

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF HUW JONES ON BEHALF OF STEWART FAMILY ASSETS LIMITED

Summary of Evidence

1. My name is Huw Arthur Hodgins Jones. I am a Commercial Operations Manager at Calder Stewart. I have worked at Calder Stewart since May 2021. At Calder Stewart, I manage commercial operations across the property, energy and capital units. As part of my role, I have oversight of the asset management team and finance and treasury function of our funds business. I also work across Calder Stewart's front end property development, capital raising and energy projects.
2. Stewart Family Assets Limited (SFAL) owns approximately 513 ha of land at Colyer Road, Awarua (SFAL Land), within the Industrial 4 (Awarua) Zone (Zone). In my opinion, its scale, zoning, proximity to South Port and key primary industries, and the opportunity to pair it with 'behind the meter' renewable generation make it a rare 'powered land' opportunity for Southland. SFAL has applied for resource consent for a wind farm on the land.
3. That opportunity is already attracting strong interest from local and international occupiers. Ground has been broken on the first project, an approximately 14,000 m² industrial storage warehouse. Invest NZ has been marketing the SFAL Land as an 'Energy Hub', and one potential occupier, Southland Silicon Materials Limited, has announced plans for a silicon smelter that could employ 1,400 people.
4. In my opinion, the designation has two key commercial effects. First, the horizon mask and electromagnetic interference (EMI) limitation reduce the amount and type of activity the Zone would otherwise permit, and could prevent projects SFAL is currently discussing. Secondly, the uncertainty the designation creates is already deterring occupiers.
5. A key source of that uncertainty is the wording in the NOR and by extension the proposed conditions. As is clear from the various technical pieces of evidence, it is very challenging to understand exactly what effects are being protected against, what activities would cause issues for Space Ops or whether they can be mitigated. That uncertainty is currently and will in the future continue to have a deterrent effect to potential occupiers seeking to establish new operations on the SFAL Land.
6. For the larger projects SFAL is targeting, such as smelting, manufacturing and processing, it could take one to three years of detailed feasibility work and several million dollars before a proposal could be put to Space Ops for approval under the proposed conditions. It is commercially irrational to commit that capital where a third party retains a discretion to refuse. In practice, those projects will very likely not proceed to that stage and could be lost to the

region. I therefore do not consider that the condition regime proposed by Space Ops materially mitigates the effects of the prohibition originally sought.

7. It is also difficult to see how Space Ops would approve a request from a landowner to breach the Designation. Mr McNeill's evidence is that its customers demand that their agreed horizon remains unobstructed, and that failing to meet its existing commercial commitments would be "reputationally and financially disastrous". No obligation is proposed on Space Ops to mitigate, including on its own land.
8. I support the reporting planner's recommendation to exclude the Zone from the horizon mask, which would remove the height-related risk from the SFAL Land. The revised EMI Limitation condition also addresses some of SFAL's concerns, as ordinary buildings and energy infrastructure would not be caught merely because of incidental radiofrequency emissions. However, a qualifying new terrestrial radiocommunication service within 2 km, potentially including telemetry, SCADA or microwave equipment, would still be automatically prohibited. SFAL requires greater certainty on how the condition applies. Even then, the compliance burden and its technical complexity are still likely to deter potential occupiers.
9. As the reporting planner identified, the application did not assess adverse economic effects, and Space Ops' evidence includes no independent economic assessment of the effect on the SFAL Land. Mr Dunn's view that the effect on SFAL is "material but geographically limited" takes a narrow view of the activities proposed and overlooks the master planning and infrastructure works the land requires. My evidence and Mr Ballingall's economic modelling seek to show the specific impact and loss of economic development we see as a result of the NOR and proposed conditions.

Conclusion

10. SFAL supports the continued operation and growth of Space Ops and wants to develop economic benefits for Southland alongside it. Its concern is that the designation should not impose uniform and discretionary control over land deliberately zoned for large-scale industrial and renewable energy development, and purchased by SFAL at a price reflecting that potential.
11. The designation has had legal effect since it was lodged on 31 July 2025 and has already materially affected SFAL. I support excluding the Zone from the horizon mask, but the proposed EMI Limitation conditions would continue to cause significant barriers for future occupiers. Under Space Ops' proposed regime, there is a risk that Southland will lose a large amount of economic development potential.

Huw Arthur Hodgins Jones

28 September 2026