activity for a period determined by the Director-General.

Euthanasia

- (12) If any lizards are found injured as part of the Authorised Activity, the Approval Holder shall contact Authorised Personnel listed under Schedule 1(3) to get advice on management of the lizard. The Approval Holder is authorised to euthanise injured lizard(s) on recommendation of the Authorised Personnel listed under Schedule 1(3) or a veterinarian.

Lizard Salvage Reporting

- (13) A report is to be submitted in writing to the DOC Operations Manager, by 30 June each year for the life of this Authorisation, summarising outcomes in accordance with the Lizard Management Plan. Each report must include:

- (a) The Project name; and
- (b) The species and number of any animals collected and released; and
- (c) The GPS location (or a detailed map) of the collection point(s) and release point(s); and
- (d) Results of all surveys, monitoring or research; and
- (e) A description of how the Lizard Management Plan was implemented including any difficulties encountered with capture and handling, how release sites were assessed, post release monitoring and what contingency actions were required.

Advice Notes:

- o Completed Amphibian and Reptile Distribution System (ARDS) cards for all herpetofauna sightings and captures (<http://www.doc.govt.nz/conservation/native-animals/reptiles-and-frogs/species-information/herpetofauna-data-collection/ards-card/>) must be sent to Herpetofauna, Department of Conservation, National Office, PO Box 10420 Wellington 6143 or herpetofauna@doc.govt.nz.
- o The Authority Approval Holder may apply to the Director-General for variations to this Approval in accordance with clause 7(2) of Schedule 7 of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024.
- o The Authority Approval Holder must comply with all statutes, bylaws, and regulations, and all notices, directions, and requisitions of the Director-General and any competent authority relating to the exercise of the Approval.

10.0 Appendix 1: List of Documents

Name	Prepared By	Date / Revision
Subdivision Plans		
Scheme Plans	McKenzie & Co	18 March 2026
Masterplan		
Ridgeburn Masterplans	Novak+Middleton	10 March 2026
Ridgeburn Residential Neighbours Masterplans	Novak+Middleton	9 March 2026
Ridgeburn Neighbourhood B – Central Fields Masterplans	Novak+Middleton	10 March 2026
Ridgeburn Neighbourhood F – Morven Hill Masterplans	Novak+Middleton	10 March 2026
Ridgeburn Family Housing Typologies Masterplans	Novak+Middleton	6 March 2026
Ridgeburn Commercial Precinct Masterplans	Novak+Middleton	10 March 2026
Ridgeburn Heritage, Community and Recreation Spaces Masterplans	Novak+Middleton	10 March 2026
Landscape Plans		
Reserves - Overview	RMM	Rev 1
Reserves - Landscape Masterplan Part 01 - Entrance Reserve	RMM	Rev 1
Reserves - Landscape Masterplan Part 02 – Quarry Spur Reserve	RMM	Rev 1
Reserves - Landscape Masterplan Part 03 - Main Road Stormwater Reserve	RMM	Rev 1

Reserves - Landscape Masterplan Part 04 - Main Road Stormwater Reserve	RMM	Rev 1
Reserves - Landscape Masterplan Part 05 - Central Reserve	RMM	Rev 1
Reserves - Landscape Masterplan Part 06 - Lookout and Wetland Reserves	RMM	Rev 1
Reserves - Landscape Masterplan Part 07 - Escarpment Reserve	RMM	Rev 1
Reserves - Landscape Masterplan Part 08 - Lookout and Wetland Reserves	RMM	Rev 1
Reserves - Landscape Masterplan Part 09 - Escarpment and Morven Hill Reserves	RMM	Rev 1
Reserves - Landscape Masterplan Part 10 - Escarpment and Morven Hill Reserves	RMM	Rev 1
Reserves - Landscape Masterplan Part 11 - Morven Hill Reserve	RMM	Rev 1
Reserves - Landscape Cross Sections	RMM	Rev 1
Reserves Materiality – Design Intent	RMM	Rev 1
Ridgeburn Wayfinding – Design Intent	RMM	Rev 1
Reserve Amenity Tree Planting	RMM	Rev 1
Reserve Amenity Planting	RMM	Rev 1

Native Shrubland Reserve Slope Planting	RMM	Rev 1
Tussock Planting	RMM	Rev 1
Riparian Margin – Upper Bank	RMM	Rev 1
Riparian Margin – Mid Bank	RMM	Rev 1
Riparian Margin – Stream Edge	RMM	Rev 1
Stormwater/Wastewater Basin Planting	RMM	Rev 1
Reserves – Stormwater Channels and Swales	RMM	Rev 1
Streams & Overland Flow Paths – Cross Sections	RMM	Rev 1
Boundary Interfaces – Overview Plan	RMM	Rev 1
Boundary Interfaces – Cross Sections	RMM	Rev 1
Boundary Interface Planting	RMM	Rev 1
Neighbourhoods – Street Trees	RMM	Rev 1
Neighbourhoods – Street Cross Sections	RMM	Rev 1
Neighbourhoods - Overview	RMM	Rev 1
Neighbourhoods – Village Character Area Streets	RMM	Rev 1
Neighbourhood – Village Character Area Typology Interface	RMM	Rev 1
Village Character Area – Materials + Planting	RMM	Rev 1

Commercial Precinct - Commercial Character Area Streets	RMM	Rev 1
Commercial Precinct - Materials + Planting	RMM	Rev 1
Engineering Drawings		
Earthworks Finished Contour Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev F
Earthworks Cut/Fill Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev D
Earthworks Ecology Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev C
Earthworks Ecology Intermittent Stream Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev C
Earthworks Erosion and Sediment Control Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev D & A
Earthworks 12D Slope Analysis	Mckenzie & Co	Rev E
Earthworks Erosion & Sediment Control Standard Details	Mckenzie & Co	Rev D
Roading Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev G
Morven Ferry Road Upgrade – Overall Plan	Mckenzie & Co	Rev B
Arrowtown-Lake Hayes Road / State Highway 8 / Seagull Intersection Upgrade	Mckenzie & Co	Rev F
Morven Ferry Road / State Highway 6 / Intersection Upgrade	Mckenzie & Co	Rev F
Roading Long Sections Sheets	Mckenzie & Co	Rev B
Roading Typical Cross Sections Sheets	Mckenzie & Co	Rev K & L

Road Vehicle Tracking Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev E & A
Road Marking Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev H
Roading Standard Details Sheets	Mckenzie & Co	Rev C
Stormwater Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev F & A
Stormwater Pre-Development Wetland Catchment Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev F
Stormwater Features Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev E, B & A
Stormwater Roadside Swale Detail Sheets	Mckenzie & Co	Rev F
Stormwater 5% AEP SW Devices Catchment Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev E
Stormwater Flood (Event) Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev A
Stormwater Post-Development Hydraulic model extent Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev A
Stormwater 1% AEP Post Development Conveyance Channels Overall Strategy Plan	Mckenzie & Co	Rev C
Stormwater Conveyance Channel Typical Cross Sections Sheets	Mckenzie & Co	Rev C
Stormwater Culvert Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev A
Wastewater Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev E
Wastewater Treatment Plan Concept Plan	Mckenzie & Co	Rev C
Water Supply Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev H
Water Treatment Plant Section Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev G

Network Utilities Plans	Mckenzie & Co	Rev E
Draft Management Plans		
Lizard Management Plan	Viridis	9 March 2026
Fish Management Plan	Viridis	21 January 2026
Pest Animal Management	Viridis	9 March 2026
Odour Management Plan	PDP	Rev 2 – 6 March 2026
Environmental Management Plan	McKenzie & Co	Rev D – 25 February 2026
Construction Management Plan	McKenzie & Co	Rev C – 13 February 2026
Remedial Action Plan and Contaminated Site Management Plan	Springline	Rev B – 28 January 2026
Draft Archaeological Management Plan	Origin Consultants	Rev A – January 2026