

Memorandum on Completeness and Scope

File FTAA-2603-1186

Application Ridgeburn (Substantive)

To [REDACTED]

From [REDACTED]

Date 09 June 2026

Subject Assessment whether the application complies with section 46(2) of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024

Purpose

1. The purpose of this memo is to assist you in making your decision on whether the Ridgeburn (Substantive) application, lodged by Ridgeburn Limited (the Applicant), received by the Fast-track Team on 12/05/2026 complies with the requirements of section 46(2) of the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (**the Act**).

Decision-maker

2. You have delegated authority to make the decision under section 46 of the Act under the instrument of delegation dated 31 March 2026.

Conflict of interest

3. I confirm that I do not have any conflict of interest in this matter that would prevent me making this assessment.

The application

4. For projects listed in Schedule 2 of the Act and referred projects, authorised persons may lodge a substantive application for approvals available under the Act.
5. The Application was referred by the Minister for inclusion in the Fast-track consenting process under section 28 of the Act. The Minister accepted the referral application on 6 October 2025 and notified the EPA of the decision on the referral application on 6 October 2025.

6. The Application was lodged on 12 June 2026. The EPA must, in consultation with the relevant administering agencies and relevant consent authorities, decide whether this substantive application complies with section 46 of the Act within 15 working days of the lodgement of the application (but may be longer where the EPA has requested further information from the applicant under section 46(2B)). This application was subject to a further information request therefore the date by which the EPA must make a decision under 46 is 9 June 2026.
7. As set out in more detail below, the EPA must decide whether the application is complete and either:
 - Notify the Panel Convener they can set up an expert consenting panel to make a decision on the application (if complete and within scope); or
 - return it to the person who lodged it (if incomplete and/or not within scope).

Project and Scope

8. The referred project is:

The project is described as being to develop a comprehensive residential and mixed-use development on approximately 212 hectares at 122 Morven Ferry Road, Arrow Junction, near Queenstown. The project may include works within the road reserves of Morven Ferry Road and State Highway 6.

The project involves:

9. *the establishment and operation of approximately 1250 residential units (including 180 affordable units), a workers accommodation/visitor accommodation complex, and commercial village precinct (which may include retail, hospitality, community services, office space, supermarket and daycare).*
 10. *60 hectares of landscape and ecological enhancement, including native planting.*
 11. *integration with existing and proposed walking and cycling trails*
12. The application is for the following activity:

The Project comprises a master-planned residential and mixed-use development including 1,210 residential units, of which 180 are identified as affordable, together with short stay visitor and worker accommodation. The development will include a mix of uses within a commercial village hub with retail, a shared working space, a daycare, retail and community facilities. The development has been designed to integrate into a network of open space reserves and walking/cycling trails and is serviced by supporting on-site three waters infrastructure. (AEE, Section 2, Page 11).

Residential Housing

The proposal provides for an integrated, master-planned residential development comprising a total of 1,210 residential units, including standalone dwellings, apartments, and terraced housing. Residential development includes:

- 13. Subdivision to create 1,174 freehold residential lots and 36 principal units (Stage 1A unit title subdivision), resulting in 1,210 residential units across the site;*
- 14. A committed delivery of 180 affordable residential units within the Affordable Precinct (Neighbourhood A). (AEE, Section 5.4.1, Page 37)*

Commercial Activities

The proposal includes the development of a consolidated Commercial Precinct providing commercial, retail, community, and visitor and workers accommodation activities to support the residential neighbourhoods and surrounding area. Commercial development includes:

- 15. A commercial precinct of approximately 5.2 hectares located at the north-eastern corner of the site;*
- 16. Approximately 13,200 m² of Gross Floor Area ('GFA'), comprising a mix of commercial activities including retail, community services, workspace and visitor and workers accommodation, including:*
 - o Approximately 7,200 m² of retail, community services, and workspace floor area; and*
 - o Approximately 6,000 m² of visitor and workers accommodation.*
- 17. Provision for daycare and community facilities. (AEE Section 5.4.2, Page 38)*

Open Space and Recreation

The development incorporates an extensive and integrated network of public open space and recreation areas, as shown on the Landscape Drawings (Appendix 8). This includes:

- 18. Approximately 32 hectares of reserve land and open space, comprising community parks, neighbourhood parks, sports fields, wetland areas, green links, and planted open space distributed across the site;*
- 19. A connected network of pedestrian and cycle paths linking residential neighbourhoods, open space areas, and the Commercial Precinct;*
- 20. Integration with, and enhancement of, the wider Queenstown Trails network to support recreation and active transport. (AEE Section 5.4.3, Page 38)*

Ecological Outcomes

The proposal includes a comprehensive programme of ecological restoration and management, as outlined in the Ecological Assessment (Appendix 14). This includes:

- 21. Approximately 103 ha of native revegetation across Morven Hill, the Kawarau River escarpment, and river terrace areas, including shrubland and tussock land restoration planting; and*

22. Ongoing pest plant and animal control across revegetated areas and sensitive ecological environments to support the establishment and long-term health of native vegetation.

Infrastructure

The development includes the provision of new and upgraded infrastructure necessary to support the proposed residential and commercial activities. Infrastructure works include:

- 23. Upgrades to Morven Ferry Road and construction of an internal roading network;
- 24. Water supply infrastructure, treatment facilities, and storage reservoirs;
- 25. Stormwater management infrastructure incorporating swales, conveyance systems, detention and treatment devices, and a wetland detention pond designed to provide attenuation and water quality treatment; and
- 26. An on-site wastewater system, including a centralised WWTP and land-based effluent disposal areas, to service the development.

27. The substantive application relates solely to the referred project as defined under the Fast-Track Approvals Act 2024. Although the application includes minor amendments introduced after the referral decision, these modifications constitute activities that either directly involve, support, or are subsidiary to, the project and do not materially alter its overall purpose, scale and character.

28. The application acknowledges three modifications between the project as referred and the project described in the substantive application:

“Following acceptance of Ridgeburn as a referred Project, Ridgeburn Limited has made the following minor amendments to the application. The modifications include:

- 29. The addition of a park and ride area adjacent to Morven Ferry Road;
- 30. A total of 1,210 residential units is now proposed; and
- 31. The addition of recreational areas within the development.”

Comparison of Key Project Elements

Feature	Referred Project Description	Substantive Application
Site Area	Approximately 212 hectares.	Approximately 212 hectares.
Residential Units	Approximately 1,250 units.	1,210 units (a 3.3% reduction).
Affordable Units	180 units.	180 units (unchanged).
Commercial Use	Village precinct including retail, hospitality, daycare, and supermarket.	Village hub including retail, shared working space, daycare, and community facilities.

Accommodation	Workers/visitor accommodation complex.	Short stay visitor and worker accommodation.
Ecological Area	60 hectares of landscape/ecological enhancement.	103 hectares of indigenous revegetation and enhancement.
New Elements	Not specified in original referral summary.	Park and Ride facility and expanded recreational areas (32ha of reserve land).

32. In my opinion, the differences made to the application are not material, and constitutes activities involved in, or that supports and is subsidiary to, the project¹. The overall purpose, scale and character of the residential and mixed-use development remain the same as what was accepted for referral.

33. The Park-and-Ride facility was added to the substantive application to respond directly to concerns raised by the Otago Regional Council during the referral stage regarding transport mitigation and reliance on private vehicles. It is a tangible, on-site measure designed to support public transport integration and reduce the development's external traffic impacts, making it an activity that clearly supports and is subsidiary to the primary residential purpose of the activity.

34. The increase from 60 hectares to 103 hectares of ecological enhancement and the formalisation of 32 hectares of reserve land (including a sports field and pump track) were by feedback from Queenstown Lakes District Council regarding the need for adequate open space. These areas support the project's character as a "master-planned residential and mixed-use development" by ensuring the community is served by essential social and recreational infrastructure. In its

¹ Under the FTAA, Project is defined as:

project—

a) means,—

i) in relation to a listed project, the project as described in Schedule 2:

ii) in relation to an unlisted project,—

A) the project as described in the referral application for the project or, if the referral application is yet to be lodged, as it will be described in the application; or

B) if the project has been referred, the project as described in the notice under section 28; and

B) includes any activity that is involved in, or that supports and is subsidiary to, a project referred to in paragraph (a).

completeness review, QLDC explicitly stated that while these minor changes exist, the Council "does not raise any issues as to scope."

35. The 3.3% reduction in residential units is a minor modification resulting from internal layout refinements and the allocation of space for the park-and-ride facility. It does not materially alter the project's overall footprint, scale or intensity.
36. In my opinion, the substantive application remains within scope of the referred project. The modifications identified constitute activities that support or are subsidiary to the project as defined in the Act, and they do not materially change the overall purpose, scale, or character of the project accepted for referral.

Fast-track consenting application process

Legislative context

37. The EPA must decide, in consultation with relevant administering agencies and consent authorities, whether the substantive application complies with section 46(2) of the Act. A substantive application complies with section 46(2) of the Act, if the application:
 - complies with sections 42, 43 and 44;
 - relates solely to a listed project or a referred project;
 - the EPA considers that, on the face of the application, the project does not appear to involve an ineligible activity; and
 - any fee, charge, or levy payable under the Fast-track Approvals (Cost Recovery) Regulations 2025 (the Regulations) in respect of the application is paid.
38. The EPA may request further information from the applicant under section 46(2A) for the purposes of determining whether the application is complete and within scope.

Section 42 Requirements

39. Section 42 of the Act states that an authorised person may lodge a substantive application for the project, 1 substantive applications for each stage of a project if the Minister has determined that the project may proceed in stages (either under s 21(1)(a) or s 37A). Section 42(4) lists the approvals that may be sought under the Act.
40. This application has been lodged by Ridgeburn Limited. This person is an authorised person under the Act because they are the person identified as the authorised person in the referral notice of decision.
41. The approvals being sought are:

42. an approval described in section 42(4)(a), (c) or (d) (resource consent, certificate of compliance or designation);
 43. A resource consent, change to or cancellation of a resource consent: **checklist A**;
 44. including subdivision or reclamation: **checklist A1**;
 45. an approval described in section 42(4)(h) (wildlife approval), **checklist E**;
 46. an approval described in section 42(4)(i) (archaeological authority), **checklist F**;
 47. All of the above listed approvals are of the type set out in section 42(4) of the Act.
-
48. For each of the approvals sought, the applicant is eligible to apply for any corresponding approval under a specified Act.

Section 43 Requirements

49. Section 43 of the Act sets out the requirements for a substantive application. The substantive application was lodged in the form and manner approved by the EPA. Assessment of section 43 requirements is included at Appendix 1.

Section 44 Requirements

50. Section 44 of the Act requires that the information provided by the applicant under section 43 must be specified in sufficient detail to satisfy the purpose for which it is required. Assessment of section 44 sufficiency is included at Appendix 1.
51. In assessing the sufficiency of information provided by the applicant, we rely on the information provided to us through consultation with each relevant administering agency and consent authority, as summarised in Appendix 2.
52. As set out in more detail in Appendix 2, the agencies consulted have advised that the information required by section 44 is provided in **sufficient** detail to satisfy the purpose for which it is required.

Ineligibility

53. The EPA needs to decide whether it considers that, on the face of the application, the project does not appear to involve an ineligible activity, as defined in section 5 of the Act. As the EPA has to consider this on the face of the application, the EPA is only able to consider information contained in the application materials.
54. The list of ineligible projects includes activities:

- on land returned under a Treaty settlement, on identified Māori Land, on Māori customary land, on land set apart as Māori reservation, or in a customary marine title or protected customary rights area without written permission from the rights holder;
- on Māori customary land, or land set apart as Māori reservation under Part 17 of Te Ture Whenua Māori Act 1993;
- in a customary marine or protected customary rights area without written agreement from the rights holder/group;
- within an aquaculture settlement area without the required authorisation;
- activities that would be prevented under section 165J, 165M, 165Q, 165ZC, or 165ZDB of the RMA (which deal with occupation of space in the common marine and coastal area); or
- that require permissions on national reserves (or reserves vest in another person) held under the Reserves Act 1977 ; or
- on land listed under clauses 1 to 11 or 14 of Schedule 4 of the Crown Minerals Act 1991 (and clauses 12 and 13 for mining activities).
- That are prohibited under the Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf (Environmental Effects) Act 2012, or section 15B or 15C the Resource Management Act 1991.
- That relate to decommissioning under the Exclusive Economic Zone and Continental Shelf (Environmental Effects) Act 2012
- That are undertaken for the purposes of an offshore renewable energy project.

55. I consider that, on the face of the application, the project does not appear to involve an ineligible activity.

Fees and levies

56. The EPA has received all fees, charges and levies payable by the applicant under the Regulations for the substantive application as follows:

- Application fee in the sum of \$250,000 plus GST;
- Levy in the sum of \$140,000 plus GST;

Consultation

57. I have consulted with and considered consultation responses from the following relevant administering agencies and relevant consent authorities.

- Otago Regional Council for:
 - an approval described in section 42(4)(a) (resource consent)
- Queenstown Lakes District Council for:
 - an approval described in section 42(4)(a) (resource consent)

- The Department of Conservation for:
- an approval described in section 42(4)(h) (Wildlife Act wildlife approval)
- Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga for:
- an approval described in section 42(4)(i) (archaeological authority);

58. A summary of the consultation is included as Appendix 2.

Requests for further information

59. The request for further information (RFI) sent to the applicant on 29 May 2026 targeted several critical gaps identified by regulatory agencies during the completeness and scope assessment.

60. Below is a summary of the specific information requested under each category:

61. Wildlife Act Authorities (Schedule 7)

62. Clarification of the specific purpose of the wildlife-related activity (e.g., salvage and relocation) as required by Schedule 7, clause 2(1)(a), rather than just stating the general project purpose of residential development.

63. A clear identification of the specific actions sought for authorization (such as capture, handling, temporary holding, relocation, or incidental mortality) and where these actions would occur, to resolve inconsistencies across the original documents.

64. A formal assessment of the proposed activity and its impacts against the statutory purpose of the Wildlife Act 1953, which was missing from the initial application.

65. Consents (Resource Consent - Schedule 5)

66. An assessment against the Regional Plan: Waste for Otago as required under Schedule 5, clause 5(2).

67. The applicant was required to either seek additional consents or provide an updated rule assessment for the following:

68. Rule 29.4.9 (Park and Ride): A specific consent for the facility included in the proposal.

69. Rule 21.7.2 (Reflectivity): Corrected plans or a consent request for building materials that appeared to exceed light reflectance standards.

70. Rule 30.5.2.2 (Meteorological Monitoring Station): Confirmation of consent requirements for this station within the Morven Hill Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF).

71. Rule 24.5.2 (Wastewater Irrigation): Detailed methodology for established spray irrigation on the Morven Hill ONF.

72. Heritage (Archaeological Authority - Schedule 8)

73. An updated assessment incorporating recorded archaeological site F41/890 (Steele's Hut/stone hut ruins) and how the project would modify or destroy each archaeological site within the boundary, as mandated by Schedule 8, clause 2(h).
74. Incomplete Appendix 7
75. The submission of missing design standards and architectural drawings (Sections C1–C4) relating to the design approach, affordable housing, standalone housing, and commercial buildings.
76. The applicant responded with the information on 5 June 2026 within the 20-working day timeframe afforded by section 46(2B). A full copy of the request and response can be found in Appendix 3.

Assessment of compliance for each section of each application form

77. I have assessed the application materials against the relevant checklists in the prescribed application form. Each assessment is contained within the appropriate approval checklist. These are included in Appendix 1 for ease of reference.
78. My view is that the application **does comply** with section 46 and the EPA may now notify the applicant of its decision.
79. The EPA must now decide whether the substantive application has a competing application under section 47A (1) (under delegation from the Minister for Infrastructure under section 47C) within 10 working days from the date of the completeness decision.
80. Once the EPA has made the decision under section 47A(1), the EPA must notify the panel convener that an expert consenting panel can be set up to commence consideration and decision of the application.

Appendix 1: Assessment of section 44 sufficiency

My assessment of the application materials is set out in the relevant checklists below:

CHECKLIST A – Resource consent, change to or cancellation of a resource consent

Clause, Schedule 5	Information required for an approval described in section 42(4)(a) (resource consent) and/or section 42(4)(b) (change or cancellation of resource consent), Clauses 5-8 of Schedule 5	Application Reference	EPA
5(1)(a)	A description of the proposed activity.	<p>Refer to Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE, Section 5 (Page 33-95). In summary:</p> <p>The Project comprises a master-planned residential and mixed-use development including 1,210 residential units, of which 180 are identified as affordable, together with short stay visitor and worker</p>	Yes, addressed.

		<p>accommodation. The development will include a mix of uses within a commercial village hub with retail, a shared working space, a daycare, retail and community facilities. The development has been designed to integrate into a network of open space reserves and walking/cycling trails and is serviced by supporting on-site three waters infrastructure. The proposal requires approvals under the Queenstown</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Lakes Proposed District Plan ('PDP') that would otherwise be required under the Resource Management Act 1991 ('RMA'), including approvals relating to subdivision, residential and commercial activities within the Rural Zone and the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone, as well as breaches of bulk and location standards. In addition, the proposal requires resource consents under the Otago Regional Plan</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>(ORP) for earthworks, diversion of water, and discharges to land and air associated with the operation of a Wastewater Treatment Plant ('WWTP').</p> <p>A permit under the Wildlife Act is also being sought for the relocation of lizards. In addition, an Archaeological Authority is required under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act ('HNZPTA'). These aspects of the proposal are addressed in Volume A and Volume B of this</p>	
--	--	--	--

		Assessment of Environmental Effects ('AEE'), respectively.	
5(1)(b)	<p>A description and map of the site at which the activity is to occur, including whether the site is within or adjacent to—</p> <p>(i) a statutory area (as defined in the relevant Treaty settlement Act); or</p> <p>(ii) ngā rohe moana o ngā hapū o Ngāti Porou (as defined in section 11 of the Ngā Rohe Moana o Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou Act 2019); or</p> <p>(iii) a protected customary rights area under the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011</p>	<p>Refer - Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE, Section 4, (Page 20-24) for the map of the site at which the activity is to occur.</p> <p>The site is not within or adjacent to a Statutory Acknowledgement Area, ngā rohe moana o ngā hapū o Ngāti Porou, or a protected customary rights area under the Marine and</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>See page 21 of the AEE for a site locality plan and site location context map.</p> <p>Appendix 1, of Appendix 44 of the application states: <i>There are no statutory areas in or adjacent to the project area.</i></p> <p><i>The project area is not within a customary marine title area, protected customary rights area, or within or adjacent to ngā rohe moana o ngā hapū o Ngāti Porou (Section 18 report).</i></p>

		Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011, as outlined in the Schedule of Consultation with Māori attached at Appendix 44.	
5(1)(c)	<p>Confirmation that the consent application complies with section 46(2)(a), (b), and (d); being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • section 42; and • sections 43 and 44; and • relates solely to a listed project or a referred project; and • any fee, charge, or levy payable under regulations in respect of the application is paid. 	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE Section 3, (Page 12-16):</p> <p>In accordance with Section 46 of the FTAA, the application complies with Section 42, Section 43 and Section 44. The application relates solely to a referred</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>The authorised person (Ridgeburn Limited) has lodged the substantive application.</p> <p>Information is in sufficient detail to satisfy the purpose for which it is required, does not involve any ineligible activities, and relates solely to a referred project.</p> <p>The application fee and levy have been paid in full.</p>

		<p>Project, and does not seek approval for an ineligible activity, as assessed in Volume F.</p> <p>In accordance with Section 46 of the FTAA, this section confirms that the substantive application remains complete and within scope, including a minor modification to the Masterplan that does not affect the overall purpose, scale, or character of the Project as accepted for</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>referral.</p> <p>Any fee, charge or levy payable under the regulations in respect of the application has been paid.</p>	
5(1)(d) and 5(6)	<p>The full name and address of—</p> <p>(iv) each owner of the site and of land adjacent to the site; and</p> <p>(v) each occupier of the site and of land adjacent to the site whom the applicant is able to identify after reasonable inquiry;</p> <p>If the applicant is not able to supply the name and address of the owner and each occupier of the site and of land adjacent to the site because the land is Māori land in multiple ownership, the applicant must include a statement to that effect (clause 5(6)).</p>	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE Section 4.4.1 (Page 24), the full names and addresses of the following are provided at Appendix 2</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>Names and addresses of site and adjacent landowners are listed in Appendix 2.</p>
5(1)(e)	<p>A description of any other activities that are part of the proposal to which the consent application relates</p>	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE Section 6 (Page</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p>

		<p>95-100). For completeness, the application seeks approval for all necessary consents for the Project under the RMA, the HNZPTA, and the Wildlife Act including any matters that are not listed in Section 6.0 of the AEE, but which are subsequently identified as being necessary through the processing of this application.</p> <p>In addition, the proposal requires the realignment and partial stopping of a paper road located within the site.</p>	<p>See Section 6, Page 95-100 of the AEE.</p>
--	--	---	---

		This will occur through a separate process under either the Local Government Act or Public Works Act (as these approvals are not provided via the FTAA), subsequent to the granting of this resource consent.	
5(1)(f)	A description of any other resource consents, notices of requirement for designations, or alterations to designations required for the project to which the consent application relates	Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE Section 6 (Page 95-100). The Project requires non-complying activity consent overall under the PDP and discretionary activity consent under the ORP. In addition, the	Yes, addressed. See Section 6, Page 95-100 of the AEE.

		Project requires resource consent under the NES-F and NES-CS.	
5(1)(g)	An assessment of the activity against sections 5, 6 and 7 of the Resource Management Act 1991	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE Section 12.4.1 (Page 177-179). in summary:</p> <p>The Ridgeburn development is consistent with the purpose of sustainable management under Section 5 of the RMA, enabling social and economic wellbeing through the provision of housing, infrastructure, and employment, while safeguarding</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>See Section 12.4.1, Page 177-279 of the AEE.</p>

		<p>natural and physical resources for future generations.</p> <p>In relation to Section 6, the proposal maintains and enhances wetlands, protects Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes through appropriate design and development controls, and improves ecological values via indigenous revegetation and habitat restoration. Cultural values have been recognised</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>through engagement with Kāi Tahu, and natural hazard risks are appropriately managed.</p> <p>Under Section 7, the proposal demonstrates regard for kaitiakitanga, represents efficient use of land within a planned growth area, and enhances environmental quality and amenity through restoration, open space provision, and integrated urban design.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		Overall, the development is consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA.	
5(1)(h) (and also clauses 5(2) and 5(3))	<p>An assessment of the activity against any relevant provisions in any of the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a national environmental standard: • other regulations made under the Resource Management Act 1991: • a national policy statement: • a New Zealand coastal policy statement: • a regional policy statement or proposed regional policy statement: • a plan or proposed plan: • a planning document recognised by a relevant iwi authority and lodged with a local authority. <p>This assessment must include an assessment of the activity against the requirements set out in clause 5(3) of Schedule 5 being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any relevant objectives, policies or rules in the documents listed; and 	Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE - Section 10 (Page 145- 167) and Section 12.4.3 Page 179.	<p>Yes, addressed</p> <p>See AEE, section 10, Pages 146-171 (AEE, amended 5 June 2026).</p> <p>Otago regional council noted in their consultation response that there was no assessment provided against the Regional Plan: Waste for Otago and the Water Conservation (Kawarau) Order 1997.</p> <p>The request for further information requested an assessment against the Regional Plan: Waste for Otago. The applicant provided this assessment in their response and at Section 10.7, Page 163 of the amended AEE.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any requirement, condition, or permission in any rules in any of those documents; and • any other requirements in any of those documents. 		<p>An assessment against the Water Conservation (Kawarau) Order 1997 was not requested from the applicant. Under Schedule 5, clause 5(2) of the FTAA, a substantive application must be accompanied by an assessment against a specific, non-inclusive list of statutory instruments. This list includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Environmental Standards (NES) • National Policy Statements (NPS) • Regional Policy Statements (RPS) • Regional and District Plans. <p>Notably, Water Conservation Orders (WCOs), which are governed by Part 9 of the RMA, are not explicitly listed as a mandatory assessment</p>
--	--	---

			<p>requirement for a substantive application under clause 5(2).</p> <p>While the Otago Regional Council (ORC) flagged the missing WCO assessment in its consultation response as a matter it considered relevant, because WCOs are not mandated by the Schedule 5 information requirements, the absence of an assessment does not constitute a failure of completeness under section 46.</p>
5(1)(i)	<p>Information about any Treaty settlements that apply in the area covered by the consent application, including—</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (vi) identification of the relevant provisions in those Treaty settlements; and (vii) a summary of any redress provided by those settlements that affects natural and physical resources relevant to the project or project area 	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE Section 8.1 Page 104 and the Assessment of Ngāi Tahu Settlement attached at Appendix 45.</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>See Section 8.1, Page 104 of the AEE.</p>

		<p>While the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 and the Ngāi Tahu Deed of Settlement 1997 apply across the wider Ngāi Tahu takiwā, the assessment confirms that no specific Treaty settlement redress sites or statutory acknowledgement areas are located within the Ridgeburn Project area, as detailed in Appendix 45.</p>	
5(1)(j)	<p>A list of any relevant customary marine title groups, protected customary rights groups, ngā hapū o Ngāti Porou (where an application is within, adjacent to or directly</p>	<p>Refer to Section 8.5 of the AEE (Page 106-107).</p>	<p>Yes, addressed Section 8.5, Page 107 of the AEE.</p>

	<p>affecting ngā rohe moana o ngā hapū o Ngāti Porou), or applicants under the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011;</p>	<p>This information requirement is not relevant to the proposal. As outlined in the Schedule of Consultation with Māori attached in Appendix 44, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu has submitted a claim for customary marine title. However, since Ridgeburn is situated outside the coastal marine area, this provision does not apply to the project.</p>	<p><i>This information requirement does not apply to the proposal. As detailed in the Schedule of Consultation with Māori (Appendix 44), Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu has lodged a claim for customary marine title and protected customary rights covering the river plume of the Mata-au Clutha River. However, because the Ridgeburn site is located outside the coastal marine area, this provision is not relevant to the Project.</i></p>
5(1)(k)	<p>Any conditions that the applicant proposes for the resource consent.</p>	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE conditions of consent contained in Volume I</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>See Volume I – Proposed Draft Consent Conditions</p>

5(1)(l)	<p>if a notice under section 30(3)(b) or (5) has been received, —</p> <p>(viii) a copy of that notice showing that it was received within the time frame specified in section 30(6)(b); and</p> <p>(ix) if a notice has been received under section 30(5), any more up-to-date information that the applicant is aware of about the existing resource consent referred to in the notice.</p>	<p>(i) Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE Volume G: Section 30 Letter.</p> <p>(ii) n/a</p>	<p>Yes, addressed</p> <p>i) See Volume G – Section 30 letter.</p> <p>ii) N/A</p>
5(4)(a)	<p>An assessment of the activity’s effects on the environment that includes the information required by clause 6.</p>	<p>a, c, d, e, Ridgeburn AEE Section 9 Page 106-144. b) - N/A no hazardous installations are proposed. f) Section 7 of the AEE Pg 102-103 - N/A g) Section 9.14 Page 144. h) Section 4.5 Page 25</p>	<p>See below</p>

5(4)(b)	An assessment of the activity's effects on the environment that covers the matters specified in clause 7.	Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE Section 9 Page 107-144.	See below
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (x) The assessment of an activity's effects on the environment must include the following information: (xi) an assessment of the actual or potential effects on the environment: (xii) if the activity includes the use of hazardous installations, an assessment of any risks to the environment that are likely to arise from such use: (xiii) if the activity includes the discharge of any contaminant, a description of— (xiv) the nature of the discharge and the sensitivity of the receiving environment to adverse effects; and (xv) any possible alternative methods of discharge, including discharge into any other receiving environment: (xvi) a description of the mitigation measures (including safeguards and contingency plans where relevant) to 	Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE Section 9 Page 106-144	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Section 9, Pages 107-145 b) Activity does not involve the use of hazardous installations. c) Section 12.4.3, Page 179 addresses the requirements of Section 105 of the RMA, providing an overview of the nature, receiving environment and alternative methods. Section 5.13.4 and 9.8.2 describes and assesses the wastewater discharges. Section 5.13.2 and 9.8.3 describe and assess the stormwater discharges.

	<p>be undertaken to help prevent or reduce the actual or potential effect of the activity:</p> <p>(xvii) identification of persons who may be affected by the activity and any response to the views of any persons consulted, including the views of iwi or hapū that have been consulted in relation to the proposal:</p> <p>(xviii) if iwi or hapū elect not to respond when consulted on the proposal, any reasons that they have specified for that decision:</p> <p>(xix) if the scale and significance of the activity's effects are such that monitoring is required, a description of how the effects will be monitored and by whom, if the activity is approved:</p> <p>(xx) an assessment of any effects of the activity on the exercise of a protected customary right.</p>		<p>d) Volume I provides proposed draft consent conditions and Volume J provides a summary of mitigation and condition response.</p> <p>e) Volume C provides a consultation summary report. Appendix 44 provides a schedule of consultation with Māori.</p> <p>f) N/A</p> <p>g) Section 9.14 (Page 145 of the AEE and Volume I – proposed consent conditions include a set of monitoring conditions.</p> <p>h) N/A</p>
7	<p>The assessment of an activity's effects on the environment must cover the following matters:</p> <p>(xxi) any effect on the people in the neighbourhood and, if relevant, the wider community, including any social, economic, or cultural effects:</p> <p>(xxii) any physical effect on the locality, including landscape and visual effects:</p>	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE, Section 9 Page 106-144</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>a) Neighbourhood effects are discussed in Section 9.13.2, page 143 of the AEE. Cultural values are discussed in Section 9.13, Economic</p>

	<p>(xxiii) any effect on ecosystems, including effects on plants or animals and physical disturbance of habitats in the vicinity:</p> <p>(xxiv) any effect on natural and physical resources that have aesthetic, recreational, scientific, historical, spiritual, or cultural value, or other special value, for present or future generations:</p> <p>(xxv) any discharge of contaminants into the environment and options for the treatment and disposal of contaminants:</p> <p>(xxvi) any unreasonable emission of noise:</p> <p>(xxvii) any risk to the neighbourhood, the wider community, or the environment through natural hazards or hazardous installations.</p>		<p>effects are addressed in Section 9.2, Page 110.</p> <p>b) Landscape and visual effects are addressed at Section 9.6, Page 124.</p> <p>c) Historic heritage and archaeological effects are addressed at Section 9.5, Page 122.</p> <p>d) Section 5.13.4 and 9.8.2 describes and assesses the wastewater discharges. Section 5.13.2 and 9.8.3 describe and assess the stormwater discharges.</p> <p>e) Noise assessment provided at Appendix 24.</p> <p>f) Natural hazards are addressed at Section 9.9, page 137.</p>
5(5)(a)	If a permitted activity is part of the proposal to which the consent application relates, a description that demonstrates that the activity complies with the requirements, conditions, and permissions for the permitted activity (so that a resource	N/A - See Section 9 of the AEE. No permitted activities are	N/A

	consent is not required for that activity under section 87A(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991)	proposed by way of this application.	
5(5)(b)	If the activity is to occur in an area that is within the scope of a planning document prepared by a customary marine title group under section 85 of the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 or the environmental covenant prepared by ngā hapū o Ngāti Porou under section 19 of the Ngā Rohe Moana o Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou Act 2019, an assessment of the activity against any resource management matters set out in that document	Not applicable, the activity is not within the scope of a planning document prepared by a customary marine title group under section 85 of the Marine and Coastal Area (Takutai Moana) Act 2011 or the environmental covenant prepared by ngā hapū o Ngāti Porou under section 19 of the Ngā Rohe Moana o Ngā Hapū o Ngāti Porou Act 2019	N/A

		(refer Consultation with Māori document Appendix 44).	
5(5)(c)	If the activity is to occur in an area that is taiāpure-local fishery, a mātaimai reserve, or an area that is subject to bylaws made under Part 9 of the Fisheries Act 1996, an assessment of the effects of the activity on the use or management of the area.	Not applicable, the activity is not to occur in an area that is a taiāpure-local fishery, a mātaimai reserve, or an area that is subject to bylaws made under Part 9 of the Fisheries Act 1996.	N/A

CHECKLIST A1 – Subdivision or reclamation resource consent

Clause, Schedule 5	Information required for an application for a subdivision consent or a reclamation consent (in addition to the information required in Checklist A)	Application Reference	EPA
--------------------	---	-----------------------	-----

If this application is for a subdivision consent, please adequately define the matters set out in clause 8(1) below. If no subdivision consent is sought, please enter n/a.

8(1)(a)	The position of all new boundaries	Ridgeburn (Substantive), Scheme Plan attached to the AEE at Appendix 5.	Yes, addressed See Appendix 5.
8(1)(b)	The areas of all new allotments, unless the subdivision involves a cross lease or company lease or unit plan	Ridgeburn (Substantive), Scheme Plan attached to the AEE at Appendix 5.	Yes, addressed See Appendix 5.
8(1)(c)	The locations and areas of new reserves to be created, including any esplanade reserves and esplanade strips	N/A no esplanade reserves or	N/A

		esplanade strips are proposed by way of this application	
8(1)(d)	The locations and areas of existing esplanade reserves, esplanade strips, and access strips	N/A no esplanade reserves, esplanade strips or access strips are located within the Project Area.	N/A
8(1)(e)	The locations and areas of any part of the bed of a river or lake to be vested in a territorial authority under section 237A of the Resource Management Act 1991	N/A no part of the bed of a river or lake is to be vested in a territorial authority under section 237A.	N/A
8(1)(f)	The locations and areas of any land within the coastal marine area that is to become part of the common marine and coastal area under section 237A of the Resource Management Act 1991	N/A there is no part of the Project area that is subject to a	N/A

		coastal marine area.	
8(1)(g)	The locations and areas of land to be set aside as new roads	Ridgeburn (Substantive), refer Scheme Plan attached to the AEE at Appendix 5.	

If this application is for a reclamation consent, please include the information to show the area to be reclaimed set out in clause 8(2) below. If no reclamation consent is sought, please enter n/a.

8(2)(a)	The location of the area to be reclaimed	N/A this application is not for a reclamation consent	N/A
8(2)(b)	If practicable, the position of all new boundaries	N/A this application is not for a reclamation consent	N/A
8(2)(c)	Any part of the reclaimed area to be set aside as an esplanade reserve or esplanade strip	N/A this application is not for a reclamation consent	N/A

CHECKLIST E – Wildlife approval

Clause, Schedule 7	Information required for an approval described in section 42(4)(h) (Wildlife Act approval), clause 2 of Schedule 7	Application Reference	EPA
2(1)(a)	Specify the purpose of the proposed activity	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), (Volume B: Wildlife Permit, Section 2, Page 6-7) - Incidental killing</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>From Memorandum – Further Information Response – FTAA-2603-1186 – Ridgeburn, Page 3:</p> <p><i>“The following provides as response from Annabelle Coates (Viridis). This has also been reflected in the updated Volume B Wildlife Permit Report (refer Section 2 page 6) and Volume E Substantive Application Information Table: Ridgeburn Ltd are seeking approval for a residential subdivision at 122 Morven Ferry Road, Queenstown.</i></p>

			<p><i>Lizards are known to be present within the site. Development will require earthworks and vegetation clearance where lizards are currently located. The purpose of the activity is to salvage lizards from within the works site and relocate them within the same site to areas that will not be impacted by works, and will be subject to habitat enhancement, revegetation and predator control.”</i></p>
2(1)(b)	Identify the actions the applicant wishes to carry out involving protected wildlife and where they will be carried out (whether on or off public conservation land)	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), Catch and handle wildlife on site as outlined in the lizard management plan (Page 84-86 of Appendix 14 (Ecological Impact Assessment))</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>From Memorandum – Further Information Response – FTAA-2603-1186 – Ridgeburn, Page 3:</p> <p><i>“The following provides as response from Annabelle Coates (Viridis). This has also been reflected in the updated Volume B Wildlife Permit Report (refer</i></p>

			<p>Section 2 page 6), the Version 2 Assessment of Effects (Attachment 2) and Volume E Substantive Application Information Table: The actions the wildlife permit is being sought for include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Catch and handle lizards on site 2. Temporarily hold lizards prior to release (up to one work day, <8 hours) 3. Relocate lizards within the same property 4. Incidental killing of lizards not captured despite best efforts. <p>The Lizard Management Plan will be updated to reflect this clearly prior to submitting the final plan for certification.”</p>
2(1)(c)	An assessment of the activity and its impacts against the purpose of the Wildlife Act	Ridgeburn (Substantive), Ecological Impact	Yes, addressed.

		<p>Assessment (Appendix 14), Effects on lizards are summarised in the attached lizard management plan (Page 72-110 of Appendix 14 Ecological Impact Assessment.</p>	<p>From Memorandum – Further Information Response – FTAA-2603-1186 – Ridgeburn, Page 4:</p> <p><i>“The following provides as response from Annabelle Coates (Viridis). This has also been reflected in the updated Volume B Wildlife Permit Report (refer Section 1.3 page 6 and Section 4 Page 8):</i></p> <p><u><i>Purpose</i></u></p> <p><i>The purpose of the Wildlife Act 1953 is to protect native wildlife and their habitats.</i></p> <p><u><i>Assessment of how the proposed wildlife activities and their associated impacts align with the statutory purpose of the Wildlife Act.</i></u></p> <p><i>Development is proposed in an area where native lizards are known to be present. Works within habitat suitable for lizards and within areas where they are known to be present cannot be avoided.</i></p>
--	--	--	--

			<p><i>Areas of high habitat value (e.g. rocky outcrops, riparian areas) have been avoided as far as practicable. Native lizards will be salvaged from areas subject to works within the site. They will be relocated to alternative habitats within the same property. The alternative habitats will be subject to habitat enhancements through revegetation, provision of alternative habitat, and pest animal and plant control. The new habitats will be protected via consent notices. Salvage and relocation, enhancement of habitat, and protection of the enhanced habitats meet the purpose of the Wildlife Act through protection of native lizards and their habitats.</i></p> <p><i>The Lizard Management Plan will be updated to reflect this clearly prior to submitting the final plan for certification.”</i></p>
--	--	--	--

2(1)(d)	List protected wildlife species known or predicted to be in the area and, where possible, the numbers of wildlife present and numbers likely to be impacted	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive) As outlined in the lizard management plan (Page 78 of the Ecological Impact Assessment (Appendix 14)). As per Conservation status of reptile species in Otago, 2025:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • McCann's skink - Not Threatened • Tussock skink - Regionally Declining • Mountain beech gecko (listed in the Otago document as south western large gecko) - Regionally Declining 	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Avifauna species identified in Table 3, Appendix 14 – Ecological Impact Assessment - Lizard species identified Table 1, Draft Lizard management Plan, Appendix ` 14 – Ecological Impact Assessment.
---------	---	--	--

2(1)(e)	An outline of impacts on threatened, data deficient, and at-risk wildlife species (as defined in the New Zealand Threat Classification System)	Ridgeburn (Substantive) As outlined in the lizard management plan Page 73-93 of Appendix 14 (Ecological Impact Assessment) and Appendix 14 Ecological Impact Assessment which provides a full detailed assessment.	Yes addressed. See Ecological Impact Assessment Appendix 14.
2(1)(f)	A statement of how the methods proposed to be used to conduct the actions involving protected wildlife will ensure that best practice standards are met	Ridgeburn (Substantive), Refer to the Lizard Management Plan Page 73-93 of Appendix 14 which will be implemented to ensure methods proposed to be used to conduct the actions involving protected	Yes, addressed. Methods are described in the Draft Lizard Management Plan (LMP). The Department of Conservation, in their consultation response, disputes the herpetological input and quality. However, the information is present and is

		<p>wildlife will ensure that best practice standards are met.</p>	<p>therefore sufficient at this stage of the process.</p> <p><i>“These objectives will be achieved by:</i></p> <p><i>a) Using current best practice to capture native lizards from vegetation and other potential habitats in the construction footprint prior to and during vegetation clearance, and relocate any captured individuals to safe and suitable habitats (avoid and minimise mortality of wildlife protected by the Wildlife Act);</i></p> <p><i>b) Setting out standard surveying and monitoring protocols that are to be followed, using the DoC Natural Heritage Management System’s Herpetofauna Inventory & Monitoring Toolbox (DoC, undated) and/or using new advances in tools and</i></p>
--	--	--	---

			<p><i>techniques not yet incorporated into the toolbox;</i></p> <p>c) <i>Meeting requirements of the Wildlife Act and Resource Management Act. “ (Section 3.1, Page 8)</i></p>
2(1)(g)	A description of the methods to be used to safely, efficiently, and humanely catch, hold, or kill the animals and identify relevant animal ethics processes:	Ridgeburn (Substantive), Methods to safely, efficiently, and humanely catch, hold, or kill the animals and identify relevant animal ethics processes is outlined in the Lizard Management Plan Page 73-93 of Appendix 14.	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>Lizard search and capture methodology available in the draft lizard management plan, Section 3.4, Pages 9-12.</p>
2(1)(h)	A statement of the location or locations in which the activity will be carried out, including a map (and GPS co-ordinates if available)	Ridgeburn (Substantive), Refer to the Lizard Management Plan	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>See Lizard Management Plan, Pages 73-94, Appendix 14 .</p>

		Page 73-93 of Appendix 14.	
2(1)(i)	A statement of whether authorisation is sought to temporarily hold or relocate wildlife	Ridgeburn (Substantive), Refer to the Lizard Management Plan Page 73-93 of Appendix 14, authorisation is sought to relocate wildlife.	Yes, addressed. <i>A suitably qualified herpetologist or ecologist ('project herpetologist') is required to implement this LMP, and a WAA to capture and relocate indigenous lizards is required (Section 3.3, Page 9)</i>
2(1)(j)	A list of all actual and potential wildlife effects (adverse or positive) of the proposed activity, including effects on the target species, other indigenous species, and the ecosystems at the site	Ridgeburn (Substantive), As outlined in the Lizard Management Plan Page 73-93 of Appendix 14 (Ecological Impact Assessment) and Appendix 14 Ecological Impact Assessment which provides a full detailed assessment.	Yes addressed. See Ecological Impact Assessment, Appendix 14.

2(1)(k)	Where adverse effects are identified, state what methods will be used to avoid and minimise those effects, and any offsetting or compensation proposed to address unmitigated adverse effects (including steps taken before the project begins, such as surveying, salvaging, and relocating protected wildlife)	Ridgeburn (Substantive), As outlined in the Lizard Management Plan Page 73-93 of Appendix 14 (Ecological Impact Assessment) and Appendix 14 Ecological Impact Assessment which provides a full detailed assessment.	Yes addressed. See Ecological Impact Assessment, Appendix 14.
2(1)(l)	A statement of whether the applicant or any company director, trustee, partner, or anyone else involved with the application has been convicted of any offence under the Wildlife Act	N/A - the applicant or any company director, trustee, partner, or anyone else involved with the application has not been convicted of any offence under the Wildlife Act 1953	Yes, addressed. Section 1.2, Page 6 of Volume B – Wildlife Act Approval report states: <i>In accordance with Clause 2(1)(l) and Clause 2(1)(m) of Schedule 7 of the FTAA the applicant or any company director, trustee, partner, or anyone else involved with the application has not been convicted of any offence under the Wildlife Act 1953 and the applicant</i>

			<i>or any company director, trustee, partner, or anyone else involved with the application has any current criminal charges under the Wildlife Act 1953 pending before a court.</i>
2(1)(m)	A statement of whether the applicant or any company director, trustee, partner, or anyone else involved with the application has any current criminal charges under the Wildlife Act pending before a court	N/A – the applicant or any company director, trustee, partner, or anyone else involved with the application does not have any current criminal charges under the Wildlife Act 1953 pending before a court.	Yes, addressed. Section 1.2, Page 6 of Volume B – Wildlife Act Approval report states: <i>In accordance with Clause 2(1)(l) and Clause 2(1)(m) of Schedule 7 of the FTAA the applicant or any company director, trustee, partner, or anyone else involved with the application has not been convicted of any offence under the Wildlife Act 1953 and the applicant or any company director, trustee, partner, or anyone else involved with the application has any current criminal charges under the Wildlife Act 1953 pending before a court.</i>

2(1)(n)	Provision of proof and details of all consultation, including with hapū or iwi, on the application specific to wildlife impacts	Ridgeburn (Substantive), (Volume B: Wildlife Permit, Section 4, Page 8)	Yes, addressed. See Volume B – Wildlife Act Approval Report, Appendix C (consultation) and Appendix 46 (CIA)
2(1)(o)	Provision of any additional written expert views, advice, or opinions the applicant has obtained concerning their proposal	Ridgeburn (Substantive), (Volume B: Wildlife Permit, Section 4, Page 8), including the Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) Appendix 46.	Yes, addressed. See Volume B – Wildlife Act Approval Report, Appendix C (consultation), including feedback from DOC, and Appendix 46 (CIA)

CHECKLIST F – Archaeological authority

Clause, Schedule 8	Information required for an approval described in section 43(3)(i) Archaeological Authority	Application Reference	EPA
2(1)(a)	a legal description of the land or, if one is not available, a description that is sufficient to identify the land to which the application relates	Ridgeburn (Substantive), (Volume A:	Yes, addressed.

		<p>Archaeological Authority Report, Section 2, Page 6-7). The site encompasses approximately 212 hectares across seven fee simple titles and is accessed via an established vehicle crossing from Morven Ferry Road. The legal descriptions of the titles are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lot 2 DP 601937 – 24.7256 ha (RT: 1174254); • Lot 3 DP 529201 – 2.0584 ha (RT: 857180); • Lot 5 DP 300661 and Sections 21, 23, 24, 64, 71 in Blocks VIII & IX Shotover SD – 82.6923 ha (RT: 	<p>Section 4.4 of the AEE provides a legal description of the land.</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>946021);</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Section 22 Block IX Shotover SD – 23.0823 ha (RT: OT406/118); • Section 23 Block IX Shotover SD – 26.5069 ha (RT: OT7D/1456); • Sections 1–2 SO 478164, Section 25 Block IX Shotover SD, Lots 3–4 DP 300661 – 45.1025 ha (RT: 946040); and • Section 1 SO 420327 – 8.5980 ha (RT: 492534). 	
2(1)(b)	the name of the owner of the relevant land, if the applicant is not the owner of the land	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE Section 4.4, Page 25 These titles are held in common ownership and collectively form the Project area</p>	<p>Yes, addressed See Appendix 2.</p>

		known as Ridgeburn. The name of the owner of the relevant land subject to this application is Janice Clear & Lynette Hamilton. The applicant has a sales and purchase agreement in place for Project area.	
2(1)(c)	proof of consent, if the owner of the relevant land has consented to the proposed activity	The Applicant (Ridgeburn Limited) has a sales and purchase agreement in place for Project area and will be the owner of the land at the time the activity is undertaken refer to Appendix 48.	Yes, addressed. See Appendix 48 – note that the agreement has been redacted under section 9 (2)(ii) of the OIA Act.
2(1)(d)	confirmation that the application complies with section 42 , 43, and 44 of the Act	Ridgeburn (Substantive), AEE	Yes, addressed.

		<p>Section 3, (Page 12-16):</p> <p>In accordance with Section 46 of the FTAA, the application complies with Section 42, Section 43 and Section 44. The application relates solely to a referred Project, and does not seek approval for an ineligible activity, as assessed in Volume F.</p> <p>In accordance with Section 46 of the FTAA, this section confirms that the substantive application remains complete and within scope, including a</p>	<p>The authorised person (Ridgeburn Limited) has lodged the substantive application, and information is in sufficient detail to satisfy the purpose for which it is required.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>minor modification to the Masterplan that does not affect the overall purpose, scale, or character of the Project as accepted for referral.</p> <p>Any fee, charge or levy payable under the regulations in respect of the application has been paid.</p>	
	confirmation that the application relates solely to a listed project or a referred project.	Application relates solely to a referred project - Refer Ridgeburn AEE Section 3, (Page 12-16)	Yes, addressed. The application relates solely to a referred project.
	any fee, charge, or levy payable under regulations in respect of the application is paid.	Any fee, charge, or levy payable under regulations in	Yes, addressed. The application fee and levy have been paid in full.

		respect of the application is paid	
2(1)(e)	a description of each archaeological site to which the application relates and the location of each site.	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive) - Refer Volume A Archaeological Authority Report Section 2 (Page 6) and Archaeological Assessment at Appendix 21.</p> <p>Summary:</p> <p>An Archaeological Assessment has been prepared by Origin Consultants Limited and is included in Appendix 21. The assessment addresses the full extent of the application site and provides detailed information on</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>HNZPT, in their consultation response, identified that a recorded archaeological site (F41/890) within the project boundary that was omitted from assessment. The following response was received by the application, acknowledging that this site was assessed as part of.” the submitted application:</p> <p><i>“This site was assessed in both the Archaeological Assessment (Appendix 21) and the Archaeological Authority report (Volume A) provided with the Substantive Application. Refer to the attached email from HNZPT, outlining that they have now located this recorded archaeological site (F41/890) and</i></p>

		<p>recorded archaeological sites and the potential for previously unrecorded archaeological material.</p> <p>Two recorded archaeological sites are present within the application area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F41/62 – the Jolly Farmstead, comprising a pre-1900 homestead complex with associated buildings and features; and • F41/890 – the remains of a pre-1900 hut site (Steele’s Hut). <p>In addition, the Archaeological Assessment</p>	<p><i>the relative assessment in the submitted application.</i></p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>identifies areas of archaeological potential across the site, including at Morven Hill and in proximity to the Kawarau River, where evidence of historic sluicing activity may be present.</p> <p>A detailed description of the recorded sites, including their extent, characteristics, and archaeological values, is provided in Appendix 21.</p>	
2(1)(f)	a description of the activity for which the authority is sought	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), Refer Volume A Archaeological Authority Report Section 3 (Page 10-</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>See Volume A, Archaeological Authority Report.</p>

		<p>12) and Archaeological Assessment at Appendix 21.</p> <p>In summary, the proposal seeks:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">•An Archaeological Authority to modify F41/62 – The Jolly Farmstead in accordance with section 42(4)(i) of the FTAA.•An Archaeological Authority to destroy F41/890 – Steele’s Hut in accordance with section 42(4)(i) of the FTAA.•An Archaeological Authority for earthworks across the remaining parts of the site under section 42(3)(i) of the FTAA in the event that any	
--	--	---	--

		<p>unrecorded archaeological sites areuncovered during the proposed earthworks.</p> <p>•Approval for a Project Archaeologist to oversee the works under the Archaeological Authority.</p>	
2(1)(g)	a description of how the proposed activity will modify or destroy each archaeological site	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), - Refer Volume A Archaeological Authority Report Section 3 (Page 10-12) and Archaeological Assessment at Appendix 21. The Jolly Farmstead buildings are proposed to be sympathetically</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>HNZPT, in their consultation response, identified that a recorded archaeological site (F41/890) within the project boundary that was omitted from assessment. The following response was received by the application, acknowledging that this site was assessed as part of.” the submitted application:</p> <p><i>“This site was assessed in both the Archaeological Assessment</i></p>

		<p>restored and repurposed as part of the development, enabling their long-term protection and ongoing use. Restoration works will retain and repair original building fabric, including stone masonry and historic elements, using appropriate materials and techniques. Steele's hut is proposed to be removed to enable development, however, there is potential for interpretation of this site within the development, subject to detailed design.</p>	<p><i>(Appendix 21) and the Archaeological Authority report (Volume A) provided with the Substantive Application. Refer to the attached email from HNZPT, outlining that they have now located this recorded archaeological site (F41/890) and the relative assessment in the submitted application.</i></p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Further archaeological investigation of the other areas will be undertaken as part of the development including Morven Hill and the Kawerau River Terrace, noting that the likelihood of uncovering archaeological remains is low. Mitigation measures are available in the event that they are, including amendments at detailed design stage and site recording. The Conditions of Consent allow this to be addressed during the construction phase</p>	
--	--	---	--

		in accordance with standard practice.	
2(1)(h)	<p>except in the case of an approval described in section 44(b) of the HNZPT Act, an assessment of—</p> <p>(xxviii) the archaeological, Māori, and other relevant values of the archaeological site in the detail that is appropriate to the scale and significance of the proposed activity and the proposed modification or destruction of the archaeological site; and</p> <p>(xxix) the effect of the proposed activity on those values</p>	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), - Refer Volume A Archaeological Authority Report Section 4 (Page 12-15) and Archaeological Assessment at Appendix 21. In addition a Cultural Impact Assessment (CIA) has been prepared by Te Ao Mārama Inc on behalf of Ngāi Tahu and is included as Appendix 46.</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>See Appendix 21 – Archaeological Assessment and Appendix 46 - CIA</p> <p>Although HNZPT expressed a preference for a physical field survey rather than just desktop research, the information provided is considered sufficient for the completeness check under Section 46 of the Fast-track Approvals Act.</p> <p>The desktop assessment correctly identifies the sites, evaluates their heritage values, and describes the physical effects of the project. The absence of a field survey is a matter of technical merit that can be addressed by the Expert Panel during its deliberations, rather</p>

			than a failure of statutory completeness.
2(1)(i)	<p>a statement as to whether consultation with tangata whenua, the owner of the relevant land (if the applicant is not the owner), or any other person likely to be affected—</p> <p>(xxx) has taken place, with details of the consultation, including the names of the parties and the tenor of the views expressed; or</p> <p>(xxxi) has not taken place or been completed, with the reasons why consultation has not occurred or been completed (as applicable).</p>	<p>Ridgeburn (Substantive), - Refer Volume A Archaeological Authority Report Section 6 (Page 15). Engagement has been undertaken with Te Ao Mārama Inc on behalf of Ngāi Tahu, including provision of technical information and preparation of a Cultural Impact Assessment. Engagement is ongoing.</p> <p>Ridgeburn Limited will be the owner of the land at the time of any works under</p>	<p>Yes, addressed.</p> <p>See Volume A Archaeological Report Section 6, Page 15 and Details of consultation with tangata whenua are available in Appendix 44.</p>

		this approval - this is confirmed by a sale and purchase agreement (as attached).	
--	--	--	--

Appendix 2: Consultation Summary

The following agencies were consulted with to inform the assessment of the application for completeness. Each agency was requested to confirm whether the application documentation provided by the EPA regarding the proposal as provided by the applicant meets the requirements of sections 42 and 43 of the Act and is provided in sufficient detail to satisfy the purpose of the Act in accordance with section 44 of the Act.

- Otago Regional Council
- Queenstown Lakes District Council
- Department of Conservation
- Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga

1. Consultation with Otago Regional Council as the relevant consent authority for the following approvals under the Resource Management Act 1991:

- Resource consent (section 42(4)(a) of the Act)

Otago Regional Council
70 Stafford Street
Dunedin 9054

22 May 2026

 Fast-Track Applications FTAA-2603-1186

Uploaded via Fast Track Portal

Otago Regional Council (ORC) has received correspondence dated 15 May 2026 from the EPA regarding a completeness and scope assessment prior to referral of a substantive application by Ridgebun Limited for a comprehensive mixed-use development at 122 Morven Ferry Road, Queenstown-Lakes District to an Expert Panel under the Fast-track Approvals Act 2024 (the Act).

Substantive Application Assessment

To inform the EPA's completeness assessment of the application, the EPA asked whether the documentation available in the application portal regarding the RMA approvals as provided by the applicant meets the requirements of sections 42 and 43 of the Act and is provided in sufficient detail to satisfy the purpose for which it is required in accordance with section 44 of the Act. The EPA has also asked whether any relevant matters listed in clauses 5 to 9 of Schedule 5 have not been addressed or have not been provided in sufficient detail.

The application documentation meets the requirements of section 42 of the Act. It is noted that clauses 5(2) and (3) of Schedule 5 of the Act require an application to be accompanied by an assessment of the relevant statutory instruments. The application does not provide an assessment of the following statutory instruments that we consider relevant:

- a. The Water Conservation (Kawarau) Order 1997; and
- b. The Regional Plan: Waste for Otago.

ORC also notes that clause 5(3) of Schedule 5 of the Act requires that an assessment includes consideration of the activity against any relevant objectives and policies within the documents listed in clause 5(2). The application does not include an adequate assessment against what ORC considers to be the relevant objectives and policies of the Regional Plan Water for Otago (RPW), the Regional Plan Air for Otago (RPA) or the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM).

ORC considers these are matters where further clarification, assessment, or supporting information is required to ensure the application adequately addresses the requirements of Section 43 of the Act and can properly be considered a complete substantive application.

Section 30 Confirmation

The EPA also asked the following specific question in accordance with section 30 of the Act:

Confirm that the written notice prepared by the Council remains accurate and final at the time of receiving this letter.

I confirm that the letter dated 27 February 2026 regarding Section 30(3)(b) remains accurate and final.

Yours sincerely,



Alexandra King
Manager Consents/Manager Environmental Delivery Data and Systems

- 2. Consultation with Queenstown Lakes District Council** as the relevant consent authority for the following approvals under the Resource Management Act 1991:
- Resource consent (section 42(4)(a) of the Act)

22 May 2026

File: Ridgeburn
Ref: FTAA-2603-1186

Tēnā koe,

Section 46 Completeness Check

Queenstown Lakes District Council (QLDC, The Council) has reviewed the submitted application material in the time it has had available. QLDC considers the application does not pass the completeness test for the following reasons:

Section 28(3)(d)(ii) information that must be submitted with the Substantive Application

Under section 27(3)(b)(ii), the Minister required the applicant to provide transport infrastructure and three waters assessments, including details of discussions with NZTA and QLDC and any agreements reached on transport and three waters infrastructure.

The applicant has provided technical transport infrastructure and three water assessments. The applicant has detailed engagement with QLDC and NZTA and how this engagement has been incorporated into the proposal within the Consultation Summary Report (Volume C).

While the report correctly identifies the meetings between the applicant and QLDC staff, it overstates the extent of meaningfulness of this consultation.

Consultation with QLDC was highly limited, with insufficient information provided in advance of meetings. As a result, discussions in these meetings were necessarily high-level and unsupported by adequate technical analysis and included no agreements from QLDC on the matters outlined by the Minister.

In QLDC's view, due to the high-level nature of the engagement, it has not had a proper opportunity to engage meaningfully with the applicant or to reach any agreement on transport or three waters matters. QLDC understands that the nature of discussions with NZTA has been of a similarly high level and has not yet resulted in any agreement.

Other Completeness deficiencies identified

QLDC considers that the traffic assessment erroneously discounts wider network effects beyond the immediate vicinity of the site as being beyond the geographic scope of a transportation analysis. QLDC has significant concerns regarding cumulative effects on the operation of the wider transport network, and its effect on the district and sub regional communities who rely on the nearby state highway to access work and other amenities in Frankton and Queenstown. Effects resulting from the proposal are relevant regardless of geographic location.

1. The cost of establishing infrastructure, maintenance and 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. The proposed levies to support the infrastructure entity and/or Residents Association are expected to support the establishment and ongoing maintenance of the following activities:
 - a. Potable water (including all inground assets, treatment and commonly held infrastructure)
 - b. Stormwater
 - c. Wastewater (including all inground assets, treatment, disposal, pumpstations)
 - d. Pest management and planting
 - e. Rubbish collection
 - f. Parks maintenance
 - g. Road maintenance
 - h. Roading assets and lighting

Without quantification of ongoing costs as part of private delivery of infrastructure and services, the benefits arising in relation to affordable housing provision is unknown.

QLDC considers that there is a lack of detail on the effects of the proposal on social infrastructure as a result of the proposal, including schooling and healthcare, nor consideration of suitable reserve land provision within the site to cater for these activities. It is noted that Arrowtown, though marginally larger than the proposed Ridgeburn development, has its own primary school.

2. There is insufficient information in the application to determine whether the proposal contributes to a well-functioning urban environment, and in particular supports reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, as sought by Policy 1 of the National Policy

Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD). This is relevant given that there is no current or planned public transport servicing the site, with heavy reliance on private motor vehicles trips. The nearest current public transport is approximately 8km down the rural state highway toward Frankton near the Lake Hayes-Arrowtown Road. In QLDC's opinion, these should be compared to areas within the existing Urban Growth Boundary for comparison. No renewable energy sources are proposed to offset emissions.

3. The proposal includes establishment of a wastewater spray irrigation system on Morven Hill, which is an identified Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF). There is insufficient information in the application to identify the works and methodology required to establish and maintain the spray irrigation system, including upgrade of the farm access track, trenching, structures, earthworks and effects on the ONF. These may require additional reasons for consent, in particular under 24.5.2 of the Proposed District Plan.
4. The proposed conditions include a requirement for a meteorological monitoring station to be established within the wastewater spray irrigation field. This is not apparent on the plans for the consent, and it is unknown whether this, in combination with the spray irrigation located on the ONF, would require consent under Rule 30.5.2.2 of the Proposed District Plan.
5. The EPA files provided to QLDC do not include a complete set of Appendix 7 – Architectural Drawings. These are critical to understanding the design framework for development in the proposal. The missing sections are:
 - a. C1 – Design approach and controls
 - b. C2 – Design standards for Affordable Housing
 - c. C3 – Design standards for Standalone Housing
 - d. C4 – Design Standards for Commercial Buildings
6. The proposal sits outside of Air Zone 1 and 2 in the Regional Plan – Air for Otago. These manage discharges from domestic home heating appliances. While this is a regional function, no regional consents are engaged because the plan does not recognise the rural nature of the site. Further information is required to address potential effects on human health from air quality or otherwise propose mitigation to reflect the proposed urban receiving environment.
7. The proposal requires consent under Rule 29.4.9 of the Proposed District Plan for a Park and Ride Facility which has not been applied for, noting that there is no proposed or planned public service for the facility. The nearest current public transport is approximately 8km down the rural state highway toward Frankton near the Lake Hayes-Arrowtown Road.

8. QLDC observes that it is likely that the Architectural plans and drawings in Appendix 7 do not appear to meet the reflectivity requirements of the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (WBRAZ) and Rural Zone, noting the plans referring to all development having a light reflectance value below 30%. This does not meet the requirements of the WBRAZ and Rural Zone Rule 21.7.2 building material and colour requirements and either needs correction or an application made for consent. There do not appear to be any corresponding conditions that would require adherence to the permitted standards.

QLDC considers that the matters set out above are required to be addressed to meet the information requirements set out in Section 42-44 of the FTAA. While minor changes have been included in the substantive application when compared to the referral application, QLDC does not raise any issues as to scope.

Nāku noa nā,

Yours sincerely,



Onur Oktem-Lewis

QLDC FTAA Programme Manager

3. **Consultation with the Department of Conservation** as the administering agency for the following Acts

- A wildlife approval as defined in clause 1 of schedule 7 of the Act (section 42(4)(h) of the Act)

Department of Conservation advice for EPA compliance assessment

Overview

Project name	Ridgeburn
Project applicant	Ridgeburn Limited
EPA unique ref. no	FTAA-2603-1186
EPA Request Number	CRM 0139014164
Conservation approvals sought	Wildlife Approval
EPA request summary	To inform the EPA's assessment of the application for completeness, please provide DOC's views on whether the documentation provided meets the requirements of sections 42 and 43 of the Act and provides sufficient detail to satisfy the purpose for which it is required, in accordance with section 44 of the Act. In your response, please include whether any relevant matters listed in clause 2 of Schedule 7 (information required in application for wildlife approval) have not been addressed or have not been provided in sufficient detail.
Request received	15 May 2026
Date due to EPA	22 May 2026

The purpose of this document is to provide advice to assist the EPA in making its decision on whether the application lodged by Ridgeburn Limited complies with the requirements of section 46(2) of the Act.

The advice covers compliance with the following:

- Preliminary matters under section 43
- Information requirements for relevant approvals
- Consultation requirements

The advice also includes further observations of relevance to further processing of the application, for example where further information could be needed for a decision by the panel.

DOC understands that this document will be passed on to the applicant, the Panel Convener and the Panel.

Applications for wildlife approvals

Clause 2 of Schedule 7 outlines the information required in an application for a wildlife approval.

Relevant section	Is the information present?	Is the information provided in sufficient detail?	Comments
Schedule 7 clause 2(1) - For the purposes of section 43(3)(h), an application for a wildlife approval must include the following information:			
(a) specify the purpose of the proposed activity:	Y	N	<i>The application checklist (Volume E) refers to Volume B, section 2.0 – this section refers to the purpose of the project (i.e. to facilitate a residential and mixed-use development etc) but not to the purpose of the proposed activity requiring wildlife approval</i>
(b) identify the actions the applicant wishes to carry out involving protected wildlife and where they will be carried out (whether on or off public conservation land):	Y	N	<i>The application checklist (Volume E) refers to "catch and handle wildlife" and further to 'as outlined in pp84-86 of Appendix 14'; however these pages do not expressly outline what activities and where. The information provided is inconsistent and unclear and spread throughout multiple documents – page 11 of the AEE refers to approval being sought for relocation; page 101 refers to handling and incidental harm; Volume B page 5 refers to "capture, handling, temporary holding and relocation", the Draft Lizard Management Plan (Appendix C to Appendix 14) mentions the wildlife authority sought is to "rescue and relocate" lizards and then (p33) that authority will be sought allowing for lizard salvage and incidental killing. Appendix 14 p32 notes that gecko presence is limited to Morven Hill and areas of exposed rock and that 'these areas will not be subject to works' but elsewhere in the documents</i>

Relevant section	Is the information present?	Is the information provided in sufficient detail?	Comments
			<i>there is reference to extensive planting and pest control on Morven Hill – it is unclear where activities will occur.</i>
(c) include an assessment of the activity and its impacts against the purpose of the Wildlife Act 1953:	Y	N	<i>The application checklist (Volume E) refers to Appendix 14 and the appended Draft LMP. There is no mention of the purpose of the Wildlife Act in these documents that we have been able to find.</i>
(d) list protected wildlife species known or predicted to be in the area and, where possible, the numbers of wildlife present and numbers likely to be impacted:	Y	Y	<i>The application checklist (Volume E) refers to the Draft LMP appended to Appendix 14 and further lists three species. The Draft LMP expands the list of species and provides density/ population estimates in section 2.4; Volume B includes estimates of numbers on page 6.</i>
(e) outline impacts on threatened, data deficient, and at-risk wildlife species (as defined in the New Zealand Threat Classification System):	Y	N	<i>The application checklist (Volume E) refers to Appendix 14 and the appended Draft LMP. A broad discussion of impacts is included at page 32 but falls short of drawing conclusions about impacts on individual species.</i>
(f) state how the methods proposed to be used to conduct the actions specified under paragraph (b) will ensure that best practice standards are met:	Y	N	<i>The application checklist (Volume E) refers to the Draft LMP. The application describes proposed methods but does not demonstrate how these align with current best practice. The draft LMP lacks evidence of input from a suitably qualified herpetologist, does not adequately address species-specific requirements, and does not reference relevant standards (including the NZ Threat Classification System). As a result, it is unclear whether proposed methods are appropriate for the species present.</i>

Relevant section	Is the information present?	Is the information provided in sufficient detail?	Comments
			<i>The term "best practice" appears once in the Draft LMP (p83) where it simply states that the objectives of the measures proposed will be achieved by "using current best practice".</i>
(g) describe the methods to be used to safely, efficiently, and humanely catch, hold, or kill the animals and identify relevant animal ethics processes:	Y	N	<i>The application checklist (Volume E) refers to the Draft LMP. The Draft LMP includes sections on methodologies (pp84-87), however it also states these will be reviewed and 'amended if appropriate' prior to work being undertaken so there is insufficient certainty about which methodologies will be employed.</i>
(h) state the location or locations in which the activity will be carried out, including a map (and GPS co-ordinates if available):	Y	N	<i>The application checklist (Volume E) refers to the Draft LMP. Four lizard release sites are identified in Figure 6. Appendix 14 p32 notes that gecko presence is limited to Morven Hill and areas of exposed rock and that 'these areas will not be subject to works' but elsewhere in the documents there is reference to extensive planting and pest control on Morven Hill – it is unclear where activities will occur.</i>
(i) state whether authorisation is sought to temporarily hold or relocate wildlife:	Y	Y	<i>The application checklist (Volume E) refers to the Draft LMP and states that "authorisation is sought to relocate wildlife" but is silent on holding wildlife. As discussed above there is conflicting information in the application about the activities proposed however it appears authorisation is in fact sought for both activities.</i>
(j) list all actual and potential wildlife effects (adverse or positive) of the proposed activity, including effects on the target species, other indigenous species, and the ecosystems at the site:	N	N	<i>The application checklist (Volume E) refers to Appendix 14 and the appended Draft LMP. All potential and adverse effects are not identified some examples include:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The extent of lizard habitat</i>

Relevant section	Is the information present?	Is the information provided in sufficient detail?	Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential effects in relation to water management, planting? • Impacts on resident lizard populations • Species mortality as a result of the project.
(k) where adverse effects are identified, state what methods will be used to avoid and minimise those effects, and any offsetting or compensation proposed to address unmitigated adverse effects (including steps taken before the project begins, such as surveying, salvaging, and relocating protected wildlife):	Y	N	<p>The application checklist (Volume E) refers to Appendix 14 and the appended Draft LMP.</p> <p>There is limited detail on the proposed effects management, noting as above not all actual and potential effects are identified.</p> <p>Methods outlined by the applicant do not adequately include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - species-specific management for salvage - relocation habitat preparation / management. - How residual effects are managed - Monitoring outcomes/objectives
(l) state whether the applicant or any company director, trustee, partner, or anyone else involved with the application has been convicted of any offence under the Wildlife Act 1953:	Y	Y	No comment
(m) state whether the applicant or any company director, trustee, partner, or anyone else involved with the application has any current criminal charges under the Wildlife Act 1953 pending before a court:	Y	Y	No comment

Relevant section	Is the information present?	Is the information provided in sufficient detail?	Comments
(n) provide proof and details of all consultation, including with hapū or iwi, on the application specific to wildlife impacts:	Y	N/A	<i>No comment</i>
(o) provide any additional written expert views, advice, or opinions the applicant has obtained concerning their proposal.	Y	Y	<i>No comment</i>

4. **Consultation with the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga** as the administering agency for an archaeological authority under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014 (section 42(4)(i)).



Competing Interests and Completeness check for project under the Fast Track Approvals Act 2024

Ridgeburn, FTAA-2603-1186

Contact Details			
Organisation Name	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga (HNZPT)		
Contact person	HNZPT Fast-track Team		
Contact Number	(04) 470 8053	Alternative	
Email	fasttrack@heritage.org.nz		

Introduction

1. Ridgeburn Limited (the Applicant) has lodged a substantive application for Ridgeburn (the Project) with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).
2. On 15 May 2026 the EPA requested feedback regarding completeness to determine whether the substantive application complies with section 46(2) of the FTA Act.
3. HNZPT has also undertaken a check for competing applications to assist in determining if there are any competing applications or existing resource consents under section 47 of the FTA Act.

Completeness Check

4. As the application includes an approval described in section 42(4)(i) (archaeological authority) HNZPT has reviewed the information provided against the requirements set out in clause 2 of Schedule 8.
5. HNZPT **does not** consider the information required for an archaeological authority has been met.
6. Clause 2(h) of Schedule 8 of the FTA Act requires an application for an archaeological authority to:
 - Describe how the proposed activity will modify or destroy each archaeological site.
 - Provide an assessment of archaeological values appropriate to the scale and significance of the proposed activity and the proposed modification or destruction of archaeological sites, and the effect of the proposed activity on those values.
7. An archaeological assessment (the assessment) was provided for the substantive application (Appendix 13 – Archaeological Assessment). This sets out the results of desk-top research but does not incorporate the results of a field survey, standard practice in the production of archaeological assessments. The assessment includes a recommendation to undertake a physical survey and ‘full assessment’ to understand the archaeological sites present within the project area and assess their values.
8. A review of ArchSite, the database of all recorded archaeological sites in Aotearoa New Zealand, reveals that archaeological site F41/890 (stone hut ruins associated with the 19th century



Doonholme Farmstead building) was recorded within the project area based on a site visit in October 2025, after the completion of the assessment. This indicates that some field survey is taking place and that there are archaeological sites within the project boundary that have not been included in the assessment.

9. Therefore, the archaeological assessment does not provide a description of how each site will be modified or destroyed, nor an assessment of archaeological values and the effect on those values.
10. HNZPT requests that an updated version of the assessment is completed that incorporates the results of any physical archaeological survey and assesses all recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites within the project boundary.

Competing Interests Check

11. HNZPT confirms that there are no current competing archaeological authority applications under the Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga 2014 Act that relate to the same activity and site.

Appendix 3: Further information requests and responses

I sent 1 further information request to the applicant under section 46(2B) of the Act. The request and response are set out below.

Request for Further Information 1:

- Date sent: 29 May 2026
- Topic: Assessment against Regional plan: Waste for Otago, ensuring the application relates to all necessary resource consent approvals, Wildlife Act Authority requirements, A recorded archaeological site that was omitted from assessment and Appendix 7 plans.
- Date of response: 5 June 2026.

**Barker & Associates
Queenstown**

PO Box 1986, Shortland Street, Auckland 1140
Level 4, Old South British Building, 3-13 Shortland Street, Auckland

5 June 2026

Environmental Protection Authority

Attn: [REDACTED]

Via e [REDACTED]

Tēnā koe Maggie,

[Further Information Response – FTAA-2603-1186 – Ridgeburn](#)

Thank you for your letter dated 29 May 2026 which sets out a further information request arising from your completeness review of the above application. The below and attached constitutes our response on behalf of Ridgeburn Limited to the request for further information.

Our response is provided in **Table 1** below and is supported by the following attachments:

- **Attachment 1:** Tracked Changes Assessment of Environmental Effects (Version 2)
- **Attachment 2:** Version 2 Assessment of Environmental Effects
- **Attachment 3:** (Updated) Volume H Rules Assessment QLDC
- **Attachment 4:** (Updated) Volume B Wildlife Permit Report
- **Attachment 5:** (Updated) Volume E Substantive Application Information Table
- **Attachment 6:** Updated Architectural Drawings
- **Attachment 7:** Email Correspondence HNZPT

We trust that we have adequately responded to all of the queries in relation to this application.

Yours sincerely | Nā māua noa, nā

Barker & Associates Limited



Nick Roberts
Managing Director



Olivia Fitzgerald
Associate

Barker & Associates
Queenstown

PO Box 1986, Shortland Street, Auckland 1140
Level 4, Old South British Building, 3-13 Shortland Street, Auckland



Table 1: Further information response.

#	Request Item	Response Comment
1.	The application lacks an assessment against the Regional Plan: Waste for Otago, which is a relevant statutory instrument. Please provide an assessment of the proposed activity against the objectives and policies of this plan to satisfy the information requirements for resource consent under Schedule 5, clause 5(2).	Refer to the assessment provided in the Assessment of Effects (Version 2) at Section 10.7 pg. 163-164 (refer Attachment 2).
2.	Under Section 46(2), the EPA must confirm that a substantive application relates to all necessary approvals. Queenstown Lakes District Council has identified several necessary consents that appear to have been omitted from your "Reasons for Consent": 1. Rule 29.4.9 (Park and Ride): The proposal includes a Park and Ride facility for which no consent has been sought. 2. Rule 21.7.2 (Reflectivity): Architectural drawings refer to development having a light reflectance value below 30%, which may breach building material standards for the WBRAZ and Rural Zone; please provide either corrected plans or seek the necessary consent. 3. Rule 30.5.2.2 (Meteorological Monitoring Station): The establishment of this station within the Morven Hill Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF) may require consent. 4. Rule 24.5.2 (Wastewater Irrigation): Detail is missing regarding the methodology for established spray irrigation on the Morven Hill ONF (including trenching and earthworks), which may trigger additional reasons for consent.	1. Refer to updated Volume H Rules Assessment (QLDC) a breach to Rule 29.4.9 is sought, this is also reflected in the Assessment of Effects (Version 2) at Section 6.1.1, with the associated assessment provided at Section 9.7.5; 2. Updated architectural drawings (A.1, B.4, C.1, C.2, C.3 and C.4) are provided at Attachment 6 demonstrating compliance with Rule 21.7.2 & Rule 24.5.4. All external surfaces will have a Light Reflectance Value under 30% with the pre-painted steel and all roofs to have an LRV of no greater than 20% in accordance with the prescribed colour palette. Changes to the Architectural Plans are listed as follows: • A.1 Ridgeburn Masterplan Design Vision and Guiding Principles - Rev 2: o page 14 – note regarding roof LRV revised • B.4 Ridgeburn Commercial and Community Hub Neighbourhood K Plans - Rev 2 o page 2 – note regarding roof LRV revised • C.1 Ridgeburn Design Approach and Controls - Rev 2 o page 9 – note regarding roof LRV revised

#	Request Item	Response Comment
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • C.2 Ridgeburn Design Standards for Affordable Housing - Rev 2 RC 03062026 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>page 13 – note regarding roof LRV revised</i> ○ <i>page 14 – materials palette revised</i> • C.3 Ridgeburn Design Standards for Family Housing - Rev 2 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>page 42 – note regarding roof LRV revised</i> ○ <i>page 43 – materials palette revised</i> • C.4 Ridgeburn Design Standards for Commercial Buildings - Rev 2 RC 03062026 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>page 4 – materials palette revised</i> ○ <i>page 10 – materials palette revised</i> <p>3. Refer to the updated Volume H Rules Assessment (QLDC), which provides an assessment of the Meteorological Monitoring Station in the ONF. While a meteorological monitoring station may be located within the ONF as part of the wastewater irrigation system, the station would comprise a mast fitted with an anemometer and associated monitoring equipment. Rule 30.5.2.2 expressly excludes "masts or poles for navigation or meteorology". Accordingly, this rule does not apply to the Meteorological Monitoring Station.</p> <p>4. It is assumed that this point is referring to Rule 25.5.2 which restricts earthworks within an ONF to 10m³. The methodology for established spray irrigation on the Morven Hill ONF is provided in the Assessment of Effects (Version 2) at Section 3.5.2 which confirms that the spray irrigation can sit above the surface and no earthworks are proposed for the establishment of spray irrigation on the Morven Hill ONF.</p>

#	Request Item	Response Comment
3	The current application defines the purpose of the activity as "to facilitate a residential and mixed-use development." It is noted that this is the purpose of the overall project, not the proposed wildlife activity. Please explicitly specify the purpose of the wildlife related actions (e.g. salvage and relocation) for which you are seeking under the Wildlife Act 1953.	<p>The following provides as response from Annabelle Coates (Viridis). This has also been reflected in the updated Volume B Wildlife Permit Report (refer Section 2 page 6) and Volume E Substantive Application Information Table:</p> <p><i>Ridgeburn Ltd are seeking approval for a residential subdivision at 122 Morven Ferry Road, Queenstown. Lizards are known to be present within the site. Development will require earthworks and vegetation clearance where lizards are currently located. The purpose of the activity is to salvage lizards from within the works site and relocate them within the same site to areas that will not be impacted by works, and will be subject to habitat enhancement, revegetation and predator control.</i></p>
4	Documentation is currently inconsistent regarding whether you are seeking authorisation for "relocation" (AEE page 11), "handling or incidental harm" (AEE page 101) or "incidental Killing" (LMP page 33). Please provide a clear and consolidated list of the specific actions (e.g. capture, handling, temporary holding, relocation, or incidental mortality) you wish to carry out and where these actions will occur.	<p>The following provides as response from Annabelle Coates (Viridis). This has also been reflected in the updated Volume B Wildlife Permit Report (refer Section 2 page 6), the Version 2 Assessment of Effects (Attachment 2) and Volume E Substantive Application Information Table:</p> <p><i>The actions the wildlife permit is being sought for include:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. <i>Catch and handle lizards on site</i> 6. <i>Temporarily hold lizards prior to release (up to one work day, <8 hours)</i> 7. <i>Relocate lizards within the same property</i> 8. <i>Incidental killing of lizards not captured despite best efforts.</i> <p><i>The Lizard Management Plan will be updated to reflect this clearly prior to submitting the final plan for certification.</i></p>

#	Request Item	Response Comment
5	There is no mention of the purpose of the Wildlife Act 1953 in the submitted documents. Please provide a formal assessment of how the proposed wildlife activities and their associated impacts align with the statutory purpose of the Wildlife Act as required under Schedule 7, clause 2(1)(c).	<p>The following provides as response from Annabelle Coates (Viridis). This has also been reflected in the updated Volume B Wildlife Permit Report (refer Section 1.3 page 6 and Section 4 Page 8):</p> <p><u>Purpose</u></p> <p>The purpose of the Wildlife Act 1953 is to protect native wildlife and their habitats.</p> <p><u>Assessment of how the proposed wildlife activities and their associated impacts align with the statutory purpose of the Wildlife Act.</u></p> <p>Development is proposed in an area where native lizards are known to be present. Works within habitat suitable for lizards and within areas where they are known to be present cannot be avoided. Areas of high habitat value (e.g. rocky outcrops, riparian areas) have been avoided as far as practicable. Native lizards will be salvaged from areas subject to works within the site. They will be relocated to alternative habitats within the same property. The alternative habitats will be subject to habitat enhancements through revegetation, provision of alternative habitat, and pest animal and plant control. The new habitats will be protected via consent notices. Salvage and relocation, enhancement of habitat, and protection of the enhanced habitats meet the purpose of the Wildlife Act through protection of native lizards and their habitats.</p> <p>The Lizard Management Plan will be updated to reflect this clearly prior to submitting the final plan for certification.</p>



#	Request Item	Response Comment
6	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga has identified a recorded archaeological site (F41/890) within the project boundary that was omitted from assessment. Because this site is missing, the application fails to describe the effects on each archaeological site. Please submit an updated archaeological assessment that includes site F41/80 and describes the specific modifications or destruction it will face as required under Schedule 8, clause 2(h).	This site was assessed in both the Archaeological Assessment (Appendix 21) and the Archaeological Authority report (Volume A) provided with the Substantive Application. Refer to the attached email from HNZPT, outlining that they have now located this recorded archaeological site (F41/890) and the relative assessment in the submitted application.
7	The application does not include a complete set of plans for Appendix 7. The following are missing: C1 – design approach and controls C2 – design standards for affordable housing C3 – design standards for standalone housing C4 – design standards for commercial buildings.	These documents were all provided with the application at Appendix 6, titled 'Architectural Design Controls Affordable Housing', 'Architectural Design Controls for Commercial Buildings', 'Architectural Design Controls for Family Housing' and 'Architectural Design Controls'. While provided with the application, they have been updated as a result of this request and have been relabelled to avoid confusion (refer Attachment 6).