

**BEFORE THE QUEENSTOWN LAKES  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management  
Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of Plan Change 44 of the  
Queenstown Lakes District Plan

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE OF RICHARD TYLER FOR HENLEY DOWNS**

---

---

**ANDERSON LLOYD**  
LAWYERS  
QUEENSTOWN

Solicitor: M Baker-Galloway  
(maree.baker-galloway@andersonlloyd.co.nz)

Level 2,  
13 Camp Street,  
PO Box 201,  
QUEENSTOWN 9348  
DX ZP95010  
Tel 03 450 0700  
Fax 03 450 0799

## QUALIFICATIONS AND EXPERIENCE

- 1 My name is Richard Malcolm Tyler.
- 2 I am a Landscape Architect at Darby Partners Limited Queenstown with 4 years' experience in the Queenstown Lakes District.
- 3 I hold a Bachelor in Landscape Architecture with Honours at Lincoln University and am a registered Landscape Architect with the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architecture. I have 16 years' experience in the industry having worked for Boffa Miskell Limited in Auckland, Jasmax Architects in Auckland and Brady Shipman Martin in Dublin, Ireland. My expertise includes design management, landscape architecture, urban design and masterplanning. I have a sound understanding of the planning and approvals process and land based development projects.
- 4 I am the landscape architectural reviewer for the Jacks Point Residents and Owners Association, having reviewed a large number of applications during the 3 years with this role and have been involved in several other masterplanning projects at Jacks Point.
- 5 For this project Darby Partners provides masterplanning, project and design management services to Henley Downs Land Holdings, Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited, (Henley Downs) Willow Pond Farm Limited (the wetland) and Jacks Point Residents and Owners Association (JPROA) land. This conglomeration of land owners is termed as 'Jacks Point'.
- 6 In preparing this evidence I have reviewed:
  - (a) The reports and statements of evidence of other experts giving evidence relevant to my area of expertise, including:

- (i) Landscape evidence for PC44 prepared by Ben Espie landscape architect on behalf of RCL;
  - (ii) Landscape Assessment evidence for PC44 prepared by Yvonne Pluger on behalf of Henley Downs;
  - (iii) Planning evidence for PC44 prepared by Chris Ferguson on behalf of Henley Downs;
- (b) Landscape effects assessment report for PC44 prepared by Ben Espie landscape architect (Vivian + Espie, dated January 2013);
  - (c) Original Coneburn Area Wide Resource Study, which was co-ordinated by Darby Partners (October 2002) and used to inform the land use planning for the original Jacks Point design;
  - (d) Original Coneburn Development Controls – co-ordinated by Darby Partners (July 2003) used to provide guidance to everyone involved in development;
  - (e) Recent updates to the Resource Study, provided by Darby Partners / Boffa Miskell as part of PC44 for Hanley Downs. *Note my role included contribution to the updates and co-authoring the document and figures;*
  - (f) Updated Jacks Point structure plan and provisions now proposed;
  - (g) Technical landscape report accompanying S42a report prepared by Marion Read landscape architect;
  - (h) Technical urban design report accompanying S42a report prepared by Tim Williams urban designer.
  - (i) Planners S42a report (June 2015) ahead of reconvened hearing
  - (j) Submissions and other materials associated with PC44.

7 I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses in the Environment Court Practice Note. This evidence has been prepared in accordance with it and I agree to comply with it. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed.

## SCOPE OF EVIDENCE

- 8 I have been asked by Henley Downs Farm Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited ('Henley Downs') to prepare masterplanning evidence in relation to their submissions on Plan Change 44 ('PC44'). This includes:
- (a) Update to the Coneburn Resource Study
  - (b) Integrated Jacks Point Vision
  - (c) Hanley Downs Structure Plan - Background
  - (d) The Proposed PC44 Structure Plan
  - (e) Detailed Description of Activity Areas on Henley Downs Land
- 9 I confirm that I have visited the site of the plan change on numerous occasions and am familiar with the area through 4 years of working within and around the zone for Jacks Point as well as for private land owners.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 10 The Updated PC44 Structure Plan is the result of a collaborative agreed outcome for both RCL and Henley Downs land. The Plan sees refinements based on updates to the Coneburn Resource Study that were undertaken following notified PC44 and includes adjustments based on submissions that were made at the time. The plan also includes refinements to integrate Henley Downs in to the Jacks Point Zone under the District Plan review.
- 11 The maximum overall yield between the notified and updated Structure Plan is slightly less (2571 notified vs. 2467 proposed lots). The key difference is that there are refinements in the way the density is spread across the land area, to provide for a wider range of living environments for the future needs of people and an improved land management strategy for the Henley Downs Farm.

- 12 The key spatial refinements that are included in the amended Jacks Point structure plan and provisions for PC44 from the notified version can be summarised as follows:
- (a) Refinements to the Residential areas on RCL land (refer to Mr Espie and Well's evidence for areas R(HD)A-E). This includes:
    - (i) Adjustments to the internal boundaries between residential activity areas;
    - (ii) Nominating a range of density rather than a maximum only (as was presented in the notified version);
    - (iii) Inclusion of indicative road connections within activity areas relating to removal of requirement for an Outline Development Plan;
    - (iv) Inclusion of indicative open space areas and pedestrian routes;
  - (b) Introduction of "Farm Preserve" Areas FP 1 and 2 that anticipate large homesite rural living and management of open space on the lower southern slopes of Peninsula Hill. Under the Plan Change as notified this area fell within the ACRAA;
  - (c) Inclusion of an Education Innovation Campus in Hanley Downs. The area flagged for the EIC was also proposed for ACRAA under the Plan Change as notified;

## UPDATE TO THE CONEBURN RESOURCE STUDY

- 13 The 2002 Coneburn Study remains the main guiding tool underpinning all landuse and management based decisions at Jacks Point. Its purpose is to provide a framework to guide growth by way of landscape constraint and opportunity mapping. To undertake a comprehensive review of the PC44 Structure Plan it was deemed necessary to provide an update to the Study to encapsulate 13 years of change since the original document was produced. This document is included as Attachment 1, with associated figures 1A–1H.
- 14 The process, undertaken following the notified PC44 was a collaboration between Darby Partners (Masterplanning) and Boffa Miskell (Landscape Assessment and Planning) and included:
  - (a) An analysis of the landscape resource including any changes that have occurred since the original study was produced;
  - (b) Updates to the Resource Analysis and Assessment;
  - (c) Refinements to the Landuse and Landscape Management Strategy.
- 15 The key findings of the Study update as reflected in the Landuse and Management Strategy (Attachment 1H) include:
  - (a) Amendment of the State Highway 6 Visual Corridor to include existing Jacks Point mitigation and proposed 6m high mitigation treatment on the flat land within the North of Hanley Downs, while retaining the open rural landscape characteristics and views to distant mountain peaks. The mitigation allows for updates to potential landuse including:
    - (i) Inclusion of the EIC area;
    - (ii) More certainty around visibility of R\_HD\_SH-1 & 2 residential areas from State Highway 6;
    - (iii) All low lying Henley Downs land to have potential for medium to high density development;
  - (b) Refinements to the Peninsula Hill Landscape Protection Area – A more detailed assessment was undertaken on the Peninsula Hill

landform that highlighted two distinctive folds in the roche moutonee landform provide a significantly higher capacity to absorb development than the remainder of the landform with its generally highly visible slopes. This enabled a more refined landscape protection overlay and area with potential for low density rural farm living;

- (c) Inclusion of the Outstanding Natural Landscape line (C90 / 2005). This line was subsequently used to refine activity areas on the Structure Plan - to be described in more detail later in my evidence;
- 16 This update provides a comprehensive spatial analysis tool and in my opinion provides support for the proposed PC44 Structure Plan and associated plan change provisions for Jacks Point. It will also be used in the upcoming District Plan review.

## **INTEGRATED JACKS POINT VISION**

- 17 The existing Jacks Point zone is an exemplary example of a sustainable living community. Dwellings are integrated with or subservient to the landscape, with neighbourhoods separated by a framework of open space and public trail network. Planting within both public and private areas is derived from endemic plant communities and there is rigorous design control over the external appearance, form and location of architecture, resulting in visually recessive built form. It remains true to the intentions of the original Coneburn Resource Study and Development Framework for a resort township.
- 18 Within the current Jacks Point Residential Neighbourhoods and the Preserve there are two distinct property types as follows:
- (a) Larger sized standard residential sections generally 600 - 1200m<sup>2</sup> in size – double car garage and high standard of design control;
  - (b) Preserve sites approximately 1 – 2Ha in size with a high standard of design control and open space planting requirement.
- 19 If the wider Jacks Point Resort Zone were to be developed under the Operative District Plan it would yield approximately 2,900 residential homes / units. This would include:

- (a) Existing developed Jacks Point Neighbourhoods (with allowance for some 100 additional comprehensive sites to be realised under the operative Density Masterplan);
  - (b) Existing developed Jacks Point Preserve;
  - (c) Undeveloped Jacks Point and Hanley Downs Village;
  - (d) Undeveloped Hanley Downs Residential Areas.
- 20 The updated PC44 Structure Plan compared with the Operative Plan proposes an increase of approximately 840 homes to a total of 3,740 residential homes / units. Assuming the New Zealand average population per home of 2.5 people per home this could equate to a future population of around 8,750 people living at Jacks Point, just under the combined population of Wanaka (5,000 people) and Cromwell (4,000 people). If 100 homes were constructed each year it would take over 35 years for Jacks Point to be fully developed.
- 21 This growth is consistent with guiding documents such as Tomorrow's Queenstown 2002 and the Growth Management Strategy 2007, which highlight Jacks Point as part of the 'Long Term Urban Growth Boundary', included with Frankton, Queenstown and Kelvin Heights.
- 22 A projected town of this size demands a comprehensive and integrated approach underpinned by best practise growth strategy for sustainable management and use of the land.
- 23 The concept behind the proposed joint RCL / JPL Structure Plan is based on the 'Urban to Rural Transect' – a framework for urban settlement pattern (Attachment 2). The Transect describes a transition from dense through to sparsely populated environments, similar to the sequence of natural habitats. Some benefits of this approach are:
- (a) Walkable, transit-connected communities;
  - (b) Context-based thoroughfare design and engineering;
  - (c) Affordable housing and income diversity;
  - (d) Various types of living environments to suit a range of people;
  - (e) Regional, local, and individual food production;
  - (f) Reduction of environmental impacts and costs of infrastructure.



- 24 Taking guidance from this concept, the proposed Plan seeks to provide a range of living opportunities from smaller terrace housing through to larger farm blocks. Density is focused on areas with higher ability to absorb change, whilst more prominent land is preserved and enhanced with provision for rural living opportunities. This cross section of living opportunities provides for a range of demographic and a more diverse community.
- 25 At a site level guidance is taken from the location within the Transect as to the treatment of roading, open space treatment setbacks and other urban design features. Elements are designed based on their intended function, rather than adopting a standard survey / engineering regime that might be considered under a conventional subdivision.
- 26 An example of this tailored approach is the existing roads within Jacks Point neighbourhoods. These were designed outside of QLDC standards to better suit the needs of the neighbourhoods, with features such as kerbless edges, planted swales, narrow carriageway widths and shared pedestrian areas. This approach was well documented within the original Coneburn Development Controls for Jacks Point, and part of the philosophy to create exceptional living environments and village communities centred around open space and rural activities.

## **HANLEY DOWNS STRUCTURE PLAN - BACKGROUND**

- 27 I will briefly provide background to the evolution of the Hanley Downs Structure Plan since its conception as part of the Jacks Point Resort Zone in 2002.
- 28 The operative Jacks Point structure plan (Attachment 3) consists of a series of hamlet style residential pods within a framework of open space, similar to the existing Jacks Point neighbourhoods. This approach was designed as part of the original resort township concept taking guidance from the initial Coneburn Resource Study and Development Controls.
- 29 Since then population growth and demand for affordable housing on smaller sections led to the submission of the RCL 2013 notified Structure Plan. (Attachment 4). This Plan replaced the hamlet style pods with a single residential urban area that could be laid out in a more

structured network of streets, pocket parks and other features typical of an urban neighbourhood.

- 30 Since 2013 RCL and HD have reworked the Structure Plan so that it integrates back into the Jacks Point zone (instead of being promoted as a separate new zone as was done in 2013). The Structure plan now agreed between RCL and HD proposes improvements to the plan - mostly reflected in refinements around the edges of the higher density residential area and treatment of the rural areas of the zone. (Attachment 5). A mix of lower density residential and rural farm lots provide a fine grain transition to the rural landscape based on updated Coneburn Study constraints mapping. *Note the plan will be discussed in more detail in the following section - the image is provided as a comparison with the previous versions. Potential dwelling locations are indicative only.*

## THE PROPOSED PC44 STRUCTURE PLAN

- 31 The proposed Plan has been produced jointly between RCL (the original Submitters of PC44) and Henley Downs (Attachment 6). It is shown over the aerial photo to visualise the relationship with existing landscape features.
- 32 As the District Plan review is imminent, future aspirations for Jacks Point that will be sought through the District Plan Review are indicated to ensure good planning and an integrated cross boundary approach, including road connections, public access routes, rationalisation of open space activity areas and adjustments to activity area boundaries.
- 33 *Note that changes were made to the Structure Plan following the QLDC June 2015 section 42A report to provide greater certainty around the outcome of some areas and to address landscape concerns. These changes are:*
- (a) *Inclusion of homesite areas within the FP-2 area rather than leaving determination of sites to be confirmed through the consenting process;*
  - (b) *Continuation of State Highway mitigation through R(HD-SH)-2 to support possible removal of existing vegetation (if this may occur);*

- (c) *The FP-1 activity area line where it meets FP-2 has been pulled back to the ONL line, ie what used to be FP-1 within the ONL line is now FP-2;*
  - (d) *The slightly more intensive residential R(HD)-F activity area line has been adjusted back to flat land more capable of absorbing residential development - and replaced by FP-1 area with a more predominant open space component.*
- 34 A diagram of land owners within PC 44 and adjacent to it is shown as two colours (Attachment 7). The outline of the Proposed PC44 Structure Plan Activity Areas is indicated in blue to help understand the relationship between the Structure Plan and land owners. Note that Preserve Lots 34, 36 and 29 are shown in blue and are under contract to be acquired by Jacks Point. The green line represents the boundary of the Notified Plan Change Area where it now otherwise departs from the solid black line for the Plan Change Area as now agreed.
- 35 A summary of masterplanning concepts for the proposed Structure Plan is as follows. *Note that a more detailed comparison between the notified and updated Structure Plan will be provided later in my evidence:*

**Within RCL Land:**

- (a) Generally higher density residential living area to support suburban growth, with opportunity for a structured road layout and neighbourhood parks on the flat land. This concept remains similar to that on the notified plan.

**Within Jacks Point Land:**

- (b) Low Density Residential Edges:

Provision for low density residential living around the edges of the higher density residential land. The function of these areas is to perform an immediate transition to the more open rural landscape with a softening of the residential edge. These activity areas are R(HD-SH)-2, R(HD)-F and R(HD)-G with a proposed range of lot size between 455 - 7,000m<sup>2</sup>. This is a similar concept that existed on the notified plan, but in my opinion applied better on the proposed plan - distributed over a slightly wider land area and with a more specific density range.

(c) Wetland:

The Structure Plan has provision for protection of the wetland area. This area may be enhanced or improved outside of the structure plan to improve ecological and landscape values.

(d) Farm Preserve 1:

There is provision for smaller farm preserve blocks on the Tablelands (FP-1). Lot sizes will likely range from roughly 1,500 – 4,000m<sup>2</sup> in size, based on a Spatial layout plan proposed to be approved by Council. This landuse will provide a transition from the low lying high density residential land to the elevated tablelands preserve sites and golf course, allowing for private land based opportunities such as revegetation planting, small scale grazing or cropping. The concept for this area is that buildings will remain subservient to the landscape, consistent with the original vision for the Tablelands and as applied to the existing Jacks Point Preserve.

(e) The landform within FP-1 is defined by a series of gully systems running from west to east providing a natural drainage system towards the wetland and low lying residential land to the east. Vegetation cover is largely defined by two fencelines - the first running east west to the top of the R(HD)-G area, the second running north south from midway down the R(HD)-G area to the south. To the east of this fenceline and west of the wetland are two distinct exposed rock landforms between the main gullies, providing an immediate backdrop to the high density low lying residential land. A mixed cover of grey shrubland exists north and east of this fenceline, with an open pastoral character to the more intensively grazed part of the site.

(f) Two open space corridors are noted on the Structure Plan to provide a link through the FP-1 activity area from the low lying high density residential land to the Tablelands. These corridors provide a structural anchor for open space within the FP-1 area, and are located within the two main gully systems within the landform.

(g) On the proposed spatial layout plan open space management and revegetation will be required to build on these open space corridors, other existing gullies and wider areas of existing grey

shrubland. Other areas of open space may include shared farm blocks on the existing pastoral land to be kept free of buildings, and rocky hummocky terrain where building would be limited by landform.

- (h) The FP-1 area extends to the south to include the extent of recessed landform and existing quarry - to be described in the following section.

- (i) Farm Preserve 2:

A farm preserve area (FP-2) is included with allowance for two large farm blocks. Buildings can be located in defined homesites located within areas of Peninsula Hill capable of absorbing change. This will provide opportunity for large farm based management including grazing or environmental enhancement. Further subdivision may occur subject to council's discretion. This rural land will appear undeveloped from the rest of the Jacks Point Zone, the State Highway and Lake Wakatipu by way of the Peninsula Hill Landscape Protection area and outstanding natural landscape overlays;

- (j) Education Innovation Campus

Inclusion of an Education Innovation Campus (EIC) - to provide for facilities such as school, technology campus or other similar community based opportunity. This land use has a major open space component allowing a transition from high density residential to rural land, supported by proposed mitigation along the northern boundary. To ensure planning provisions correctly aligned with the proposed landuse Darby Partners has undertaken an analysis of similar situations to analyse site coverage and building height. (Attachment 8). Both examples in urban areas (Christchurch Polytechnic and Auckland Film Studios) have a high site coverage in part due to reduced car parking from greater availability of public transport, walking and cycling. Park City Studios, Utah, Lincoln University and Queenstown Primary School all have site coverage around 20%. On this basis a 20% site coverage and a 10m maximum height limit were chosen to allow for the range of activities anticipated for the EIC area.

- (k) The EIC activity area is strategically located with direct access to the State Highway (to avoid traffic effects on residential amenity), while open space pedestrian networks allow walking and cycling opportunities from within the Jacks Point zone.

(l) State Highway Mitigation:

State Highway Mitigation is proposed consistent with existing Jacks Point planting and mounding to provide certainty around visibility from State Highway 6 and retention of views to distant mountain peaks.

### **COMPARISON BETWEEN NOTIFIED AND PROPOSED STRUCTURE PLAN**

- 36 A detailed comparison between the notified and proposed Structure Plans has been prepared (Attachment 9), with the notified plan shown in blue. The anticipated densities and yields is shown on Attachment 10. I will briefly describe the proposed activity areas on Jacks Point Land as follows:
- 37 Activity Area R(HD)-E (on Jacks Point Land) has been subtly refined to align with site contours. The density remains similar to that notified. The extent of the activity area where it joins the wetland has been sited to allow for protection and enhancement of the wetland and its margin.
- 38 Activity Area R(HD)-F is fully contained within Jacks Point Land on flat low lying land capable of a range of densities, intended to provide a transition to the Peninsula Hill landform. The extent of the area is defined by the base of the south eastern part of the peninsula Hill Landscape Protection Zone and follows a well-defined line of landform and vegetation. A public access route runs through a gully system between areas R(HD)-F and G and extends through the Farm Preserve 1 area to the Tablelands.
- 39 The notified Plan showed a single homesite (area H) in a similar location, with the high density residential activity area extending to the edge of the activity area.
- 40 Area R(HD)-G has expanded from the notified area I to include the entire extent of the slightly recessed sloping landform, as generally

contained within the grazed paddock and fencelines. The density range remains similar.

- 41 Area J on the notified plan (100 lots @ 630m<sup>2</sup>size) and Area K (4 lots @ 1Ha size) has been distributed across a wider land area to Farm Preserve 1(FP-1) Activity Area with additional provision for open space protection / enhancement and public access. The yield of lots under FP-1 will be less than was originally proposed for areas J and K and at a reduced density;
- 42 The FP-1 activity area (and subsequent plan change boundary) includes the existing Jacks Point quarry land to provide an end use and reinstatement regime for the quarry. This additional land will potentially support a land swap whereby the wetland will be vested to JPROA, and the quarry land acquired for residential development under FP-1;
- 43 Farm Preserve 2 (FP-2) Activity Area encompasses all remaining land to the north of FP-1 and to the west of OSL / Highway Landscape Protection and EIC Areas. Building is provided for within two large homesite areas -contained within subtle depressions in the undulating landform and outside of the Landscape Protection Areas. These homesites are roughly 1 Hectare in size to allow a cluster of farm and accessory buildings. Access to the homesites will follow existing farm tracks along the base of each of the gullies between the two Peninsula Hill landforms, leading out to Woolshed road along the north of the EIC area;
- 44 State Highway mitigation is proposed adjacent to State Highway 6 directly east of Activity Area R(HD-SH)-1, and to the north of Activity Area R(HD-SH)-2. The intention is to maintain consistency with existing mounding and planting running alongside R(JP-SH)-4 or Jacks Point Neighbourhood 7 to the south. The second portion of mitigation to the north of EIC Area (also a combination of mounding and planting) will buffer views in to site when travelling south along the State Highway 6. For the purposes of the structure plan all mitigation is assumed to be 6m, and will be detailed at the resource consent stage for R(HD-SH)-1, R(HD-SH)-2 and EIC Areas.
- 45 Area R(HD)-SH-1 is similar to area B on the notified plan in extent and density and is supported by proposed mitigation along State Highway 6. Area R(HD-SH)-2 extends out towards Woolshed road and allows for

small rural lots consistent with the two existing dwellings, also supported by proposed mitigation along the northern boundary;

- 46 The Education Innovation Campus (EIC) has been included to the flat land to the north of area R(HD)-A, supported by proposed mitigation. It is intended that mitigation could be integrated with the open space component of this area.

## CONCLUSION

- 47 The two key concepts underpinning the proposed revised PC44 Structure Plan for Jacks Point are the Coneburn Resource Study – as updated in 2015, and principles adopted from the ‘Urban to Rural Transect’.
- 48 The key change to the proposed Structure Plan from notified is the specification of a wider range of low density and rural based living environments around the edges of the suburban residential land, inclusion of two large farm blocks and the EIC area. Overall the yield is slightly less with some higher density residential areas being either replaced or refined to allow for lower density lots distributed over a wider area. The rural lots provide opportunity for improved land management, restoration and enhancement and a finer grain of management that a single farm block regime would allow.
- 49 The proposed Structure Plan provides a long term framework for growth at Jacks Point and ensures a sustainable use of the landscape resource. Once complete Jacks will accommodate a range of living, employment, recreational and business opportunities of a similar scale to that provided in Queenstown or Wanaka.
- 50 It will enable certainty around resources such as infrastructure and will not lead to adhoc subdivision development as all potential land-use and development is considered in a co-ordinated manner under the framework of landscape and constraints based mapping.



DATED 26<sup>th</sup> June 2015

Richard Malcolm Tyler

## APPENDICES

|               |   |
|---------------|---|
| Attachment 1  | Updated Coneburn Resource Study Document        |
| Attachment 1A | Updated Tenure & Existing Landuse               |
| Attachment 1B | Updated District Plan Zoning                    |
| Attachment 1C | Updated Ecology / Vegetation                    |
| Attachment 1D | Updated Visibility Analysis                     |
| Attachment 1E | Updated State Highway Mitigation                |
| Attachment 1F | Updated Landscape Character                     |
| Attachment 1G | Updated Potential to Absorb Change              |
| Attachment 1H | Updated Landuse & Landscape Management Strategy |
| Attachment 2  | Urban to Rural Transect                         |
| Attachment 3  | Jacks Point Resort Zone – Existing              |
| Attachment 4  | PC44 – Notified March 2013                      |
| Attachment 5  | PC44 – RCL / Jacks Point June 2015              |
| Attachment 6  | PC44 Structure Plan                             |
| Attachment 7  | PC44 Land Ownership – Overlay                   |
| Attachment 8  | EIC Study – Site Coverage                       |
| Attachment 9  | PC44 Structure Plan – Overlay                   |
| Attachment 10 | PC44 Structure Plan Area Analysis Schedule      |