QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Private Bag 50072, Queenstown 9348, New Zealand
QUEENSTOWN, 10 Gorge Road | P: +64 3 441 0499
WĀNAKA, 47 Ardmore Street | P: +64 3 443 0024
www.qldc.govt.nz

November 13, 2026

The South Island Office
C/- Brown and Company Planning Group
PO Box 1467
QUEENSTOWN

PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE REQUEST TO THE PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

CORBRIDGE RESORT ZONE

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Tēnā koe **Jeff Brown and Morgan Shepherd**,

This request is being made for additional information relating to the Corbridge Resort Zone Private Plan Change Request (**Plan Change**) and the responses provided by the requestor to the Council's first request for further information through Clause 23(1)(a-d).

This request has been made pursuant to Clause 23(2) of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, which outlines:

> *23(2) A local authority, within 15 working days of receiving any information under this clause, may require additional information relating to the request.*

The information sought is considered to be appropriate to the scale and significance of the actual or potential environmental effects anticipated from the implementation of the Plan Change.

The Council has sought feedback on the Plan Change and further information provided by the requestor from the Council's consultant experts to help inform this request for information under Clause 23(2) of the First Schedule. When expert input has been considered, it has been stated.

This letter has been structured so that each topic includes a summary of the initial Request for further information, and the requestors response to the request, and the Council's additional request for further information made through Clause 23(2) including reasons for the request.

1. Planning

September RFI Request

(Q14) Provide an assessment of cultural effects in the AEE, in particular in relation to waterbodies and landscape values.

Requestor Response

Consultation with Aukaha and TAMI is ongoing.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Council acknowledges correspondence regarding this matter from the applicant. However, this matter remains outstanding as there is no assessment of actual and potential cultural effects of implementing the change as required by schedule 1, clause 22(2), and schedule 4, clauses 6(1)(f) and 7(1)(a)).

1.1 The requestor is requested to provide an assessment of actual and potential cultural effects of implementing the change in the AEE, in particular in relation to waterbodies and landscape values, with the latter being in accordance with Te Tangi a te Manu. The assessment should indicate how the proposal responds to any issues identified on behalf of mana whenua and any available information within Chapter 5 of the Proposed District Plan in relation to cultural values, and the scale of effects, whether positive or adverse.

2. Transport

The applicant's response table dated 16 October 2026 and updated Transportation Assessment dated 14 October 2026 provide useful additional information and substantially addresses some of Council's transport requests, particularly the modelling of residential occupation of visitor accommodation units and the derivation of the 1,050 vehicle-movement threshold.

However, the transport related RFI has **not been fully answered**. Material information remains outstanding regarding the assessment of alternative State Highway 6 access arrangements, cumulative effects on the wider transport network, sensitivity testing of the individual trip-generation assumptions, controls over the design and delivery of internal walking and cycling routes, and the operation and scope of Rules 27.7.34B.2 and 29.4.11B.

The interdependencies between the questions are important.

- Questions 24–28 address the location and form of the SH6 access, wider-network effects, modelling assumptions and the robustness of the resulting mitigation triggers.
- Questions 29–30 address the viability of public transport.
- Questions 31–37 address active transport.
- Questions 38–42 address whether the proposed rules respond appropriately to the effects identified by the Transportation Assessment.

The matters should be considered collectively rather than as isolated responses or at least refer to the interdependencies and/or the updated Transport Assessment.

State Highway 6 Access

September RFI Request

(Q24) Provide an assessment of alternative long-term SH6 access arrangements, including a shared intersection/roundabout arrangement servicing both Ballantyne Road and the proposed Zone, which would provide a more appropriate long-term safety and network outcome.

Requestor Response

An assessment is not appropriate at this stage, but the report has been updated to set out that when a roundabout is required, its location will also be required to be assessed as discussed at paragraph 8.3.5 onwards.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Additional information is being requested to understand the effects of the proposed State Highway 6 access to and from the Zone. Further information is being requested by Council's transport expert to understand the effects of different options for the upgrades to the site's access to the State Highway.

2.1 Provide a comparative assessment of options for upgrading the existing access and providing a shared intersection or roundabout opposite Ballantyne Road. The assessment should address road-safety performance, intersection spacing, effects on Ballantyne Road, land requirements, constructability, integration with the proposed Zone, access closure requirements and the ability of each option to accommodate the development enabled by the Plan Change. Identify the mechanism and decision point by which the preferred long-term location will be selected and secured.

Cumulative Traffic Effects

September RFI Request

(Q25) Confirm whether the cumulative traffic effects on the wider SH6 corridor, including the SH6/SH84 roundabout, have been assessed and, if so, provide the outcomes of that assessment, and appropriate mitigations to any adverse effects.

Requestor Response

Intersections further from the site have not been assessed as discussed at paragraph 3.1.8 and 3.1.9. The updated ITA section 6.2.1 posits that movements to and from external attractors will be relatively limited and suggests that arrivals and departures will be to/from the east (for the airport) and shorter-distance trips will be to the west (i.e. Wānaka).

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Additional Information is being requested to understand the effects on the wider traffic network beyond what was provided for within the initial request for further information. This is to better understand the effects of development traffic associated with the proposal, and to understand its effects on SH6 up to the SH6/SH84/Riverbank Road (Mt Iron) roundabout. It is understood that a detailed assessment of the Mt Iron roundabout has been done by others for the Mt Iron FTAA decision and that the findings were that the roundabout is nearing capacity.

2.2 Provide a screening assessment of the development traffic expected to reach the

SH6/SH84/Riverbank Road (Mt Iron) roundabout. The assessment should identify the assumed distribution of development traffic, the resulting peak-hour and daily traffic additions, and the basis for concluding whether detailed operational assessment is or is not required.

Sensitivity Testing

September RFI Request

(Q26) Provide sensitivity testing of the transport modelling assumptions, including alternative assumptions regarding internal trip capture, visitor accommodation occupancy, worker accommodation travel patterns, worker accommodation demand and traffic generation.

Requestor Response

An assessment of traffic generation is considered to be robust. However, a sensitivity test has been included in increasing the traffic generation by a third as discussed at paragraph 7.1.7 onwards.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Additional information is being requested as to understand the effects on the Wānaka transport network regarding trip generation beyond what was provided within the previous response from the requestor, for the same reason as the preceding request 2.2.

2.3 Provide a sensitivity table that separately tests the material trip-generation assumptions, including residential trip rates, visitor-accommodation occupancy, internal trip capture or trip chaining, worker-accommodation occupancy and travel, golf and hospitality activity, and the proportion of trips distributed toward Wānaka.

Transport Mitigation Measures

September RFI Request

(Q27) Confirm how proposed transport mitigation measures and upgrade triggers would respond if actual development staging, visitor accommodation yields or traffic generation differ from the assumptions used in the transport assessment.

Requestor Response

This is addressed through the staging provisions in Rule 27.7.34 and by the complementary rule, Rule 29.4.11B, in the Transport Chapter.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Additional information is requested to help understand the effect of the staging provisions in regard to transport infrastructure. This is to understand how/what monitoring will be undertaken for each development stage.

2.4 Provide a consolidated explanation, supported by an amended rule framework if necessary, showing how infrastructure requirements will respond where actual staging, activity yields, occupancy or traffic generation differ from the Transportation Assessment. Identify the monitoring or assessment required at each stage, the measure of traffic generation to be used, who must undertake the assessment, the approval process, and the point by which any identified improvement must be operational.

Transport network connections

September RFI Request

(Q30) Explain how the proposed transport network connections and development layout would support future implementation of these services.

Requestor Response

It is worth noting that public transport would not enter the site as the roads are private, but the expected passenger volume is unlikely to make any service economic to operate.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

The economics of a potential future public transport route would not be solely determined by the patronage generated by the resort, but other destinations served by a route. Additional information is being requested to understand the effect of the proposed access for the site, and how the internal network would link with a potential future public transport stop (which may be in the public road reserve). This request is also being made to better understand the effect of no such provisions being included within the PDP.

2.5 Identify how the proposed access and internal network could accommodate a future private shuttle or public-transport connection (i.e., a public stop at the access point rather than within the private site), including the location or design principles for passenger pick-up and drop-off, vehicle turning, waiting, accessible pedestrian connections and safe access to any future stop on SH6. If no provision is proposed, explain how the layout avoids precluding these facilities and identify the relevant provision or assessment matter.

Active Travel Routes

September RFI Request

(Q32) Provide further information regarding how the proposal provides for the future delivery of an active travel connection between the site and Wānaka.

Requestor Response

A future active travel connection is not compromised by the Zone as there is sufficient land adjacent to the State Highway that will remain undeveloped. Proposed new rule, Rule 51.4.4 provides for the construction of any walkway / cycleway not otherwise provided for by Rule 51.4.3 (the walkway / cycleway annotated on the Structure Plan) as a restricted discretionary activity. The matter of controls for Rule 51.4.3 include connection to existing routes, as does the matter of discretion in Rule 51.4.4. This will allow Council to consider connection to existing walking and cycling networks when processing applications for the construction of walkways and cycleways within the Zone.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Additional information is being requested to understand how the site would connect to a future active travel route if developed. The Council are requesting additional information to understand how the site would connect to a future link if developed.

2.6 Show the potential route or corridor by which the Structure Plan walkway/cycleway could connect to a future route toward Wānaka, including the connection across or alongside the SH6 frontage. Explain what part of the connection lies within the Plan Change area, what

provision secures or enables it, and how development within the Zone will avoid obstructing its future delivery. For this purpose, it would also be appropriate to indicate the State Highway 6 road reserve on the structure plan and label it accordingly.

2.7 There is an expectation that this will be required to be constructed as part of subdivision across the frontage of the site (either within the SH6 road reserve or within the site) as part of future subdivision. This will also connect with the cycleway/pathway running through the site and connecting to the Clutha River Trail. Please indicate how this will be achieved through the provisions.

Active Travel

September RFI Request

(Q33) Confirm whether land, corridor protection, easements or other design measures have been incorporated to ensure that a future active travel connection can be delivered and is not compromised by future development.

Requestor Response

Same response as Question 32.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Additional information is being requested to understand the effects of a future active transport link and how it relates to the Zone's proposed Structure Plan.

2.8 Confirm whether the corridor will be protected through the Structure Plan, a rule, setback, easement, consent notice or another mechanism and Provide a network-integration plan or equivalent explanation showing how the internal walkway/cycleway, Upper Clutha River Track connection, SH6 frontage and any future route toward Albert Town and Wānaka would operate together. If no defined protection is proposed, demonstrate how the provisions ensure buildings, access arrangements, landscaping and other works cannot compromise the future connection.

Rule 51.4.2

September RFI Request

(Q35) Provide an explanation of why Rule 51.4.2 does not reserve control over the width and geometric design of the walkway/cycleway.

Requestor Response

It is reasonable to expect that an application for the walkway / cycleway will include engineering plans that detail the width and geometric design of the trail.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Additional information is being requested to understand the effects of the proposed design parameters and the controls which will be available regarding them.

2.9 Explain the statutory basis on which Council could (through the Plan Change provisions) require an appropriate width, gradient, crossfall, horizontal and vertical geometry, sight distance and user separation if these matters are not expressly reserved in Rule 51.4.3.

Alternatively, amend the matters of control to include these matters and reference the applicable Council or NZTA design standards.

Internal site provisions pedestrian paths

September RFI Request

(Q37) Confirm internal site provision of other paths for pedestrians, cyclists, and golf carts including widths, materials and the specific routes. Consider desire paths for workers, residents, golfers, and other visitors and the needs and safety of each type of users, or provide a proposed rule that will ensure these outcomes.

Requestor Response

As discussed above, proposed new rule, Rule 51.4.4 provides for the construction of any walkway / cycleway not otherwise provided for by Rule 51.4.3 (the walkway / cycleway annotated on the Structure Plan) as a restricted discretionary activity. Cart paths associated with the golf course will form part of the resource consent application for the golf course construction under Rule 51.4.32. Detail regarding widths, materials and the specific routes will be provided at that stage.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

The Structure Plan provides an indicative motor vehicle route network but omits a lower speed (golf carts, cyclists and pedestrians) movement network. Additional information is being requested to understand the effects of the proposal on interactions between pedestrians, cyclists, golf carts and service vehicles.

2.10 Provide an indicative internal active-movement network showing the principal connections between accommodation, worker housing, golf facilities, hospitality activities, the public walkway/cycleway, SH6 and the Upper Clutha River Track. Explain how the proposed provisions require a connected network and manage conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists, golf carts and service vehicles. Identify the matters of control or discretion addressing route continuity, width, surfacing, gradients, crossings, lighting where appropriate, accessibility and user safety.

Rule 29.4.11B

September RFI Request

(Q38) Explain how the proposed Rule 29.4.11B threshold of 1,050 site-generated vehicle movements per day was derived and demonstrate how that threshold is consistent with Figure 8-2 of the NZTA Planning Policy Manual, including identification of the site traffic generation level at which auxiliary turning lanes, a right-turn bay, a roundabout, or other intersection treatment would be warranted.

Requestor Response

1,050 is derived by reading along the 'x' axis of NZTA Figure 8-2 to reach the expected Design Year traffic flow of 9,601 vehicles per day. The traffic volume on the minor road is then read from the 'y' axis at this volume and this equates to 1,050 vehicles per day. A right-turn bay is identified as being required from NZTA Figure 8-2 at 200 vehicles per day (Para 7.2.3). However a more detailed assessment (Para 7.1.2 onwards) shows that in fact it is needed before then. Roundabout treatments are shown on NZTA Figure 8-2 in the area bounded by the orange and blue lines. The

NZTA graph does not set out any other intersection treatments.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Additional information is being requested to understand the proposal regarding the assessment traffic level, turning bays and ant roundabout or alternative treatment.

2.11 Provide a schedule or clear explanation showing the assessed traffic level or development stage for providing the right-turn bay, left-turn lane and any roundabout or alternative treatment, and identify the specific provision that secures each improvement before its warrant is reached.

Rule 27.7.34B.2 Staging and 29.4.11B (High Traffic Generating Activities)

September RFI Request

(Q39) Explain how these provisions are intended to operate together, including:

a. whether the Stage 2 and Stage 3 intersection assessments are required irrespective of traffic generation levels, or only where the threshold in Rule 29.4.11B is exceeded;
b. the circumstances in which each provision is intended to apply;
c. whether the provisions could result in different conclusions regarding the need for SH6 intersection upgrades; and
d. why both mechanisms are required, and how they collectively ensure timely provision of any necessary intersection upgrades.

(Q40) Confirm whether any upgrade identified through the Stage 2 or Stage 3 assessments could be required at a traffic level lower than the 1,050 vehicle-per-day threshold specified in Rule 29.4.11B.

(Q41) Explain the planning and transportation rationale for limiting discretion to these matters. In particular, how the proposed rule enables consideration of wider transport effects that may arise from development within the zone, including:

a. integration with the existing transport network;
b. measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate traffic generation;
c. measures to facilitate mode shift and reduce reliance on private vehicle travel;
d. effects on the operation, safety and efficiency of the wider transport network;
e. cumulative transport effects arising from staged development; and
f. any off-site transport improvements or travel demand management measures that
g. may be necessary to appropriately manage transport effects.

(Q42) Identify why these matters are not included in the proposed matters of discretion in Rule 29.4.11B and explain how the proposed rule gives effect to the transport-related objectives and policies of the Proposed District Plan.

Requestor Response

The figure of 1,050 vehicles per day is read from NZTA [Figure 8-2][1] for the expected traffic volume on State Highway 6. Broadly, this graph also shows that as the traffic volume on the major road varies, the threshold at which a roundabout is required also varies, based on the principle of providing the safest type of intersection for any given permutation of the flows on the roads.

The number of crashes is influenced by the types of turning movements and the numbers of vehicles that make these movements. Consequently, as traffic flows on the minor road diminish (as assuming that the volumes on the major road stay the same), the exposure to risk declines and so a priority intersection becomes increasingly 'safe'. Conversely, as the number of vehicles on the minor road increases, the exposure to risk increased and so a priority intersection becomes more 'unsafe'.

However NZTA Figure 8-2 has this relationship the other way around. In essence, at present Figure 8-2 shows that with (say) 10,000 vehicles on the major road and 1,000 vehicles on the minor road, then a priority intersection is appropriate. However with 10,000 vehicles on the major road and 500 vehicles on the minor road, then a roundabout is required, despite the lower volumes halving the risk of a collision. The reason for this is not known, and a formal query has been raised with NZTA.

Pending a response from NZTA, the only scenario where a roundabout would be required at flows of less than 1,050 vehicles on the minor approach would be if the traffic flows on the major road were greater than has been assessed. While this could arise (such as through traffic growth being greater than the anticipated 4.9% per annum for the next ten years), it is not considered that this is a particularly likely outcome.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Additional information is being requested to understand the effects how Rules 27.7.34B.2 and 29.4.11B are intended to operate together.

2.12 Explain how Rules 27.7.34B.2 and 29.4.11B are intended to operate together. In particular:

- explain what additional circumstances or effects Rule 29.4.11B is intended to address, given that the Stage 2 and Stage 3 assessments under Rule 27.7.34B.2 are required irrespective of traffic generation;
- confirm whether assessments under the two rules could reach different conclusions regarding the need, form or timing of an SH6 intersection upgrade and, if so, explain how any inconsistency would be resolved;
- explain why both mechanisms are required and how they collectively ensure that any necessary intersection upgrade is identified, secured and operational when required; and
- Confirm whether any upgrade identified through the Stage 2 or Stage 3 assessments could be required at a traffic level lower than the 1,050 vehicle-per-day threshold specified in Rule 29.4.11B. , including for reasons other than SH6 traffic being higher than assumed in deriving that threshold.

2.13 Explain the planning and transportation rationale for limiting discretion to these matters

1 The requestor response appears to have a typo and the Council understand that it intended to refer to Figure 8-2.

specified in Rule 29.4.11B. In particular, how the proposed rule enables consideration of wider transport effects that may arise from development within the zone, including: a. integration with the existing transport network; b. measures to avoid, remedy or mitigate traffic generation; c. measures to facilitate mode shift and reduce reliance on private vehicle travel; d. effects on the operation, safety and efficiency of the wider transport network; e. cumulative transport effects arising from staged development; and f. any off-site transport improvements or travel demand management measures that may be necessary to appropriately manage transport effects.

2.14 Identify why these wider transport matters listed in the point above are not included in the proposed matters of discretion in Rule 29.4.11B and explain how the proposed rule gives effect to the transport-related objectives and policies of Chapter 29 of the Proposed District Plan.

3. Landscape

The further information request made by Council staff on September 18th led to the amendment of the requestor's visual modelling plans[2] rather than directly responding to the questions themselves. Following this the Council's Landscape Architect has provided the following additional questions regarding the updated visual modelling plans provided by the requestor on October 23, 2026.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

The Council's request for additional information is interconnected and regards the landscape visual modelling. The Council has requested additional information following the initial request for further information as changes to the visual modelling are needed to understand the effects of what is being proposed.

3.1 Provide technically accurate digital terrain model view simulations and rendered simulations using the development envelope enabled by the proposed Plan Change provisions (rather than the building development anticipated by the masterplan, which does not form part of the Plan Change). Confirm reading distance and page size for the rendered simulations so that this material can be checked in the field.

3.2 Confirm that the landscape assessment has not relied on the masterplan instead of the plan change.

3.3 Advise any amendments to the Landscape Effects Assessment (or proposed provisions, including Structure Plan layout) as a consequence of reviewing the model view simulations and rendered simulations using the development envelope enabled by the proposed Plan Change provisions (item 3.1 above).

3.4 Provide the following on a scaled, legible plan (or series of plans): a. all assessed highway viewpoints; b. retained shelterbelts; c. Landscape Amenity Management Areas (LAMAs); and d. the Golf Visibility Summary mapping to enable the Council to understand the potential landscape effects of i the plan change.

2 Baxter Plans October 23 RFI response

3.5 Explain how the proposed RL framework, including the ±1 metre variation and the absence of a spatially fixed transition in heights across each Activity Area, provides a clear and certain development envelope for the purpose of assessing future Restricted Discretionary Activity applications. In particular, explain how future consent authorities and landscape experts will determine the appropriate visibility baseline for buildings where the location and extent of RL transitions are not fixed within the planning framework.

3.6 Explain how adverse landscape and visual effects will be managed where Landscape Amenity Management Areas are established independently of, or in advance of, building development. Please also clarify whether the assessment of effects assumes that building design and Landscape Amenity Management Areas will always be consented and assessed concurrently. If so, please explain how the planning framework secures that outcome.

3.7 Provide a Zone of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) analysis for development in AA-H, that clearly reveals the extent of potential visibility from the Mata-au ONF area (including the publicly accessible tracks).

3.8 Explain the evidential basis for the conclusion that no development outcome enabled by the proposed zoning framework would result in visual effects greater than those illustrated in the submitted visual simulations. Identify the assumptions relied upon in reaching that conclusion and explain how those assumptions are secured through the proposed provisions.

3.9 Identify the relationship between the proposed roof form and roof pitch controls and the building forms illustrated in Document 5b, including whether the illustrated building typologies: generally fall within the proposed roof pitch range; and support the proposed provision that allows for flat roofed buildings.

4. Ecology

Lizard assessment

September RFI Request

(Q70) Provide an assessment of lizards and lizard habitat by a suitably qualified herpetologist, given that potential lizard habitats were identified.

Requestor Response

Please refer to Section 7.2 of the updated Ecological Assessment which has been amended for clarity. Habitats have been assessed by a herpetologist.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Additional information is being requested to understand the actual and potential effects of the implementation of the PPC.

4.1 Further information is required to enable the actual and potential effects of the implementation of the plan change on lizards to be understood, including a lizard survey of the site by a suitably qualified and experienced herpetologist.

Threatened or At Risk invertebrates

September RFI Request

(Q71) Explain why the presence of Cerius otagensis or other Threatened or at-risk invertebrates is not proposed to be determined as part of the plan change.

Requestor Response

The Ecological Assessment assumes C. otagensis is present on desert broom host plants and defers management to the time of a resource consent application. This is considered an appropriate time to undertake the assessment. Other points relating to this species:

a. C. otagensis has not been seen since 1981 and only four specimens have ever been found. It is likely to be highly cryptic and hard to find and recognise. Therefore, assuming it is present and managing as appropriate is safer than relying on a survey.
b. Populations could come and go over the years, so the most certain time is when consent is underway to ensure information is up to date.
c. There is only an effect where/if desert broom host plants are removed. This will not be determined until a resource consent application is prepared.
d. Effects management measures for desert broom will need to happen prior to development regardless, so the survey effort is not important at the plan change stage. Assuming their presence is a logical and efficient way to deal with this at the Plan Change stage (refer to Section 10.5 of the Ecological Assessment). This is included in the Plan Change provisions (see Rule 51.4.32 and relevant matter of control), as well as the appropriate protocols for survey and removal of host plants if any plants are affected. Survey methods will include a walkover survey by day and night, live-capture pitfall trapping (including by desert broom plants), beating broom plants by day and night, and light trapping at night for moths.

Further general point:

- Key habitats of Threatened or At Risk invertebrate species possibly present on site are all retained and/or enhanced through the Corbridge Resort Zone Structure Plan and provisions, except for possibly a few scattered desert broom plants in one area of grassland. Surveys are therefore not important for effects management.

Section 10.5 of the Ecological Assessment has been updated to incorporate this.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Additional information is being requested to understand the actual and potential effects of the PPC on threatened or At Risk invertebrates.

4.2 Further information is required to enable the actual and potential effects of the implementation of the plan change on Threatened or At Risk invertebrates to be understood, including an invertebrate survey of the site by a suitably qualified and experienced ecologist.

Habitat Loss

September RFI Request

(Q74) Explain why "*some habitat loss during works is likely unavoidable"* and other potential adverse effects on lizards are identified but "*…the overall effect is likely to be nil to positive without effects management*".

Requestor Response

This point relates to lizard habitat and fragmentation (not lizard death/injury) in Section 7.3. This outcome is anticipated because only a small amount of modified habitat will be removed during construction, but a substantially greater area of higher-quality habitat will be established prior to Stage 1 works. The overall outcome is therefore almost certainly positive for lizard habitat and connectivity. The Ecological Assessment has been updated for clarity (refer to Section 9.3).

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Additional information is being requested to confirm Council's expert has understood the response from the requestors regarding the initial further information request.

4.3 Concerning effects on lizards, the updated assessment says "…the overall effect is likely to be nil to positive without effects management". The Council interprets this to mean "…adverse effects are likely to be nil as only a small area of modified habitat will be removed, and following effects management effects may be positive" since the request includes establishment of higher-quality habitat. Please confirm if this is a correct interpretation.

Desert Broom Plants

September RFI Request

(Q75) Explain why removal of 14% of desert broom plants from the site is considered less than minor at the site scale and also why it would result in "*less than minor to nil*" effects on Cerius otagensis (if present) given this species' threat classification of 'Nationally Critical'.

Requestor Response

This relates to Section 9.1, which states that about 14 individual plants could be lost from the site (not 14% of plants from the site): *"Loss of approximately 14 scattered individuals of desert broom would occur, representing a small proportion of the population on site. This effect is considered less than minor without effects management. Effects can easily be managed to provide a net positive outcome (see Section 10)."* Wildland's opinion remains the same, that this is a less than minor effect. This is due to the large population present on the site, combined with the assumption that the substantial replanting of indigenous shrubland will include plenty of desert broom. The second part of this was inferred but has been made explicit in the updated Ecological Assessment.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

The Council is requesting additional information to better understand the effects of the proposal regarding desert broom beyond the initial response received from the requestor.

4.4 In the response, it is stated that "removal of 14% of desert broom plants" is incorrect and instead 14 individual plants will be removed. However, the total number of plants on site is estimated to be 100 (see Table 2 of the assessment). The Council is seeking further

information to understand the level of effects on desert broom, including whether the proposed plantings of this species will offset losses (and how this outcome is incorporated into the provisions).

Excavation

September RFI Request

(Q77) Provide an ecological assessment of the effects of excavation and shaping of the central lake and associated ponds as proposed in the Infrastructure Assessment (Patersons 20/08/2026), including how water levels, water quality and algal blooms will be managed and whether this could affect ecological values.

Requestor Response

No notable ecological values are present in the proposed lake area – it is just cropped land at present. Water levels, algal blooms and water quality are beyond the expertise of Wildlands. However, additions to Sections 9.1, 9.2 and 10.3 of the Ecological Assessment have been made in relation to effects assessment for the lake, relating to vegetation and avifauna. It is noted that the construction of the lake will require a resource consent, at which time detailed design will be undertaken and assessment of water levels, quality and agal blooms can be provided.

Information requested pursuant to cl23(2) of the First Schedule

Additional information is requested to better understand the effects of proposed excavations associated with the Zone's development in relation to the ecology present.

4.5 Additional information is requested to understand the effects of the pond construction on ecology, and if such effects have been assessed.

4.6 Further information is required to enable the effects of pond construction and operation on ecology to be assessed. Deferral of the assessment of effects of the pond construction to the resource consent application is not consistent with the remainder of the application where effects on ecological values etc. have been assessed. Further information is required to enable the effects of pond construction and operation to be assessed.

Yours sincerely, Nāku noa nā

Sean Cameron Widdowson