

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

**Appendix 2: 'PA Specific Submissions
Summary, Landscape Comments Table' and
'Response to Submissions Version of the
PA Schedule' (ordered by PA)**

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(a) 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill PA ONF

21.22.1 PA ONF Peninsula Hill: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The Peninsula Hill ONF encompasses the elevated roche moutonnée landform of Peninsula Hill which frames the south side of Whakatipu Waimāori's (Lake Whakatipu's) Frankton Arm. Along its north and west boundaries, the PA ONF adjoins urban zoned land at Kelvin Peninsula. The southern part of the ONF coincides with the Jacks Point Zone (Exception Zone) and the Jacks Point Urban Growth Boundary. The south boundary adjoins the Jacks Point Zone Tablelands and Homesites area. The eastern boundary adjoins urban zoned land including Hanley Downs and the Coneburn SHA.

Commented [BG1]: OS 183.31 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Mana whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. Largely unmodified roche moutonnée glacial landform of Peninsula Hill with a smoother and more coherent 'up ice' slope to the southwest/south, and a steeper rough 'plucked' slope extending from the northeast around to the northwest. Highest point: 834m. This form indicates the direction of travel of the glacier that formed the roche moutonnée clearly.
2. Exposed and irregular rock faces and outcrops, landslips and loose boulders throughout the north-western, northern and north-eastern flanks with thin soil cover.
3. Two elevated landform 'ribs' extending on a west to east alignment on the south side of the hill.
4. Further afield, the roche moutonnée of Peninsula Hill is linked to the roche moutonnée of Jacks Point Hill by the Tablelands - a hummocky elevated area formed by glacial processes.

Important hydrological features:

5. A series of steep gullies draining from the western, northern, and eastern hill slopes to the Frankton Arm of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) or the Kawarau River.
6. Shallow gullies (including localised wetlands) draining the lower-lying landform ribs to the south of the hill in an easterly direction and which eventually discharge into the Kawarau River.
7. A series of small tarns, formed in topographic depressions in the bedrock left by glacial processes, around the crest of Peninsula Hill and the lower north-western hill slopes.

Commented [BG2]: OS 183.32 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

8. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. Swathes and scattered pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri, occur across the hillslopes with more extensive areas associated with the steeper bluffy terrain overlooking Frankton and Frankton Arm.

9. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
 - a. Grazed pasture covers the lower southeastern slopes facing the Remarkables, while rough pasture (exotic grassland) occurs on the southern and western side of the hill.
 - b. Mixed exotic tree plantings throughout the north-western lower slopes in the vicinity of the access from Kelvin Peninsula.
10. Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
11. Plant pest species include wilding pines, hawthorn, broom and sweet briar. Woody weeds cover much of the north facing slopes including the bluffy terrain overlooking Frankton and the Kawarau River.

Important Land-use patterns and features:

12. Grazed pasture is the dominant land use across the PA. Associated with this activity is a network of farm tracks throughout the north-western and northern slopes that provide access between Kelvin Peninsula and the hilltop which is also used for paid scenic drive and animal encounter activities, and throughout the lower-lying rib/gully landforms to the south of the hill 'proper' (accessed from Hanley Downs and Jacks Point).
13. Other human modification is limited to: a cluster of communication towers on the hilltop; a dwelling on the north-eastern edge of the ONF (on Peninsula Road); and a dwelling on the south-western edge (accessed via Preserve Drive).
14. The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) at Jacks Point Zone includes the lower-lying ribs and gullies to the south of the hill. Much of this area is zoned Landscape Protection Area (LPA) under the Jacks Point zone and provides an important counterpoint or 'offset' for the urban and rural living development at Jacks Point and Hanley Downs. Within the LPA, policy focuses on enabling low-intensity pastoral farming and landscape restoration. A dwelling is anticipated in a localised hollow at the western end of the uppermost gully with a second dwelling anticipated adjacent the south boundary of the ONF. A range of location-specific assessment criteria and development controls are included in the zone provisions to guide an appropriate development outcome. Walking and cycling trails are also anticipated linking between Hanley Downs, Jacks Point and the existing track along the edge of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) (within PA ONL Homestead Bay).
15. State Highway 6 which runs along the outside of the north-eastern edge of the ONF.

Commented [BG3]: Typographical correction to align with standard Schedule format.

Commented [BG4]: OS 183.38 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

Commented [BG5]: OS 183.26 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.
OS 183.38 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

16. Rees or Boyes Cottage (archaeological site F41/761) at the base of Peninsula Hill.

Mana whenua features and their locations:

17. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
18. The north-eastern extent of the ONF overlaps the mapped wāhi tūpuna Tititea. Tititea was a pā located on the south side of the Kawarau River near Whakatipu Waimāori.

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

Mana whenua associations and experience:

19. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
20. Kāi Tahu tradition tells of an incident where a 280 strong war party was repelled from this area and chased to the top of the Crown Range, which is now named Tititea in memory of this incident.
21. The mana whenua values associated with Peninsula Hill and Tititea include, but may not be limited to, kāika and tauraka waka.

Important historic attributes and values:

22. The association of the hill with W. G. Rees' early sheep run.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

23. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
24. The popularity of the views across the Frankton Arm to Peninsula Hill, (partially flanked and backdropped by the Remarkables) as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.
25. The identity of the area as an important gateway feature on the south side of Queenstown.
26. The landmark qualities of the landform as a reference point in views from Queenstown.
27. The popularity of the recreational 'features' listed below.

Important recreation attributes and values:

28. The popularity of the area as a tourism destination: as a breeding and finishing farm with deer, sheep, cattle, goats, donkeys, pigs, and miniature horses, many of which can be fed by the public as paid visitors of Deer Park Heights. The area also has a number of film location attractions and picnic spots. Access by vehicle only.
29. Walking and cycling on the Jacks Point Trail (part of the Queenstown Trail) that runs along the western edge of the PA ONF Peninsula Hill (trail is located within PA ONL Homestead Bay).
30. SH6 as a key scenic route in very close proximity.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

31. The area's natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above) which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial, slope and fluvial processes.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

32. Engaging and attractive long-range views from the Frankton Arm, Queenstown, Frankton (including the airport), SH6, Queenstown Hill, the Queenstown Gondola, Queenstown Gardens, and the Frankton Track to the rugged and dramatic north-western, northern, and north-eastern hill slopes. From this orientation the open and distinctive roche moutonnée landform is highly legible and its generally undeveloped character forms a memorable contrast with the fringe of urban development along its base. The waters of the Frankton Arm seen in the foreground of view along with the Remarkables in the background of the outlook add to the scene, establishing it as one of the key vistas associated with Queenstown.
33. Intermittent closer-range views from Kelvin Peninsula that afford an appreciation of the rocky and 'plucked' landform character and dynamic nature of the northwest to northeast side of the hill. The contrast established by this natural landform backdrop seen within an urban context adds to the memorability and appeal of such views.
34. Highly attractive and memorable close to long-range views from the Jacks Point Trail to the south of Peninsula Hill across the undulating tablelands to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, flanked by Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and the distant peaks of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), ~~Mount Dewar~~ and Coronet Peak. The careful siting and design of rural living and urban development within the Jacks Point zone means that, where visible, built development is subservient to the natural landscape in these views.
35. Memorable 'gateway' views from SH6 to the southern and eastern sides of the hill and which screen views to Queenstown. The dominance of the landform feature by virtue of its proximity, scale, distinctive physical form, and undeveloped character, together with the limited awareness of urban development at Jacks Point, adds to the scene.
36. Attractive mid and long-range views from Jacks Point, Hanley Downs, and Coneburn SHA to the southern and/or eastern hill slopes. These orientations afford an appreciation of the rugged character of the eastern side of the feature and the smoother and more coherent landform character on the southern side. The mountainous backdrop against which the feature is seen together with its visual dominance (as a consequence of its scale, proximity, and appearance) and visual connection to the patterning of open and undeveloped hummocky terrain in the foreground of view (which is a fundamental development strategy of the Jacks Point zone) adds to the appeal of the outlook.
37. Appealing longer-range views westbound on the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road. In these views there is an awareness of the scale and form of the landscape feature rising out of the low-lying fans, deltas and hummocky terrain throughout the Coneburn valley. This theme of contrast is reinforced by the legible patterning of urban development (existing or anticipated) across the majority of the valley floor juxtaposed against the undeveloped roche moutonnée. At higher elevations along the road the broader mountain setting adds to the spectacle.
38. Highly attractive mid and long-range views from ~~Whakatipu-wai-Māori~~ Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) to the west and southwest to the smoother western and southern roche moutonnée slopes. From this orientation, ~~built development within the Jacks Point zone is largely screened from view, or, where visible, difficult to see.~~

Commented [BG6]: OS 183.47 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

Commented [BG7]: OS 77.36 Kai Tahu ki Otago. OS 188.36 Elisha Young-Ebert.

Commented [BG8]: Grammar correction BGLA.

39. Engaging and seemingly 'close-range' views from planes approaching or exiting Queenstown airport via the Frankton Arm. Such views offer an appreciation of the rugged nature of the northern hill slopes and the broader glacial landscape context within which the roche moutonnée is set.
40. In all of the views, the dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes is evident within the ONF along with the very limited extent and generally subservient nature of built development within the ONF and the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpinning the high quality of the outlook.

Naturalness attributes and values:

41. The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Peninsula Hill set within an urban context, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to its pastoral, tourism, and infrastructure use are visible, the very low number of buildings, the relatively modest scale of tracks and limited visibility of infrastructure on top limits their influence on the character of the landform as a natural landscape element.
42. The irregular patterning and proliferation of grey shrubland, exposed rock faces, and areas of visible erosion in places adds to the perception of naturalness.

Memorability attributes and values:

43. The appealing and engaging views of the largely undeveloped and highly legible roche moutonnée landform of Peninsula Hill. The juxtaposition of the landscape feature within an urban context, along with its location on a key scenic highway route and the airport approach path, and the magnificent mountain and lake context within which it is seen in many views, are also factors that contribute to its memorability.

Transient attributes and values:

44. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the roche moutonnée slopes.

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

45. The juxtaposition of the generally undeveloped 'natural' landform in close proximity to Queenstown contributes to an impression of wildness, and the experience afforded from locations such as the Jacks Point Trail and ~~Whakatipu-wai-Maori~~ Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) to the west and southwest, where views of Peninsula Hill are generally unencumbered by visible built development contributes an impression of remoteness.

Commented [BG9]: OS 183.23 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

Commented [BG10]: OS 77.36 Kai Tahu ki Otago. OS 188.36 Elisha Young-Ebert.

Commented [BG11]: OS 183.23 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

Aesthetic attributes and values:

46. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
47. More specifically, this includes:
 - a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the generally undeveloped roche moutonnée landform, juxtaposed beside an urban context or natural lake/mountain setting.
 - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. the clearly legible roche moutonnée landform profile and character;
 - ii. the open and pastoral character of Peninsula Hill;
 - iii. the distinctly rugged character of the northern side of the feature and the more coherent appearance of the southern side of the feature as a consequence of the landform and vegetation character; and,

iv. the very limited level of built modification evident through the ONF.

48. It is noted that control of plant pests species such as wilding pines can temporarily detract from aesthetic values.

Commented [BG12]: Typographical correction.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA ONF Peninsula Hill can be summarised as follows:

49. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.

50. **High associative values** relating to:

- a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
- b. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
- c. The recreational attributes of the ONF.

51. **Very High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Queenstown, Frankton, SH6, Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), the Jacks Point and Frankton Trails, Kelvin Peninsula, Hanley Downs, Coneburn SHA, Jacks Point, the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road, and the airport approach path, along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
- c. A high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of the more natural landscape across Peninsula Hill.
- d. A sense of remoteness and wildness primarily as a consequence of the landform's proximity to Queenstown and urban development within the Coneburn valley and the overt contrast established by its scale, naturalness and dramatic appearance within an urban context. From some orientations on the lake and local trail network, the very limited visibility of built development in the wider outlook establishes Peninsula Hill as part of the expansive natural landscape.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONF Peninsula Hill for a range of activities is set out below.

i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for **small scale and low key** activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise

Commented [BG13]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONF values.

Commented [BG14]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – no** landscape capacity for tourism related activities. **Excepting in relation to the two homesites within the Jacks Point zone and consented dwellings within the PA at Hanleys Farm, no** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities.

Commented [BG15]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG16]: OS 181.5 Henley Downs Ltd.

- iii. **Urban expansions – no** landscape capacity.

- iv. **Intensive agriculture – no** landscape capacity.

- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.

- vi. **Farm buildings – very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character in lower-lying flat land within the ONF.

- vii. **Mineral extraction – no** landscape capacity.

- viii. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONF values. **No** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.

Commented [BG17]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG18]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of the National Grid and utilities such as overhead lines, or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.

Commented [BG19]: OS 70.9 Transpower. OS 86.7 Melissa Brook.

Commented [BG20]: OS 183.7 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

- x. **Renewable energy generation – no** landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy developments. **Very limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.

- xi. **Production forestry – no** landscape capacity.

Commented [BG21]: Typographical correction.

- xii. **Rural living – very limited to no** landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; is designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).

Commented [BG22]: OS 183.7 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd. OS 183.70 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd. OS 183.76 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd. OS 21.4 Mee Holdings Ltd.

Commented [BG23]: OS 183.7 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd. OS 183.76 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd. OS 21.4 Mee Holdings Ltd.

21.22.1 Peninsula Hill PA ONF Schedule

August 2023 Final

Blue highlighted text: captured in “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill PA ONF Schedule”. New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text: relates to a submission point that has not be captured in the “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill PA ONF Schedule”. This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **One example identified.**

Green wash line item: Submission point re-notified 22 June 2023.

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS21.4	Ben Gresson On Behalf Of Mee Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the capacity rating be amended in landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill to include some capacity for tourism related activities, rural living and urban expansion.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in response to OS 183.7.	Accept submission in part.
OS22.4	Ben Gresson On Behalf Of Scope Resources Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill be amended to include some capacity for cleanfill to be deposited in hidden gullies in this landscape.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. ONFs typically have a particularly high sensitivity to earthworks changes due to their limited size/extent. In addition, in this instance, the largely unmodified roche moutonnée geomorphology of the ONF heightens this sensitivity to landform modification via earthworks. As a consequence, Schedule 21.22.1 acknowledges the capacity for very limited earthworks for activities/elements that are established within the ONF (farm and public tracks).	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>While it may be possible to deposit clean fill in visually discreet locations (hidden gullies), the change to the landform would inevitably detract from the physical values of the ONF, more specifically: as a largely unmodified roche moutonnée; and its shallow gully patterning. For this reason, it is not considered appropriate to include specific reference to clean fill activities.</p>	
OS22.5	Ben Gresson On Behalf Of Scope Resources Limited	Oppose	That reference to earthworks be included after reference to farm in the landscape capacity for landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill.	<p>The submission is unspecific as to the types of farm earthworks that it seeks to include reference to.</p> <p>Schedule 21.21.1 acknowledges that there is very limited capacity for earthworks in relation to farm access. Based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process and the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal, it is my assessment that the ONF is likely to be highly sensitive to other farm related earthworks such as farm quarries, irrigation ponds etc.</p>	Reject submission.
OS70.9	Ainsley McLeod on behalf of Transpower	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.1 Capacity (ix) as follows:</p> <p>Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of <u>the National Grid and</u> utilities such as overhead lines, <u>cell phone towers, navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.</u></p> <p>NB the response to OS 70.9 has been coordinated with the response to OS 86.7.</p>	Accept submission subject to refinement.
OS77.36	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill paragraphs 38 and 45 be amended to correct the	<p>Agree with this submission point.</p> <p>Amend Schedule 21.22.1 [38] as follows:</p> <p>Highly attractive mid and long-range views from <u>Whakatipu wai-Māori Whakatipu Waimāori</u> (Lake Whakatipu) to the west</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	<p>and southwest to the smoother western and southern roche moutonnée slopes. From this orientation built development within the Jacks Point zone is largely screened from view, or, where visible, difficult to see.</p> <p>Amend Schedule 21.22.1 [45] as follows:</p> <p>The juxtaposition of the generally undeveloped 'natural' landform in close proximity to Queenstown and the experience afforded from locations such as the Jacks Point Trail and Whakatipu wai Māori Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) to the west and southwest, where views of Peninsula Hill are generally unencumbered by visible built development.</p>	
OS86.7	Melissa Brook	Oppose	<p>That landscape capacity 21.22.1.ix. utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended to: limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as an overhead lines or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments which cannot be screened, these should be co-located with existing infrastructure or designed and located to reduce their visual prominence to the extent practicable, recognising the operational and functional requirements of regionally significant infrastructure means this may not be practicable in all instances.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.1 Capacity (ix) as follows:</p> <p>Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of the National Grid and utilities such as overhead lines, or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.</p> <p>NB the response to OS 86.7 has been coordinated with the response to OS 70.9.</p>	Accept submission subject to refinement.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS95.1	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Ben Sharpe, Brian Sharpe and William Sharpe	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove the site located at 48 Peninsula Road, Kelvin Heights from the outstanding natural landscape priority area.	The Ritchie Kerr Appeal Consent Order (and Landscape Report prepared by Rebecca Lucas) mapping reflects the scope of the Ritchie Kerr Appeal. Mapping changes to PA mapping are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Accept submission.
OS95.2	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Ben Sharpe, Brian Sharpe and William Sharpe	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove the site at 48 Peninsula Road, Kelvin heights and have the site rezoned to the Proposed District Plan's Lower Density Suburban Residential zone.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS120.1	Rosalind Devlin On Behalf Of Park Ridge Limited	Oppose	That the location of the Peninsula Hill outstanding natural feature eastern boundary as it applies to Lot 1 DP 553950 is amended to match the fine-scale line shown on the PDP Chapter 41 Jacks Point Structure Plan.	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS181.1	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of RCL Henley Downs Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill be amended so the outstanding natural feature overlay boundary aligns with the edges of the no-build areas approved within lot 8 DP 498179 under RM210606.	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS181.5	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of	Oppose	That the landscape schedules 21.22 and 21.23 are amended to ensure that	In light of the mapping set out above, it is recommended that Schedule 21.22.1 Capacity (ii) Visitor Accommodation is amended as follows:	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	RCL Henley Downs Limited		the text of the schedules does not preclude residential visitor accommodation in existing or any future residential dwellings.	Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – no landscape capacity for tourism related activities. Excepting in relation to the two homesites within the Jacks Point zone and consented dwellings within the PA at Hanleys Farm, no landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities.	
OS183.1	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the boundary of the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to exclude parts of the submitters land zone Jacks Point Zone/within the Urban Growth Boundary.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS183.2	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the classification of the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended on the land zoned Jacks Point Zone/within the Urban Growth Boundary.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (including my understanding of the Jacks Point landscape Protection Area provisions and field work), I do not consider that this area merits a 'distinction' from the rest of the ONF. I also note that this 'landscape distinction' across Peninsula Hill was 'tested' in the Jacks Point appeal process and after landscape witness cross examination, the relief was withdrawn.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.3	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the relief sought regarding the boundary and classification of the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is provided for through an appropriate exception regime under the Outstanding Natural Feature schedule if it is to be adopted.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS183.4	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to provide for the Jacks Point Zoned land portion of the Outstanding Natural Feature as a separate character unit under the schedule if it is to be retained.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (including my understanding of the Jacks Point Landscape Protection Area provisions and field work), I do not consider that this area merits a 'distinction' from the rest of the ONF. Also see response to OS 183.2.	Reject submission.
OS183.5	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is rejected in its entirety to give effect to this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS183.6	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the boundaries of the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill, including the ONL and ONF boundaries, are amended.	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.7	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to include new definitions to provide for the intent of capacity in landscapes with different abilities to absorb appropriate development. Revised capacity ratings are required if these are to be retained within the schedules.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The range of land uses to be addressed in the Priority Area Schedules was confirmed by the Environment Court in the Topic 2 Decisions.</p> <p>The PA capacity terminology is deliberately different to the Chapter 24 LCU capacity ratings as the latter related to one specific development typology: rural living (see PA Methodology Report, Section 3).</p> <p>On this basis, and relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal (including field work), I consider that the following changes to the Schedule 21.22.1 Capacity ratings are appropriate:</p> <p>x. Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy developments. Very limited landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.</p> <p>xii. Rural living – very limited to no landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a ‘low-key’ rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).</p> <p>I consider that a rating of no landscape capacity remains appropriate for tourism related activities (resorts), urban expansion, intensive agriculture, mineral extraction, other transport infrastructure (i.e. beyond trails), large scale renewable energy and production forestry due to the landscape sensitivity of the ONF.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.8	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to recognise and provide for the benefits of change, enhancement and remediation.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The focus of the PA Schedules is to identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected and/or play an important role in shaping the values of the PA, rather than to signal what changes might enhance the landscape values within the main body of the PA Schedule.</p> <p>That said, the identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>It is also expected that such matters would be traversed in detail as part of a detailed (and more site specific) landscape assessment in support of a plan change or resource consent process.</p>	Reject submission.
OS183.9	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation.	Addressed in response to OS 183.8.	Reject submission.
OS183.10	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to recognise the attributes and features listed in point 21 of this submission as part of the Outstanding Natural Feature within the landscape schedule.	<p>Schedule 21.21.1 acknowledges the proximity of the ONF to Jacks Point Zone and the Jacks Point Track.</p> <p>The suggested amendment to the General Description of the Area discussed under OS183.31 better clarifies the relationship of the Jacks Point Zone and UGB to the ONF.</p> <p>Schedule 21.21.1 [22] includes reference to the area as part of the W.G Rees early sheep run.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>With respect to recreational and access opportunities, the focus of the PA Schedule is on identifying existing values that need to be protected, rather than outlining opportunities.</p> <p>The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence with respect to planned development and utilities so that its reference in the Schedule 21.22.1 can be considered.</p>	
OS183.11	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to incorporate submitter feedback as to important values within the landscape schedule.	Schedule 21.22.1 has been amended to incorporate submitter feedback where considered appropriate from a landscape expert perspective.	Accept submission in part.
OS183.12	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That without derogating from the generality of the submission, the submitter seeks any additional, amended, consequential, or further relief in respect of the schedules reflect the matters raised in this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS183.13	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That if the amendments within this submission are not included then the submitter seeks it to be deleted or otherwise withdrawn from the variation.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.14	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended so the starting position of the schedule is to only describe those values which contribute to a feature as being outstanding. Values and other descriptors within the schedule that do not meet this purpose should be deleted.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>All of the attributes and values identified in Schedule 21.21.1 are considered to be of relevance to an understanding of the landscape values of the Peninsula Hill ONF.</p> <p>The submitter is also referred to the recommended amendments to the Schedule 21.22 Preamble which may go some way to clarifying matters in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS183.15	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title important hydrological features to be specified more accurately with respect to areas identified with ecological and habitat values if these are to be retained.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The request for hydrological (and ecological) features to be more fully described and mapped suggests a level of detail typically associated with a site-specific landscape assessment. Consistent with landscape assessment best practice and the Topic 2 Decisions, the PA Schedules of Values are intended to describe the landscape values associated with the PA, rather than form detailed landscape assessments of sites within the PA.</p> <p>Further, the Preamble to 21.22 explains that <i>a finer grained location-specific assessment of landscape attributes and values would be required for any plan change or resource consent. Other landscape values may be identified through these finer grained assessment processes.</i></p>	Reject submission.
OS183.16	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title important hydrological features to delete references to the removal or eradication of pest flora and fauna species.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The reference to existing pest flora and fauna species in Schedule 21.21.1 is considered relevant as a noteworthy landscape 'element' that plays a role in (negatively) shaping landscape values.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.17	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title important ecological features and vegetation types to delete references to the removal or eradication of pest flora and fauna species.	Addressed in response to OS 183.16.	Reject submission.
OS183.18	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title land use patterns and features to contextualize existing forms of modification and development within the priority area by describing the future ability to consolidate and enhance or develop those existing uses over time.	The meaning of this submission point is unclear. However, if the intention is for Schedule 21.21.1 to be amended to describe future landscape opportunities for the area in the 'Important Land use patterns and features' section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) that is not in accordance with the purpose of the PA Schedule to describe the existing values of the landscape; and b) such an exercise would be unhelpfully open ended. 	Reject submission.
OS183.19	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title particularly important views to and from the area to acknowledge that the zoning extends higher than existing development on northern slopes.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. This amendment is not considered appropriate as the 'zoning' that extends higher than existing development corresponds to the Peninsula Hill Landscape Protection Area and/or ONF, where built development (other than two homesites) is generally not contemplated (unless it protects landscape values).	Reject submission.
OS183.20	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title particularly important views to and from the area to reference the built environment within the Jacks	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. 21.21.1 [38] describes the visibility of built development within Jacks Point Zone as being largely screened from view, or difficult to see in mid and long-range views from the lake. The latter is the consequence of the diminishing influence of	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Downs Farm Holdings Limited		Point Zone to recognise that there are a tableland homesites that are quite visible from the lake and these frame an appropriate and attractive foreground to views.	distance coupled with the careful siting and design of built development along with mitigation mounding and plantings. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence that the tableland homesites are quite visible from the lake to allow careful consideration as to whether this text amendment should be incorporated into Schedule 21.21.1.	
OS183.21	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title summary of landscape values summary of physical values to reflect the reasonably modified nature of the vegetation and habitats making them no more than moderate.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The notified version of Schedule 21.21.1 was reviewed by an ecologist with no such qualification recommended. Further, the Preamble to Schedule 21.21 acknowledges: <i>The landscape attributes and values identified, relate to the priority area as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing the attributes and values of specific sites.</i> It goes on to explain that a finer grained assessment will be required for plan changes or resource consents, and it is through these finer grained assessments that other values (including lower values) may be identified. 'Moderate' rated vegetation and habitats may be identified through such a process.	Reject submission.
OS183.22	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title summary of landscape values to amend the associative values to note that only a small part of the proposed Outstanding Natural Feature is accessible for recreation.	This submission point is factually incorrect. Refer Schedule 21.21 [28]. Also note that Schedule 21.21.1 [29] describes the extent of the trail.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.23	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title summary of landscape values to amend to perceptual values to remove reference to remoteness and wildness if in proximity to urban development.	<p>The Preamble to Schedule 21.21 acknowledges <i>that the landscape attributes and values identified, relate to the priority area as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing the attributes and values of specific sites.</i></p> <p>It goes on to explain that a finer grained assessment will be required for plan changes or resource consents, and it is through these finer grained assessments that other values (including lower values) may be identified. The relevance (or not) of remoteness and wildness values for parts of the ONF in proximity to urban development would be identified through such a process.</p> <p>However, some refinement of Schedule 21.22.1 [45] to better explain the relevant context of remoteness and wildness values is recommended as follows:</p> <p>The juxtaposition of the generally undeveloped 'natural' landform in close proximity to Queenstown contributes to an impression of wildness and the experience afforded from locations such as the Jacks Point Trail and Whakatipu-wai-Māori (Lake Whakatipu) to the west and southwest, where views of Peninsula Hill are generally unencumbered by visible built development contributes an impression of remoteness.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS183.24	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title summary of landscape values to generally recognise the distinction of the Exception zoned parts of the Outstanding Natural Feature.	<p>It is not appropriate to include this reference to the Exception Zone (EZ) in the Schedule as the basis of the EZs is that they are location specific zones that have been crafted to protect landscape values (so fundamentally align with ONF context). They also require that any new development not anticipated by the EZ will protect landscape values (PDP 3.2.5.4(b)). Further, the Chapter 41 zoning of the JP Zone within the ONF focuses on enabling pastoral farming, landscape restoration and trails/farm tracks and allows for a very limited number of homesites.</p> <p>In short, the landscape outcome for the Exception Zone part of Peninsula Hill is similar to the Rural zoned land within the ONF</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				and therefore does not merit distinction in the Summary of Landscape Values. The response to OS 183.2 is also relevant here. Also see s42A Report.	
OS183.25	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title landscape capacity to change the capacity rating for tourism related activities, urban expansions and transport infrastructure.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence with respect to planned development and utilities so that its reference in Schedule 21.21.1 can be considered. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal (including field work), I consider that tourism related activities (resorts) and urban development are not appropriate within Peninsula Hill PA ONF. Further, urban development is generally inappropriate within ONF/Ls as urban development inevitably means the ONF/L will fail to qualify as a RMA s6(b) landscape in terms of 'naturalness' (see <i>Long Bay</i> and <i>High Country Rosehip</i>).	Reject submission.
OS183.26	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title landscape capacity to change the capacity for rural living to recognise at least the two homesites in the Jacks Point Zone. Amend to generally recognise distinction of the Exception zoned parts of the Outstanding Natural Feature.	See response to OS 183.38. The Capacity section of Schedule 21.21.1 addresses the potential for future development rather than a description of existing development.	Accept submission in part.
OS183.27	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title landscape capacity to	There does not appear to be a formed or unformed public road through Dead Horse Gully.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited		include reference to the road through Dead Horse Gully.	The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence on this aspect so that it can be appropriately addressed in Schedule 21.22.1.	
OS183.28	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title landscape capacity to indicate at what scale such potential activities have been considered, and accordingly, without more specific examples and analysis, the landscape capacity section should be deleted.	The methodology applied in relation to Capacity is described in the PA Schedules Methodology Report at Section 3. It is recommended that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 is amended to explain the capacity ratings which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	Accept submission in part.
OS183.29	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title landscape capacity to include where there are existing and planned development opportunities and associated amenities and utilities in the capacity ratings.	The Capacity section of the PA Schedule addresses the potential for future development rather than a description of existing development. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence with respect to planned development and utilities so that its reference in Schedule 21.21.1 can be considered.	Reject submission.
OS183.30	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title landscape capacity to change the capacity for additional subdivisions, industrial and service activities, lifestyle, earthworks and associated ancillary activities to having a moderate or high capacity.	Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (including my understanding of the Jacks Point Landscape Protection Area provisions and field work), I consider that the capacity ratings in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.1 are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.31	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the general description of the area to replace the reference to the southern boundary adjoining the Jacks Point Zone to 'includes part of the Jacks Point Zone', include the words 'within the Urban Growth Boundary and which exhibits a more modified domestic landscape character in contrast with upper slopes of the ONF', and to include the sentence 'The Jacks Point Zone is an exception zone under the District Plan framework'.	<p>Aspects of this submission point relate to a level of detail that is not appropriate in a General Description of the Area.</p> <p>However, it is considered helpful to amend this section of Schedule 21.21.1 as set out below:</p> <p><i>The Peninsula Hill ONF encompasses the elevated roche moutonnée landform of Peninsula Hill which frames the south side of Whakatipu Waimāori's (Lake Whakatipu's) Frankton Arm. Along its north and west boundaries, the PA ONF adjoins urban zoned land at Kelvin Peninsula. <u>The southern part of the ONF coincides with the Jacks Point Zone (Exception Zone) and the Jacks Point Urban Growth Boundary.</u> The south boundary adjoins the Jacks Point Zone Tablelands and Homesites area. The eastern boundary adjoins urban zoned land including Hanley Downs and the Coneburn SHA.</i></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS183.32	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 5 to reference the eastern slopes draining into the Kawarau River.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.21.1 [5] as follows:</p> <p><i>A series of steep gullies draining from the western, northern, and eastern hill slopes to the Frankton Arm of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) <u>or the Kawarau River.</u></i></p>	Accept submission.
OS183.33	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 6 to remove the reference to including localised wetlands.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Schedule 21.21.1 has been reviewed by an ecologist with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.34	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to include a point under point 8 which states 'Recently planted and regenerating grey shrubland on the lower southern slopes within the Jacks Point Zone is associated with subdivision and development patterns.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. In accordance with landscape assessment best practice, it is not considered necessary to explain the provenance of plantings within each PA Schedule. Further, the development context of the Jacks Point Zone in close proximity to the ONF is repeatedly mentioned throughout Schedule 21.21.1.	Reject submission.
OS183.35	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 9(a) to include the words 'reading as part of the more modified landscape character associated with the Jacks Point Zone.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (including my understanding of the Jacks Point Landscape Protection Area provisions and field work), the pastoral areas do not read as part of the modified landscape character of JPZ but rather provide an important counterpoint or foil to the (urban) developed area and read as a contiguous part of the generally undeveloped roche moutonnée landform feature (ie the ONF).	Reject submission.
OS183.36	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 11 to remove the reference to wilding pines unless there is further precision and mapping as to where these are located.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Wilding pines are evident in parts of the ONF. The request for wilding pines to be more fully described and mapped suggests a level of detail typically associated with a site-specific landscape assessment. Consistent with landscape assessment best practice and the Topic 2 Environment Court Decisions, the PA Schedules of Values are intended to describe the landscape values of the PA rather than sites within the PA. Further, the Preamble to 21.22 explains that <i>a finer grained location-specific assessment of landscape attributes and values would be required for any plan change or resource</i>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p><i>consent. Other landscape values may be identified through these finer grained assessment processes.</i></p> <p>It is considered that the detailed description and mapping of wilding pines would be addressed as part of such work.</p>	
OS183.37	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 11 to include the words 'cover are peppered over'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Schedule 21.21.1 has been reviewed by an ecologist with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS183.38	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 14 to replace the words 'provides an important counterpoint or 'offset' for the' with 'is contrasted with the', replace the sentence 'A dwelling is anticipated in a localised hollow at the western end of the uppermost gully', with 'At least two homesites and associated curtilage and access are anticipated, one at the western end of the uppermost gully and another on the southern boundary of the proposed ONF', make minor typographical changes, and include the words 'for the future of these lower slopes, including the potential for further discreet siting of homesites, associated curtilages, and	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.1 [14] as follows:</p> <p>The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) at Jacks Point Zone includes the lower-lying ribs and gullies to the south of the hill. Much of this area is zoned Landscape Protection Area (LPA) under the Jacks Point zone and provides an important counterpoint or 'offset' for the urban and rural living development at Jacks Point and Hanley Downs. Within the LPA, policy focuses on enabling low-intensity pastoral farming and landscape restoration. A dwelling is anticipated in a localised hollow at the western end of the uppermost gully with a second dwelling anticipated adjacent the south boundary of the ONF. A range of location-specific assessment criteria and development controls are included in the zone provisions to guide an appropriate development outcome. Walking and cycling trails are also anticipated linking between Hanley Downs, Jacks Point and the existing track along the edge of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) (within PA ONL Homestead Bay).</p> <p>Based on my detailed review of additional homesites in the vicinity as part of the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process (including evidence preparation), I do not agree with the inclusion of 'at least' as it signals the potential for additional homesites to be appropriate. My detailed evaluation of the area revealed this not to be the case. For similar reasons, I do</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			additional access and development opportunities' regarding location-specific assessment criteria for appropriate development outcomes.	not agree with including reference to the potential for further homesites within the ONF in this part of Schedule 21.21.1.	
OS183.39	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 23 to delete or otherwise amend with more specificity as to where viewpoint included are from, and that those are limited to particularly important public viewpoints.	The meaning of this submission point is unclear. A wide range of views of Peninsula Hill are included in tourism publications which suggests that it is a part of the high value landscape around Queenstown that is valued by the broader community.	Reject submission.
OS183.40	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 25 to include the words 'within the urban contact and foreground of Jacks Point Zone development' regarding the identity of the area as an important gateway feature.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal (including field work), I do not consider that this change is necessary, as Peninsula Hill PA ONF is inevitably seen within the urban context of Queenstown as well as the Jacks Point Zone. Despite that urban context, it reads as a natural landscape gateway feature.	Reject submission.
OS183.41	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove point 26 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal (including field work), I do not consider that this change is necessary as the PA ONF does read as a landmark from many locations in Queenstown.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.42	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 27 to include the words 'and enhanced access opportunities created through subdivision and development proposals' regarding the popularity of the recreational features listed in the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The potential benefits to recreational values accruing as part of a future subdivision proposal are not an existing landscape value.	Reject submission.
OS183.43	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove point 30 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal (including field work), I do not consider that this change is necessary as SH6 is a key scenic route in very close proximity to the ONF.	Reject submission.
OS183.44	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 31 to change the scope of the point from 'area' to 'northern upper hill slope' and to include further precision to describe the southern hill slopes as more characterised by urban development and modified farming and recreational uses associated with the Jacks Point Zone.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and (including field work), I do not consider that this change is necessary as the southern hillslopes of the ONF are relatively unmodified (in terms of earthworks), are largely pastoral with very little built development visible (i.e. buildings and tracks are difficult to see). As a consequence, the southern hill slopes are highly expressive of the landscape's formative processes.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.45	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 32 to replace the words 'and its generally undeveloped character forms a memorable contrast with the fringe of urban development along its base' with 'although residential development zoning extends higher than existing built development'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PA Schedule describes the existing visual composition rather than an undeveloped zone (and noting that the Jacks Point Zone context is acknowledged in several locations throughout Schedule 21.21.1).	Reject submission.
OS183.46	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 33 to include reference 'to the Northern slopes'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. This change is not considered necessary as 21.21.1 [33] refers to the northwest and northeast sides of the hill in relation to this view.	Reject submission.
OS183.47	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 34 to remove mention of the 'Highly attractive and memorable' long-range views, remove the words 'dramatic and generally undeveloped' roche moutonnée, remove reference to 'Mount Dewar and Coronet Peak', replace the words 'subserving to' with 'appropriately sited within' and to include the	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and (including field work), I disagree with the majority of this submission point. However I agree that reference to Mt Dewar in should be removed. Amend Schedule 21.21.1 [34] as follows: <i>Highly attractive and memorable close to long-range views from the Jacks Point Trail to the south of Peninsula Hill across the undulating tablelands to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, flanked by Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and the distant peaks of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) – Mount Dewar and Coronet Peak. The careful siting and design of</i>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			words 'and forms the foreground context of'.	<i>rural living and urban development within the Jacks Point zone means that, where visible, built development is subservient to the natural landscape in these views.</i>	
OS183.48	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 35 to change the word 'memorable' with 'limited' regarding the gateway views from State Highway 6, remove mention of the 'dominance' of the landform, and replace the words 'by virtue of its proximity, scale, distinctive physical form, and undeveloped character, together with the limited awareness of urban development at Jacks Point adds to the scene' with 'and its lower slopes of a more domesticated character within Jacks Point Zone contrast with urban development of the Jacks Point Zone in the foreground. Lower slopes of the feature provide for an effective transition between urban built form and more natural upper slopes of the feature'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.49	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove point 36 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.50	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 37 to include the words 'transition of domesticated lower slopes exhibiting rural living development to the more natural upper slopes of the roche moutonnée', remove the word 'undeveloped' and the sentence 'At higher elevations along the road the broader mountain setting adds to the spectacle.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.51	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 38 to include the words 'particularly of the Tablelands and golf course, frames an attractive foreground context for these views'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.52	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove point 39 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.53	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 40 to include reference to the 'upper slopes of the' Outstanding Natural Feature, replace the words 'very limited extent' with 'carefully sited', replace the words 'generally subservient' with 'appropriate', and include the words 'including those portions zoned Jacks Point Zone'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.54	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 41 to include reference to 'the upper slopes' of Peninsula Hill as opposed to the entire feature, remove the word 'which', change the perception of naturalness 'for the lower slopes within the Jacks Point Zone' from 'high' to 'low', make minor typographical amendments, include reference to the modifications related to its	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			pastoral, tourism, and infrastructure as being 'dominant', and replacing the section regarding the built form of the area with 'Careful siting of built form including homesites and associated curtilages, farm-buildings, access tracks and trails, infrastructure, fencing, and other forms of domestication are viable and influence the character of the landform'.		
OS183.55	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 42 to include reference to 'exotic shrubs' and to provide further context as to where the perception of naturalness is viewed from and to what parts of the Outstanding Natural Feature it applies to.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and (including field work), I do not consider that these changes are necessary.</p> <p>More specifically, with respect to reference to exotic shrubs, they are not a vegetation feature that is particularly dominant, meriting reference under Naturalness values.</p> <p>A discussion of naturalness within a Schedule of Values relates to the degree of modification associated with the area rather than views of the landscape. For this reason, it is not appropriate to describe specific views in this part of Schedule 21.21.1.</p>	Reject submission.
OS183.56	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 43 to reference the 'upper slopes' regarding the roche moutonnee landform of Peninsula Hill and replace the words 'along with its location on a key scenic	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			highway route and the airport approach path, and the magnificent mountain and lake context within which it is seen in many views' with 'including transition areas of the lower slopes within the Jacks Point Zone'.		
OS183.57	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove point 44 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.58	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 45 to include reference to the 'upper slopes' regarding the generally undeveloped landform.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.59	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove point 46 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.60	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 47(a) to include reference to the 'upper slopes of the' roche moutonnee landform and replace the word 'beside' with 'with a transition to' regarding the juxtaposition of the priority area and the urban landscape.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.61	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 47(b) ii to replace the words 'open and' with 'modified' and to include the words 'dominated by farming, recreational and lifestyle uses'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.62	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 47 (b) iii to replace the word 'more' with 'moderately'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.63	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 47(b) iv to replace the words 'very limited level of' with 'appropriate siting of'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.64	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 49 to change the rating of physical values from 'high' to 'moderate', include the words 'but reasonably modified' regarding vegetation features and to remove the words 'and mana whenua features'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.65	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 50(c) to include reference to 'access, farming, and lifestyle' attributes, include reference to the 'lower slopes of the' Outstanding Natural Feature, and to include the words 'including those parts of the zones Jacks Point Zone'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and (including field work), I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point as the 'Recreational attributes and values' reference 'access'. 'Farming and lifestyle use' are not in my opinion aspects of the ONF that make a noteworthy contribution to the PA ONF's associative values.	Reject submission.
OS183.66	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 51(b) to remove mention of the visibility of the area from various surrounding locations.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process. The extensive visibility of the feature from several prominent locations in the wider area is an important part of why Peninsula Hill is valued.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.67	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 51(c) to change the perception of naturalness from 'high' to 'moderate', replace the word 'more' with 'less', to include the words 'character' and reference to the 'lower slopes' of Peninsula Hill.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.68	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 51(d) to replace the words 'A sense of remoteness and wildness primarily' with 'A sense of dominant urban context', replace the words 'by its scale, naturalness and dramatic appearance within an urban context' with 'built urban form and development', include the words 'including within the Tablelands of Jacks Point Zone, frames an attractive foreground view of built form to', remove the word 'in' and 'establishes', include reference to the 'upper slopes' of Peninsula Hill and to remove reference to 'as part of the expansive natural landscape'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.69	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for commercial recreational activities from 'very limited' to 'limited', remove the words 'optimise the screening and/or camouflaging', make minor typographical amendments, replace the word 'protects' with 'provide for', and to include 'where appropriate' regarding the capacity rating'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.70	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities from 'no landscape capacity for tourism related activities' to 'moderate', replacing the word 'excepting' with 'particularly', removing reference to 'the two homesites' and replacing it with 'the lower slopes of the landform within the Jacks Point Zone', removing the capacity rating of 'no landscape capacity' for visitor accommodation activities, and including the words 'within which further siting of homesites,	Partly addressed in response to OS 183.7. Other changes to text not supported, based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			associated curtilage, and access opportunities are available' regarding capacity.		
OS183.71	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for earthworks from 'very limited' to 'moderate', include reference regarding capacity to the 'golf course, mitigation landscape and formation of homesites within the lower slopes of the landform zoned Jacks Point Zone', and to remove the words 'that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.72	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for farm buildings from 'very limited' to 'limited', remove the words 'modestly scaled' regarding buildings that reinforce existing rural character and remove the words 'in lower lying flat land' for such buildings within the Outstanding Natural Feature.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.73	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for transport infrastructure from 'very limited' to 'limited' and to include a capacity rating of 'moderate' for identified access through Dead Horse Gully and towards identified homesites within the lower slopes of the landform zoned Jacks Point Zone'.	Addressed in response to OS 183.27.	Reject submission.
OS183.74	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for utilities and regionally significant infrastructure from 'limited' to 'moderate'.	Addressed in response to OS 183.29.	Reject submission.
OS183.75	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove the capacity rating for renewable energy generation from 'no landscape capacity' and to change the capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation from 'very limited' to 'limited'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.76	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for rural living to no landscape capacity 'other than moderate landscape capacity for identified homesites within the Jacks Point Zone and their associated curtilage areas'.	Addressed in response to OS 183.7.	Accept submission in part.
OS183.77	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for urban expansion from 'no capacity' to 'limited'.	Addressed in response to OS 183.25.	Reject submission.
OS188.36	Elisha Young-Ebert	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill paragraphs 38 and 45 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Addressed in response to OS 77.36.	Accept submission.

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(b) 21.22.2 Ferry Hill PA ONF

21.22.2 PA ONF Ferry Hill: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The Ferry Hill PA ONF encompasses the elevated roche moutonnée landform of Ferry Hill.

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. The steeply sloping roche moutonnée glacial landform of Ferry Hill (694m), with a smooth 'up-glacier' slope to the southwest and south, and a steeper rough 'plucked' down-glacier slope generally to the west, northwest, north, and northeast.
2. Ferry Hill, formed by the over-riding Wakatipu glacier, is recognised in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory as being one of the four best examples of roche moutonnée in Central Otago and one of the most easily seen and appreciated. It is of national scientific, aesthetic or educational value and is assessed to be vulnerable to significant damage by human related activities.
3. The cone-like peak landform of Ferry Hill.

Important hydrological features:

4. The unnamed streams along the western side of the PA.
5. The irrigation race around the eastern and southern lower flanks of Ferry Hill.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

6. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. Swathes and scattered pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri and mingimingi occupy the bluffs, rocky slopes and gullies on the landform. Some of these shrublands are interspersed with hawthorn, sweet brier and elderberry.
7. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
 - a. Open pasture and scattered scrub throughout the elevated steep slopes and crest of Ferry Hill.
 - b. Grazed pasture with scattered shelterbelts (including poplars) and clusters of pine and willow trees throughout the lower and more gently sloping flanks of Ferry Hill and the saddle between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill.
 - c. Amenity and shelter plantings around the few scattered dwellings on the northern and western sides of Ferry Hill.
8. Existing elements that require management: Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
9. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, hawthorn, buddleia, elderberry, sycamore, broom and gorse.

Important land-use patterns and features:

10. Grazed pasture which is the dominant land use across the PA. Associated with this activity is a network of farm tracks, fencing and **farm buildings sheds**.
11. Short stretches of unformed road: at the north end of Hansen Road (south) linking to Waipuna (Lake Johnson); at the southern end of Hansen Road (north) extending southwards along the western side of Ferry Hill.
12. The very sparse scattering of rural **and rural living dwellings (including consented but unbuilt platforms)** and farm buildings in rural zoned areas around the edges of the PA ONF.
13. Infrastructure is evident within the PA and includes: Aurora distribution lines over the saddle near Lake Johnson (one crossing the river at Tucker Beach).
14. The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) associated with Queenstown which adjoins the southern and eastern sides of the PA.
15. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character and/or proximity include: the urban residential and commercial development adjoining the south and eastern edges of the area (taking in Frankton and Quail Rise); Frankton Road (SH 6A); and the rural living development at Tucker Beach and Hansen Road on the northern and north-western lower slopes of Ferry Hill (Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct zone).

Commented [BG1]: OS142.22 Maree Baker-Galloway on behalf of the Hansen Family Partnership.

Commented [BG2]: OS 103.1 Tim Williams on behalf of Katherine and David Coulter.
OS 142.23 Maree Baker-Galloway on behalf of the Hansen Family Partnership.

Commented [BG3]: OS 142.5 Maree Baker-Galloway on behalf of the Hansen Family Partnership.
OS 145.5 Maree Baker-Galloway on behalf of Jon Waterston.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

16. Archaeological features relating to historic farming in the area around lake Johnson.

Mana whenua features and their locations:

17. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

Mana whenua associations and experience:

18. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.

Important historic attributes and values:

19. The general area as a site of early gold mining.
20. Early farming around Waipuna (Lake Johnson).

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

21. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
22. The identity of Ferry Hill as part of the dramatic backdrop to Frankton and the western side of the Whakatipu Basin.

Important recreation attributes and values:

23. SH6 as a key scenic route in close proximity.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

24. The area's natural landforms, land type, and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial processes (excepting the water race which is man-made).
25. Indigenous rocky outcrop, steep slope and gully plantings which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values throughout the area.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

26. Engaging and attractive short to long-range views from the Frankton Arm, Frankton (including the airport), SH6 and Kelvin Peninsula to the cone-like peak of Ferry Hill (in combination with the roche moutonnée landforms of Pt781 and Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) which are within the West Whakatipu Basin PA ONL). In many of these views the open pastoral character of the smooth and more rough roche moutonnée slopes forms a bold contrast with the urban context. In longer range views from many of the more distant locations on the south side of the feature, there is a clear appreciation of the roche moutonnée landform profile and the waters of the Frankton Arm in the foreground of view, along with the often-snow-capped mountains of Ben Lomond and Coronet Peak in the background add to the appeal. In closer range views (e.g. Frankton and SH6), intervening landforms, vegetation and/or built development curbs the field of view in places. Despite the limited expanse of the feature visible, the contrast established by the natural landform within an urban context adds to the memorability and appeal of such views.
27. Attractive mid and long-range views from the Fitzpatrick Basin, Dalefield, Hawthorn Triangle, the elevated flanks and foothills associated with Slope Hill and sections of Queenstown Trail coinciding with this part of the Whakatipu Basin, to the distinctive cone-like peak of Ferry Hill. In closer range views, the expanse of the PA ONF is curtailed by intervening landform and vegetation; however, there is an increased appreciation of the localised rocky outcrops, scarps, and hummocky terrain of the landforms adding to their appeal. In some views, there is an appreciation of the band of urban (Quail Rise) and rural living development (Tucker Beach) throughout the lower and gentler slopes of Ferry Hill and along the north side of the Waipuna (Lake Johnson) saddle along with the poplar shelterbelts, scattered shade trees and the odd rural dwelling across the north side of Ferry Hill. Nevertheless, from this orientation, the large-scale and distinctive sculptural form of the landform and its generally undeveloped character makes it memorable.
28. Attractive mid and long-range views from Ladies Mile to the southeast and east sides of Ferry Hill. From this orientation, the distinguishing roche moutonnée landform profile is clearly legible and there is an awareness of the transition from the smooth 'ice up' character to the rough 'plucked' character indicating the direction of travel of the glacier that sculpted this landform.
29. Engaging and seemingly 'close-range' views from planes approaching or exiting Queenstown airport via the Frankton Arm. Such views offer an appreciation of the roche moutonnée and the broader glacial landscape context within which the PA ONF is set.

30. In all of the views, the dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONF, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the PA and the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

Naturalness attributes and values:

31. The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Ferry Hill PA ONF set within an urban or rural living context, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to pastoral and infrastructure uses are visible, the very low number of buildings, the relatively modest scale of tracks and the limited visibility of infrastructure limits their influence on the character of the area as a natural landscape element.
32. The irregular patterning and proliferation of grey shrubland, exposed rock faces and scrub in places, adds to the perception of naturalness.

Memorability attributes and values:

33. The appealing and engaging views of the largely undeveloped and legible roche moutonnée landform. The juxtaposition of the landscape feature within an urban or rural living context, along with its location on a key scenic highway route and the airport approach path, along with the magnificent mountain and lake context within which it is seen in many views, are also factors that contribute to its memorability.

Transient attributes and values:

34. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the roche moutonnée slopes.
35. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation (poplars and willows in particular).

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

36. A sense of the remoteness across the western side of the landform that is set well apart from urban and rural living development and strongly associates with the broader undeveloped ONL mountain context associated with Pt 781 and Sugar Loaf.

Aesthetic qualities and values:

37. The experience of all of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
38. More specifically, this includes:
- a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the generally undeveloped roche moutonnée landform, juxtaposed beside an urban or rural living context.
 - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. The distinctly rugged character of the west, northwest, north and northeast sides of the roche moutonnée landforms and the more coherent appearance of the southwest and south of each as a consequence of the landform and vegetation character and patterns.
 - ii. The generally open and pastoral character of Ferry Hill.
 - iii. The cone-like peak landform of Ferry Hill.
 - iv. The very limited level of built modification evident through the ONF.

Commented [BG4]: OS 142.25 Maree Baker-Galloway on behalf of the Hansen Family Partnership.
OS 145.19 Maree Baker-Galloway on behalf of Jon Waterston.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

The combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA ONF Ferry Hill can be summarised as follows:

39. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
40. **High associative values** relating to:
 - a. The mana whenua associations of the area
 - b. The historic associations of the area
 - c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
41. **High perceptual values** relating to:
 - a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
 - b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Frankton, the scenic route of SH 6, sections of the Queenstown Trail network, the Ladies Mile corridor, the western side of the Whakatipu Basin, and the airport approach path, along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
 - c. The identity of the roche moutonnée as a natural and dramatic landscape backdrop to Frankton and the western side of the Whakatipu Basin.
 - d. A sense of remoteness and wildness associated with the western side of the PA.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONF Ferry Hill for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low key activities that integrate with, and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONF values.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing consented platforms (including on the low lying southern margins of the PA adjacent Hansen Road) and which: are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); enhance public access (where appropriate).

Commented [BG5]: OS 77.5 Michael Bathgate on behalf of Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG6]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG7]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

No landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA. No landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA no landscape capacity.

Commented [BG8]: OS 142.26 Maree Baker-Galloway on behalf of the Hansen Family Partnership.

iii. **Urban expansions – no landscape capacity.**

iv. **Intensive agriculture – no landscape capacity.**

v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.

vi. **Farm buildings – very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.

vii. **Mineral extraction – no landscape capacity.**

viii. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity for trails that are located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement, and protect the area's ONE values. **Very Limited to No** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.

Commented [BG9]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG10]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG11]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG12]: OS 142.30 Maree Baker-Galloway on behalf of the Hansen Family Partnership.

ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. **In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.**

Commented [BG13]: OS 70.10 Ainsley McLeod on behalf of Transpower New Zealand Limited.

x. **Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy developments. Very limited to no** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.

Commented [BG14]: OS 142.30 Maree Baker-Galloway on behalf of the Hansen Family Partnership.

xi. **Production forestry – no landscape capacity.**

xii. **Rural living – very limited to no** landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; is designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).

Commented [BG15]: OS 90.1 Will Hodgson. OS 145.24 Maree Baker Galloway on behalf of Jon Waterstone.

Commented [BG16]: OS 90.1 Will Hodgson. OS 145.24 Maree Baker Galloway on behalf of Jon Waterstone.

21.22.2 Ferry Hill PA ONF Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.2 Ferry Hill PA ONF Schedule". New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text: relates to a submission point that has not be captured in the "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.2 Ferry Hill PA ONF Schedule". This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **One example identified.**

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS61.2	Michelle Rudd	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill be retained as notified.	Supports Schedule 21.22.2 and in particular retaining and protecting the wild, expansive and natural setting of Ferry Hill ONF. These characteristics are addressed in Schedule 21.22.2 so no further comment required.	Accept submission in part.
OS70.10	Ainsley McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and	Amend Schedule 21.22.2 Capacity (ix) as follows: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. <u>In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.</u>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.		
OS90.1	Will Hodgson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill be retained as notified, except for landscape capacity as set out in the submission.	<p>Supports Schedule 21.22.2 but suggests tolerance for rural living is amended from no capacity to very low capacity.</p> <p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 1 Woodlot Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Crown Investment Trust Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal, and having carefully reviewed the spatial extent of the mapped Ferry Hill Priority Area ONF, I consider that the following amendment to Schedule 21.22.2 Capacity is appropriate:</p> <p>xii. Rural living – Very limited to no landscape capacity for rural living development which : is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; is designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).</p> <p>It is also noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 acknowledges that the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</p> <p>This means that there is an acknowledgement that a finer grained assessment as part of a site-specific proposal may determine a higher capacity for a landuse which may give the submitter some comfort in this regard.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS90.4	Will Hodgson	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.2 Ferry Hill be amended so that; some landscape capacity is changed to high landscape capacity, limited landscape capacity is changed to moderate landscape capacity, very limited landscape capacity is change to low landscape capacity, and no landscape capacity is change to very low landscape capacity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The rating of capacity is explained (and defined) in the Section 3 of the Methodology Report. This is deliberately distinguished from the rating of landscape values for the reasons explained.</p> <p>Given the RMA s6(b) context of the PA and PDP policy context for ONF/Ls (protect landscape values and 'difficult to see' test) it is extremely unlikely that any of landuses addressed in the PA Schedules would be assessed as having a 'high' capacity.</p> <p>A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to assist plan user's understanding of capacity ratings in the PA Schedules.</p> <p>It is expected that this additional text, along with the (existing) Schedule 21.22 Preamble explanation below, may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p> <p><i>The capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</i></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS103.1	Tim Williams On Behalf Of Katherine and David Coulter	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill be amended to exclude the submitter's property at Gracefield Lane - Lot 4 DP 538521.	<p>ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.</p> <p>The submitter expresses the view that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The schedule does not acknowledge the different landscape character of the site as contemplated by rural living development (RM151046). The schedule does not acknowledge a different capacity associated with their land given its proximity to Frankton North where buildings of significant height are anticipated. <p>Item (a)</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>Having carefully reviewed the consented and unbuilt platforms mapping for the area, it is recommended that Schedule 21.21.2 is amended as follows to more specifically acknowledge the rural living that is consented in the area:</p> <p><i>12. The very sparse scattering of rural and rural living dwellings and farm buildings in rural zoned areas around the edges of the PA ONF.</i></p> <p>Item (b)</p> <p>Schedule 21.21.2 acknowledges the proximate urban area at [15].</p> <p>Further, the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 acknowledges that:</p> <p><i>the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</i></p> <p>The far more fine-grained landscape assessment that the submitter is suggesting should inform Schedule 21.22.2 is appropriate as part of a resource consent or plan change process.</p>	
OS114.7	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Woodlot Properties Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that it fails to recognise that the Ferry Hill outstanding natural feature is a highly modified landscape that has been extensively farmed.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Schedule 21.22.2 acknowledges the farming use of Ferry Hill PA ONF at [10].</p> <p>It is noted that the submitter goes on to express the view that the area has 'very low' naturalness values. Case law supports the identification of areas that are dominated by pastoral uses (and other agriculture/horticulture related uses) as having naturalness values that allow the land to qualify for consideration as a RMA s6(b) landscape (e.g. <i>Man O'War Station</i>).</p> <p>It is also noted that the question as to whether the PA qualifies as a RMA s6(b) landscape or feature is beyond the scope of</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				the Variation and that the mapping of the District’s ONF/Ls has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions).	
OS114.8	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Woodlot Properties Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that it incorrectly states at [7] that there are important ecological features and vegetation types and lists features that do not have ecological importance such as open and grazed pastures.	<p>Not technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Schedule 21.22.2 [7] reference to pasture and scrub is listed as an ‘other distinctive vegetation type’ and is considered worthy of mention under the header “Important ecological features and vegetation types” (emphasis added), for the reason explained in the above submission point.</p> <p>With respect to the submitter’s advice that it is misleading to suggest that the PA ONF has noteworthy indigenous vegetation, Schedule 21.22.2 has been reviewed by an expert ecologist with that expert supporting the notified text.</p>	Reject submission.
OS114.9	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Woodlot Properties Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [8] and [9] under the heading important ecological features and vegetation types lists animal and plant pest species.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the PA ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>However, it is agreed that as currently drafted the PA Schedules are potentially confusing in this regard as these aspects of the landscape are negative rather than positive.</p> <p>A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS114.10	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Woodlot	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is rejected as notified and that the	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Properties Limited		relationship between mana whenua associations, Wāhi Tūpuna Chapter and consultation with mana whenua for applications are clarified.		
OS114.11	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Woodlot Properties Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [21] a very generic statement is made that descriptions and photographs of the area in tourist publications but provides no evidence as to what publications or photographs are referred to.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. It is not usual practice to identify which tourist publications make reference to an ONF/L in a Schedule of Landscape Values. However, the view from Coronet Peak is cited as one of the top ten most photogenic spots in Queenstown and takes in Ferry Hill. See: https://www.queenstownnz.co.nz/stories/post/top-ten-most-photogenic-spots-in-queenstown/	Reject submission.
OS114.12	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Woodlot Properties Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [31] where naturalness attributes and values are described incorrectly states Ferry Hill as seemingly undeveloped character... which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness when it has been completely modified for agriculture/ farming and contains some built modification and domestication.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The farming activity and built modification within the Ferry Hill PA are acknowledged at 21.22.2 [10], [12], [13], [30] and [31]. The evaluation of naturalness is guided by the interpretation of 'natural' in Te Tangi a te Manu, [9.44] to [9.46] , drawing from <i>Harrison, WESI</i> and the <i>West Wind</i> Environment Court decisions.	Reject submission.
OS114.13	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Woodlot	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is rejected as notified or amended to	The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 acknowledges the point raised in this submission as follows:	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Properties Limited		make clear that the landscape capacity schedules are at a landscape character unit level rather than a site specific level.	<i>The capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</i>	
OS142.3	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the priority area, outstanding natural landscape and outstanding natural feature annotations included within landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill are removed from the lower, already developed parts of the outstanding natural landscape and outstanding natural feature.	Amendments to the PA mapping are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS142.4	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the 'Important landforms and land types' section of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended to distinguish between the elevated cone-like peak of Ferry Hill and the lower slopes, or if the landscape schedule is to be retained as notified, that the lower slopes including the submitters land is excluded from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 1 Woodlot Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Crown Investment Trust Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal, I consider the lower slopes and cone like peak to be a coherent landform feature. I do not agree with distinguishing the lower slopes and separate from the cone like peak. I also note that amendments to the PA mapping are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS142.5	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the 'Land use patterns and features' section of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended to further particularise the	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			broader list of established activities occurring within the outstanding natural feature which are historically recognised as appropriate and in keeping with the landform.	<p>Almost all of the attributes and features requested for inclusion in the Schedule are already mentioned. The exceptions to this are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Consented but unbuilt platforms. b) High degree of modification from farming. <p>With respect to Item (a), it is recommended that Schedule 21.22.2 [12] is amended as follows:</p> <p>The very sparse scattering of rural dwellings (including consented but unbuilt platforms) and farm buildings in rural zoned areas around the edges of the PA ONF.</p> <p>With respect to Item (b), the presence of farming is acknowledged at Schedule 21.21.2 [10] and [31], however this cannot be described as a high degree of modification. Further, the degree of modification of a landscape is typically evaluated under the 'naturalness' header.</p> <p>The evaluation of naturalness in all of the PA Schedules is guided by the interpretation of 'natural' in <i>Te Tangi a te Manu</i>, [9.44] to [9.46] , drawing from <i>Harrison, WESI</i> and the <i>West Wind</i> Environment Court decisions.</p>	
OS142.6	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the 'important ecological features and vegetation types' of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended to delete references to vegetation types such as pasture, plant pest species and animal pest species from the important ecological and vegetation types section.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Schedule 21.22.2 [7] reference to pasture is listed as an 'other distinctive vegetation type' and is considered worthy of mention under the header "Important ecological features and <u>vegetation types</u>" (emphasis added) due to the proliferation of this vegetation type.</p> <p>Also refer response to OS 114.9.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS142.7	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of	Oppose	That the section on 'important archaeological and heritage features and their locations' (paragraph	No technical evidence is provided by the submitter as to why this accepted aspect of landscape values should be deleted from Schedule 21.22.2.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Hansen Family Partnership		16) of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is deleted.	Further, Schedule 21.22.2 has been reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the notified text.	
OS142.8	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph 23 which specifies the SH6 as a key scenic route is deleted from landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Scenic routes are typically popular with residents and visitors alike, as travelling routes for recreational purposes. It is also noted that Schedule 21.22.2 has been reviewed by a recreation and tourism expert with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS142.9	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended so that the landscape values for physical values (paragraph 39), associative values (paragraph 40) and perceptual values (paragraph 41) are low or moderate rather than high.	Addressed in response to OS 145.9.	Reject submission.
OS142.10	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That if the overall landscape values for landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill are not amended (as per submission point #142.9), the values need to be amended to assign a low naturalness ranking to the submitters site and other lower-lying slopes.	Addressed in response to OS 145.10.	Reject submission.
OS142.11	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended so the landscape capacity includes an	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Hansen Family Partnership		<p>indication of at what scale such potential activities have been considered and specific examples and analysis, or if the landscape capacities cannot be amended the landscape capacity section should be deleted.</p>	<p>The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the PA and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites.</p> <p>Within the 12 landuses identified by the Court for consideration with respect to landscape capacity, there is a very large range of potential development scales and styles (for example, in the case of renewable energy, there are solar farms, wind farms and hydro schemes, each of which can be of a widely varying scale). To provide a meaningful analysis for every landuse typology at a range of scales within each PA Schedule would be an enormous task. Rather, it is expected that this detailed analysis would occur as part of a resource consent or plan change application, as explained in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22.</p> <p>Further, to delete the Capacity section of the Schedules would not align with the directions from the Environment Court.</p> <p>However in considering this submission point, it is recommended that Schedule 21.22.2 Capacity (x) is amended as follows:</p> <p>Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy developments. Very limited to no landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.</p>	
OS142.12	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	<p>That if the landscape capacities for landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill section are retained as notified, then for the submitters site, this should be amended to recognise and provide for likely future development associated with existing land uses.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>This submission point suggests a site-specific grain of detail be included within the PA Schedule.</p> <p>As explained in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22, the landscape capacity is based on the scale of the PA and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites. The preamble also explains that a varying level of capacity may be determined as part of a detailed landscape assessment supporting a resource consent or plan change process.</p> <p>There are a wide range of development scenarios that could be associated with the existing landuses (pastoral farming,</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				rural living). It is expected that the appropriateness of future development associated with existing landuses would be assessed in detail as part of a resource consent or plan change application.	
OS142.20	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the 'Important hydrological features' section (paragraphs 4 and 5) of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is deleted.	<p>No technical evidence is provided by the submitter as to why this accepted aspect of landscape values should be deleted from Schedule 21.22.2.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 1 Woodlot Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Crown Investment Trust Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal, I consider that the hydrological features of described in Schedule 21.22.2 that merit reference in a Schedule of Landscape Values for the PA ONF.</p>	Reject submission.
OS142.21	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the 'Important ecological features and vegetation types' (paragraphs 6 - 9) of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill are deleted.	<p>No technical evidence is provided by the submitter as to why this accepted aspect of landscape values should be deleted from Schedule 21.22.2.</p> <p>Further, Schedule 21.22.2 has been reviewed by an ecology expert with that expert supporting the notified text.</p>	Reject submission.
OS142.22	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	<p>That paragraph 10 relating to 'Important land-use patterns and features' of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows:</p> <p>Grazed pasture which is the dominant land use across the PA. Associated with this activity is a network of farm tracks, fencing, farm buildings, and sheds.</p>	<p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 1 Woodlot Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Crown Investment Trust Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal, I agree with the intention of this submission point.</p> <p>Amend 21.22.2 [10] as follows:</p> <p><i>Grazed pasture which is the dominant land use across the PA. Associated with this activity is a network of farm tracks, fencing and <u>farm buildings, and sheds.</u></i></p>	Accept submission (subject to refinement).

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS142.23	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph 12 relating to 'Important land-use patterns and features' of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows: "Rural residential development and farm buildings in rural zoned areas in the lower-lying parts of the PA ONF".	My response to OS 103.1, recommends the inclusion of reference to rural living in Schedule 21.22.2 [12]. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 1 Woodlot Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Crown Investment Trust Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal, I consider that the other changes recommended as part of this submission point are inappropriate.	Accept submission in part.
OS142.24	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the 'Naturalness attributes and values' section (paragraph 31) of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows: The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of the elevated cone-like peak of the Ferry Hill PA ONF set within an urban or rural living context, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to pastoral and infrastructure uses are visible, the very low number of buildings, the relatively modest scale of tracks and the limited visibility of infrastructure limits their influence on the character of the area as a natural landscape element.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 1 Woodlot Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Crown Investment Trust Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal, I disagree with limiting the description of 'naturalness' to the 'elevated cone like peak of Ferry Hill'. This is due to the generally visually recessive character, very limited level (or amount) and/or modest/small scale of built development throughout the balance of Ferry Hill, which confers the perception of a high level of naturalness across the lower flanks of Ferry Hill.	Reject submission.
OS142.25	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of	Oppose	That subsection 'b' of paragraph 38 on 'Aesthetic qualities and values' within	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Hansen Family Partnership		<p>landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The distinctly rugged character of the west, northwest, north and northeast sides of the roche moutonnee landforms and the more coherent appearance of the southwest and south of each as a consequence of the landform and vegetation character and patterns. ii. The open and pastoral character of Ferry Hill. iii. The cone-like peak landform of Ferry Hill. iv. The very limited level of built modification evident through the ONF. 	<p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 1 Woodlot Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Crown Investment Trust Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal, I disagree with deleting reference to ‘open’ and the proposed qualification of the extent of built development is not supported as these are matters of fact.</p> <p>However, some modification to the wording of 21.22.2 [10] b is supported which may go some way to addressing the submitter’s concerns in this regard.</p> <p>Amend 21.22.2 [38] (b) as follows:</p> <p>At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The distinctly rugged character of the west, northwest, north and northeast sides of the roche moutonnee landforms and the more coherent appearance of the southwest and south of each as a consequence of the landform and vegetation character and patterns. ii. The generally open and pastoral character of Ferry Hill. iii. The cone-like peak landform of Ferry Hill. iv. The very limited level of built modification evident through the ONF. 	
OS142.26	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Hansen Family Partnership		<p>included within landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - no landscape capacity in the cone-like peak of the ONF. Some landscape capacity in the lower slopes. 	<p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 1 Woodlot Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Crown Investment Trust Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal, the lower slopes of Ferry Hill ONF extend beyond the submitters land to take in the exposed steep slopes on the north and east side of the landform. The majority of these areas along with parts of the submitters land (e.g. Lake Johnson margins and land above Tucker Beach Road rural living area) are highly sensitive to built development change as a consequence of the landform character, elevation and/or visibility.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there may be some very limited scope for visitor accommodation associated with existing rural living dwellings on the low-lying southern margins of the PA adjacent Hansen Road.</p> <p>It is recommended that Schedule 21.22.2 Landscape Capacity (ii) is amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ii. Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - very limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing consented platforms (including on the low lying southern margins of the PA adjacent Hansen Road) and which: are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). No landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA. No landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA. No landscape capacity. 	

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS142.27	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	<p>That the landscape capacity for urban expansions included within landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows:</p> <p>iii. Urban expansions - no landscape capacity in the cone-like peak of the ONF. Some landscape capacity in the lower slopes.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Urban development is inappropriate within ONF/Ls as urban development inevitably means the ONF/L will fail to qualify as a RMA s6(b) landscape in terms of 'naturalness' (see <i>Long Bay</i> and <i>High Country Rosehip</i>).</p>	Reject submission.
OS142.28	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	<p>That the landscape capacity for earthworks included within landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows:</p> <p>v. Earthworks - very limited landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns in the cone-like peak of the ONF. <u>Some landscape capacity in the lower-lying slopes.</u></p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>ONFs typically have a particularly high sensitivity to earthworks changes due to their limited size/extent.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 1 Woodlot Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Crown Investment Trust Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal, in this instance, the largely unmodified roche moutonnée geomorphology of the ONF (including the lower lying slopes on all sides of the landform), heightens this sensitivity to landform modification via earthworks.</p> <p>As a consequence, Schedule 21.22.2 acknowledges the capacity for very limited earthworks for activities/elements that are established within the ONF (farm and public tracks).</p> <p>Within this context, it is appropriate that earthworks beyond a very limited scale are carefully evaluated as part of a detailed resource consent or plan change process.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS142.29	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	<p>That the landscape capacity for farm buildings included within landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows:</p> <p>vi. Farm buildings - very limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character in the cone-like peak of the ONF. <u>Some landscape capacity in the lower-lying slopes.</u></p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 1 Woodlot Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Crown Investment Trust Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal, the lower slopes of Ferry Hill ONF extend beyond the submitters land to take in the exposed slopes on the north and east side of the landform. The majority of these areas, along with parts of the submitter's land (eg Lake Johnson margins and land above Tucker Beach Road rural living area), are highly sensitive to built development change as a consequence of the landform character, elevation and/or visibility.</p> <p>Further, it is expected that the scale of lots and landownership throughout Ferry Hill PA suggests a very limited requirement for farm buildings and/or potential adverse cumulative landscape effects associated with additional farm buildings in combination with dwellings.</p> <p>Within this context, a capacity rating of very limited (which signals that a very small amount of sensitively located and designed development is appropriate), is considered to be suitable.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that capacity ratings apply to the PA as a whole and that individual sites can contain a different capacity rating which requires detailed consideration and assessment through a resource consent process.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS142.30	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	<p>That the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure included within landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows:</p> <p>viii. Transport infrastructure - some limited landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONF values. <u>Limited No</u> landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 1 Woodlot Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Crown Investment Trust Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal, and having carefully reviewed the spatial extent of the mapped Ferry Hill Priority Area ONF, I consider that the following amendment to Schedule 21.22.2 Capacity is appropriate:</p> <p>vii. Transport infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONF values. Very limited to nNo landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 acknowledges that:</p> <p><i>the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</i></p> <p>This means that there is an acknowledgement that a finer grained assessment as part of a site-specific proposal may determine a higher capacity for a landuse which may give the submitter some comfort in this regard.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS142.31	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	<p>That the landscape capacity for rural living included within landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows:</p> <p>xii. Rural living - no landscape capacity in the cone-like peak of the ONF. Some landscape capacity in the lower slopes of the ONF.</p>	Refer response to OS 90.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS145.1	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	<p>That Council's GIS PDP maps and the priority area and rural character landscape map included in landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended to identify the correct outstanding natural feature boundary determined by the Environment Court and subsequent resource consent decision RM190049. The proposed new boundary is included in Appendix 1 of the submission.</p>	Amendments to the PA mapping are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS145.2	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the priority area boundary included in landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is moved further up the hill to the 500masl contour where the slope changes and the cone-like peak begins to form to enable the land lower than the 500masl to be excluded from the outstanding natural feature and landscape schedule 21.22.2 (link to submission point #145.4).	Amendments to the PA mapping are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS145.3	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That both the landscape values and landscape capacity components of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill are updated to identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation.	Addressed in response to OS 114.9.	Accept submission in part.
OS145.4	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the 'Important landforms and land types' section of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended to distinguish between the elevated cone-like peak of Ferry Hill and the lower slopes. Land lower than 500masl is to be excluded from the outstanding natural feature and landscape schedule 21.22.2 (as per submission point #145.2).	Addressed under discussion of OS 142.4.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS145.5	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the 'Land use patterns and features' section of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended to further particularise the broader list of established activities occurring within the outstanding natural feature which are historically recognised as appropriate and in keeping with the landform.	Addressed in response to OS 142.5.	Accept submission in part.
OS145.6	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the 'important ecological features and vegetation types' of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended to delete references to vegetation types such as pasture, plant pest species and animal pest species from the important ecological and vegetation types section.	Addressed in response to OS142.6.	Accept submission in part.
OS145.7	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the section on 'important archaeological and heritage features and their locations' (paragraph 16) of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 142.7.	Reject submission.
OS145.8	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the section on 'important recreation attributes and values' (paragraph 23) of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 142.8.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS145.9	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended so that the landscape values for physical values (paragraph 39), associative values (paragraph 40) and perceptual values (paragraph 41) are low or moderate rather than high.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work and 'other expert' input), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 1 Woodlot Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Crown Investment Trust Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal, I do not consider that the rankings of landscape values in Schedule 21.22.2 should be altered.</p> <p>I also note that were the submitter correct in this regard, relying on caselaw, it is very unlikely that Ferry Hill would qualify as an ONF and specifically, the test of 'outstandingness'. I note that the ONF status of Ferry Hill has been confirmed by the Environment Court.</p>	Reject submission.
OS145.10	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That if the overall landscape values for landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill are not amended (as per submission point 145.9), the values need to be amended to assign a low naturalness ranking to the submitters site and other lower-lying slopes.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>With respect to the suggestion that a 'low' naturalness ranking should apply to the submitters site and other lower-lying slopes, the response to OS 142.5 explains the provenance of the approach to assessing naturalness in the PA Schedules.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that:</p> <p><i>The landscape attributes and values identified, relate to the priority area as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing the attributes and values of specific sites.</i></p> <p><i>The landscape attributes and values may change over time.</i></p> <p><i>A finer grained location-specific assessment of landscape attributes and values would be required for any plan change or resource consent. Other landscape values may be identified through these finer grained assessment processes.</i></p> <p>It is inappropriate to single out the rating of naturalness (or other landscape values) for individual sites in a PA Schedule of Landscape Values, however it is acknowledged in the Schedule 21.22 Preamble that varying values may emerge via</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				the finer grained landscape assessment that is required as part of resource consent and plan change processes.	
OS145.11	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended so the landscape capacity includes an indication of at what scale such potential activities have been considered and specific examples and analysis, or if the landscape capacities cannot be amended the landscape capacity section should be deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 142.11.	Reject submission.
OS145.12	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That if the landscape capacities for landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill section are retained as notified, then for the submitters site, this should be amended to recognise and provide for historical and future farming activities.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>This submission point suggests a site-specific grain of detail be included within the PA Schedule.</p> <p>In this regard, the Preamble to Schedule 21.22, explains that the landscape attributes and values identified, relate to the priority area as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing the attributes and values of specific sites. The Preamble explains that a finer grained location-specific assessment of landscape attributes and values would be required for any plan change or resource consent and that other landscape values may be identified through these finer grained assessment processes.</p> <p>Further, Schedule 21.22.2 acknowledges existing and historical pastoral farming in the PA. The capacity for the style of pastoral farming evident at Ferry Hill is not addressed in the PA Schedules as this is a permitted activity under the PDP.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS145.13	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That any other consequential changes be made that are necessary to achieve the relief sought in the submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS145.14	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the 'Important hydrological features' section (paragraphs 4 and 5) of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 142.20.	Reject submission.
OS145.15	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the 'Important ecological features and vegetation types' (paragraphs 6 - 9) of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill are deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 142.21.	Reject submission.
OS145.16	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That paragraph 10 relating to 'Important land-use patterns and features' of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows: Grazed pasture which is the dominant land use across the PA. Associated with this activity is a network of farm tracks, shelter trees, fencing, farm buildings, and sheds.	Addressed in response to OS 142.22.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS145.17	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That paragraph 12 relating to 'Important land-use patterns and features' of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows: "Rural residential development and farm buildings in rural zoned areas in the lower-lying parts of the PA ONF".	Addressed in response to OS 142.23.	Reject submission.
OS145.18	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the 'Naturalness attributes and values' section (paragraph 31) of landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows: The 'seemingly' undeveloped character <u>of the elevated cone-like peak of the Ferry Hill PA ONF</u> set within an urban or rural living context, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to pastoral and infrastructure uses are visible, the very low number of buildings, the relatively modest scale of tracks and the limited visibility of infrastructure limits their influence on the character of the area as a natural landscape element.	Addressed in response to OS 142.24.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS145.19	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	<p>That subsection 'b' of paragraph 38 on 'Aesthetic qualities and values' within landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The distinctly rugged character of the west, northwest, north and northeast sides of the roche moutonnee landforms and the more coherent appearance of the southwest and south of each as a consequence of the landform and vegetation character and patterns. ii. The open and pastoral character of Ferry Hill. iii. The cone-like peak landform of Ferry Hill. iv. The very limited level of built modification evident through the ONF. 	Addressed in response to OS 142.25.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS145.20	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities included within landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows: ii. Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - no landscape capacity in the cone-like peak of the ONF. Some landscape capacity in the lower slopes of the ONF.	Addressed in response to OS142.26.	Accept submission in part.
OS145.21	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for urban expansions included within landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows: iii. Urban expansions - no landscape capacity in the cone-like peak of the ONF. Some landscape capacity in the lower slopes of the ONF.	Addressed in response to OS 142.27.	Reject submission.
OS145.22	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for farm buildings included within landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows: vi. Farm buildings - some landscape capacity for modestly scaled	Addressed in response to OS 142.29.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			buildings that reinforce existing rural character.		
OS145.23	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	<p>That the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure included within landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows:</p> <p>viii. Transport infrastructure - some limited landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONF values. Limited landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.</p>	Addressed in response to OS142.30.	Accept submission in part.
OS145.24	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jon Waterston	Oppose	<p>That the landscape capacity for rural living included within landscape schedule 21.22.2 Ferry Hill is amended as follows:</p> <p>xii. Rural living - no landscape capacity in the cone-like peak of the ONF. Some landscape capacity in the lower slopes of the ONF.</p>	Addressed in response to OS 90.1.	Accept submission in part.

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(c) 21.22.3 Shotover River PA ONFL

21.22.3 PA ONF/L Kimiākau (Shotover River): Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA ONF/L is takes in the river corridor and context winding broadly southwards from west of Mount Dewar, through Arthurs Point, around Tucker Beach to the confluence with the Kawarau River. The PA ONF includes the lower reaches of Moonlight Creek to the west of Mount Dewar.

In the vicinity of the Shotover Loop, the ONF portion of the PA corresponds to the gorge. The elevated land to the north, that includes a roche moutonnée knoll corresponds to ONL, with the distinction between the ONL and ONF coinciding with the transition from the steep escarpment of the gorge to the less steep slopes of the knoll.

The mapped PA ONF includes the upper edges of the landforms framing the river corridor. This takes in the gravel beds and river floodplains to the west of Arthurs Point and at Big Beach (south of Arthurs Point), Tucker Beach and the Kawarau confluence. It also includes the steep hill slopes bordering Piano Terrace and the western end of the Shotover Canyon Track to the west of Mount Dewar.

Commented [BG1]: OS 207.2 QLDC.

Amended PA Schedule title (ONF/L rather than ONF) to reflect the Decision of the Arthurs Point Hearing Commission (dated 8 June 2023). NB same amendment in Schedule header.

Text amendments in the General Description are recommended to assist an understanding of the ONF and ONL portions of the PA as a consequence of the Arthurs Point Hearing Commission Decision (dated 8 June 2023).

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Mana whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. Steep escarpments, scarps, roche moutonnée knoll, gorges/canyons, bluffs and river cliffs, where glacial and alluvial processes have eroded underlying schist.
2. Alluvial floodplains and terraces, dynamic river braids and gravel shoals at bends in the course of the river to the west of Arthurs Point and at Big Beach, Tucker Beach and the confluence with the Kawarau River.
3. The overall transition along the course of the river from a predominantly narrow and steeply incised corridor (interspersed with alluvial flats and gravel beds at river bends) upriver (north) of Tucker Beach to a more consistently broad and open riverbed and valley at the confluence with the Kawarau.
4. In places, the seamless merger of the riverbanks with the flanking large-scale mountain landforms of Ferry Hill, Sugar Loaf, Bowen Peak and Mount Dewar.

Commented [BG2]: Consequential change following the more detailed landscape information presented at the Arthurs Point hearing.

Important hydrological features:

5. The Kimiākau (Shotover River), in particular the following features and attributes:
 - a. Waterbody with a gravel and schist bed.
 - b. The fast-flowing waters with numerous rapids.
 - c. Emerald green colouring Clarity of the waters in the vicinity of the gorge.

Commented [BG3]: OS 59.2 Anna Hutchinson Family Trust.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

6. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. Pockets of grey shrubland, especially within the gorged sections upstream of Tucker Beach and upstream of Arthurs Point and on adjacent hillslopes.

- b. Remnant pockets of mountain beech in the gorge upstream of Arthurs Point.
 - c. Cushion vegetation associated with stable areas of riverbed at Tucker Beach and Big Beach.
 - d. A large regionally significant wetland known as the Shotover River Confluence Swamp by the lower braided section near the Kawarau River confluence. The wetland features a mosaic of sedgeland, rushland and willow.
7. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
- a. The almost continuous patterning of willows and poplars along the riverbanks.
8. The rocky gorges and associated beech forest and grey shrubland provide habitat for New Zealand falcon and other native birds including bellbird, South Island tomtit, grey warbler, fantail and silvereye.
9. The river and adjoining stable areas of riverbed provide suitable feeding and nesting habitat for the nationally threatened black-fronted tern (*Chilidonias albotiatus*) (Nationally endangered), black billed gull (*Larus bulleri*) (Nationally critical) and the banded dotterel (*Charadrius bicinctus*) (Nationally vulnerable).
10. Habitat for trout and salmon.
11. Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
12. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, sycamore, elderberry, buddleia, hawthorn, sweet briar, broom and gorse. Large areas of stable riverbed being colonised by buddleia.

Commented [BG4]: Typographical correction.

Important land-use patterns and features:

13. A very limited number of rural living dwellings on the intermediate ledges framing the river corridor, with two located near the southern end of Domain Road, three scattered across the elevated ledges to the northwest of the Edith Cavell Bridge, two located on the elevated terraces to the northeast of the Edith Cavell Bridge, one located on the elevated terrace southeast of Edith Cavell Bridge and one opposite Big Beach. The very limited number of dwellings and/or their discreet location (with the latter factor not applying to all of the existing dwellings) are important factors in the appropriateness of these elements within the river corridor.
14. The Lower Shotover / Kimiākau Trail along the true left bank of the river linking between Littles Road and Domain Road and parts of the Countryside Trail and Twin Rivers Trail and the southern end of the PA ONF. All of the trails are part of the Queenstown Trail network.
15. The network of relatively short tracks along the river, to the north and south of Arthurs Point.
16. The western end of the Shotover Canyon Track (north of Arthurs Point).
17. An almost continuous patterning of 'conservation' focused land along Kimiākau and the Moonlight Creek (comprising Stewardship Area, DoC marginal strip or Council Reserve). Noteworthy publicly accessible reserve areas are located at Tucker Beach and the river terraces north of Arthurs Point.
18. The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) associated with Arthurs Point adjoins either side of the river PA ONF.
19. Infrastructure is evident within the corridor and includes: pipelines at the Old Shotover Bridge; a transmission corridor – the Cromwell-Frankton A 110KV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid and gravel extraction is located near the confluence with the Kawarau; informal gravel trails and vehicular tracks; fencing; and two Aurora distribution lines (one crossing the river at Tucker Beach, and the other running along the corridor roughly between Tucker Beach and Big Beach); the Queenstown Airport runway and Runway End Safety Area (RESA) located at the southern end of the PA; Morningstar Reserve area comprising a range of and industrial commercial activities and facilities area beneath the Edith Cavell Bridge including Shotover Jet and Queenstown Rafting tourism operations, Canyon-Brewing

Commented [BG5]: OS 106.1 RD & EM Anderson Family Trust.

Commented [BG6]: OS 59.6 Anna Hutchinson Family Trust.

Commented [BG7]: OS 70.11 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

Commented [BG8]: OS 70.11 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

Commented [BG9]: OS 86.5 Melissa Brook.

and carparking area, as well as the Shotover Canyon Swing which has a steel cable line that crosses the river and is located north of the Edith Cavell bridge. A bridge is planned to be built in the future to cross the Shotover River at Tuckers Beach Reserve as part of the Queenstown Trail.

Commented [BG10]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG11]: OS 166.9 RealNZ Limited.

20. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the river corridor due to their scale, character and/or proximity include: the Queenstown Wastewater Treatment Plant, the urban area of Quail Rise on the eastern side of Ferry Hill; the scattering of rural living properties throughout Tucker Beach rural living area, along the top of the cliffs adjacent Domain Road, Littles Road and Fitzpatrick Road; and throughout the river terraces adjacent Littles Stream.

Commented [BG12]: OS 59.6 Anna Hutchinson Family Trust.
OS 59.13 Anna Hutchinson Family Trust.

21. State Highway 6 which crosses the river at the southern end of the PA.

22. Gorge Road which crosses the river at Arthurs Point (via the Edith Cavell Bridge).

23. The very popular commercial jet boat and rafting operations at the southern end of the ONF and the area north and south of the Edith Cavell Bridge.

Commented [BG13]: OS 166.10 RealNZ Limited.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

24. Edith Cavell Bridge at Arthurs Point (District Plan reference 35, archaeological site E41/300).
25. The Thomas Arthurs Monument, beside Edith Cavell Bridge, Arthurs Point (District Plan reference 29).
26. The steam tractor beside the Oxenbridge Tunnel near Arthurs Point (true right bank; District Plan reference 31).
27. The house and sleepout, Paddy Mathias Place Arthurs Point Road (true left bank, District Plan reference 62).
28. The Old Shotover River Bridge (District Plan reference 222).
29. The Oxenbridge Mining Tunnel near Arthurs Point (true right bank). The 170m tunnel was part of a failed mining scheme by the Oxenbridge brothers, attempting to divert water from the river to recover gold from the riverbed. Today it is used by rafters and kayakers (HNZPT List Number 5607; archaeological site E41/94).
30. Sew Hoy's Big Beach Claim Historic Area (at Big Beach; HNZPT List Number 7545).
31. A protected Poplar near Arthurs Point (true right bank; District Plan reference 163).
32. Old Shotover Bridge Stone Causeway (archaeological site F41/790).
33. Kawarau Diversion Syndicate Project features (dredge and diversion tunnel, archaeological site E41/255).
34. Stone abutment of 1862 bridge (archaeological site E41/301).
35. Prince Arthur Dredge (archaeological site E41/95).
36. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, and associated domestic sites along the riverbanks (for example, archaeological sites E41/247, E41/243, and F41/766).

36A. Shotover Jet and Queenstown Rafting Operations (Queenstown's first commercial jet boating and rafting operations).

Commented [BG14]: OS 166.11 RealNZ Limited.

Important mana whenua features and their locations:

37. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.

38. The ONF is mapped as wāhi tūpuna Kimiākau (Shotover River), part of the extensive networks of mahika kai (food & resource gathering) and traditional travel routes in this area.
39. A contemporary nohoaka (camping site to support traditional mahika kai activities provided as redress under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlements Act 1998) is located at Tucker Beach.
40. The confluence of the Kimiākau and the Kawerau is known as Puahuru.

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

Mana whenua associations and experience:

41. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
42. For generations, mana whenua traversed these catchments gathering kai and other resources.
43. The mana whenua values associated with this ONF include, but may not be limited to, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

Important historic attributes and values:

44. Gold mining in and alongside the river, which is reputed to have been one of the richest gold bearing rivers in the world.
45. The naming of the river which was coined by William Gilbert Rees after his business partner, George Gammie's English estate, Shotover Park. The river had been previously called Tummel by two Scottish pioneers named Donald Angus Cameron and Angus Alphonse Macdonald who had passed through the area before Rees arrived. It was also referred to as the Overshot by the early goldminers, but it was the name Shotover that stuck.
46. The scattering of various historic features (including the Old Ferry Hotel on Spence Road), especially bridges and bridge sites, along and adjacent the PA ONF, which collectively tell the story of the early European history of the area.

Commented [BG15]: OS 59.15 Anna Hutchinson Family Trust.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

47. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
48. The popularity of Kimiākau (Shotover River) as an inspiration/subject for art, photography, postage stamps and books. Also as a wedding venue.
49. The identity of the river as an important natural and historic landscape context for Arthurs Point, Tucker Beach, Quail Rise, and the various rural living areas along its margins.
50. The popularity of the recreational 'features' listed below and their general ease of accessibility.
51. The importance of the natural heritage area to the local community as evidenced by the efforts of local community groups (eg e.g. APCA and KAPOW) to manage weeds and pests, clear debris in the river and revegetate sections of the river corridor.

Commented [BG16]: Typographical correction.

Important recreation attributes and values:

52. Gold panning on the river; walking (including dog walking), running and cycling the trail alongside the river (including footbridges); jetboating, rafting, paddleboarding and kayaking on the river, particularly through the Shotover gorge/canyon section; swimming in the river; picnicking by the river.
53. Some motorbiking activities at the southern end of the ONF.
54. Arthurs Point DOC Visitor Services office and tourism ticketing / access points.
55. Te Araroa Trail connection via the Wakatipu Track, passing over the Shotover River near Frankton.
56. Sport fishing for trout and salmon.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

57. Clearly legible glacial, fluvial / hydrological processes that have shaped the river corridor and which continue to add to its dynamic qualities. These are evident in scarps, floodplains and the changing patterns of channels and alluvial deposits and gravel banks along the river course.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

58. Highly attractive close, mid and long-range views from tracks/bridges (which are public places and including Edith Cavell Bridge), local roads, reserve land, the water, the SH6 bridge and nearby dwellings (including at Arthurs Point) along the river corridor. Vegetation and landform patterns, together with the winding corridor, contain and frame views, contributing a highly variable character to the outlook.
59. Throughout the gorge/canyon sections near Arthurs Point, the fast-flowing narrow channel, framed by unmodified rock escarpments, bluffs and large-scale vegetation-clad river cliffs, is spectacular.
60. Throughout river bends and towards the lower reaches, the corridor is wider, affording longer-range views of the broader mountain setting. Here, the engaging patterning of the dynamic river waters and gravel beds framed by the undeveloped vegetation-clad river cliffs and terraces dominates the outlook. The filtering and framing effect of vegetation in places along with the alternating availability of such views serves to enhance their interest and appeal. In places, the steep and large-scale mountainous landforms of Ferry Hill, Sugar Loaf, Bowen Peak, Mount Dewar and the broader mountain setting add to the sense of drama and grandeur. Elsewhere, historic features within or adjacent the corridor, rapids and/or the dynamic gravel shoals add to the appeal of the outlook.
61. From low-lying vantage points within the corridor (on the water and on tracks) intervening landform and/or vegetation features largely obscure views to urban and rural living development adjacent the area adjacent.
62. Appealing mid and long-range views from SH6 Shotover Bridge in which the broad river corridor reads as a swathe of natural landscape bookmarking the interface between Queenstown and the Wakatipu Basin proper. In these views, the attractive vegetation dominated riverbanks, along with the dynamic gravel beds and water channels and Old Shotover bridge, create the impression of a relatively undeveloped river corridor. The visibility of the distant Northern Remarkables and Coronet Range in outlooks adds to the appeal.
63. In all of the views, the dominance of 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONF, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the ONF and the contrast

Commented [BG17]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG18]: OS 200.41 Gertrude's Saddlery Limited.

with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook. The limited visibility of urban development at Arthurs Point from much of the corridor also plays a role in this regard.

Naturalness attributes and values:

64. The seemingly undeveloped character of the river corridor due to the dominance of the escarpment, cliff and bluff landforms, the waterbody and its largely vegetated margins. While trails, tunnels, footbridges, road bridges, ~~transmission corridors National Grid, power lines, wilding conifers,~~ the odd house and vehicular tracks are evident in the corridor, these features either indicate the high recreational values of the ONF (see shortly) or are of a character, location and/or extent that means they are not dominant elements. The exception to this is the transmission corridor at the southern end of the area which contributes a localised utilitarian influence.
65. From the bridges and more elevated locations within the corridor, there is an awareness of the urban or rural living land use adjacent the corridor. Even so, there remains a perception of significant naturalness within the river landscape, largely due to the densely vegetated riverbanks, escarpment and bluff landforms and/or close proximity to the dramatic mountain context. Buildings tend to be glimpsed behind plantings making them recessive, with the historic character of some contributing to the charm of the area. Structures such as the historic bridges, signage, and seating associated with the trails also contribute positively to the appearance of the area. Overall, there is the impression of a landscape that is highly picturesque, variable and aesthetically appealing.
66. For the gorge stretches of river corridor, the dramatic escarpments, scarps, cliffs, and bluffs that frame the river create the impression of a strongly enclosed, intimate, and dramatic river character. The wild waters and exotic vegetation add to this impression and there is generally a very high perception of naturalness and 'getting away from it all' due to very limited exposure to development.

Commented [BG19]: OS 70.12 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

Commented [BG20]: OS 200.26 Gertrude's Saddlery Limited.
OS 200.45 Gertrude's Saddlery Limited.
OS 200.47 Gertrude's Saddlery Limited.

Memorability attributes and values:

67. The dramatic gorges near Arthurs Point and stretches of rapids.
68. The appealing and engaging views of the sinuous braided river corridor flanked by vegetation.
69. The various footbridges and historic features along the river corridor.

Transient attributes and values:

70. The fluctuations and changing patterns of the river waters and floodplain gravel banks.
71. The autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation (river edge poplars and willows in particular).
72. Seasonal snowfall throughout the riverbanks provides a noteworthy spectacle.

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

73. The gorge sections of the corridor where there is a strong sense of wildness.
74. Large stretches of the balance of the area, where despite the greater corridor width, intervening vegetation and / or landforms, screens ~~views~~ views of surrounding buildings and roads.
75. The dark night sky (i.e. lack of light pollution), contributes to the impression of wildness and remoteness in places.

Commented [BG21]: Typographical correction.

Aesthetic qualities and values:

76. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.

77. More specifically, this includes:

- a. The highly attractive and intimate composition created by the fast-flowing watercourse framed by the dramatic scarps, escarpments, bluffs, and vegetation-clad cliffs throughout the gorge sections.
- b. The dynamic and natural patterning of the braided channel and gravel shoals throughout wider sections, seen framed by vegetation.
- c. The striking seasonal leaf colour display associated with the area.
- d. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. the visually discrete character of the majority of built development bordering the area;
 - ii. the historic built development that is seen in places;
 - iii. the sympathetic design of the trail tracks and structures; and
 - iv. the exotic trees along the river course, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Perceptual (Sensory) • Associative

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA ONF can be summarised as follows:

- 78. **Very High** physical values relating to the velocity and clarity of the waters, the dynamic attributes of the river corridor, the gorges and floodplains shaped by the river, the habitat values for native fauna, the areas of indigenous vegetation and the mana whenua features in the area.
- 79. **Very High** associative values relating to:
 - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
 - b. The historic features in the area.
 - c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
 - d. The recreational attributes of the ONF.
- 80. **Very High** perceptual values relating to:
 - a. The strong legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
 - b. The appealing aesthetic and distinctive memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural and cultural landscape elements. The area's transient values, the intimate, dramatic, and enclosed character of the gorge sections and the accessibility of the area generally play an important role.

- c. A strong perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of more natural landscape elements and processes throughout the area.
- d. A sense of remoteness and wildness in places, particularly throughout the gorge sections due to the sheer scale of natural landforms and wildness of the wild river waters and elsewhere, in places where landform and/or vegetation obscure views of built development.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Kimitiākau (Shotover River) PA ONF for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – **some** landscape capacity for **small scale and low key** activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; **and** enhance public access; **and protect the area's ONF values.**
 - Commented [BG22]:** OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.
 - Commented [BG23]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2
 - Commented [BG24]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** – **no** landscape capacity; **very limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms which are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). No landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA. No landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA.**
 - Commented [BG25]:** OS 200.64 Gertrude's Saddlery Limited. OS 172.11 Arthurs Point Trustees Limited.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks** – **very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with public access tracks, trails, tunnels, and bridge structures, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – **very limited to no** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
 - Commented [BG26]:** OS 172.9 Arthurs Point Trustees Limited.
 - Commented [BG27]:** OS 172.9 Arthurs Point Trustees Limited.
- vii. **Mineral extraction** – **no** landscape capacity.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure** – **very limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; **and** integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; **and protect the area's ONF values. No landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.**
 - Commented [BG28]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.
 - Commented [BG29]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be co-located with existing infrastructure or designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.
- x. **Renewable energy generation** – **no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. **Very limited to no** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
 - Commented [BG30]:** OS 172.9 Arthurs Point Trustees Limited.
- xi. **Production forestry** – **no** landscape capacity.
 - Commented [BG31]:** Typographical correction.
- xii. **Rural living** – **Very limited to no** landscape capacity for development that is: clustered with existing development; located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).
 - Commented [BG32]:** OS 172.9 Arthurs Point Trustees Limited. OS 200.65 Gertrude's Saddlery Limited.
 - Commented [BG33]:** OS 172.9 Arthurs Point Trustees Limited.

21.22.3 Shotover River PA ONF/L Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.3 Shotover River PA ONF/L Schedule". New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text: relates to a submission point that has not be captured in the "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.3 Shotover River PA ONF Schedule". This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **Fifty examples identified.**

Green wash line item: Submission point re-notified 22 June 2023.

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS12.1	Ella Pedley	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required other than to note the Schedule 21.22.3 text changes recommended in Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.3 (July 2023).	Accept submission in part.
OS12.5	Ella Pedley	Support	That the capacity assessment for landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS13.1	Jennie Semple	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS13.3	Jennie Semple	Support	That the values and attributes of landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River are retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS13.5	Jennie Semple	Support	That the Shotover River Outstanding Natural Feature is protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development in accordance with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS13.9	Jennie Semple	Oppose	That any other consequential changes be made to achieve the purpose of sustainable management and protection of the Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape within and around Arthurs Point.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS13.12	Jennie Semple	Oppose	That the notified landscape map contains an error which shows an extended Urban Growth Boundary over Atley Road which the Environment Court and Appeals Court ordered to be reversed. This error should be rectified and include a further period of time for people to respond once rectified.	The PA Mapping corresponds to the notified PDP ONF/L mapping for the area.	Reject submission.
OS14.1	Matthew Semple	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS14.3	Matthew Semple	Support	That the values and attributes of landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River are retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS14.5	Matthew Semple	Support	That the Shotover River Outstanding Natural Feature is protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development in accordance with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS14.9	Matthew Semple	Oppose	That any other consequential changes be made to achieve the purpose of sustainable management and protection of the Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape within and around Arthurs Point.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS15.1	Andrew Blackford	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimitiākau Shotover River be retained as notified including the extent of the Outstanding Natural Feature.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS16.4	Richard and Lindsay Macharg	Oppose	That the boundary of landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River be amended to include 'Tremain house' and 'Tremain's corner'.	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS16.5	Richard and Lindsay Macharg	Oppose	That the boundary of landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River be amended at the cut out around Bordeaux's store and its associated accommodation and extensive outbuildings.	Addressed in response to OS 16.4.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS16.6	Richard and Lindsay Macharg	Oppose	That the boundary of landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be amended to use Malaghans Road as the southeastern boundary as the landscape boundary.	Addressed in response to OS 16.4.	Reject submission.
OS36.1	Suzanne Rose	Support	That the Outstanding Natural Feature status of the Kimiākau (Shotover River) in landscape schedule 21.22.3 is retained.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS36.2	Suzanne Rose	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River attributes and values at paragraph 48 be amended so that there is no reference of historical documents that feature wilding conifers, including art, photography, postage stamps and books, should determine our future landscapes.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the PA ONL (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>However, it is agreed that as currently drafted the Schedules are potentially confusing in this regard as these aspects of the landscape are negative rather than positive.</p> <p>A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS45.1	Natalie Reeves	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS59.1	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be rejected, or alternatively that amendments be made to address points raised in submission 59, with any other consequential changes made that are necessary to achieve the relief sought.	The merits or otherwise of rejecting Schedule 21.22.3 are addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report. A number of changes are recommended to Schedule 21.23.3 as shown in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.3. These address matters raised in submissions and consequential relief where the matters raised are supported by the landscape and other experts.	Accept submission in part.
OS59.2	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River paragraph 5 be amended to include a statement that the Shotover River is a heavily silt laden river and not known for its clarity.	Amend Schedule 21.22.3 [5] as follows: The Kīmiākau (Shotover River), in particular the following features and attributes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Waterbody with a gravel and schist bed. b. The fast-flowing waters with numerous rapids. c. <u>Emerald green colouring</u> Clarity of the waters <u>in the vicinity of the gorge</u>. 	Accept submission in part.
OS59.4	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That in 21.22.3 Kīmiākau Shotover River important land use patterns and features the actual development pattern be considered and described.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I consider that the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.3 'Important landuse patterns and features' section is accurate.	Reject submission.
OS59.5	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna	Oppose	That 21.22.3 Kīmiākau Shotover River paragraph 18 be amended to reflect the	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Hutchinson Family Trust		land use patterns and that this will change as an urban area develops.	Reference to the UGB in Schedule 21.22.3 [18] acknowledges the urban context of part of the PA as an important landuse pattern that influences part of the PA. Therefore no text amendments are required in this regard.	

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS59.6	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That 21.22.3 Kimiakau Shotover River paragraph 19 be amended to recognise all land use patterns, including major infrastructure like the Queenstown Wastewater disposal fields and gravel extraction activity that operates at the confluence.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.3 [19] as follows:</p> <p>Infrastructure is evident within the corridor and includes: pipelines at the Old Shotover Bridge; a transmission corridor and gravel extraction near the confluence with the Kawerau; informal gravel trails and vehicular tracks; fencing; and two Aurora distribution lines (one crossing the river at Tucker Beach, and the other running along the corridor roughly between Tucker Beach and Big Beach); commercial activity area beneath the Edith Cavell Bridge including Shotover Jet tourism operation, Canyon Brewing and carpark area, as well as the Shotover Canyon Swing which has a steel cable line that crosses the river and is located north of the Edith Cavell bridge. A bridge is planned to be built in the future to cross the Shotover River at Tuckers Beach Reserve as part of the Queenstown Trail.</p> <p>Schedule 21.22.3[19] describes the infrastructure within the PA. The Queenstown wastewater facility is outside the PA. However it is recommended that Schedule 21.22.3 [20] is amended to acknowledge this landuse:</p> <p>Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the river corridor due to their scale, character and/or proximity include: the Queenstown Wastewater Treatment Plant, the urban area of Quail Rise on the eastern side of Ferry Hill; the scattering of rural living properties throughout Tucker Beach rural living area, along the top of the cliffs adjacent Domain Road, Littles Road and Fitzpatrick Road; and throughout the river terraces adjacent Littles Stream.</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS59.7	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.3.iv. intensive agriculture be amended to make clear that while the landscape schedules refer to neighbouring land uses that affect the context of the Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF), this section only refers to intensive agriculture within the ONF and not adjacent to the ONF.	It is implicit in the Schedules and associated policy context (3.3.38), that the capacity assessment only applies to the relevant PA. For this reason, no change is considered necessary to the text.	Reject submission.
OS59.8	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.3.vi. farm buildings be amended to make clear that while the landscape schedules refer to neighbouring land uses that affect the context of the Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF), this section only refers to farm buildings within the ONF and not adjacent to the ONF.	Addressed in response to OS 59.7.	Reject submission.
OS59.9	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.3.xii. be amended to make clear that while the landscape schedules refer to neighbouring land uses that affect the context of the Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF), this section only refers to rural living within the ONF and not adjacent to the ONF.	Addressed in response to OS 59.7.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS 59.12	Werner Murray (The Property Group) On Behalf Of Anna Hutchison Family Trust,	Oppose	That paragraph 18 of landscape schedule 21.22.3 be amended to more accurately describe and look at the factual elements that are present, rather than having a planning outcome influence a landscape opinion. The Urban Growth Boundary is a planning construct rather than a land use pattern.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, I do not consider that the wording of 21.22.3 [18] is appropriate. In my experience an UGB plays an important in shaping landuse patterns.	Reject submission.
OS 59.13	Werner Murray (The Property Group) On Behalf Of Anna Hutchison Family Trust,	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 be amended to acknowledge that the Queenstown Wastewater Plant has a significant influence both visually and practically on the landscape character of the river corridor, being located directly adjacent to the ONF.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in response to 59.6 although it is not accepted that the Wastewater Treatment Plant has a significant influence on the character of the PA.	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS 59.14	Werner Murray (The Property Group) On Behalf Of Anna Hutchison Family Trust,	Oppose	That paragraph 20 of landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River be amended to be more inclusive of landuse patterns and features, as excluding those that could be perceived as undesirable could lead to false expectations from members of the public and users of the District Plan around what the ONF as a regulatory tool is designed to do, and can do.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The meaning of this submission point is unclear. For completeness, Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I consider that the Response to Submissions Version	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				of Schedule 21.22.3 'Important landuse patterns and features' section is accurate.	
OS 59.15	Werner Murray (The Property Group) On Behalf Of Anna Hutchison Family Trust,	Oppose	That paragraph 46 of landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to include reference to the cluster of buildings at the Old Ferry Hotel on Spence Road adjacent to the PA ONF.	Amend Schedule 21.22.3{46} as follows: The scattering of various historic features (including the Old Ferry Hotel on Spence Road), especially bridges and bridge sites, along and adjacent the PA ONF, which collectively tell the story of the early European history of the area.	Accept submission.
OS 59.16	Werner Murray (The Property Group) On Behalf Of Anna Hutchison Family Trust,	Oppose	That paragraphs 47-51 of landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River are amended to recognise the attributes and values that extend beyond Arthurs Point, Tucker Beach and Quail Rise which include important settlement patterns dating back to the 1800s and the elements of large infrastructure important to Queenstown as a whole.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The Shared and Recognised Values section of the Schedules relates to a description of such values within the PA. The locations referenced in this submission point are located outside the PA.	Reject submission.
OS 59.17	Werner Murray (The Property Group) On Behalf Of Anna Hutchison Family Trust,	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 be amended so that it is clear that the landscape capacity rating 'no capacity for urban expansion' relates to expansion within the ONF and not adjacent to the ONF.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. As guided by Chapter 3, the PA Schedules only apply to the mapped PA. The submitter is also referred to the S42A Report, where the way that the PA Schedules will be used as part of the District Plan is explained in more detail.	Reject submission.
OS 59.21	Werner Murray (The Property Group) On	Oppose	That the landscape schedules be considered with regard to Part 2 of the	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Behalf Of Anna Hutchison Family Trust,		RMA as there is a high possibility for unintended consequences whereby the landscape schedules will be used to refer to adjoining areas and make inferences around the appropriateness of development that adjoins the ONF.		
OS 59.22	Werner Murray (The Property Group) On Behalf Of Anna Hutchison Family Trust,	Oppose	That the variation is rejected, refused or otherwise declined.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS 59.23	Werner Murray (The Property Group) On Behalf Of Anna Hutchison Family Trust,	Oppose	That if the variation is adopted, that it be amended, varied or otherwise modified (including schedules 21.22.3 and 21.22.6) to address the concerns, issues, and other matters raised in this submission including any necessary additional or consequential relief.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS63.5	Julian Pedley	Oppose	That the outstanding natural landscape line for landscape schedule 21.23.3 Shotover River is incorrect and should be amended to be based upon the 2016 Proposed District Plan map.	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation. Further, the extent of the ONF/L in the vicinity of the Shotover Loop has been confirmed by the Arthurs Point Hearing Commission Decision (dated 8 June 2023) and aligns with the extent of the PA mapping in this area.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS69.1	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimitiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS69.7	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimitiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS70.11	Ainsley McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at paragraph 19 to replace the words 'a transmission corridor' with 'the Cromwell-Frankton A 110KV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid is located within the ONF'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.3 [19] as follows: Infrastructure is evident within the corridor and includes: pipelines at the Old Shotover Bridge; a transmission corridor the Cromwell-Frankton A 110KV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid is located near the confluence with the Kawerau; informal gravel trails and vehicular tracks; fencing; and two Aurora distribution lines (one crossing the river at Tucker Beach, and the other running along the corridor roughly between Tucker Beach and Big Beach); commercial activity area beneath the Edith Cavell Bridge including Shotover Jet tourism operation, Canyon Brewing and carpark area, as well as the Shotover Canyon Swing which has a steel cable line that crosses the river and is located north of the Edith Cavell bridge. A bridge is planned to be built in the future to cross the Shotover River at Tuckers Beach Reserve as part of the Queenstown Trail.	Accept Submission.
OS70.12	Ainsley McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22 Shotover River is amended at paragraph 64 to replace the words 'transmission corridors' with 'the National Grid', replace the words 'transmission corridor' with 'National Grid that is necessarily visual dominant', and to replace the	Amend Schedule 21.22.3 [64] as follows: The seemingly undeveloped character of the river corridor due to the dominance of the escarpment, cliff and bluff landforms, the waterbody and its largely vegetated margins. While trails, tunnels, footbridges, road bridges, transmission corridors National Grid that is necessarily visually dominant, power lines, the odd house and vehicular tracks are evident in the corridor, these features either indicate the high recreational values of the ONF (see shortly) or are of a character, location and/or extent that means they are not	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			word 'which' with 'and' in the landscape schedule.	<p>dominant elements. The exception to this is the transmission corridor at the southern end of the area which contributes a localised utilitarian influence.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not agree with the submitter's request to add reference to the National Grid as being 'necessarily visually dominant' in Schedule 21.22.3. This is partly because the Schedule of Values relates to the PA as a whole rather than being at a site specific (or landscape elements specific) level. Further, the localised visual dominance of this infrastructure is already acknowledged at the end of [64], where the localised utilitarian influence is noted.</p> <p>It is noted that no technical evidence is provided in support of this aspect of the submission point.</p>	
OS71.1	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS71.7	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS72.1	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS72.7	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS83.1	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS83.7	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS86.1	Melissa Brook	Oppose	That priority area 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be amended so that the Lower Shotover Delta portion of the priority area is in accordance with the guidance provided in Objective 3.2.5.2, Objective 3.2.5.3, 3.1B.5(e) and Policy 3.3.36 of the Proposed District Plan for the priority areas to apply to Rural zones.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 86.5	Melissa Brook	Oppose	That the following be added under the heading 'Important land-use patterns and features: The Queenstown Airport runway and Runway End Safety Area (RESA) located at the southern end of the PA on a substantially modified landform.	Amend 21.22.3 [19] as follows: Infrastructure is evident within the corridor and includes: pipelines at the Old Shotover Bridge; a transmission corridor near the confluence with the Kawerau; informal gravel trails and vehicular tracks; fencing; and two Aurora distribution lines (one crossing the river at Tucker Beach, and the other running along the corridor roughly between Tucker Beach and Big Beach); <u>the Queenstown Airport runway and Runway End Safety Area (RESA) located at the southern</u>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				end of the PA : commercial activity area beneath the Edith Cavell Bridge including Shotover Jet tourism operation, Canyon Brewing and carpark area, as well as the Shotover Canyon Swing which has a steel cable line that crosses the river and is located north of the Edith Cavell bridge. A bridge is planned to be built in the future to cross the Shotover River at Tuckers Beach Reserve as part of the Queenstown Trail.	
OS87.1	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS87.7	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS90.2	Will Hodgson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS92.1	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS92.7	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS106.1	Tim Williams On Behalf Of RD & EM Anderson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River is amended to exclude the submitter's property at 91 Oxenbridge Tunnel Road,	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject mapping amendment. Accept submission in part.

Commented [BG1]: Typographical correction.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Arthurs Point (Section 121 Block XIX Shotover SD and Lot 2 DP 19294).	<p>In response to this submission, it is recommended that Schedule 21.22.3 [13] is amended as follows, to acknowledge the existing rural living development north of the Edith Cavell Bridge within the PA (and including the submitter's land):</p> <p>A very limited number of rural living dwellings on the intermediate ledges framing the river corridor, with two located near the southern end of Domain Road, <u>three scattered across the elevated ledges to the northwest of the Edith Cavell Bridge, two located on the elevated terraces to the northeast of the Edith Cavell Bridge, one located on the elevated terrace southeast of Edith Cavell Bridge</u> and one opposite Big Beach. The very limited number of dwellings and/or their discreet location (with the latter factor not applying to all of the existing dwellings) are important factors in the appropriateness of these elements within the river corridor.</p>	
OS107.1	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS107.7	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS112.1	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS112.7	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.1	J Semple	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is supported as notified and	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			should be adopted as a matter of priority and importance.		
OS122.7	J Semple	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure such as bridges or crossings of the Shotover River in the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River should be amended to have no capacity for such activities.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Bridges as a landuse activity are addressed under 'transport infrastructure'. Schedule 21.22.3 advises that there is no landscape capacity for transport infrastructure other than trails (for which there is very limited capacity). For this reason, no change is required to Schedule 21.22.3 in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS122.10	J Semple	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is adopted in the Proposed District Plan to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.13	J Semple	Support	That the values of the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River are appropriately recorded so that those values can be considered in any future resource consent application or plan changes.	The submitter requests a number of changes to the Schedule text, including the addition of a landscape description of the area derived from the QLDC Read Landscape Boundaries Report, April 2014. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I consider that all of the attributes and values signalled in the submission are captured in Schedule 21.22.3, albeit in a slightly different structure that accords with landscape assessment best practice. The submission is critical that Schedule 21.22.3 forms a one size fits all approach to describing the landscape values and landscape capacity of the Shotover River ONF and wider ONL	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>mountain context. The interrelationship between the Shotover River ONF and that broader mountain context is referenced in Schedule 21.22.3 at [4], [60], [62] and [65]. Schedule 21.22.3 also makes repeated mention of the varying attributes and values associated with the different parts of the Priority Area, thus supporting the 'distinction' with respect to landscape attributes and values for the section around Arthurs Point requested by the submitter. For example see [2], [3], [6], [59], [66] and [67].</p> <p>Further, the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the attributes and values, along with landscape capacity of a priority Area, are evaluated at a Priority Area level and that the PA Schedules are intended to be read in full.</p> <p>It should also be noted that Schedule 21.22.3 has been renamed as a PA ONF/L with the description of the area modified to reflect the Decision of the Arthurs Point Hearing Commission (dated 8 June 2023).</p>	
OS122.16	J Semple	Oppose	That the land included within the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is ultimately protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.19	J Semple	Oppose	That any consequential amendments or refinements to the provisions of the Proposed District Plan and/or landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River to better achieve the purpose of sustainable management, and the protection of the Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape is adopted.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS131.1	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS131.7	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS136.1	Barbara Lusk	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS136.4	Barbara Lusk	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS150.1	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS150.7	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS 166.8	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Important ecological features and vegetation types paragraph 11 and 12 are deleted to remove reference to animal and plant pest species.	Addressed in response to OS 36.2	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS166.9	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Important land-use patterns and features paragraph 19 be amended to further describe activities beneath the Edith Cavell Bridge, including Queenstown Rafting, and delete reference to Canyon Brewing, to read: Morning Star Reserve area compromising a range of commercial and industrial activities and facilities beneath the Edith Cavell Bridge including Shotover Jet and Queenstown Rafting tourism operations and car parking.	Amend Schedule 21.22.3 [19] as follows: Infrastructure is evident within the corridor and includes: pipelines at the Old Shotover Bridge; a transmission corridor near the confluence with the Kawerau; informal gravel trails and vehicular tracks; fencing; and two Aurora distribution lines (one crossing the river at Tucker Beach, and the other running along the corridor roughly between Tucker Beach and Big Beach); <u>the Queenstown Airport runway and Runway End Safety Area (RESA) located at the southern end of the PA Morningstar Reserve area comprising a range of and industrial commercial activities and facilities area beneath the Edith Cavell Bridge including Shotover Jet and Queenstown Rafting tourism operations, Canyon Brewing and carparking area, as well as t</u> The Shotover Canyon Swing which has a steel cable line that crosses the river and is located north of the Edith Cavell bridge. A bridge is planned to be built in the future to cross the Shotover River at Tuckers Beach Reserve as part of the Queenstown Trail.	Accept submission.
OS166.10	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Important land-use patterns and features paragraph 23 add rafting.	Amend Schedule 21.22.3 [23] as follows: The very popular commercial jet boat <u>and rafting</u> operations at the southern end of the ONF and the area north and south of the Edith Cavell Bridge.	Accept submission.
OS166.11	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations have a paragraph added that reads: 36A. Shotover Jet	Amend Schedule 21.22.3 [36] as follows: <u>36A. Shotover Jet and Queenstown Rafting Operations (Queenstown's first commercial jet boating and rafting operations).</u>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			and Queenstown Rafting Operations (Queenstown's first commercial jet boating and rafting operations).		
OS166.12	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Important historic attributes and values have a paragraph added that reads: 46A. Shotover Jet and Queenstown Rafting Operations (Queenstown's first commercial jet boating and rafting operations).	The inclusion of this item under [36] A above is considered to be adequate.	Reject submission.
OS166.13	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Aesthetic qualities and values paragraph 78.d.ii. include commercial recreation activities, to read: the historic built development and commercial recreation activities that are seen in places.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The Schedule references the cultural landscape elements that contribute to aesthetic and memorability values, which is considered to address this matter.	Reject submission.
OS166.14	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.3.i Commercial recreational activities be amended to delete the words 'are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements' and delete 'and protect the area's ONF values'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider that the deletion of the locational and screening aspects are appropriate.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				The deletion of reference to the protection of landscape values text is supported, refer BG EIC.	
OS166.15	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.3.ii Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended from no capacity to some landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 172.9.	Accept submission in part.
OS166.16	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.3.iii Urban expansion be amended to provide an exemption Morning Star Reserve Area so that it reads: Urban expansion - no landscape capacity except within and around the Morning Star Reserve Area where (sic) is some landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 172.9.	Reject submission.
OS166.17	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.3.v Earthworks have added at the end the words: Some landscape capacity within and around the Morning Star Reserve Area.	I consider that reference to specific sites with respect to the capacity for earthworks in a Schedule of Landscape Values is inappropriately detailed. This is discussed more fully in BG EIC	Reject submission.
OS166.18	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3.viii Transport infrastructure be amended to add the sentence at the end of the paragraph: except within and around the Morning Star Reserve Area where (sic) is some landscape capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I consider that the text change requested in this regard is inappropriate.</p> <p>The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence with respect to the type of transport infrastructure that they consider might be required in the Reserve area.</p>	
OS166.19	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.3.ix Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended to add the sentence at the end of the paragraph: Some landscape capacity within and around the Morning Star Reserve Area.	<p>Addressed in response to OS 166.18.</p> <p>The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence with respect to the type of infrastructure that they consider might be required in the Reserve area.</p>	Reject submission.
OS166.20	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.3.x Renewable energy generation be amended to add the words at the end of the paragraph: , except within and around the Morning Star Reserve Area.	Addressed in response to OS 172.9.	Accept submission in part.
OS172.1	Emma Ryder on behalf of Arthurs Point Trustees Ltd.	Oppose	That the landscape schedules apply at a priority area level to guide future development but not preclude it.	<p>The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that site specific landscape assessments will be required for resource consent and plan change applications.</p> <p>The question of whether clarification that the PA Schedules do not preclude development is required, is addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.</p>	Reject submission. N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS172.2	Emma Ryder on behalf of Arthurs Point Trustees Ltd.	Oppose	That site specific landscape assessments be given more weight than the landscape schedules.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS172.3	Emma Ryder on behalf of Arthurs Point Trustees Ltd.	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that the landscape capacity for development currently identified is not applied or interpreted at a site-specific scale.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I consider that the capacity ratings as shown in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.3 are appropriate.</p> <p>The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the capacity ratings are at a PA level rather than a site-specific level and that more detailed landscape assessment will be required as part of resource consent and plan change applications that may identify varying attributes, values and capacity ratings at a finer grain.</p>	Reject submission.
OS172.5	Emma Ryder on behalf of Arthurs Point Trustees Ltd.	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that construction within existing building platforms and consented development is not restricted by the landscape schedule.	<p>It is recommended that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 is amended to explain that the Schedules do not apply to permitted activities. This may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p> <p>For completeness, it is not considered appropriate that variations to existing platforms or consented development should be exempted from the Schedules.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS172.7	Emma Ryder on behalf of Arthurs Point Trustees Ltd.	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that clarity is provided that variations to existing building platforms should not be precluded by the landscape schedule and instead be assessed on their individual merits through associated site-specific landscape assessments.	Addressed in response to OS 172.3 and OS 172.5.	Accept submission in part.
OS172.9	Emma Ryder on behalf of Arthurs Point Trustees Ltd.	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that text be added to landscape schedule to ensure that rural living is not precluded, with these assessed on their merits through site specific landscape assessments.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Section 3 of the PA Schedules Methodology Report explains the capacity rating scale (and noting that it is recommended that this explanatory detail is incorporated into the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to assist plan users). The Methodology Report goes on to explain that 'moderate' is deliberately not a term used in the rating scale.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.3 Landscape Capacity are appropriate.</p> <p>xii. Rural living – Very limited to n landscape capacity for development that is: clustered with existing development; located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p><u>natural landscape elements: designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).</u></p> <p>In considering this submission point (and the submission in full), I also consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.3 Landscape Capacity are appropriate (as a consequential amendment to the amendment made to the landscape capacity for rural living):</p> <p>vi. Farm buildings – very limited to no landscape capacity <u>for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.</u></p> <p>x. Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity <u>for commercial scale renewable energy generation. Very limited to no landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.</u></p> <p>For completeness, I remain of the view that a rating of no landscape capacity is appropriate for visitor accommodation not associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms, tourism related activities (i.e. resorts), urban development, intensive agriculture, mineral extraction, transport infrastructure (other than trails), commercial scale renewable energy generation and production forestry. This is largely due to the landscape values associated with the area coupled with the relatively confined extent of the PA. Put another way, the relatively limited extent of the PA that is not riverbed, escarpment or riverbank means that there is unlikely to be 'anywhere to go' in terms of appropriately locating these landuses with adversely impacting on landscape values.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 acknowledges that:</p> <p><i>the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in</i></p>	

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p><i>landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</i></p> <p>This means that there is an acknowledgement that a finer grained assessment as part of a site-specific proposal may determine a higher capacity for a landuse which may give the submitter some comfort in this regard.</p>	
OS172.11	Emma Ryder on behalf of Arthurs Point Trustees Ltd.	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that residential visitor accommodation and visitor accommodation be provided for within existing and consented development.	Addressed in response to OS 200.64.	Accept submission in part.
OS187.1	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS187.7	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS197.1	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS197.7	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS200.1	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to exclude the submitters land from the priority area.	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation. Further, the extent of the ONF/L in the vicinity of the Shotover Loop has been confirmed by the Arthurs Point Hearing Commission Decision (dated 8 June 2023) and aligns with the extent of the PA mapping in this area.	Reject submission.
OS200.2	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to address specific amendments needed to the schedule in the instance that the submitter land is rezoned under a separate renotification process.	Addressed in response to OS 200.1.	Reject submission.
OS200.3	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to address specific amendments needed to the schedule in the instance that the submitters land is considered to be an Outstanding Natural Feature through the separate renotification and zoning process under the PDP.	Addressed in response to OS 200.2.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS200.4	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to recognise and provide for the expected development and change in character of the area.	<p>This submission point relies on the ONF/L context within the submitter's site being confined to the Shotover River ONF mapping agreed to by the landscape architects that presented evidence at the recent Arthurs Point Hearing in the vicinity of the Shotover Loop.</p> <p>The extent of the RMA s6(b) land in the vicinity of the Shotover Loop has been confirmed by the Arthurs Point Hearing Commission Decision (dated 8 June 2023) and aligns with the extent of the PA mapping in this area that is supported by the Environment Court in the Topic 2 Decisions and expert witnesses in the Joint Statement arising from Expert Planner and Landscape Conferencing in relation to Strategic Policies and Priority Area Expert Conferencing, TOPIC 2: RURAL LANDSCAPES (dated 29 October 2020).</p> <p>For this reason, I do not consider it appropriate or relevant to add reference to Schedule 21.22.3 to 'recognise and provide for the expected development and change in character of the area' as requested.</p>	Reject submission.
OS200.5	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to change the boundary line of the Shotover Outstanding Natural Feature and the priority area around the Shotover loop is confirmed as the boundary line that was determined in Council Decisions on Stage 1 of the Proposed District Plan.	Addressed in response to OS 200.1.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS200.6	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That, in the alternative to the change of the boundary lines of the priority area, the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended so the submitters land and its surrounds are withdrawn from the proposed variation or the entire Shotover River priority area be withdrawn from the variation.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS200.7	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to recognise and provide for the benefits of change and enhancement of land within the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The focus of the Schedules is to identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected.</p> <p>That said, the identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>It is also expected that such matters would be traversed in detail as part of a detailed (and more site specific) landscape assessment in support of a plan change or resource consent process.</p>	Reject submission.
OS200.8	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to incorporate submitter feedback as to important values within the schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>This aspect of the submission seeks to incorporate detailed attributes and values relevant to the submitter's land.</p> <p>The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the Schedules have been drafted to record landscape values at a PA rather than a site-specific level. It goes on to explain that varying attributes and values, along with capacity ratings, may be identified as part of a more detailed assessment associated</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>with a resource consent or plan change application and that it is expected that it is this grain of landscape assessment that would identify site specific values.</p> <p>Further, many of the attributes and values mentioned in the submission are already acknowledged in Schedule 21.22.3.</p> <p>For these reasons, and relying on my landscape evaluation of the area, I do not consider that further amendments to Schedule 21.22.3 are required in this regard.</p>	
OS200.9	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That without derogating from the generality of the points in this submission, the submitter seeks any additional, amended, consequential, or further relief in respect of the schedules reflects the intent of the matters raised in this submission.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS200.10	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That if the amendments raised in this submission are not included within the schedule, then the submitter seeks for it to be deleted or otherwise withdrawn from the variation to Chapter 21.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS200.11	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to exclude the submitters land from the landscape schedule.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS200.12	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to recognise that the Shotover Outstanding Natural Feature is defined by highly legible escarpments which demark its boundaries, and which are not/will not be affected by adjacent land development and subdivision.	Addressed in response to 200.1 meaning that the requested amendment is not relevant.	Reject submission.
OS200.13	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to recognise that further development of the land is a logical extension for the urban growth in the Arthurs Point area and will not have an adverse effect on any values of the Outstanding Natural Feature identified in the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 200.4.	Reject submission.
OS200.14	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the northern edge of the Shotover River Gorge is correctly drawn and that the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended so that the land north of the boundary line is not part of any Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape.	Addressed in response to OS 200.1 and OS 200.4.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS200.15	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to recognise opportunities to enhance the currently degraded values through eradication and enhancement opportunities.	Addressed in response to OS 200.7.	Reject submission.
OS200.16	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended so the starting point of the schedule only describes values which contribute to a feature as being outstanding.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The PA Schedules identify the attributes and values that contribute to the 'outstanding-ness' of the priority area, with the methodology applied, drawing from Te Tangi a te Manu.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some aspects referenced in the Schedule are likely to be of greater or lesser importance in shaping the 'outstanding-ness' of the PA. However, it is the collective relationship of the identified attributes and values that ultimately results in the RMA s6(b) classification.</p> <p>Put another way, the aim of the description of attributes and values in each PA Schedule is to signal at a priority area level (rather than a site-specific level), the key landscape matters to consider when evaluating the appropriateness of a resource consent or plan change application.</p> <p>As explained in response to OS 200.7, the PA Schedules include reference to negative landscape aspects such as existing plant and animal pests. These aspects have the potential to influence landscape values and have been deliberately included in the Schedules as a cue to what appropriate development within a PA might seek to manage.</p>	Reject submission.
OS200.17	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended under the title important ecological features and vegetation types to only include vegetation types which contribute to	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>It is widely accepted by the Environment Court and landscape profession that non-SNA, non-protected and even exotic vegetation can make a noteworthy contribution to the values of</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			outstandingness. Within the area of the Shotover Loop land, recognise that existing wilding pines detract from the landscape's shared and recognised values.	an ONF/L (for example, the poplars at Glendhu Bay, referenced in <i>Parkins Bay</i>). Wilding conifers are referenced in Schedule 21.22.3 [12].	
OS200.18	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended under the title important ecological features and vegetation types to only include vegetation types which contribute to outstandingness. Recognise the opportunity and benefit of legal mechanisms to achieve such outcomes, secured through development proposals by way of offset/positive effect/compensation.	Addressed in response to OS 200.17. Reference to "the opportunity and benefit of legal mechanisms to achieve such outcomes, secured through development proposals by way of offset/positive effect/compensation" is a matter of District Plan policy rather than a landscape attribute or value.	Reject submission.
OS200.19	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended under the title important land use patterns and features to contextualise the interface with the priority area and the Arthurs Point urban growth boundary if the Gorge landform with adjacent flat terraces is zoned and suitable for urban development.	For the reasons set out in response to OS 200.4, I disagree with the amendments requested.	Reject submission point.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS200.20	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended under the title important historical attributes and values to recognise that the submitters land is historically part of a working farm, which has led to significant modification adjacent to the river escarpments.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The notified version of Schedule 21.22.3 has been reviewed by a heritage expert with no such text change recommended.	Reject submission.
OS200.21	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended under the title important shared values and recognized values to specify what parts of the Outstanding Natural Feature are being discussed and viewed from where/published where.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. It is not usual practice to identify which tourist publications refer to an ONF/L in a Schedule of Landscape Values. However, for example, the Kimiākau (Shotover River) is referenced and pictured on the 100% Pure NZ website https://www.newzealand.com/in/plan/business/shotover-jet/ The area is a popular subject for artists (e.g. Peter Macintyre) and is depicted in the NZ Post 1981 Scenery Series.	Reject submission.
OS200.22	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended under the title important shared and recognized values by deleting references that appear to have been inappropriately influenced by particular interest views, such as reference to a single wedding venue, with no context as to where that is in the Outstanding Natural Feature.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The notified version of Schedule 21.22.3 has been reviewed by a recreation and tourism expert who considered it appropriate to include reference to the wedding venue. It is understood that this reference relates to both venues within the area such as Trelawn Place, and the reserve areas within the PA.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS200.23	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended under the title important shared and recognized values to recognise opportunities for enhancement of landscape values through change in character and appropriate development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PA Schedules seek to identify existing landscape attributes and values. The Capacity section of the PA Schedules flags the potential for enhancement of public access as part of future landuse change, where appropriate. For these reasons the text changes sought under this submission point are not considered appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS200.24	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended under the title particularly important views to and from the area to recognise that some views to/within the Outstanding Natural Feature will change and be affected by future development and zoning.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my responses to OS 200.1 and OS 200.4, I disagree with the amendments requested.	Reject submission.
OS200.25	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended under the title particularly important views to and from the area to remove references to private views, such as from Arthurs Point houses, and should not be identified as particularly important views.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I consider this to be a matter of fact i.e. that the river corridor is an important component of the visual amenity values enjoyed by those audiences. This is largely due to the close proximity of the viewing audience.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS200.26	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended under the title naturalness and values so that the particular units of the Outstanding Natural Feature are further particularised to describe more accurately, differences in naturalness.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, it is recommended that the following amendment is made to Schedule 21.22.3 [64]:</p> <p>The seemingly undeveloped character of the river corridor due to the dominance of the escarpment, cliff and bluff landforms, the waterbody and its largely vegetated margins. While trails, tunnels, footbridges, road bridges, transmission corridors, power lines, wilding conifers, the odd house and vehicular tracks are evident in the corridor, these features either indicate the high recreational values of the ONF (see shortly) or are of a character, location and/or extent that means they are not dominant elements. The exception to this is the transmission corridor at the southern end of the area which contributes a localised utilitarian influence.</p> <p>For completeness, I do not agree with the submitter that the presence of wilding pines significantly detracts from naturalness values in the vicinity of the Shotover Loop.</p> <p>I also note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that values are described at a PA level (rather than a site-specific level), and that a more detailed landscape assessment as part of a resource consent or plan change application may identify different values within the PA.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS 200.27	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Shotover River is amended under the title landscape capacity to indicate at what scale the	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			potential activities have been considered.	Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, and applying best practice landscape assessment methods, I consider that the landscape capacity ratings and comments in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.3 are appropriate.	
OS200.28	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at the title landscape capacity to include and reflect on where there are existing and planned subdivision/urban development opportunities and associated amenities and utilities.	Addressed in response to OS 200.24.	Reject submission.
OS200.29	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at the general description of the area to include a sentence which states 'The mapped PA ONF boundaries follow those topographical edges of the Shotover Riverine system which demarcate the upper extent of the River gorge with adjacent land of a flatter and distinctly different character'.	Addressed in response to OS 200.12.	Reject submission.
OS200.30	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 11 to include the sentence 'These	Addressed in response to OS 200.18.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			should be effectively controlled through district plan provisions or other legal mechanisms, associated with subdivision and development proposals' in regard to animal pest species.		
OS200.31	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 12 to include the sentence 'These should be effectively controlled through district plan provisions or other legal mechanisms, associated with subdivision and development proposals' regarding plant pest species.	Addressed in response to OS 200.18.	Reject submission.
OS200.32	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to include a new point under the title important ecological features and vegetation types which states 'In particular, wilding tree species in the vicinity of the Shotover Loop detract from natural and scenic landscape values, and are directed/encouraged to be removed under national, regional, and district planning instruments'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Reference to wilding conifers (along with other pest plant species present within the PA) is already included in Schedule 21.22.3 [12]. The additional text sought by the submitter is considered to be unnecessary.	Reject submission.
OS200.33	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Gertrude's Saddlery Limited		amended at point 14 to include a sentence which states 'Views from this trail are not considered to be public places for the purposes of implementing this schedule or other provisions of the District Plan'.	<p>This part of the PA Schedules relates to 'important landuse patterns and features' and the statement that the trails are part of the Queenstown Trail network is a matter of fact. Referencing views from the trail in this part of the PA Schedule is confusing as 'views' are specifically referenced under 'perceptual landscape values'.</p> <p>Further, referencing QLDC GIS mapping, the Queenstown Trail traverses both public <u>and</u> private land within the PA. This means that for at least part of the trail within the PA, public views are a relevant consideration.</p> <p>That said, see response to OS 200.39 which recommends better clarification that consideration of views from tracks and bridges relates to locations that are public places.</p>	
OS200.34	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 18 to include the words '(Shotover Loop Land). Land within the UGB is identified for residential subdivision and development and is accepted to change views to and from the ONF, as well as have an influence on the landscape character of the river corridor due to its scale, character and/or proximity'.	For the reasons set out in response to OS 200.1, OS 200.2 and OS 200.4, I disagree with the amendments sought by the submitter.	Reject submission.
OS200.35	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to include a point under the title important historic attributes and values which states 'The remaining influences of historic farming and pastoral activities, in particular within the Shotover	Addressed in response to OS 200.20.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Loop Land have significantly modified adjacent terraces above the ONF and provide a point of distinction between the adjacent more natural incised cliffs of the River Gorge'.		
OS200.36	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to remove point 47 to address that there is no certainty as to what publications it is referencing are.	Addressed in response to OS 200.21.	Reject submission.
OS200.37	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to remove point 48 from the landscape schedule unless it is further specified as to what is being referenced.	Addressed in response to OS 200.21.	Reject submission.
OS200.38	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 49 to include the sentence 'The ability to enhance access to and along the river through district plan provisions or other legal mechanisms, associated with subdivision and development proposals is recognised as a positive outcome' regarding the identity of the river as an important natural and historic	Addressed in response to OS 200.23.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			landscape context for Arthurs Point.		
OS200.39	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 51 to include the sentence 'Opportunities to enhance biodiversity and remove wilding species are supported through district plan provisions or other legal mechanisms, associated with subdivision and development proposals'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PA Schedules seek to identify existing landscape attributes and values. The Capacity section of the PA Schedules flags the potential for enhancement of biodiversity and removing wilding species (i.e. landscape restoration and enhancement) as part of future landuse change, where appropriate. For these reasons the text changes sought under this submission point are not considered appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS200.40	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to include a point under the title important recreation attributes and values which states 'Opportunities to enhance recreational and commuter access to the Arthurs Point Urban areas through the Shotover Loop Land'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submitter requests text that relates to future development opportunities under 'important recreation attributes and values'. This part of the PA Schedule describes the <u>existing</u> attributes and values of the landscape. Public access improvements are most appropriately referenced under the Landscape Capacity section of the PA Schedules, refer Schedule 21.22.3 Capacity (i), (viii).	Reject submission.
OS200.41	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 58 to replace the words 'tracks, bridges' with 'public places', remove the words 'bridge and nearby dwellings (including at Arthurs Point) along the river corridor' and to include reference to	Amend Schedule 21.22.3 [58] as follows: Highly attractive close, mid and long-range views from tracks / bridges (<u>which are public places and</u> including Edith Cavell Bridge), local roads, reserve land, the water, the SH6 bridge and nearby dwellings (including at Arthurs Point) along the river corridor. Vegetation and landform patterns, together with the winding corridor, contain and frame views, contributing a highly variable character to the outlook.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			'native' vegetation and landform patterns.		
OS200.42	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 59 to include the sentence 'Particularly when contrasted with adjacent terraced land which is historically associated with pastoral and farming uses, and is anticipated for urban density subdivision and development'.	For the reasons set out in response to OS 200.1, OS 200.2 and OS 200.4, the additional text requested by the submitter is not supported.	Reject submission.
OS200.43	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 61 to include the words 'however the appearance of development and subdivision on the adjacent upper terraces is an expected and appropriate occurrence'.	For the reasons set out in response to OS 200.1, OS 200.2 and OS 200.4, the additional text requested by the submitter is not supported.	Reject submission.
OS200.44	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 63 to replace the words 'along with the generally subservient nature of' with 'contrasting with', include the words 'and anticipated future' and 'and adjacent to', and remove the sentence 'The limited visibility of urban development at Arthurs Point from much of the corridor	For the reasons set out in response to OS 200.1, OS 200.2 and OS 200.4, the additional text requested by the submitter is not supported.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			also plays a role in this regard'.		
OS200.45	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 64 to include the sentence '(Except where the influence of Wilding pine species is significant and detracts from values, such as at the Shotover Loop land)'.	Addressed in response to OS 200.26.	Accept submission in part.
OS200.46	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to remove point 65 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider that it is appropriate to remove [65] from Schedule 21.22.3.	Reject submission.
OS200.47	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 67 to identify where along the Shotover River Gorge this is pertaining to. Also, replace the words 'the wild waters and' with 'The persistence of self-seeded' regarding exotic vegetation, include reference to how such vegetation 'Detracts from this impression, given this is a	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider that the text changes sought by the submitter in relation to Schedule 21.22.3 [67] are appropriate.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			nationally and regionally recognized invasive species requiring eradication, and which threatens biodiversity values', and to remove the words 'and there is generally a very high perception of naturalness and 'getting away from it all' due to the very limited exposure to development'.	The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the PA Schedules are to be read in full. The gorge stretches of the corridor are geographically referenced in [3]. My response to OS 200.26 also addresses this submission point.	
OS200.48	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to remove point 71 from the landscape schedule which contains information about the autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The seasonal variation in leaf colour is a characteristic that is, in my expert opinion, often valued by the community, particularly in a District such as Queenstown Lakes where the temperature range and species types result in a stunning array of leaf colour. With respect to leaf fall, the abundance of deciduous species within the PA means that leaf fall opens up a quite different visual experience and landscape character within the area. For these reasons, I do not agree with the text changes requested by the submitter in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS200.49	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 72 to remove reference to seasonal snowfall as snow falls everywhere in the District.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider that it is appropriate to remove [72] from Schedule 21.22.3.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				In my opinion, the snowfall on the riverbanks which often includes frost and icicles forming on the trees (and which is often seen in combination with the surrounding snow-capped mountains), is a noteworthy spectacle and deserving of mention in Schedule 21.22.3, despite the fact that snow falls throughout much of the District.	
OS200.50	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to remove point 73 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider that it is appropriate to remove [73] from Schedule 21.22.3.	Reject submission.
OS200.51	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 74 to replace the word 'screens' with 'softens'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider that it is appropriate to replace the word 'screens' with 'softens' in Schedule 21.22.3 [74].	Reject submission.
OS200.52	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 77(a) to include the word 'native' regarding vegetation.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider it appropriate to qualify the vegetation as being native.</p> <p>In my opinion, both indigenous and exotic vegetation contribute positively to the landscape character of the gorge section of the river corridor.</p> <p>It is also noted that It is widely accepted by the Environment Court and landscape profession that exotic vegetation can make a noteworthy contribution to the values of an ONF/L (for example, the poplars at Glendhu Bay, referenced in <i>Parkins Bay</i>).</p>	
OS200.53	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 77(b) to include the word 'native' regarding vegetation.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider it appropriate to qualify the vegetation as being native.</p> <p>In my opinion, both indigenous and exotic vegetation contribute positively to the landscape character of the wider sections of the river corridor.</p> <p>It is also noted that it is widely accepted by the Environment Court and landscape profession that exotic vegetation can make a noteworthy contribution to the values of an ONF/L (for example, the poplars at Glendhu Bay, referenced in <i>Parkins Bay</i>).</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS200.54	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to remove point 77(c) from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 200.48.	Reject submission.
OS200.55	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 77(d) i to replace the words 'visually discrete character of the majority of' with 'contrast with'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider it appropriate to amend the text of Schedule 21.22.3 [77](d)(i) as requested.	Reject submission.
OS200.56	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to remove point 77(d) iv from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 200.53.	Reject submission.
OS200.57	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 78 to include a new section within the summary of landscape values for the schedule that includes opportunities for change and enhancement. Enhancement opportunities include, eradication of wilding tree species, pest control, enhanced access and recreation, biodiversity	Opportunities for change and enhancement are already addressed in the Landscape Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.3 via reference to such matters as 'landscape restoration and enhancement' and 'public access'.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			enhancement, positive interface with subdivision and development land.		
OS200.58	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to change the rating of perceptual values in the priority area from 'very high' to 'moderate'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider it appropriate to amend the rating perceptual values to moderate.	Reject submission.
OS200.59	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 80(c) to include the sentence 'however this is detracted significantly by the invasive presence of wilding tree species and consequent loss of biodiversity values'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider it necessary to amend the Schedule text in this manner.	Reject submission.
OS200.60	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to change the rating of perceptual values in the priority area from 'very high' to 'moderate'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider it appropriate to amend the text of Schedule 21.22.3 [80] as requested.	
OS200.61	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 80(c) to include the sentence 'however this is detracted significantly by the invasive presence of wilding tree species and consequent loss of biodiversity values'.	Addressed in response to OS 200.26.	Reject submission.
OS200.62	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended at point 80(d) to replace the words 'A sense of remoteness and wildness in places, particularly throughout the gorge sections due to the sheer scale of natural landforms and wildness of the wild river waters and elsewhere, in places where landform and/or vegetation obscure views of built development' with 'A sense of connection to and with adjacent urban development, including through enhanced access and recreation opportunities, and the contrast of urban areas adjacent to the riverine escarpment'.	Addressed in response to OS 200.40, OS 200.50 and OS 200.55.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS200.63	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to change the capacity rating for commercial and recreational activities from 'some' to 'moderate', remove reference to 'to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging' and include the words 'initiatives such as wilding tree removal, pest eradication and biodiversity enhancement'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Section 3 of the PA Schedules Methodology Report explains the capacity rating scale (and noting that it is recommended that this explanatory detail is incorporated into the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to assist plan users). The Methodology Report goes on to explain that 'moderate' is deliberately not a term used in the rating scale.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not agree that it is appropriate to change the landscape capacity rating for commercial recreation activities or delete reference to 'to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging' text change sought by the submitter.</p> <p>With respect to the text changes requested at the end of the paragraph, I consider that the new text is unnecessary as the landscape aspects referenced are implicit in the 'landscape restoration and enhancement' terminology that is already included in the Schedule text.</p>	Reject submission.
OS200.64	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to change the capacity rating for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities from 'no' capacity to 'moderate' capacity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Section 3 of the PA Schedules Methodology Report explains the capacity rating scale (and noting that it is recommended that this explanatory detail is incorporated into the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to assist plan users). The Methodology Report goes on to explain that 'moderate' is deliberately not a term used in the rating scale.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider that Landscape Capacity item (ii) should be amended as requested by the submitter. In particular the steep or exposed character of the majority of Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA ONF makes it highly sensitive to built development change.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there may be some very limited scope for visitor accommodation associated with existing rural living dwellings within the Priority Area.</p> <p>It is recommended that Schedule 21.22.3 Landscape Capacity (ii) is amended as follows:</p> <p>ii. Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – no landscape capacity. <u>very limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms which are: located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).</u> No landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA. <u>No landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA.</u></p>	
OS200.65	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to change the capacity rating for urban expansions from 'no' capacity to 'high' capacity 'within the adjacent terraces to the ONF boundary at the Shotover Loop Land'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Urban development is inappropriate within ONF/Ls as urban development inevitably means the ONF/L will fail to qualify as a RMA s6(b) landscape in terms of 'naturalness' (see <i>Long Bay</i> and <i>High Country Rosehip</i>).</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS200.65	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to change the capacity rating for rural living from 'no' capacity to 'moderate' capacity 'within the adjacent terraces to the ONF boundary at the Shotover Loop Land'.	Addressed in response to OS 172.9.	Accept submission in part.
OS200.66	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to change the capacity rating for earthworks from 'very limited' capacity to 'moderate' capacity and to include the words 'anticipated subdivision and development'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. For the reasons set in response to OS 200.1, OS 200.2 and OS 200.4, and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I do not consider appropriate to amend Schedule 21.22.3 Landscape Capacity (v).	Reject submission.
OS200.66	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Gertrude's Saddlery Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to include a capacity rating for biodiversity enhancement activities to 'High landscape capacity within the Shotover Loop Land to remove wilding tree species and enhance biodiversity measures'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Biodiversity enhancement is not one of the landuse activities identified by the Environment Court in the Topic 2 decisions for consideration in the Capacity section of the PA Landscape Schedules. Further, the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the Landscape Capacity comments acknowledges this positive aspect of landuse use change and is intended to signal to plan users that future landuse changes should give careful consideration to how such measures can be integrated into resource consent and plan changes proposals.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>In addition, to signal biodiversity enhancement as appropriate in the Shotover Loop effectively singles out a part of the PA where this landscape benefit is appropriate.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules project (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals and Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point, the Shotover River corridor, local reserves and Watties Track etc), and review of the Arthurs Point Hearing Evidence and Decision, I consider that landscape restoration and enhancement is likely to be appropriate throughout much of the PA (rather than simply around the Shotover Loop).</p>	
OS204.1	Anna-Louise and Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimitiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS204.7	Anna-Louise and Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimitiākau Shotover River be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.1	Dennis Behan	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 Kimitiākau Shotover River be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.4	Dennis Behan	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River should be protected in perpetuity from inappropriate development.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS205.7	Dennis Behan	Support	That the mapping, values identified and capacity assessment of landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is strongly supported.	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.10	Dennis Behan	Support	That paragraphs 78-80 and the landscape capacity assessment of the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is supported.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS205.13	Dennis Behan	Support	That recreational access where it will not erode the values identified in the submission and necessary infrastructure development where the values outlined can be adequately preserved or protected in landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River are supported	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.16	Dennis Behan	Support	That with particular regard to landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River the inclusion of 111-115 Atley Road within the landscape schedule is strongly supported	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.17	Dennis Behan	Support	That the assessment provided within the landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River appropriately concludes that the landscape has no capacity to absorb any new/additional	Addressed in response to OS 12.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			development and is supported.		
OS207.1	Jennifer Fraser On Behalf Of Queenstown Lakes District Council	Oppose	That the mapping for landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to exclude part of property 111 Atley Road as it is zoned as Lower Density Suburban Residential.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A.
OS207.2	Jennifer Fraser On Behalf Of Queenstown Lakes District Council	Oppose	That the boundary of landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to align with the final decision made on the renofied Gertrude Saddlery LTD and Larchmont Developments LTD Stage 1 submissions.	<p>The title of Schedule 21.22.3 has been changed to Kimiākau Shotover River PA ONF/L (rather than PA ONF) to reflect the Decision of the Arthurs Point Hearing Commission (dated 8 June 2023).</p> <p>A series of text amendments are recommended in the General Description are recommended to assist an understanding of the ONF and ONL portions of the PA as a consequence of the Arthurs Point Hearing Commission Decision.</p> <p>Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA ONF/L is takes in the river corridor and context winding broadly southwards from west of Mount Dewar, through Arthurs Point, around Tucker Beach to the confluence with the Kawarau River. The PA ONF includes the lower reaches of Moonlight Creek to the west of Mount Dewar.</p> <p>In the vicinity of the Shotover Loop, the ONF portion of the PA corresponds to the gorge. The elevated land to the north, that includes a roche moutonnée knoll corresponds to ONL, with the distinction between the ONL and ONF coinciding with the transition from the steep escarpment of the gorge to the less steep slopes of the knoll.</p> <p>The mapped PA ONF includes the upper edges of the landforms framing the river corridor. This takes in the gravel beds and river floodplains to the west of Arthurs Point and at Big Beach (south of Arthurs Point), Tucker Beach and the Kawarau confluence. It also includes the steep hill slopes</p>	Accept in part submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				bordering Piano Terrace and the western end of the Shotover Canyon Track to the west of Mount Dewar.	

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(d) 21.22.5 Lake Hayes PA ONF

21.22.5 PA ONF Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes): Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) ONF encompasses the pronounced ridgeline extending north-eastwards from Slope Hill and framing the western side of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes), and Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) itself.

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Mana whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. The pronounced and steep glacier overridden schist ridgeline extending north-eastwards from Slope Hill and framing the eastern side of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).

Important hydrological features:

2. The shallow lowland, glacial lake of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) (325m). The lake is currently eutrophic (with poor water quality) due to elevated nutrient inputs from its catchment. While nutrient loads have stabilised in the past 20 years, the lake remains eutrophic due to its internal phosphorus load. Sediment run-off also threatens the recovery of Lake Hayes.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

3. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. A raupō (*Typha orientalis*) - makura (*Carex secta*) community at the south end of Lake Hayes fronting crack willow woodland.
 - b. Swathes and scattered pockets of grey shrubland along the steep western slopes framing the western side of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes). Small pockets of grey shrubland also occur along the shoreline.
4. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
 - a. The almost continuous patterning of willows and Lombardy and black poplars along the shoreline of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).
 - b. Proliferation of exotic weeds around the edges of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes). Dense growth of hawthorn, broom, elderberry, sweet brier and blackberry encountered along the northwest side of the lake above the shoreline willows.
 - c. Numerous indigenous plantings have been established along the loop trail, particularly on the southern and western side of the lake.
5. Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) is a valued habitat for threatened native fish species: the Koaro (*Galaxias brevipinnis*). Other native fish species present include: the upland bully (*Gobiomorphus breviceps*) and shortfin eel (*Anguilla australis*).

6. Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) is a valued habitat for the nationally threatened swamp birds Australasian Bittern (*Botaurus poiciloptilus*) classified as nationally critical and Great Crested Grebe (*Podiceps cristatus australis* - classified as nationally vulnerable).
7. Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) is of special value as a breeding area for a variety of waterfowl, including Paradise Shelduck (*Tadorna variegata*), Grey Duck (*Anas superciliosa*), the New Zealand shoveller/Kuruwhengi (*Anas rhynchotis variegata*), Black Swan (*Cygnus atratus*), Grey Teal (*Anas gracilis*), Mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*) and New Zealand Scaup (*Aythya novaeseelandiae*).
8. Other aquatic birds that inhabit Lake Hayes include white-faced Heron (*Ardea novaehollandiae novaehollandiae*), White Heron (*Egretta alba modesta*), Black shag (*Phalacrocorax carbo*), Little shag (*Phalacrocorax melanoleucos*), the Marsh Crake (*Porzana pusilla affinis*), Australian Coot (*Fulica atra australis*) (*Anas platyrhynchos*), Swamp hen/Pukeko (*Porphyrio porphyrio melanotus*), and New Zealand Kingfisher (*Halcyon sancta vagans*).
9. The raupō (*Typha orientalis*) - makura (*Carex secta*) community provides important nesting habitat and shelter for waterfowl and rails while the crack willow trees along the shoreline provide important roosting sites for shags and kingfisher.
10. Waiwhakaata(Lake Hayes) is an important recreational fishery with brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) and European perch (*Perca fluviatilis*) with Mill Creek providing the only spawning source for these species.
11. Animal pest species include feral cats, hares, rabbits, ferrets, stoats, weasels, possums, rats and mice.

Commented [BG1]: OS 115.2 Khaylm Marshall.

Important land-use patterns and features:

12. Human modification which is currently concentrated around the northern and eastern margins of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) (adjacent and close to the ONF). Along the southern and western side of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes), built development is generally well set back from the lake edge.
13. The Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata (part of the Queenstown Trail) which forms a loop around the lake, creating multiple access points to the lake.
14. State Highway 6 which at the southern end of the lake and the northern and western side of the lake coincides with a block of conservation land that extends westwards (beyond the ONF) to Slope Hill Road.
15. Informal jetties in places. Public boat ramps.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

16. No historic heritage features, heritage protection orders, heritage overlays or archaeological sites have been identified/recorded to date within the ONF.

Mana whenua features and their locations:

17. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
18. Waiwhakaata is the Kāi Tahu name for Lake Hayes.

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values •

Mana whenua associations and experience are:

19. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
20. Wāi maori (fresh water) is a central element in Kāi Tahu creation traditions. The whakapapa of wāi māori describes bonds, relationships, and connections that bind Kāi Tahu to the land, waters and all life supported by them.

Important historic attributes and values:

21. Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) has historical significance for its association with early commercial fishing in the area.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

22. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
23. The popularity of the postcard views across Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.
24. The very high popularity of the recreational 'feature' listed below.

Important recreation attributes and values:

25. Walking, running and cycling along the Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata (part of the Queenstown Trail).
26. Non-motorised activity permitted on Waiwhakaata(Lake Hayes); rowing, kayaking, swimming (when water quality permits), paddleboarding and fishing at Waiwhakaata(Lake Hayes).
27. Picnicking around the lake shoreline.
28. A large carparking area at the northern end of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) where visitors base themselves from for recreational activities.
29. The Wakatipu Rowing Club located on the eastern edge of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes). Also used by local community groups such as Scouts and Cubs.
30. Aotearoa's National Walkway, the Te Araroa Trail passing along the western edge of the lakefront via the Wakatipu Track connecting Frankton/ Queenstown (south) to Arrowtown (north).
31. Regionally significant fishery, spawning habitat (Mill Creek) and game bird habitat.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

32. The area's natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial processes.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

33. 'Postcard' long-range views from SH6 at the south end of the lake, across the lake that includes the historic homestead and mature trees at Threeewood (outside the ONF), the Lake Hayes Showground Reserve, the lake edge deciduous tree plantings, and the Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata, all viewed against a mountain backdrop. The seasonal leaf colour and mirror-like qualities of the lake during still weather are particularly memorable aspects of this composition.
34. Appealing mid to long-range views westbound on SH6 to the southern end of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes), and the ridgeline framing the western side of the lake. The depth of the outlook together with its 'classic' elements that include water in the foreground and a structured layering of mountainous landforms and gateway impression (enabling first glimpses of Queenstown) contribute to the memorability of the vista.
35. Attractive close to mid-range intermittent views from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road across the lake to Slope Hill and the ridgeline framing the western side of the lake, backdropped by the surrounding mountain context. The filtering and framing effect of vegetation in places along with the alternating availability of such views enhances their interest and appeal.
36. Highly attractive close to long-range views from the Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata, the necklace of reserves around the edge of Lake Hayes and the residential properties around Lake Hayes (outside the ONF), across the lake to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, the undeveloped ridgeline farming the western side of the lake and/or the more distant surrounding mountain backdrop.
37. Attractive long-range views of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) from the Northern Remarkables, in particular the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts).
38. Attractive long-range views from the Queenstown Trail on Christine's Hill and from Arrowtown Lakes Hayes Road at McIntyre's Hill southwards out over the lake, backdropped by the dramatic ONF and ONL mountain context.
39. In all of the views, the dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONF, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the ONF and the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

Naturalness attributes and values:

40. The exotic vegetation bordering Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) which, along with almost continuous patterning of rural living development along its northern and eastern sides, contribute a reduced perception of naturalness. While the waterbody itself is relatively unencumbered by structures (excepting the odd informal jetty and the public boat ramps) and overt modification, its widely reported water quality issues detract from its perceived naturalness. The generally undeveloped character of land along the southern and western sides, together with the proliferation of wetland, grey shrubland and large-scale exotic vegetation in places around the lake edges, serves to increase the perceived naturalness at a localised level.

Memorability attributes and values:

- 41. The highly attractive outlook of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes). The close proximity of Slope Hill ONF in the outlook, collectively seen within a relatively developed immediate context serves to enhance the memorability of the outlook.

Transient attributes and values:

- 42. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation (lake edge poplars and willows in particular).
- 43. The mirror-like qualities of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) during calm and settled weather conditions.

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

- 44. The track along the western side of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) and localised sections of the balance of the track where intervening landform and vegetation screens views to nearby development.

Aesthetic qualities and values:

- 45. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
- 46. More specifically, this includes:
 - a. The highly attractive large-scale composition created by the glacial lake, juxtaposed beside a rural living and urban context.
 - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. the very limited level of built modification evident within the ONF;
 - ii. the mirror-like qualities of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) during certain weather conditions; and
 - iii. the poplars and willows around the edges of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes), which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA ONF Waiwhakaata(Lake Hayes) can be summarised as follows:

- 47. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
- 48. **High associative values** relating to:
 - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
 - b. The historic features of the area.

- c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
- d. The significant recreational attributes of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).

49. **Very High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The very high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the scenic route of SH6, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road, The Remarkables Ski Field Access Road and the Queenstown Trail, along with the area's transient values, also play an important role.
- c. A high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of more natural landscape elements and patterns along the southern and western sides of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).
- d. A localised sense of remoteness and wildness associated with the track around Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONF Waiwhakaata(Lake Hayes) for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – limited** landscape capacity for activities small scale and low key activities that: integrate with, and complement/enhance, existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONF values.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – no** landscape capacity.
- iii. **Urban expansions – no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – very limited** capacity for earthworks associated with farm or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings – no** landscape capacity.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – no** landscape capacity.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONF values. **No** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.

Commented [BG2]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG3]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG4]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG5]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2

Commented [BG6]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG7]: OS 70.17 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

ix. **Renewable energy generation** – no landscape capacity.

x. **Production ~~f~~Forestry** – no landscape capacity.

xi. **Rural living** – no landscape capacity.

xii. **Jetties, and boatsheds, Lake structures and moorings** – no landscape capacity.

Commented [BG8]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG9]: [OS 77.28 Kai Tahu ki Otago](#).

21.22.5 Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) PA ONF Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.5 Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) PA ONF Schedule". New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS70.17	Ainley McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.5 Lake Hayes is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.5 Capacity (ix) as follows: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. <u>In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.</u>	Accept submission.
OS115.2	Khaylm Marshall	Oppose	That the physical value of the Lake Hayes Outstanding Natural Feature is increased from high to "very high" (para 47) of landscape schedule 21.22.5.	The submitter requests that the physical values are increased from 'high' to 'very high' to reflect the threats to water quality in Lake Hayes from upstream development activities that may degrade the physical and recreational values of Lake Hayes. Schedule 21.22.5 seek to identify the attributes and values associated with the Priority Area ONF. It is methodologically flawed to elevate the values of the PA ONF in an attempt to	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>manage activities outside of the PA ONF or activities that may be a threat to the PA.</p> <p>However, the interconnectedness of the Mill Creek spawning habitat to the valued fishery in Lake Hayes is acknowledged.</p> <p>Schedule 21.22.5 [2] acknowledges the eutrophic state of the lake as a consequence of the elevated nutrient and sediment levels from the catchment (which includes Mill Creek).</p> <p>It is recommended that Schedule 21.22.5 [10] is amended as follows:</p> <p>Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) is an important recreational fishery with brown trout (<i>Salmo trutta</i>) and European perch (<i>Perca fluviatilis</i>), with Mill Creek providing the only spawning source for these species.</p>	

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(e) 21.22.6 Slope Hill PA ONF

21.22.6 PA ONF Slope Hill: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The Slope Hill PA ONF encompasses the elevated roche moutonnée landform of Slope Hill.

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Mana whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. The roche moutonnée glacial landform of Slope Hill, formed by the over-riding Wakatipu glacier, with a smooth 'up-glacier' slope to the southwest and a steeper rough 'plucked' (down-glacier) slope to the east adjacent to Lake Hayes. Rock outcrops throughout the elevated north-western flanks. Highest point: 625m.
2. The Slope Hill roche moutonnée is recognised in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory as one of the best examples of this type of landform in Otago and one of the most easily seen and accessible. It is identified as a site of national scientific, aesthetic and recreational values and is considered to be vulnerable to significant damage by human related activities.

Important hydrological features:

3. Three steep (unnamed) stream gullies draining the southern faces of Slope Hill.
4. A gully draining the north-eastern side.
5. A small kettle lake on the elevated south-western flanks.
6. The irrigation race along the western flanks.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

7. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. Remnant native vegetation comprising matagouri shrubland in the stream gullies and on some adjacent slopes on Slope Hill.
8. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
 - a. Grazed pasture with scattered shelterbelts and clusters of exotic shade trees throughout the elevated slopes.
 - b. Amenity and shelter plantings around the two dwellings and wetland on the north side.
 - c. Poplar plantings around the flanks.
9. Animal pest species include feral cats, hares, rabbits, ferrets, stoats, weasels, possums, rats and mice.

9a. Exotic plant pests such as willow, hawthorne and broom in gullies.

Commented [BG1]: OS 82.21 Milstead Trust.
OS 140.18 Maryhill Ltd.

Important land-use patterns and features:

10. Slope Hill **PA ONE** is predominantly in pastoral use with very limited rural living use. Modification is limited to a network of farm tracks across the landform, **other infrastructure (eg water tanks, fencing, utilities), a** trig point and communication tower on the highpoint and two dwellings and associated farm buildings on the northern sides of Slope Hill. Built development is generally characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is well integrated by a mix of established and more recent vegetation features and reads as being subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns.

Commented [BG2]: OS 59.10 Anna Hutchinson Family Trust.
OS 59.11 Anna Hutchinson Family Trust.

Commented [BG3]: OS 139.36 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

Commented [BG4]: OS 82.16 Milstead Trust.

10a Other neighbouring landuses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character and or proximity include: the rural living development throughout the western, southern and northern lower flanks of the roche moutonnée, outside the PA; and the existing or anticipated urban development associated with the Ladies Mile area.

Commented [BG5]: OS 82.14 Milstead Trust.
OS 139.9 Grant Stalker Family Trust.
OS 140.6 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

Commented [BG6]: OS 139.1 Grant Stalker Family Trust.
OS 139.8 Grant Stalker Family Trust.
OS 139.9 Grant Stalker Family Trust.
OS 140.6 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

11. No historic heritage features, heritage protection orders, heritage overlays or archaeological sites have been identified/recorded to date within the ONF.

Mana whenua features and their locations:

12. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

Mana whenua associations and experience:

13. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.

Important historic attributes and values:

14. Slope Hill has contextual value for its association with Threeewood Farm, one of the Wakatipu Basin's earliest farms.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

15. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

16. The area's natural landforms, land type, and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial processes.

17. Indigenous gully plantings which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values within the gullies on Slope Hill.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

18. Highly attractive framed mid-range views eastbound on SH6, west of the Shotover Bridge to the south-western smooth 'up ice' flanks of Slope Hill. The composition comprises an attractive patterning of the Shotover River terraces and their layered tree plantings (a mix of evergreen and exotic species including Lombardy poplars) below the highly legible and more 'natural' pastoral elevated slopes of the roche moutonnée and backdropped by (often) snow-capped mountain ranges of Cardrona and the Crown Range. The large-scale road cuttings that frame the highway add to the structure and distinctiveness of the vista. Overall, the outlook impresses as an engaging and memorable gateway to the Wakatipu Basin and seemingly more spacious 'rural' landscape beyond Queenstown/Frankton.
19. Appealing mid to long-range views westbound on SH6 on the elevated section of the highway east of the intersection with Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road to the south-eastern flanks of Slope Hill. The open pastoral character of the rough 'plucked' slopes of the landform in this view forms a bold contrast with the exotic vegetation and building-dominated low-lying terraces of Ladies Mile and Frankton to the left of view. From this orientation, the roche moutonnée blends seamlessly with the layered patterning of dramatic mountains and roche moutonnée that frame the western side of the Wakatipu Basin and Lake Wakatipu more generally. The depth of the outlook together with its 'classic' elements that include a structured layering of mountainous landforms and the gateway impression (enabling first glimpses of Queenstown) contribute to the memorability of the vista. It is possible that anticipated urban development throughout Ladies Mile may obscure views of the lower margins of the landform feature, adjacent Ladies Mile.
20. Highly attractive close to long-range views from the Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata, the necklace of reserves around the edge of Lake Hayes, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and the residential area properties around Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) (outside the ONF), across the lake (ONF) to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, the undeveloped ridgeline framing the western side of the lake and/or the more distant surrounding mountain backdrop.
21. Attractive mid to long-range views from the eastern western side of the Wakatipu Basin (including Tuckers Beach, Domain Road, Hawthorn Triangle, Dalefield, parts of the Shotover River corridor, the Hawthorn Triangle, the eastern end of Slope Hill Road and parts of the Queenstown Trail) to parts of the smooth pastoral elevated south-western flanks and the more rugged north-western flanks. From this these orientations, the open and generally undeveloped landform forms a marked contrast with the rural living development context in the foreground of view.
22. Attractive long-range views from the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts), the Queenstown Trail on Christine's Hill and from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road at McIntyre's Hill to Slope Hill beside the highly attractive glacial lake of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) and viewed within a broader ONL mountain context.
23. Attractive close, mid, and long-range views from Ladies Mile, Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country to the south side of Slope Hill. From this orientation the distinguishing roche moutonnée landform profile is clearly legible and there is an awareness of the transition from the smooth 'ice up' character to the rough 'plucked' character. It is possible that anticipated urban development throughout Ladies Mile may obscure views of the lower margins of the landform feature, adjacent Ladies Mile.
24. In all of the views, the dominance of 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONF, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the ONF and the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

Commented [BG7]: OS 139.28 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

Commented [BG8]: OS 140.25 Maryhill Ltd.
OS 139.69 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

Commented [BG9]: OS 139.42 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

Commented [BG10]: OS 139.42 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

Commented [BG11]: OS 139.42 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

Commented [BG12]: OS 139.42 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

Commented [BG13]: OS 139.28 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

Naturalness attributes and values:

25. The seemingly 'undeveloped' character of Slope Hill which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to its pastoral use are visible, the very low number of buildings,

the relatively modest scale of tracks and limited visibility of infrastructure kerbs their influence on the character of the landform as a natural landscape element.

Memorability attributes and values:

26. The appealing and engaging views of the largely undeveloped and legible roche moutonnée landform of Slope Hill. The close proximity of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) ONF in the outlook, collectively seen within a relatively developed immediate context serves to enhance the memorability of the outlook.

Transient attributes and values:

27. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation.
28. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the roche moutonnée slopes.

Aesthetic qualities and values:

29. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
30. More specifically, this includes:
 - a. The highly attractive large-scale composition created by the generally undeveloped and distinctive roche moutonnée landform, juxtaposed beside a rural living and urban context.
 - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. the clearly legible roche moutonnée landform profile and character;
 - ii. the open and pastoral character of Slope Hill;
 - iii. the very limited level of built modification evident through the ONF; and
 - iv. the poplars around the flanks of Slope Hill, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

The combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA ONF Slope Hill and Lake Hayes Remarkables can be summarised:

31. **Very High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
32. **High associative values** relating to:
 - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
 - b. The historic associations of the area.
 - c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.

d. ~~The significant recreational attributes of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).~~

Commented [BG14]: OS 139.56 Grant Stalker Family Trust. OS 140.57 Maryhill Ltd.

33. **Very High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The very high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Lake Hayes Estate, Shotover Country, the Ladies Mile corridor, the eastern side of the Wakatipu Basin, the scenic route of SH6, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road, the Remarkables Ski Filed Access Road and the Queenstown Trail, along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
- c. The identity of the roche moutonnée as a natural landscape backdrop to Ladies Mile and the western and central portion of the Wakatipu Basin and as a gateway feature to Queenstown/ the Wakatipu Basin.
- d. A high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of natural landscape elements and patterns at Slope Hill.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONF Slope Hill for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for ~~small scale and low key~~ activities that: integrate with, and complement/enhance, existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; ~~and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONF values.~~
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – ~~no landscape capacity; very limited~~** ~~landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms which: are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; are designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). No landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA. No landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA.~~
- iii. **Urban expansions – no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings – ~~in these areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses;~~ very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – no** landscape capacity.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONF values. **No** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.

Commented [BG15]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG16]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG17]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG18]: OS 139.62 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

Commented [BG19]: OS 139.66 Grant Stalker Family Trust. OS 140.67 Maryhill Ltd.

- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of the National Grid and utilities such as overhead lines, or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. Very limited to no landscape capacity or discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Production forestry – no** landscape capacity.
- xii. **Rural living – very limited to no** landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; is designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).

Commented [BG20]: OS 70.18 Transpower New Zealand Limited.
OS 86.9 Melissa Brook

Commented [BG21]: OS 140.7 Maryhill Limited.

Commented [BG22]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG23]: OS 139.68 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

Commented [BG24]: OS 139.68 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

21.22.6 Slope Hill PA ONF Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.6 Slope Hill PA ONF Schedule". New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS59.2	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected, or alternatively that amendments be made to address points raised in submission 59, with any other consequential changes made that are necessary to achieve the relief sought.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS59.10	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill paragraph 8 be amended for clarity.	Amend Schedule 21.22.6 [10] as follows: <i>Slope Hill PA ONF is predominantly in pastoral use with very limited rural living use. Modification is limited to a network of farm tracks across the landform, a trig point and communication tower on the highpoint and two dwellings and associated farm building on the northern sides of Slope Hill. Built development is generally characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is well integrated by a mix of established and more recent vegetation features and reads as being subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns.</i>	Accept submission in part.
OS59.11	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill paragraph 10 be amended to make	Addressed in response to OS 59.10.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Hutchinson Family Trust		clear if referring to the entire roche moutonnée or only to the part of Slope Hill that has been recorded as an Outstanding Natural Feature within the schedule.		
OS59.18	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That paragraph 7 of landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended as it currently overstates the status of indigenous vegetation within or adjacent to the ONF as set out in the Ladies Mile Master Plan.	Addressed in response to OS 82.10.	Reject submission.
OS59.19	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be amended to recognise the extensive body of historic photographs that are available in the area, which depict high levels of human activity often celebrating European settlement.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the notified text in relation to such aspects.	Reject submission.
OS59.20	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to acknowledge and adequately address the tension that exists between the ONL, rural and urban land uses.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The developed context is acknowledged in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.6 appropriately.	Reject submission.
OS59.21	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedules be considered with regard to Part 2 of the RMA as there is a high possibility for unintended	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			consequences whereby the landscape schedules will be used to refer to adjoining areas and make inferences around the appropriateness of development that adjoins the ONF.		
OS59.22	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That the variation is rejected, refused or otherwise declined.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS59.23	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That if the variation is adopted, that it be amended, varied or otherwise modified (including schedules 21.22.3 and 21.22.6) to address the concerns, issues, and other matters raised in this submission including any necessary additional or consequential relief.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS70.18	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual	Amend Schedule 21.22.6 Capacity (ix) as follows: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of <u>the National Grid and utilities such as overhead lines, or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.</u>	Accept submission subject to refinement.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			prominence, including associated earthworks'.	NB the response to OS 70.18 has been coordinated with the response to OS 86.9.	
OS82.7	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that it fails to recognise the Slope Hill outstanding natural feature is a highly modified landscape that has been extensively farmed and therefore has a very low naturalness, highly influenced by human activities.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.6 acknowledges the farming use of Slope Hill at [10]. It is noted that the submitter goes on to express the view that the area has 'very low' naturalness values. Case law supports the identification of areas that are dominated by pastoral uses (and other agriculture/horticulture related uses) as having naturalness values that allow the land to qualify for consideration as a RMA s6(b) landscape (e.g. <i>Man O'War Station</i>). It is also noted that the question as to whether the PA qualifies as a RMA s6(b) landscape or feature is beyond the scope of the Variation and that the mapping of the District's ONF/Ls has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions).	Reject submission.
OS82.8	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that it fails to recognise the western end of Slope Hill is more modified than the eastern end and has a much greater capacity to absorb development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider there to be a discernible difference with respect to landscape modification between the western and eastern ends of Slope Hill PA ONF. In coming to my conclusions on this point, I have carefully reviewed the consented and unbuilt platforms and note that almost all of the recently consented platforms to the west of Slope Hill (excepting one), are located outside the PA.	Reject submission.
OS82.9	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that it	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			fails to recognise that Slope Hill outstanding natural feature is more extensively modified below the irrigation race than above it.	It is noted that, in the main, the irrigation race skirts around the edge of the Slope Hill PA ONF, with very little land below the water race located within the mapped extent of the PA. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider there to be a discernible difference with respect to landscape modification for the land within the Slope Hill PA ONF above and below the irrigation race.	
OS82.10	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified as it incorrectly states at [7] there is 'particularly noteworthy' indigenous vegetation features when this appears to be on the basis of the presence of matagouri which is not particularly noteworthy.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.6 [7] reference to matagouri shrubland is considered worthy of mention under the header "Important ecological features and vegetation types". It is also noted that Schedule 21.23.6 has been reviewed by an expert ecologist with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS82.11	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that it incorrectly states there is 'particularly noteworthy' indigenous vegetation when it fails to reflect the fact that Slope Hill outstanding natural feature has been extensively farmed for over 100 years, and it is misleading to suggest it has noteworthy indigenous vegetation.	The responses to OS 82.7 and OS 82.10, address this submission point.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS82.12	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [9] under the heading 'important ecological features and vegetation types' the schedule lists animal pest species which are not important ecological features and vegetation types.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the PA ONL (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>However, it is agreed that as currently drafted, the Schedules are potentially confusing in this regard as these aspects of the landscape are negative rather than positive.</p> <p>A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS82.13	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [10] the description fails to acknowledge the irrigation race which has been an important land use pattern and feature.	The irrigation race is acknowledged at Schedule 21.22.6 [6] under "Important hydrological features".	Reject submission.
OS82.14	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [10] the description fails to acknowledge the significant rural living use on Slope Hill as a whole, outside of the	Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I consider that Schedule 21.22.6 should be amended after [10], to add a new schedule item (with consequential numbering change):	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			outstanding natural landscape boundary.	10a Other neighbouring landuses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character and or proximity include: the rural living development throughout the western, southern and northern lower flanks of the roche moutonnée, outside the PA.	
OS82.15	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [10] the description fails to acknowledge the greater extent of activity and modification at the western end of Slope Hill.	Addressed in response to OS82.8.	Reject submission.
OS82.16	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [10] the description fails to acknowledge other farm buildings which exist but that have not been identified.	<p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [10] should be amended as follows:</p> <p>Slope Hill is predominantly in pastoral use with very limited rural living use. Modification is limited to a network of farm tracks across the landform, a trig point and communication tower on the highpoint, and two dwellings and associated farm building on the northern sides of Slope Hill. Built development is Slope Hill is predominantly in pastoral use with very limited rural living use. Modification is limited to a network of farm tracks across the landform, a trig point and communication tower on the highpoint and two dwellings and associated farm buildings on the northern sides of Slope Hill. Built development is generally characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is well integrated by a mix of established and more recent vegetation features and reads as being subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns.</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS82.17	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [11] the description fails to recognise the historic Glenpanel Homestead which is outside of the outstanding natural landscape boundary.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PA Schedules aim to identify the landscape values within the spatial area that is mapped. The Glenpanel homestead is outside the priority area and is not an element that particularly influences the perceptual or associative values of the PA itself. Further, Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS82.18	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the relationship between mana whenua associations, Wāhi Tūpuna Chapter and consultation with mana whenua for applications be clarified in the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report. It should also be noted that Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by a cultural landscape / mana whenua expert (Aukaha) with that expert supporting the notified text.	Reject submission.
OS82.19	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [14] under the heading 'important historic attributes and values' the description fails to recognise the historic Glenpanel Homestead and associated farming activity, as well as the irrigation race.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Reference to the Glenpanel homestead is addressed in response to OS82.13 and OS 82.17. It should be noted that the review of the notified version of Schedule 21.22.6 by a heritage expert did not identify the irrigation race as a noteworthy heritage element.	Reject submission.
OS82.20	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [15] a generic statement is made that 'the descriptions and photographs of the area	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. It is not usual practice to identify which tourist publications make reference to an ONF/L in a Schedule of Landscape Values.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			in tourist publications' but provides no evidence provided as to what publications or photographs are referred to.	However, for example, Slope Hill is photographed in publicity material for the Countryside trail. See: https://queenstowntrails.org.nz/maps-and-trails/half-day-trails/countryside-trail/	
OS82.21	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [17] the majority of the planting in the gullies are exotic weeds such as willow, hawthorne and broom, and not 'indigenous gully plantings' as stated.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal and review of Schedule 21.22.6 by an expert ecologist, I consider the wording of Schedule 21.22.6 [17] to be technically correct.</p> <p>Further, best practice landscape assessment would not acknowledge weeds species in gullies as contributing to legibility and expressiveness values (i.e. the 'readability' of the landscape's formative processes). I also note that Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by an ecology expert with that expert supporting the notified wording in this regard.</p> <p>However, it is recommended that Schedule 21.22.6 is amended to acknowledge these exotic weed species in gullies. Amend Schedule 21.22.6 after [9], to add new schedule item (consequential numbering change):</p> <p><u>9a. Exotic plants pests such as willow, hawthorne and broom in gullies.</u></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS82.22	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [25] where the 'naturalness attributes and values are described' the schedule incorrectly states Slope Hill	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The farming activity and built modification (including airport radar) are acknowledged at Schedule 21.22.6 [10], [18], [19], [21], and [25].</p> <p>The evaluation of naturalness is guided by the interpretation of 'natural' in <i>Te Tangi a te Manu</i>, [9.44] to [9.46], drawing from</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			as 'natural' and 'undeveloped' when it has been completely modified for agriculture and farming and includes an airport radar system on its highest point.	<i>Harrison, WESI</i> and the <i>West Wind</i> Environment Court decisions.	
OS82.23	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [31] the schedule refers to 'mana whenua features in the area' when no mana whenua features are identified in paragraph 12 which refers to the whole area, and also features vegetation features when, as noted earlier, the gullies on Slope Hill contain exotic weeds species.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The Priority Area Schedules have been reviewed by a cultural expert with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard. The response to OS 82.21 also addresses matters relevant to this submission point.	Reject submission.
OS86.9	Melissa Brook	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.6.ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended to: limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as an overhead lines or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments which cannot be screened, these should be co-located with existing infrastructure or	Amend Schedule 21.22.6 Capacity (ix) as follows: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of the National Grid and utilities such as overhead lines, or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. NB the response to OS 86.9 has been coordinated with the response to OS 70.18.	Accept submission subject to refinement.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			designed and located to reduce their visual prominence to the extent practicable, recognising the operational and functional requirements of regionally significant infrastructure means this may not be practicable in all instances.		
OS139.1	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to recognise and provide for the development of the flats of Ladies Mile and amend the priority area boundaries in these locations.	Development within the flats of Ladies Mile is outside the spatial extent of Slope Hill PA ONF and to provide for such development within the Priority Area would be inappropriate. However, it is appropriate to acknowledge this development context in Schedule 21.22.6. Building on the amendment recommend in response to OS82.14, the following amendment is recommended Schedule 21.22.6 after [10], to add new schedule item (consequential numbering change): <i>10a. Other neighbouring landuses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character and or proximity include: the rural living development throughout the western, southern and northern lower flanks of the roche moutonnée, outside the PA; and the existing or anticipated urban development associated with the Ladies Mile area.</i>	Accept submission in part.
OS139.2	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to reclassify the lower foothills as a rural lifestyle zone/section 7 amenity landscape.	ONF/L mapping amendments and rezoning to Rural Lifestyle (or other) Zone (or any other zone) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS139.3	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the southern boundary line of the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to be further up Slope Hill and particularly to	Addressed in response to OS139.2.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			exclude landform modifications on the lower flanks.		
OS139.4	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to provide for the desired outcomes of the submitter through an appropriate exception regime under the landscape schedules.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal and 'other expert' review of the PA Schedules, along with my comments in response to OS 82.8, I consider that an exception regime is unwarranted on landscape grounds in this location.</p> <p>I also note that the introduction of an exception regime is beyond the scope of the Variation. This matter is also addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.</p>	Reject submission.
OS139.5	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to provide for the lower slopes of the outstanding natural feature as a separate character unit/lifestyle transition area under the schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that the lower flanks of Slope Hill PA ONF demonstrate a different character or landscape capacity that merits distinction from the balance of the PA. Rather, I consider that the lower and upper slopes of the PA read as a contiguous and coherent landscape feature that has a consistent sensitivity to development change (when evaluated at a PA level, rather than a site level, as is required for the PA Schedules).</p>	Reject submission.
OS139.6	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is rejected as notified if the outcomes	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Stalker Family Trust		desired by the submitter are not incorporated into the landscape schedule.		
OS139.7	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remap the bottom flanks of the priority area further up the slope to both exclude modified landholdings not warranting section 6 classification and protection.	Addressed in response to OS 139.2.	Reject submission.
OS139.8	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to account for the dense urban and mixed use development under the Ladies Mile masterplan so that lawful development of this land is not affected or implicated in the future by the adjacent landscape schedule values.	Addressed in response to OS 139.1.	Accept submission.
OS139.9	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to account for the adjacent residential development anticipated and zoned to occur, including through either the Ladies Mile masterplan, Rural Lifestyle Zoning, or development under the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone.	Responses to OS 139.1 and OS 82.14 recommend amendments to Schedule 21.22.6 to better acknowledge the proximate urban and rural living context of the Priority Area.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS139.10	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to acknowledge that the zoning and development raised in point 139.9 should not be limited by the values contained within the adjacent Slope Hill outstanding natural feature.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Landscape Schedules are not required to address the potential implications of the identified values of the ONF/L on neighbouring landuses, rather that is a matter for the District Plan as guided by Chapters 3, 4 and 6.	Reject submission.
OS139.11	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to provide for the lower slopes of the outstanding natural feature to be effectively a lifestyle transition area between lower more intensive development and the more upper natural slopes.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.
OS139.12	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to use new definitions to provide for the intent of capacity in landscapes with a different ability to absorb development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submitter would appear to be suggesting that the capacity ratings used in the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study are applied to the PA ONF/Ls capacity rating work. Section 3 of the PA Methodology Report explains the distinction between the two, and why an alternate approach is required for the PA Schedules. A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to assist plan user's understanding of capacity ratings in the PA Schedules. It is expected that the explanatory text in the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble, which explains that the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications, may provide some comfort to the submitter.	
OS139.13	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to revise the capacity ratings as well a corresponding scale of development to guide the implementation of this.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Further, the meaning of this submission point is unclear. That said, the response to OS 139. 12 may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS139.14	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to recognise and provide for the benefits of change, enhancement, and remediation of land within the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The focus of the Schedules is to identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected. That said, the identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level). It is expected that such matters would be traversed in detail as part of a detailed (and more site specific) landscape assessment in support of a plan change or resource consent process.	Reject submission.
OS139.15	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That if the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill fails to respond to the imperative to remedy degraded landscapes and in both the landscape values and landscape capacity comments, the schedules	Addressed in response to OS 139.14.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			should identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation.		
OS139.16	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to more accurately recognise and provide for existing uses, their likely and anticipated upgrade, replacement, or development within the priority area.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Schedule 21.22.6 outlines the existing uses evident within Slope Hill PA ONF. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence of any uses that have been omitted so that they can be captured in Schedule 21.22.6.</p> <p>With respect to the suggestion that Schedule 21.22.6 should recognise and provide for the upgrading of existing uses, their replacement or development, this goes beyond the identification of the landscape values of the ONF and are planning matters that are addressed in other parts of the District Plan.</p>	Reject submission.
OS139.17	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to recognise particular attributes present within the priority area listed in this submission as part of the values and character of the outstanding natural feature within the schedule so as to identify these human elements of the landscape.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Many of the attributes and features requested for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.6 are already mentioned, albeit under more generic terms such as farm tracks, infrastructure, pastoral farming and the like, which is considered to be appropriate for a PA scale description, rather than a site-by-site description.</p> <p>The exceptions to this are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Walking trails. b) Historical farming uses. c) Pest control. <p>I am unaware of any publicly accessible trails within Slope Hill PA ONF and the submitter is encouraged to provide evidence in this regard.</p> <p>With respect to reference to historic farming uses, Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				While the submitter may be managing pests at a site-specific level, this is not a particular characteristic of the PA as a whole that merits mention in Schedule 21.22.6.	
OS139.18	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That, without derogating from the generality of the points raised in this submission, the submitter seeks any additional amended, consequential, or further relief in respect of the schedules reflects the matters raised in this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS139.19	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That if the amendments raised in this submission are not included within the schedule, then the submitter seeks that the landscape schedule is deleted or otherwise removed from the proposed variation to Chapter 21.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS139.20	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so the starting point of the schedule is to only describe those values which contribute to a feature as being outstanding.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The PA Schedules identify the attributes and values that contribute to the 'outstanding-ness' of the PA, with the methodology applied, drawing from <i>Te Tangi a te Manu</i>.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some aspects referenced in the Schedules are likely to be of greater or lesser importance in shaping the 'outstanding-ness' of the PA, however it is the collective relationship of the identified attributes and values that ultimately results in the RMA s6(b) classification.</p> <p>Put another way, the aim of the description of attributes and values in each PA Schedule is to signal, at a PA level (rather than a site-specific level), the key landscape matters to</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>consider when evaluating the appropriateness of a resource consent or plan change application.</p> <p>As explained in response to OS 82.12, the PA Schedules include reference to negative landscape aspects such as existing plant and animal pests. These aspects have the potential to influence landscape values and have been deliberately included in the PA Schedules as a cue to what appropriate development within a PA might seek to manage.</p>	
OS139.21	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to only include vegetation types which are protected under the Proposed District Plan as those which contribute to outstanding-ness.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>It is widely accepted by the Environment Court and landscape profession that non-SNA, non-protected and exotic vegetation can make a noteworthy contribution to the values of an ONF/L (for example, the poplars at Glendhu Bay, referenced in <i>Parkins Bay</i>).</p> <p>The submitter goes on to request a number of changes to the description of "other vegetation types" that conflate physical and associative and perceptual values. This is not considered necessary as, where, for example, pastoral values are of importance to the perceptual values, they are typically discussed under the description of "important views" and "aesthetic qualities", thus providing the 'contextual reference' for the physical attribute.</p> <p>The submitter also requests that areas of identified ecological habitat should be mapped within the PA Schedule. This goes well beyond the usual scope of a Schedule of Landscape Values for an ONF/L, and is in my opinion, best addressed as part of a detailed landscape assessment for a site-specific resource consent application or plan change.</p>	Reject submission.
OS139.22	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove references of the requirement of the removal or eradication of pest flora	Addressed in response to OS 82.12.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			and fauna species from the landscape schedule.		
OS139.23	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so the land use patterns and features section of the schedule particularises a broader list of established activities occurring within the outstanding natural feature which are historically recognised as appropriate.	Addressed in response to OS 139.17.	Reject submission.
OS139.24	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so the rankings within the naturalness attributes and values section are 'low' to 'moderate' rather than 'high'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in response to OS 82.7 and OS 82.22.	Reject submission.
OS139.25	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That if the overall ranking within the naturalness attributes and values section of the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are not amended then the lower flanks should be specifically amended to include low to moderate values.	Addressed in response to O S139.5.	Reject submission.
OS139.26	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to be contextualised by further describing the future ability to consolidate and enhance	Addressed in response to OS 139.17.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			or develop existing uses over time.		
OS139.27	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to recognise that the property in question for this submission continues as a working farm today, and associated modification to landform and values are anticipated from the continuation of this permitted activity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.6 acknowledges pastoral farming as an important attribute and value associated with Slope Hill PA ONF. It does not however, follow that modification to the landform and values (emphasis added) associated with this permitted activity are anticipated. Rather it is my understanding that the PDP policy context for Rural Zoned land where a RMA s6(b) overlay applies, has been 'developed' to protect landscape values.	Reject submission.
OS139.28	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to additionally recognise that some views to lower flanks of Slope Hill will change and be affected by future development and zoning.	Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I consider it appropriate to amend Schedule 21.22.6 [19] and [23] as follows: <i>19. Appealing mid to long-range views westbound on SH6 on the elevated section of the highway east of the intersection with Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road to the south-eastern flanks of Slope Hill. The open pastoral character of the rough 'plucked' slopes of the landform in this view forms a bold contrast with the exotic vegetation and building-dominated low-lying terraces of Ladies Mile and Frankton to the left of view. From this orientation, the roche moutonnée blends seamlessly with the layered patterning of dramatic mountains and roche moutonnée that frame the western side of the Wakatipu Basin and Lake Wakatipu more generally. The depth of the outlook together with its 'classic' elements that include a structured layering of mountainous landforms and the gateway impression (enabling first glimpses of Queenstown) contribute to the memorability of the vista. It is possible that anticipated urban development throughout</i>	Accept submission. Discuss with QLDC

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p><i>Ladies Mile may obscure views of the lower margins of the landform feature, adjacent Ladies Mile.</i></p> <p>23. Attractive close, mid, and long-range views from Ladies Mile, Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country to the south side of Slope Hill. From this orientation the distinguishing <i>roche moutonnée</i> landform profile is clearly legible and there is an awareness of the transition from the smooth 'ice up' character to the rough 'plucked' character. <i>It is possible that anticipated urban development throughout Ladies Mile may obscure views of the lower margins of the landform feature, adjacent Ladies Mile.</i></p>	
OS139.29	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the particular units of the outstanding natural feature are further particularised to describe more accurately differences in naturalness, such as the lower slopes adjacent to Ladies Mile.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.
OS139.30	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete the summary of landscape values section from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5. Further, the requirement to include a rating of the landscape values draws from PDP 3.3.40(c).	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS139.31	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove the important hydrological features from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided by the submitter as to why this accepted aspect of landscape values should be deleted from Schedule 21.22.6.	Reject submission.
OS139.32	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to include a sentence under point 8 which states 'modified pasture, fencing, farming uses, rural living and amenity planting across the lower slopes.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. 'Fencing' and 'rural living dwellings' are not "other distinctive vegetation types" and therefore do not belong in this part of Schedule 21.22.6. Fencing is an accepted part of pastoral farming and rural living is acknowledged in Schedule 21.22.6 [10]. Amenity planting is acknowledged at Schedule 21.22.6 [8](b), and pastoral farming is acknowledged repeatedly throughout Schedule 21.22.6. It is also noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the schedules are intended to be read in full.	Reject submission.
OS139.33	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 8(b) to remove the words 'the two', and replace 'and wetland on the north side' with 'and their curtilage areas'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The identification of the two dwellings in Schedule 21.22.6 is a statement of fact. Reference to the curtilage is considered unnecessary as it is acknowledged that there are amenity plantings around the dwellings.	Reject submission.
OS139.34	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 8(c) to include the words 'resulting from lifestyle subdivision and development'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. It is understood that many of the poplar plantings in the District derive from historic farm shelter and shade planting strategies. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence in this regard so that the appropriateness of this amendment can be considered.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS139.35	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 9 to include the words 'Opportunities for their control are supported through future subdivision and development proposals'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. This submission point relates to a policy intention rather than landscape values and therefore is not relevant to a Schedule of Landscape Values. That said, the response to OS 82.12 may provide the submitter with some comfort in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS139.36	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 10 to change the capacity rating of important land-use features and to amend references within the paragraph. Also, that a sentence is included regarding the lower slopes being characterised as a transition or lifestyle area.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Many of the aspects sought for deletion in Schedule 21.22.6 [10] are matters of fact or addressed in other submissions (e.g. OS 82.14) and are therefore rejected. However, some minor amendment is recommended which may go some way to addressing the submitters concerns in this regard: <i>10 Slope Hill is predominantly in pastoral use with very limited rural living use. Modification is limited to a network of farm tracks across the landform, other infrastructure (eg water tanks, fencing, utilities), a trig point and communication tower on the highpoint and two dwellings and associated farm buildings on the northern sides of Slope Hill. Built development is generally characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is well integrated by a mix of established and more recent vegetation features and reads as being subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns.</i>	Accept submission in part.
OS139.37	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove the important shared and recognised attributes and values from the landscape schedule unless they are more accurately specified	Addressed in response to OS 82.20.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			within the landscape schedule.		
OS139.38	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to include a point under the title legibility and expressiveness attributes and values which states 'Remaining working farm and lifestyle practices including associated with irrigation races, infrastructure, access, modified pasture and landform, earthworks, and shelter/amenity planting.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The suggested text amendment is not relevant to "legibility and expressiveness attributes and values".	Reject submission.
OS139.39	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 18 to include the words 'resulting from rural lifestyle subdivision and development' and to replace the words 'and seemingly more spacious 'rural' landscape beyond Queenstown/Frankton' with 'framed within the urban context of the foreground flats'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.34.	Reject submission.
OS139.40	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 19 to include reference to lifestyle developments on the lower slopes of Slope Hill.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				Appeal and careful review of the Slope Hill PA ONF mapping, rural lifestyle development is not evident within the lower slopes of Slope Hill PA ONF (mapped area) in views westbound on SH6.	
OS139.41	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove point 20 from the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that the viewing experience discussed in [20] should be deleted from Schedule 21.22.6.</p> <p>However, I do consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [20] would benefit from refinement as follows:</p> <p><i>Highly attractive close to long-range views from the Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata, the necklace of reserves around the edge of Lake Hayes, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and the residential properties around Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) (outside the ONF), across the lake (ONF) to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, the undeveloped ridgeline framing the western side of the lake and/or the more distant surrounding mountain backdrop.</i></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS139.42	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 21 to include the words 'of the upper slopes' in reference to attractive long-range views present, remove reference to the eastern end of Slope Hill Road and parts of the Queenstown Trail, remove reference to the undeveloped nature of the	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [21] should be amended as requested by the submitter.</p> <p>However, I do consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [21] would benefit from refinement as follows:</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			land, replace reference to the 'marked contrast' with 'transition of', and include reference to the steeper upper slopes of the priority area.	<i>Attractive mid to long-range views from the eastern western side of the Whakatipu Basin (including Tuckers Beach, Domain Road, Hawthorn Triangle, Dalefield, parts of the Shotover River corridor, the Hawthorn Triangle, the eastern end of Slope Hill Road and parts of the Queenstown Trail) to parts of the smooth pastoral elevated south-western flanks and the more rugged north-western flanks. From these this orientations the open and generally undeveloped landform forms a marked contrast with the rural living development context in the foreground of view.</i>	
OS139.43	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 22 to include reference to the attractive long-range views of the upper slopes from the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [22] should be amended as requested by the submitter as the lower slopes of the PA are also visible from the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road.	Reject submission.
OS139.44	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove point 23 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that the viewing experience discussed in [23] should be deleted from Schedule 21.22.6.	Reject submission.
OS139.45	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 24 to remove reference to the dominance of the natural	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			landscape elements, include reference to the upper slopes of the outstanding natural feature, replace the words 'generally subservient nature of' with 'attractive', remove reference to the built environments contract with the surrounding land with reference to the land being a lifestyle transition with a flatter developed landscape in the 'foreground'.	appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [24] should be amended as requested by the submitter. My response to OS 139.5 is also of relevance here.	
OS139.46	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 26 to reference the pastoral and farming character of the area, amending the high perception of naturalness of the area to a moderate perception and naturalness and domestication, remove reference to modifications related to pastoral use being in low numbers, and references to the 'naturalness' of the area.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [26] should be amended as requested by the submitter. My response to OS 82.22 is also of relevance here.	Reject submission.
OS139.47	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 27 to reference the upper slopes of Slope Hill and to remove reference of the area being undeveloped.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [27] should be amended as requested by the submitter.	
OS139.48	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 28 to include the words 'resulting from rural lifestyle subdivision and development.	Addressed in response to OS 139.34.	Reject submission.
OS139.49	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 30 to include the word 'important'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. This aspect of the Schedule is talking about the "Aesthetic qualities and values" of the ONF. This is not the same as the "Particularly important viewpoints" section. The aesthetic qualities of the ONF will inevitably be experienced from some 'other' public viewpoints other than the specific viewpoints discussed in Schedule 21.22.6. (For example, the Old Shotover River Bridge, Remarkables Park.) Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [30] should be amended as requested by the submitter.	Reject submission.
OS139.50	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 31(a) to remove reference to the undeveloped nature of the landscape, include reference to the upper slopes of the 'roche moutonnee' landform, include reference to the landscape being a transitions	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [31](a) should be amended as requested by the submitter.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			of rural living on the lower slopes and the adjacent flats.	My response to OS 139.5 is also of relevance here.	
OS139.51	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 31(b)ii to include the words 'resulting from its use as a working farm'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The 'working farm character' of Slope Hill PA ONF is implicit in its description as having an open and pastoral character.	Reject submission.
OS139.52	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 31(b)iii to replace the words 'very limited level' with 'attractiveness of lifestyle', and to include the words 'lower flanks'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, and having carefully reviewed the consented and unbuilt platforms within the Slope Hill PA ONF, I note that almost all of the recently consented platforms (excepting one) are located outside the mapped PA. It should also be noted that my response to OS 139.1, acknowledges the proximate rural living context to parts of Slope Hill PA ONF.	Reject submission.
OS139.53	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 31(b)iv to include the words 'and which have resulted from rural lifestyle subdivision and development'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.34.	Reject submission.
OS139.54	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the rating for physical landscape values from 'very high' to 'high' and to remove the	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by geomorphology, ecology and cultural experts. All of these experts have supported the wording of Schedule 21.22.6 [32] as notified.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			words 'habitats, species, hydrological values and mana whenua features in the area.		
OS139.55	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 33(b) to include reference to farming in relation to the historic associations of the area.	Addressed in response to OS 139.17.	Reject submission.
OS139.56	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove point 32(d) from the landscape schedule.	I agree with this submission point. Amend Schedule 21.22.6 [32] (d) as follows: d. The significant recreational attributes of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).	Accept submission.
OS139.57	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 35(a) to include reference to the physical values of the priority area being associated with the upper slopes of the priority area.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.
OS139.58	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 34(b) to remove reference to the visibility of the priority area from different locations within the District.	Addressed in response to OS 139.91, OS 139.42, OS 139.43 and OS 139.44.	Reject submission.
OS139.59	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 34(c) to include reference to the lowers slopes of the priority	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			area as being a lifestyle transition area between Ladies Mile and the upper slopes of the priority area, and remove reference to the natural landscape backdrop and the western and central portion of the Wakatipu Basin.		
OS139.60	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove point 34(d) from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [34](d) should be amended as requested by the submitter. My response to OS 139.5 is also of relevance here.	Reject submission.
OS139.61	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for commercial recreational activities from 'very limited' to 'limited', replace reference to the screening and/or camouflaging of natural landscape elements with 'integrate with', remove reference to developments being designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, character and to remove refence to integrating 'appreciable	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 Capacity (i) should be amended as requested by the submitter.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			landscape restoration and enhancement and to enhance public access to the area.		
OS139.62	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities from 'no' capacity to 'limited', and to include the sentence 'landscape capacity for activities that: integrate with, and complement/enhance existing land uses; and are located to integrate with natural landscape elements and provide for the area's ONF values'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 Capacity (ii) should be amended as requested by the submitter. In particular, the open, elevated, steep and exposed character of the majority of Slope Hill PA ONF makes it highly sensitive to built development change.</p> <p>However, it is acknowledged that there may be some very limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing rural living dwellings within the PA.</p> <p>It is recommended that Schedule 21.22.6 Landscape Capacity (ii) is amended as follows:</p> <p><u>ii. Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – no landscape capacity– very limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms which: are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements: are designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character: integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate): and enhance public access (where appropriate). No landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA. No landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA.</u></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS139.63	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Stalker Family Trust		landscape capacity of urban expansion from 'no' capacity to 'limited'.	Urban development is inappropriate within ONF/Ls as urban development inevitably means the ONF/L will fail to qualify as a RMA s6(b) landscape in terms of 'naturalness' (see <i>Long Bay</i> and <i>High Country Rosehip</i>).	
OS139.64	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove the landscape capacity rating for intensive agriculture.	To delete consideration of 'intensive agriculture' in the landscape capacity section of the PA Schedules would not align with the directions of the Environment Court. The proposed amendments to the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble include an explanation of this landuse term (along with other landuse terms that are not defined in PDP Chapter 2) which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns.	Reject submission.
OS139.65	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for earthworks from 'very limited' to 'limited', include reference to current lifestyle development and remove reference to protecting naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. ONFs typically have a particularly high sensitivity to earthworks changes due to their limited size/extent. In addition, in this instance, the largely unmodified roche moutonnée geomorphology of the ONF heightens this sensitivity to landform modification via earthworks (and which have the potential to detract from naturalness and expressiveness values). As a consequence, Schedule 21.22.6 acknowledges the capacity for very limited earthworks for activities/elements within the ONF associated with farm tracks and public tracks. Lifestyle development within the spatial extent of Slope Hill PA ONF is limited to two dwellings only and therefore does not merit reference in terms of the capacity for earthworks across the PA as a whole. Further, it is expected that a detailed landscape assessment as part of a resource consent or plan change application in the vicinity of the two lifestyle developments would identify localised areas where a varying capacity for earthworks may be apparent. I also note that in reviewing the more recent consents associated with the existing lifestyle development, there would	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				appear to have been a very careful approach to managing earthworks within the Slope Hill PA.	
OS139.66	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the capacity for farm buildings from 'very limited' to 'limited', remove reference to this capacity rating to areas of the outstanding natural landscape with pastoral land uses and include the words 'or serve a purpose to support farming activities'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Slope Hill PA ONF has a high landscape sensitivity to built development change as a consequence of its open, elevated, steep and exposed nature. For this reason and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that the landscape capacity for farm buildings in Slope Hill PA ONF should be changed from very limited to limited.</p> <p>However, I do consider that the text of Schedule 22.22.6 capacity c (v) would benefit from amendment as follows due to the fact that almost all of the PA is in pastoral landuse:</p> <p>Farm buildings – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, very limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS139.67	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure from 'very limited' to 'limited' and to remove the words 'and protect the area's ONF values. No landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>ONFs typically have a particularly high sensitivity to earthworks changes due to their limited size/extent. In addition, in this instance, the largely unmodified roche moutonnée geomorphology of the ONF heightens the sensitivity to landform modification typically associated with transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Within this context, it is appropriate that transport infrastructure beyond trails is carefully evaluated as part of a detailed resource consent or plan change process.</p> <p>For this reason and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure in Slope Hill PA ONF should be changed from very limited to limited .	
OS139.68	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for rural living from 'no' capacity to 'moderate' and to include the words 'within the lower flanks/foothills of the ONF for activities that: integrate with, and complement/enhance existing land uses, provide for a transition between urban development of the adjacent flats; and are located to integrate with natural landscape elements'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I consider that the following amendment to Schedule 21.22.6 Capacity is appropriate:</p> <p>(xi) Rural living – very limited to no landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; is designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).</p> <p>It is also noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 acknowledges that:</p> <p><i>the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</i></p> <p>This means that there is an acknowledgement that a finer grained assessment as part of a site-specific proposal may determine a higher capacity for a landuse which may give the submitter some comfort in this regard.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS139.69	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove	Addressed in response to OS 140.25.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Stalker Family Trust		references to private views, such as from Lake Hayes houses from identification as particularly important views.		
OS140.1	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill, PA overlay and ONF boundary is amended to recognise and provide for future development and change within the foothills of the Slope Hill ONF.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.
OS140.2	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the proposed southern boundary line of the Slope Hill ONF is amended and moved further up Slope Hill to exclude the lower flanks where modified landholdings are located that do not warrant section 6 classification and protection.	Addressed in response to OS 139.2.	Reject submission.
OS140.3	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the northern and western boundary of the Slope Hill ONF is amended to exclude the significantly modified and developed land located on the lower flanks of Slope Hill and follow a clear topographical or geomorphological boundary that is consistent with the findings of the Environment Courts topic 2.1 decision (Hawthenden).	Addressed in response to OS 139.2.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.4	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That if the Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF) boundary line and priority area overlay contained within landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is not amended as sought by submission points #140.2 and #140.3 that: (a) an exception regime is provided to exclude the lower flanks of Slope Hill and/or; (b) The lower slopes of Slope Hill are identified as a separate character unit / lifestyle transition area; or (c) landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is deleted in its entirety from the landscape schedules.	Addressed in response to OS 139.4 and OS 139.5.	Reject submission.
OS140.5	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 is amended to provide for interface issues with the adjacent Ladies Mile or Rural Lifestyle / Wakatipu Basin Amenity Zoned land which is anticipated to become dense urban and mixed use development in accordance with the Ladies Mile Masterplan. The landscape schedule needs to be amended to account for this and ensure that anticipated future development of the Ladies Mile land will not be affected or implicated by the	Addressed in response to OS 139.1.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			scheduled values of landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill.		

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.6	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to acknowledge that upon development the Ladies Mile will significantly change in character. The schedule therefore needs to be amended to: (a) Account for the adjacent residential development anticipated and zoned to occur (either via the Ladies Mile Masterplan, Rural Lifestyle Zoning (southern boundary of ONF), or development under the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (western and northern boundaries of ONF); (b) Acknowledge that such zoning and future development of the Ladies Mile area should not be limited by the values contained within the adjacent Slope Hill ONF and will not impact on those values; and (c) Provide for the lower slopes of the ONF to effectively be a lifestyle transition area between lower more intensive development and the more upper natural slopes of the ONF.	Responses to OS 139.1 and OS 82.14 recommend amendments to Schedule 21.22.6 to better acknowledge the proximate urban and rural living context of the PA. With respect to the request to reference a lifestyle transition are across the slower slopes of the ONF, this is addressed in response OS 139.5.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.7	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the capacity ratings, if retained within landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are amended to provide for the full spectrum of available land uses anticipated and to include a corresponding scale of development to guide implementation of these capacity ratings.	<p>Addressed in response to OS 139.12. Also see the response to OS 139.68, OS 139.66, OS 140.67and 139.63 which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p> <p>In considering this submission point, it is recommended that Schedule 21.22.6 Capacity (x) is amended as follows:</p> <p>Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. Very limited to no landscape capacity or discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS140.8	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape values included within landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are amended to identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation.	Addressed in response to OS 139.15.	Reject submission.
OS140.9	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacities included within landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are amended to identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation.	Addressed in response to OS 139.14.	Reject submission.
OS140.10	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be amended to more accurately recognise and provide for the full range of historical,	Addressed in response to OS 139.16 and OS 139.17.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			established and existing activities and uses and their likely and anticipated future upgrade, replacement, or redevelopment.		
OS140.11	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to acknowledge that properties along the lower flanks of the Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF) have developed over time and that these contribute to the overall character, values, and history of the proposed ONF including its farming, lifestyle, and associative and historical attributes. Particular attributes and features that need to be recognised within the schedule include: (a) Existing accessways and stock tracks; (b) Walking trails; (c) Historical farming uses and structures including irrigation races; (d) Fences and retaining walls / earthworks; (e) Introduced and recently planted vegetation from subdivision and development; (f) Pest control; (g) Water storage and supply; (h) Supply of other utilities (power, wastewater, stormwater);	Addressed in response to OS 139.17.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			and (i) Residential dwellings and domestic curtilages.		
OS140.12	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That any additional, amended, consequential, or further relief in respect of the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill reflects the intent of the matters raised in this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS140.13	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That if the relief sought and suggested amendments in this submission regarding landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are not included that the schedule is deleted or withdrawn from the variation to Chapter 21.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS140.14	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that only values that contribute to a feature as being outstanding are included (as per Environment Court Decision 2.2 and the Partially Operative Otago RPS 2019, chapter 3). Values and other descriptors within this landscape schedule that do not meet this purpose should be deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 139.20.	Reject submission.
OS140.15	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	Amend landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill so that only vegetation types which are protected under the	Addressed in response to OS 139.21.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Proposed District Plan (either through a Significant Natural Area (SNA) overlay or tree protection rules) are identified as those which contribute to the natural feature being considered "outstanding".		
OS140.16	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That if human elements are to be included as ecological features and vegetation types within the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill, that these are further particularized by the following: (a) Grazed pasture, shelter belts, amenity planting...[etc.] all contribute to character and context of the ONF. These practices exist historically within the landscape and contribute to its distinctive sense of place and historical association as a working farm; and (b) Perceived values include the ability to continue to operate, undertake, modernize, develop and consolidate such activities within the landscape.	Addressed in response to OS 139.16.	Reject submission.
OS140.17	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That if the 'Important ecological features and vegetation types' section is retained within landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill,	Addressed in response to OS 139.21.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			these attributes need to be specified more accurately with respect to areas of identified ecological and habitat value so that they can be inform future development applications.		
OS140.18	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to either delete the requirement to remove or eradicate pest flora and fauna species or that this section is reworded to align with the PDP assessment matters which recognise the opportunity and benefit of legal mechanisms to achieve such outcomes and reduce pest species secured through development proposals by way of offset/positive effect/compensation.	Addressed in response to OS 82.12.	Accept submission in part.
OS140.19	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to further particularise the broader list of established activities occurring within the Slope Hill ONF and which are historically recognised as appropriate and in keeping with the landform.	Addressed in response to OS 139.17.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.20	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	<p>That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is either amended to change the level of naturalness from 'high' to 'medium' or 'low' to recognise that the lower flanks of the ONF have been highly modified by established residential and farming activities or:</p> <p>If the level of naturalness is not changed as above that the values included for the Slope Hill landscape schedule are amended to acknowledge the modification of the landscape by farming activities and associated introduced pests, accessways, recreation, fencing, utilities and services.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Addressed in response to OS 82.7 and OS 82.22.</p> <p>The various modifications to the PA referenced by the submission point are addressed in Schedule 21.22.6, with the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explaining that it is intended that Schedules are read in full.</p>	Reject submission.
OS140.21	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	<p>That landscape schedule 21.22.6 is amended to contextualise the existing forms of modification and development within the Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF) by further describing the future ability of the landscape to consolidate and enhance or develop these uses over time. For example, farming practices established within the ONF has modified the land as well as provided a human</p>	Addressed in response to OS 139.17.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>association and intimate connection to the land.</p> <p>Other important land use patterns and features to be included within this landscape schedule include:</p> <p>(a) Amenity planting from subdivision and land use consent proposals; (b) Ancillary farming activities such as stock water, fences, and utilities; (c) Infrastructure and access connections; and (d) Pest control operations.</p>		
OS140.22	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 14 relating to 'Important historical attributes and values' to recognise that this property continues as a working farm today and associated modifications to landform and values are anticipated from the continuation of this permitted activity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS140.23	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete paragraph 15 on 'Important shared and recognised values'.	Addressed in response to OS 82.20.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.24	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 18 to recognise that some views towards the lower flanks of Slope Hill will be affected by future development and zoning and in particular on Ladies Mile, and that such change will not undermine or detract from the recognized values of the landscape schedule / ONF.	Addressed in response to OS 139.28. Discuss with QLDC planner- how far has Ladies Mile gotten to in terms of process?	Accept submission.
OS140.25	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete all references to private views such as from Lake Hayes houses.	Amend Schedule 21.22.6 [20] as follows: Highly attractive close to long-range views from the Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata, the necklace of reserves around the edge of Lake Hayes, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and the residential area properties around Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) (outside the ONF), across the lake (ONF) to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, the undeveloped ridgeline framing the western side of the lake and/or the more distant surrounding mountain backdrop.	Accept submission in part.
OS140.26	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to identify the particular units of the ONF and describe more accurately the differences in the naturalness of values and attributes.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.

Commented [PE1]: Does not match changes in PA ONL schedule at point 20

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.27	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape values are consistent with and supported by the summary statements.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, along with the review of the PA Schedules by other expert input, I do not agree that Schedule 21.22.6 needs to be amended as suggested by the submitter. As the Methodology Report explains, the PA Schedules have been prepared in accordance with landscape assessment best practice.	Reject submission.
OS140.28	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete the 'Summary of Landscape Values' section, or: If this section is to be retained within the landscape schedule, it is to be amended to reflect the modified character of different units within the ONF, such as the lower flanks.	Addressed in response to OS 139.30.	Reject submission.
OS140.29	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete the 'Landscape Capacity' section.	The Landscape Capacity section of the PA Schedules has been directed by the Environment Court's Topic 2 Decisions.	Reject submission.
OS140.30	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That if the landscape capacities identified within the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are retained, these are amended	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.6 outlines the existing uses evident within Slope Hill PA ONF. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence of any uses (consented or supported by other	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			to recognise existing and planned rural living opportunities and associated amenities and utilities within the lower flanks of the ONF (where the boundary has also been disputed by the submitter).	statutory or non-statutory documents) that have been omitted so that they can be captured in Schedule 21.22.6. With respect to the suggestion that Schedule 21.22.6 should recognise and provide for planned rural living opportunities and associated amenities and utilities, this would appear to embrace matters that go well beyond the identification of the landscape values of the PA ONF and its capacity for landuse change.	
OS140.31	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That if the landscape capacities identified within the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are retained, then much of the lower flanks of Slope Hill need to be amended to moderate or high capacity for additional rural living, farming, earthworks and associated and ancillary activities.	Addressed in response to OS 139.68.	Reject submission.
OS140.32	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is further refined into character units and including the lower slopes being identified as a transition or lifestyle character unit.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.
OS140.33	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to either delete the 'Important hydrological features' section of the schedule, OR: More precisely describe what each of these specific values	Addressed in response to OS 139.31. Schedule 21.22.6 explains that the hydrological features contribute to the "Legibility and expressiveness values" [16] and the "Physical values" [31].	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			contribute to making the Slope Hill landscape outstanding.		
OS140.34	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 8 to add an additional subsection (b) to read: Modified pasture, fencing, farming uses, rural living and amenity plantings across the lower slopes.	Addressed in response to OS 139.32.	Reject submission.
OS140.35	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 8(b) to read: Amenity and shelter plantings around dwellings and their curtilage areas.	Addressed in response to OS 139.32.	Reject submission.
OS140.36	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 8(c) to read: Poplar plantings around the flanks resulting from lifestyle subdivision and development.	Addressed in response to OS 139.34.	Reject submission.
OS140.37	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to add the following sentence to the existing paragraph 9: 'Opportunities for their control are supported	Addressed in response to OS 139.35.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			through future subdivision and development proposals'.		
OS140.38	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	<p>That the landscape schedule 21.22.5 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 10 to read the following:</p> <p>'Slope Hill is predominately in pastoral use with rural living use peppered across the lower slopes. Modification includes a network of farm tracks across the landform, a trig point and communication tower on the highpoint, other infrastructure and utilities, dwellings and their associated curtilages and farm buildings on the northern sides of Slope Hill. Built development is generally characterised by carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is well integrated by a mix of established and more recent vegetation features and enhances the 'natural' landscape patterns'.</p>	Addressed in response to OS 139.36.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.39	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.5 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 10 to include the following additional sentence at the end of the 'Important land use and features' section: 'The lower slopes are characterised as a transition or lifestyle area between the foreground of more development on the flats (including anticipated and zoned future urban development) and lifestyle / Arcadian character of the lower slopes'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.36.	Reject submission.
OS140.40	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.5 Slope Hill is amended to include the following additional paragraph (new paragraph 17) at the end of the 'Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values' section: 'Remaining working farm and lifestyle practices including those associated with irrigation races, infrastructure, access, modified pasture and landform, earthworks, and shelter / amenity planting'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.38.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.41	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.5 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 18, second sentence to include the following after 'Lombardy poplars': 'resulting from rural lifestyle subdivision and development'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.34.	Reject submission.
OS140.42	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 18, final sentence to read the following: 'Overall, the outlook impresses as an engaging and memorable gateway to the Wakatipu Basin framed within the urban context of the foreground flats'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The suggested text amendment is not relevant to "legibility and expressiveness attributes and values" (which addresses how the landscape or feature demonstrates the formative processes of landscape).	Reject submission.
OS140.43	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 19, second sentence to read the following: 'The open pastoral character of the rough 'plucked' slopes of the landform in this view forms a bold contrast with the exotic vegetation and lifestyle development across lower slopes, and the building-dominated low-lying terraces of Ladies Mile and Frankton to the left of the view'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.40.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.44	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete paragraph 20.	Addressed in response to OS 139.41.	Reject submission.
OS140.45	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 21 to read the following: 'Attractive mid to long-range views of the upper slopes from the eastern side of the Wakatipu Basin (including Tuckers Beach, Domain Road, Hawthorn Triangle, Dalefield, parts of the Shotover River corridor, the Hawthorn Triangle, to the more rugged north-western flanks). From this orientation the landform forms a transition of rural living development between the context in the foreground view, and the steeper upper slopes'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.42.	Reject submission.
OS140.46	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 22 to read the following: 'Attractive long range view of the upper slopes from the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts), the Queenstown Trail on Christine's Hill and from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road at McIntyre's Hill to Slope Hill beside the highly attractive	Addressed in response to OS 139.43.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			glacial lake of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) and viewed within a broader ONL mountain context'.		
OS140.47	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete paragraph 23.	Addressed in response to OS 139.44.	Reject submission.
OS140.48	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 24 to read the following: 'In all of the views, the 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes are more evident within the upper slopes of the ONF, along with the attractive built development within the ONF as a lifestyle transition with the flatter 'developed' landscape in the foreground'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.45.	Reject submission.
OS140.49	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 26 to read the following: 'The pastoral and farming character of Slope Hill which conveys a moderate perception of naturalness and domestication, including a number of buildings across the lower flanks, and a series of tracks and infrastructure	Addressed in response to OS 139.46.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			influence on the character of the landform'.		
OS140.50	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 27, first sentence to read the following: 'The appealing and engaging views of the upper slopes to the legible roche moutonnée landform of Slope Hill'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.47.	Reject submission.
OS140.51	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 28 to read the following: 'Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation resulting from rural lifestyle subdivision and development'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.34.	Reject submission.
OS140.52	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 30 to read the following: 'The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of important public viewpoints'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.49.	Reject submission.
OS140.53	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 31, subsection 'a.' to read: 'The highly attractive large-scale composition created by the	Addressed in response to OS 139.50.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			distinctive upper slopes of the roche moutonnee landform, juxtaposed beside a transition of rural living on the lower slopes and urban context on the adjacent flats'.		
OS140.54	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 31, subsection 'b.' to read: 'At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal: i. the clearly legible roche moutonnée landform profile and character; ii. the open and pastoral character of Slope Hill resulting from its use as a working farm; iii. the attractiveness of lifestyle built modification evident through the ONF lower flanks; and iv. the poplars around the flanks of Slope Hill, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native, and which have resulted from rural lifestyle subdivision and development'.	Addressed in response to OS139.51, OS 139.52 and OS 139.53.	Reject submission.
OS140.55	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 32 to	Addressed in response to OS 139.54.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			read: 'High physical values due to the high-value landforms, and vegetation features'.		
OS140.56	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 33, subsection 'b.' to read: 'The historic associations of the area, including farming'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.55.	Reject submission.
OS140.57	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 33 to delete subsection 'd.'	Addressed in response to OS 139.56.	Accept submission.
OS140.58	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 34, subsection 'a.' to read: 'The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes particularly associated with the upper slopes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.57.	Reject submission.
OS140.59	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 34, subsection 'b.' to read: 'The very high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its	Addressed in response to OS 139.58.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			distinctiveness and appealing composition of natural landscape elements.'		
OS140.60	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 34, subsection 'c.' to read: 'The identity of the lower slopes of the roche moutonee as a lifestyle transition area between Ladies Mile and the upper slopes, and as a gateway feature to Queenstown / the Wakatipu Basin'	Addressed in response to OS 139.59.	Reject submission.
OS140.61	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 34, to delete subsection 'd.'	Addressed in response to OS 139.60.	Reject submission.
OS140.62	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Commercial recreational activities reads as follows: i. Commercial recreational activities - limited landscape capacity for activities that: integrate with, and complement/enhance existing recreation features and area located to integrate with natural landscape	Addressed in response to OS 139.61.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			elements and provide for the area's ONF values'.		
OS140.63	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities reads as follows: 'ii. Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - Limited landscape capacity for activities that: integrate with, and complement/enhance existing land uses: and are located to integrate with natural landscape elements and provide for the area's ONF values'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.62.	Reject submission.
OS140.64	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Urban expansions is 'limited' and not 'no' landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 139.63.	Reject submission.
OS140.65	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the activity of Intensive agriculture (iii) is deleted from the landscape capacity list.	Addressed in response to OS 139.64.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.66	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Earthworks reads as follows: 'iv. Earthworks - limited landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm or public access tracks and current lifestyle development that is sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.65.	Reject submission.
OS140.67	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Farm buildings reads as follows: 'v. Farm buildings - limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character or serve a purpose to support farming activities'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.66.	Accept submission in part.
OS140.68	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Transport infrastructure reads as follows: 'vii. Transport infrastructure - limited landscape capacity for trails that are: located to	Addressed in response to OS 139.67.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement'.		
OS140.69	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Rural living reads as follows: xi. Rural living - Moderate landscape capacity within the lower flanks / foothills of the ONF for activities that integrate with, and complement/enhance existing land uses, provide for a transition between urban development of the adjacent flats; and are located to integrate with natural landscape elements'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.68.	Reject submission.

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(f) 21.22.8 Arrow River PA ONF

21.22.8 PA ONF Haehaenui (Arrow River): Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

Haehaenui (Arrow River) PA ONF is the river corridor stretching broadly southwards from the confluence of the river and Pizollis Gully (on the south side of Big Hill), along the eastern side of Arrowtown and the toe of the Crown escarpment to meet the Kawarau River near Chard Farm, west of the Kawarau Bridge. The mapped PA ONF includes the upper edges of the landforms framing the river corridor. This takes in the river floodplains near Arrowtown.

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Mana whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. The steep river cliffs and localised gorges (generally located downstream of the SH6 bridge) and the more gently profiled riverbanks (generally to the north of the SH6 bridge).
2. Dynamic river braids and gravel shoals at bends in the course of the river near Arrowtown and Morven Ferry Road.
3. The interaction of fluvial processes with a landscape and sediments derived under a range of climatic and geomorphic processes over different time scales.
4. Small waterfalls along the course of the river including where the Sawpit Gully Stream flows into the Arrow River.
5. Contains the Arrow Junction piemontite-schist quarry which is recognised in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory and as being of national importance with respect to scientific, aesthetic or educational values and being vulnerable to significant damage by human related activities.

Important hydrological features:

6. The Haehaenui (Arrow River), in particular the following features and attributes:
 - a. Waterbody with a gravel and schist bed.
 - b. Clarity of the waters.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

7. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. Pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri and mingimangi (*Coprosma propinqua*) and remnant pockets of mountain beech bordering the Arrow River. Sweet briar is a component of the grey shrubland.
8. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
 - a. The almost continuous patterning of willows, poplars, and a range of exotic deciduous trees along the riverbanks.

- b. The proliferation of lupins and other exotic wildflower species along the riverbanks.
 - c. Wilding conifers occur in places along the riverbanks.
 - d. Exotic grass floodplains, flats and banks in places.
9. The indigenous forest and shrubland vegetation, exotic grassland and rocky to bluffy terrain provide habitat for New Zealand falcon, bellbirds, grey warbler, fantail and silver eye and skink, and geckos.
 10. Habitat for eel, kōaro and salmon, rainbow trout, brown trout, and rainbow trout.
 11. Valued habitat for sports fishing spawning in Haehaenui (Arrow River).
 12. Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, mice, and rats.
 13. Plant pest species include sycamore, elderberry, wilding conifers, sweet briar, broom, gorse and lupin.

Important land-use patterns and features:

14. The network of public walking (some of which are universally accessible) and cycling trails along the riverbanks (including the Arrow River Bridges Trail which forms part of the Queenstown Trail network). This includes:
 - a. Several footbridges which are regarded as noteworthy features in their own right along the trail network as a consequence of their scale, design and/or the views afforded. Including the Southern Discoveries suspension bridge, the Swain Family Bridge, the Edgar Suspension Bridge and Norman Smith footbridge (where the Arrow River trail joins the Macetown Road).
 - b. The Knights Family Underpass and the Barfoot Tunnel (beneath SH6).
15. The almost continuous patterning of Informal Recreation zoned land along the western side (true right side) of the river extending from the northern end of Arrowtown to the SH6 bridge at Arrow Junction.
16. The swathe of Informal Recreation zoned land on the eastern side of the river (true left side) to the north of the SH6 bridge at Arrow Junction.
17. The Urban Growth Boundary associated with Arrowtown which adjoins the western boundary of the PA ONF (in the vicinity of Arrowtown)
18. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the river corridor due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include: the Arrowtown Golf Course (south of Arrowtown); the scattering of relatively spacious rural living properties along the eastern side of Centennial Avenue and Morven Ferry Road and the western side of SH6 (Gibbston Highway); and the established cluster of rural living dwellings throughout Arrow Junction.
19. State Highway 6 which crosses the river at Arrow Junction.
20. The Macetown pipeline which runs from Macetown to Arrowtown alongside and crossing over parts of the Arrow River.
21. The flood berm in the vicinity of Bush Creek.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

22. The Macetown Road and stone retaining walls along the river upstream of Arrowtown, and the William Fox Memorial at Coopers Terrace to the north of Arrowtown (at the base of German Hill, District Plan reference 6).

23. The Macetown Heritage Area Overlay (MHAO) extends throughout the river corridor north of Arrowtown. This forms part of the much larger area of heritage significance due to its concentration of historic gold mining sites, focussed on the deserted mining town of Macetown, which span from the earliest exploitation of gold in the Arrowtown area in 1862, through to the end of gold mining in the 1930's. Such a continuum of mining activity – first alluvial then hard-rock or quartz – has left a distinct and intelligible landscape with diverse features and stories linked by a series of mining tracks that still allow access to this remote and stunning countryside. The MHOA encompasses three key areas; the Rich Burn Valley, Macetown and the Arrow River valley, all three of which have distinctive characters and features that coalesce to form a broader mining heritage of regional significance. Among these, Macetown (outside the PA) is highly significant, representing the surviving remains of a remote 19th century mining village to which stories are still attached and some history has been traced to its founders, occupants and demise. Situated within its larger mining heritage context (which includes part of the PA), Macetown can be interpreted as part of a community of gold mining activity sites, which are a key part of the wider Otago gold mining story.
24. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, dams, and associated domestic sites along the riverbanks (for example, archaeological sites F41/653, F41/748, and F41/652).

Mana whenua features and their locations:

25. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
26. The ONF is mapped as wāhi tūpuna Haehaenui (Arrow River), part of the mahika kai networks in this area.

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

Mana whenua associations and experience:

27. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
28. For generations, mana whenua traversed these catchments gathering kai and other resources.
29. The mana whenua values associated with this ONF include, but may not be limited to, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

Important historic attributes and values:

30. Gold mining in and alongside the river which led to the establishment of a settlement at Arrowtown. The sites associated with Macetown represent a particularly rich archaeological landscape.
31. The naming of the river, which was named the Arrow because its point of junction with Bush Creek resembled the outline of an arrowhead.
32. The scattering of various historic features along and adjacent the PA ONF, which collectively tell the story of the early European history of the area.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

33. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.

34. The popularity of the Arrow River as an inspiration/subject for art, photography, and books.
35. The identity of the river as an important natural and historic landscape context for Arrowtown.
36. The popularity of the recreational 'features' listed below.
37. The importance of the natural heritage area to the local community as evidenced by the efforts of the Arrowtown Wilding Group, Predator Free Arrowtown, and the Arrowtown Choppers to manage weeds and pests, clear debris in the river and revegetate sections of the river corridor.
38. The Wall of Recognition along the route of the Arrow River Bridges Trail, which recognises the landowners and members of the local community that have been instrumental in the establishment and development of the Queenstown Trail.

Important recreation attributes and values:

39. Gold panning and fishing on the river; walking and cycling the trails alongside the river.
40. The highly accessible nature of the river, particularly from Arrowtown creates a popular destination for picnicking and dog exercise as recreation activities, and river access for wading/ dogs/ water play.
41. A gateway to four-wheel drive recreation access trails.
42. Significant sports fishery and spawning habitat.

Commented [BG1]: Typographical correction.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

43. Clearly legible alluvial / hydrological processes that have shaped the river corridor and which continue to add to its dynamic qualities. These are evident in the floodplains, the gorge landform and the changing patterns of channels and gravel banks along the river course.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

44. Highly attractive close, mid and long-range views from tracks, footbridges, reserve land, the SH6 bridge and adjacent dwellings along the predominantly vegetation-clad river corridor. Vegetation and landform patterns together with the winding corridor contain and frame views, contributing a highly variable, albeit generally relatively enclosed, character to the outlook. In places, the steep and large-scale escarpment edging the Crown Terrace and/or the mountain slopes of German Hill, Big Hill, and other enclosing mountains add a sense of drama and grandeur. Elsewhere, historic buildings bordering the corridor (for example, Dudley's Cottage and the Chinese Settlement in Arrowtown, and quaint cottages at Whitechapel) and the dynamic river waters and/or waterfalls add to the appeal of the outlook.
45. Appealing mid and long-range views from Tobin's Track and parts of the zig-zag section of the Crown Range Road to discrete sections of the river corridor and its predominantly vegetation-clad banks. In such views, the expansive outlook across the eastern portion of the Whakatipu Basin, seen framed by mountains and dotted with roche moutonnée adds to the appeal of the outlook.

Naturalness attributes and values:

46. The seemingly undeveloped character of the river corridor due to the dominance of the waterbody and its vegetated margins. While trails, footbridges, underpasses, and a road bridge are evident in the corridor,

these activities indicate the high recreational values of the ONF (see previously). Where evident, structures are typically modest in scale and/or of an appealing or sympathetic character, which means that they are subservient to the natural landscape.

47. Between Arrowtown and the SH6 bridge there is an awareness of the urban or rural living land use adjacent the corridor. Even so, there remains a perception of significant naturalness within the river landscape, largely as a consequence of the densely vegetated margins and close proximity to the seemingly untamed and dramatic slopes of the Crown Escarpment. Buildings tend to be glimpsed behind plantings, making them recessive, with the historic character of some contributing to the charm of the area. Structures such as bridges, underpasses, signage, and seating associated with the Arrow River Trail also contribute positively to the appearance of the area. Overall there is the impression of a landscape that is highly picturesque, variable, and aesthetically appealing.
48. For the stretch of river corridor north of Arrowtown and south of the SH6 bridge, steeper slopes and gorges with exposed schist outcrops frame the river to form a contained and intimate river character. Whilst exotic vegetation is apparent, grey shrubland and manuka/beech remnants are more common and there is generally an increased perception of naturalness due to very limited exposure to development.

Memorability attributes and values:

49. The appealing and engaging views of the vegetated river corridor generally, and in places, seen flanked by historic buildings.
50. The various foot/cycle bridges, underpasses, historic features, and the dramatic gorges along the river corridor.

Transient attributes and values:

51. The fluctuations and changing patterns of the river waters and floodplain gravel banks.
52. The signature reds and golds of the autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation (river edge poplars and willows in particular).
53. The seasonal display of wildflowers (including lupins) along the riverbanks.
54. Distinctive dappled light impression throughout the wooded river margins on sunny days.
55. Seasonal snowfall and, during which, frosted trees in the shaded river corridor by Arrowtown provide a noteworthy spectacle.

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

56. The river corridor upstream (north) of Arrowtown that is flanked by undeveloped mountains and hills.
57. Stretches of the river corridor tracks where intervening vegetation and / or landforms screen views of surrounding buildings, roads and pastoral areas.

Aesthetic qualities and values relate to:

58. The experience of all of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
59. More specifically, this includes:
 - a. The highly attractive and intimate composition created by the watercourse framed by the densely vegetation-clad riverbanks.
 - b. The striking seasonal leaf colour display associated with the area.

- c. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. the river cliff and gorge formations to the south of the SH6 bridge;
 - ii. the visually discrete character of the majority of built development bordering the area;
 - iii. the historic built development that is seen in places;
 - iv. the sympathetic design of the trail tracks and structures; and
 - v. the exotic trees and wildflowers along the river course, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Perceptual (Sensory) • Associative

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for Haehaenui (Arrow River) PA ONF are summarised as follows:

- 60. **High** physical values relating to the clarity of the waters, the dynamic attributes of the river corridor, the gorges and floodplains shaped by the river, the habitat values for native and introduced fauna, the areas of indigenous vegetation and the mana whenua features in the area.
- 61. **High** associative values relating to:
 - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
 - b. The historic features in the area.
 - c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
 - d. The recreational attributes of the ONF.
- 62. **High** perceptual values relating to:
 - a. The strong legibility and expressiveness values of the area derived from the visibility of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
 - b. The appealing aesthetic and distinctive memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural and cultural landscape elements. The area's transient values, intimate and enclosed character, and the accessibility of the area play an important role in this regard.
 - c. A strong perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of more natural landscape elements and processes throughout the area.
 - d. A sense of remoteness and wildness in places where the landform and/or vegetation serves to obscure views of built development.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Haehaenui (Arrow River) PA ONF for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONF values.
 - Commented [BG2]:** OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.
 - Commented [BG3]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.
 - Commented [BG4]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – no** landscape capacity for tourism-related activities. N-Very limited to no landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms which are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). **No** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA.
 - Commented [BG5]:** OS 68.5 Barnhill Corporate Trustee Ltd.
 - Commented [BG6]:** OS 68.5 Barnhill Corporate Trustee Ltd.
- iii. **Urban expansions – no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with public access tracks, trails, underpasses, and bridge structures, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings – very limited to no** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character and maintain the openness and legibility attributes.
 - Commented [BG7]:** OS 68.5 Barn Hill Corporate Trustee Ltd.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – no** landscape capacity.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONF values. **No** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.
 - Commented [BG8]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.
 - Commented [BG9]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be co-located with existing infrastructure or designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
 - Commented [BG10]:** OS70.20 Transpower New Zealand Limited.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. Very limited to no landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
 - Commented [BG11]:** OS 68.5 Barn Hill Corporate Trustee Ltd.
- x. **Production forestry – no** landscape capacity.
 - Commented [BG12]:** Typographical correction.
- xi. **Rural living – very limited to no** landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; is designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).
 - Commented [BG13]:** OS 68.5 Barn Hill Corporate Trustee Ltd.
 - Commented [BG14]:** OS 68.5 Barn Hill Corporate Trustee Ltd.

21.22.8 Arrow River PA ONF Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.8 Arrow River PA ONF Schedule". New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS68.3	Debbie MacColl On Behalf Of Barn Hill Corporate Trustee Ltd	Oppose	That all the activities that happen in the Arrow (Haehaenui) and Kawarau River Outstanding Natural Features from past, present and future are recognised within the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>No specific past, present or future activities in relation to the Arrow River are referenced in the submission as being omitted in Schedule 21.22.8. For this reason, it is unclear as to what text changes are requested in this regard.</p> <p>The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence with respect to specific activities that they consider should be referenced in Schedule 21.22.8.</p>	Reject submission.
OS68.5	Debbie MacColl On Behalf Of Barn Hill Corporate Trustee Ltd	Oppose	That all areas within the Arrow (Haehaenui) and Kawarau River Outstanding Natural Landscapes are amended to have 'some' landscape capacity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work and having carefully reviewed the spatial extent of the mapped Arrow River PA ONF, I consider that the following amendments are appropriate:</p> <p>ii. Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – no landscape capacity for tourism-related activities. <u>Very limited to no</u> landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities <u>associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms which are located to optimise the screening and/or</u></p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p><u>filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). No landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA.</u></p> <p>vi. Farm buildings – <u>very limited to n</u>o landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character and maintain the openness and legibility attributes.</p> <p>x. Renewable energy generation – <u>no landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. Very limited to no landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.</u></p> <p>xii. Rural living – <u>very limited to n</u>o landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; is designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).</p> <p>I remain of the view that a rating of no landscape capacity for urban development, tourism related activities (ie resorts), intensive agriculture, mineral extraction, transport infrastructure (other than trails), commercial scale renewable energy generation and production forestry. This is largely due to the landscape values associated with the area coupled with the very confined extent of the PA. Put another way, a relatively limited extent of the PA is not riverbed or riverbank which means that there is very unlikely to be 'anywhere to go' in terms of appropriately locating these landuses without adversely impacting on landscape values.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over</p>	

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</p> <p>This means that there is an acknowledgement that a finer grained assessment as part of a site-specific proposal may determine a higher capacity for a landuse which may give the submitter some comfort in this regard.</p>	
OS70.20	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.8 Arrow River is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.8 Capacity (ix) as follows:</p> <p>Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. <u>In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.</u></p>	<u>Accept submission.</u>

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(g) 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL

21.22.12 PA ONL Western Whakatipu Basin: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL encompasses the steep south-eastern mountain slopes of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), the steep south and eastern mountain slopes of Bowen Peak and the two elevated roche moutonnée landforms of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill and including Sugar Loaf) and Pt 781. The PA ONF also takes in Waipuna (Lake Johnson) sitting in the ice-eroded gully between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill (a separate PA ONF). Collectively, the mountain slopes form the northern backdrop to Sunshine Bay, Fernhill and Queenstown, and the ~~western/north-western backdrop~~ mountain setting to Gorge Road and Arthurs Point. The PA ONL adjoins the Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA ONF along its north-eastern boundary in the vicinity of Arthurs Point.

Commented [BG1]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 189.10 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 138.17 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. The steeply sloping foliated schistose mountain landforms of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond 1,748m) and Bowen Peak (1,631m), which form part of the wall of mountains typical of the U-shaped glaciated valleys of which the Whakatipu Valley is an example.
2. The distinctive peaks of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) and Bowen Peak.
3. Exposed rock outcrops and bluffs in places.
4. The Ben Lomond saddle that extends on a west-east orientation between Ben Lomond and Bowen Peak and (in combination with the flanking peaks) separates the Whakatipu Valley from the Moke Creek Valley to the north.
5. The elevated ridgeline spurs extending southwards from the Ben Lomond saddle and taking in Pt 1121 and Cemetery Hill (812m, also known as 'Bobs Peak') immediately west of Queenstown (upon which the skyline Gondola and luge development is located).
6. The extensive ridgeline descending south-westwards from Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) to Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu (ONL)) and taking in Pt 1580, Pt 1395, Pt 1335, Pt 1138 and Pt 850.
7. The small roche moutonnée landform (480m) towards the western edge of the PA, Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu (ONL)).
8. Glacial till deposits at the toe of the steep mountain slopes forming shallow localised shelves and throughout the more gently sloping lower reaches of gullies within the PA.
9. A localised area of ribs of bedrock on the lower-lying slopes to the west of Sunshine Bay.
10. The steeply sloping roche moutonnée glacial landforms of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill, 907m), Sugar Loaf (911m), and Pt 781, with a smooth 'up-glacier' slope to the southwest and south of each landform and a steeper rough 'plucked' down-glacier slope generally to the west, northwest, north and northeast.
11. The elevated saddle-like landform between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill, within which Lake Johnson is located.

Commented [BG2]: Typographical correction.

12. Scarps and hummocky topography on the southeast slopes of Queenstown Hill and the eastern side of Sugar Loaf which are indicative of historic large-scale landslides.

Important hydrological features:

13. One Mile Creek and its numerous steeply incised tributaries draining the south-eastern flanks of Ben Lomond to Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu).
14. The series of unnamed streams on either side of the One Mile Creek network, draining directly to Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu).
15. The steeply incised Horn Creek (or Bush Creek), McChesney Creek, Domestic Creek, Shady Creek, and numerous unnamed streams draining the southern and eastern sides of Bowen Peak to Kimiākau (Shotover River PA ONF).
16. The shallow lowland, glacial lake of Waipuna (Lake Johnson, 399m). The lake is currently eutrophic (with poor water quality) due to elevated nutrient inputs from its catchment.
17. The numerous unnamed streams on the western, northern and south-eastern side of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill)/Sugar Loaf; the south side of Pt 781; between Sugar Loaf and Pt 781; and between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill.
18. Small kettle lakes and wetlands across the elevated slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
19. The wetland at Matakauri Park, on the east side of Gorge Road.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

20. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. Pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri and mingimingi occur throughout the low-lying rocky slopes of Bowen Peak adjacent to Gorge Road and Moonlight Track.
 - b. Kohuhu (*Pittosporum tenuifolium*) dominant (broadleaved) shrubland at the western end of the PA bordering the lake shore.
 - c. Pockets of mountain beech forest remnants in the gullies of One and Two Mile Creek and Bushy Creek.
 - d. Relic specimens of kowhai on the bluffs above McChesney Creek.
 - e. Subalpine shrubland and snow tussock grassland higher up above the bushline and areas of grey shrubland. The shrubs associated with the subalpine shrubland include species of the genera *Dracophyllum*, *Hebe*, *Leucopogon*, *Gaultheria*, *Pimelea* and *Ozothamnus*.
 - f. Parts of the beech forest in One Mile Creek and adjoining areas of subalpine shrubland and snow tussock grassland within the Ben Lomond Scenic Reserve.
 - g. Crack willows line much of the Waipuna (Lake Johnson) shoreline. Wetland vegetation comprising a mix of rushes and sedges at the southern and northern end of the lake where there is an absence of crack willows. Pockets of rushland and sedgeland also in isolated shoreline areas where gaps exist in the willow cover.
 - h. Swathes and scattered pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri and mingimingi occupy the bluffs, rocky slopes and gullies on each of the roche moutonnée landforms, as well as some hillslopes such as above the eastern shoreline of Waipuna (Lake Johnson). Some of these shrublands are interspersed with hawthorn, sweet briar and elderberry.

- i. Extensive patches of manuka (*Leptospermum scoparium*) and scattered specimens of bog pine (*Halocarpus bidwillii*) on the higher western slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
 - j. Short tussockland grassland covers large parts of the undulating crest terrain between Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and Sugar Loaf.
 - k. A large wetland (sedgeland) called the Matakauri wetland on the outskirts of Queenstown by Gorge Road which is classified as a Regionally Significant Wetland.
21. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
- a. The almost continuous patterning of plantation *Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Douglas fir) forest throughout the mid and lower flanks of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) and the southern flanks of Bowen Peak.
 - b. Areas of pasture adjacent to Gorge Road as far as Watties Track.
 - c. The almost continuous patterning of plantation larch and Douglas fir forest throughout the southern lower flanks of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
 - d. The more fragmented patterning of wilding conifers intermixed with grey shrubland, hawthorn, sycamore, broom, gorse and crack willow throughout the southern lower flanks of Pt 781, the western and northern lower slopes of Sugar Loaf and western lower slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
 - e. Open pasture and scattered scrub throughout the elevated steep slopes and crest of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill), Sugar Loaf and Pt 781.
 - f. Grazed pasture with scattered shelterbelts (including poplars) and clusters of pine and willow trees throughout the saddle between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill.
 - g. Amenity and shelter plantings around the few scattered rural and rural living dwellings at the southern end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) and on the north-western side of Sugar Loaf.
 - h. Amenity plantings around the two groupings of dwellings on the south side of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill), near the entrance to the Queenstown Hill Time Walk.
22. Waipuna (Lake Johnson) is a SNA in the District Plan. The riparian vegetation is of significance to aquatic values.
23. Scrub and exotic trees/weeds throughout the lower mountain slopes to the west of Sunshine Bay and adjacent Gorge Road, Arthurs Point and the Moonlight Track.
24. Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
25. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, hawthorn, buddleia, elderberry, sycamore, broom, cotoneaster and gorse.

Important land-use patterns and features:

- 26. Grazed pasture across the low-lying flatter land on the eastern side of the PA adjacent to Gorge Road, parts of the slopes to the west of Arthurs Point and the majority of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill), Sugar Loaf, Pt 781 and around Waipuna (Lake Johnson). Very low-intensity grazing across the elevated pastoral slopes. Associated with this activity are a network of farm tracks, fencing and farm buildings sheds.
- 27. The proliferation of plantation and wilding conifers around the edges of the PA that define the interface between much of the PA and urban Queenstown/Arthurs Point.

Commented [BG3]: OS 142.35 Hansen Family Partnership.

Commented [BG4]: OS 142.35 Hansen Family Partnership.

Commented [BG5]: OS 142.36 Hansen Family Partnership.

28. The gondola (towers, cableway and cabins in a cleared area of Douglas fir forest), luge tracks and chairlift and associated buildings (top and bottom stations, maintenance workshop), café/restaurant/terminal building, service buildings, lighting, signage, jumping-off point for paragliders, vehicular access track, star gazing platforms, bungee platform and associated buildings, zip lining and associated tree top huts and network of mountain bike trails (Queenstown Mountain Bike Park) on Cemetery Hill.
29. The swathe of Community Purpose and Informal Recreation zoned land across the slopes of Cemetery Hill facing towards Queenstown (where the Skyline gondola, luge, and mountain bike tracks are) and along either side of the lower reaches of One Mile Creek.
30. The Queenstown Hill Time Walk that leads from near the Queenstown city centre (Belfast Street) to the summit of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and coincides with Informal Recreation zoned land across the lower south-western slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
31. An area of Community Purposes zoned land adjacent the northern edge of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) on Gorge Road and coinciding with Matakauri Park wetland and boardwalk.
32. The Tiki Trail, Fernhill Loop and Ben Lomond tracks near Queenstown; the Arawata Track at the western end of Sunshine Bay; and the Moonlight Track on the north-western side of Arthurs Point. Associated with these tracks are signage, stiles, and seating.
33. The general absence of rural and rural living buildings within the PA, excepting a scattering at the north-western end of Arthurs Point, a scattering along the Gorge Road valley floor (including adventure tourism related facilities and activities), a very small pocket of urban dwellings at the toe of the Queenstown Time Walk, and the small cluster of rural living dwellings at the south end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
34. An unformed road leading from Gorge Road up the lower slopes on the east side of Bowen Peak; from Wynyard Crescent up the mountain slopes; and from Lomond Crescent up the mountain slopes (Ben Lomond Track).
35. Short stretches of unformed road: at the north end of Hansen Road (south) linking to Waipuna (Lake Johnson); at the southern end of Hansen Road (north) extending southwards along the western side of Ferry Hill; and from the western end of Tucker Beach Road extending southwards to the lower northern slopes of Pt 781.
36. Infrastructure is evident within the PA and includes: Aurora distribution lines around the lower slopes of Ben Lomond to the west of Sunshine Bay, along the Gorge Road corridor and on the south-eastern side of the area, and over the saddle near Waipuna (Lake Johnson); water reservoir designations near Greenstone Place and Scott Place in Fernhill; and a firefighting pond near the luge.
37. The UGB associated with Queenstown and the Fernhill/Sunshine Bay suburban area which adjoins the southern edges of the PA, and the Arthurs Point UGB which adjoins the north-western margins of the PA.
38. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include: the urban residential and commercial development adjoining the southern edges of the PA (taking in Sunshine Bay, Fernhill, Queenstown and Frankton); the urban residential and commercial development adjoining the north-western edges of the area (including Arthurs Point); the Queenstown Mountain Bike Club pump track area used for recreation and events on Kerry Drive near the south boundary; rural living development towards the western end of Tucker Beach; and Gorge Road, Glenorchy Queenstown Road and Frankton Road (SH6A).

Commented [BG6]: OS 186.2 Richard Kemp.

Commented [BG7]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 189.20 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited.
OS 138.7 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 138.8 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 138.25 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

Commented [BG8]: OS 186.2 Richard Kemp.

Commented [BG9]: OS 186.2 Richard Kemp.

Commented [BG10]: OS 75.6 Peter Clark.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

39. Queenstown Powerhouse, One Mile Creek (District Plan reference 96).
40. Old McChesney Bridge Abutment Remains, Arthurs Point (District Plan reference 104, archaeological site E41/236).

Commented [BG11]: OS 189.22 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited.
OS 138.26 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

41. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, dams, and associated domestic sites in the area (for example, archaeological sites E41/204, E41/228, and E41/279).
42. A protected horse chestnut (*Aesculus hippocastanum*) on Gorge Road (western side of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill)) and a grouping of protected English oaks (*Quercus robur*) at the south-western end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
43. Various archaeological features associated with goldmining across the area (e.g., sluicings, tailings, water races, hut sites, dams, etc.), especially in the area around Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
44. Archaeological features relating to historic farming in the area around Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
45. Historic walking track from Queenstown to the top of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).

Mana whenua features and their locations:

46. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
47. Much of the ONL is mapped as the wāhi tūpuna Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) or Te Tapunui wāhi tūpuna. The very northern extent overlaps the Kimiākau (Shotover River) wāhi tūpuna.

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

Mana whenua associations and experience:

48. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
49. Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura is named after Hakitekura, a Kāti Māmoe woman who was the first person to swim across ~~Whakatipu wai māori~~ Whakatipu Waimāori. ~~After watching other young women from the mountains attempting to outswim each other, she decided that she wanted to outdo them. She got a kauati (a stick used to start fire) from her father, and a bundle of dry raupō as kindling. The next morning, Hakitekura set out from Tāhuna (the flat land where Queenstown now stands). With the kauati and raupō bound tightly in harakeke (flax) to keep them dry, she swam across the lake in darkness, with the bundle strapped to her. When Hakitekura was discovered missing, her father remembered his daughter's request for a kauati, and a waka was sent across the lake to bring her back. The mountains where she would look across the lake were thereafter known as ~~Te Taumata a Hakitekura~~ Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (The Resting Place of Hakitekura).~~
50. The name Te Tapunui signifies a place considered sacred to Kāi Tahu whānui both traditionally and in the present.
51. Kimiākau is part of the extensive network of mahika kai (food & resource gathering) and traditional travel routes in the area.
52. The mana whenua values associated with this ONF include, but may not be limited to, wāhi tapu, wāhi taoka, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

Commented [BG12]: OS 77.39 Kai Tahu Otago. OS 188.39 Elisha Ebert-Young.

Commented [BG13]: OS 77.48 Kai Tahu Otago. OS 188.48 Elisha Ebert-Young.

Important historic attributes and values:

53. The naming of the Ben Lomond, after Ben Lomond in Scotland by the early shepherd, Duncan McAusland.

54. Early European interactions with the creeks in the area as sources of water, power, and gold, as well as obstacles that needed to be bridged.
55. Gold mining in the area and the associated physical remnants.
56. Early farming around Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
57. The contextual value of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) as a landscape feature that historically defined communication routes around the Whakatipu Basin.
58. The importance of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) as an early tourist destination.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

59. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
60. The popularity of the postcard views from Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak) ~~out over Queenstown~~, Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill), Walter Peak, Cecil Peak, the Remarkables, ~~Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond)~~ and the broader mountain context, as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.
61. The very high popularity of the Skyline Gondola and luge facility and the Queenstown Time Walk (both described below). The very close proximity of these recreational features to Queenstown urban area also plays a role.
62. The identity of Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak), Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) and, further afield, Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) as part of the dramatic backdrop to Queenstown.
63. ~~The popularity of the postcard views from Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) out over Lake Whakatipu, Cecil Peak, Walter Peak, The Remarkables, Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), and the broader mountain context, as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.~~
64. The identity of Bowen Peak as part of the dramatic backdrop to Arthurs Point.

Commented [BG14]: Amended for consistency as the other outlooks are referred to in a general sense.
OS42.5 Sunnyheights Limited.

Commented [BG15]: Combined from [63] to reduce repetition.
OS42.5 Sunnyheights Limited.

Commented [BG16]: Combined with [60] to reduce repetition.
OS42.5 Sunnyheights Limited.

Important recreation attributes and values:

65. Walking, running, mountain biking, paragliding, luging, riding the gondola, bungee jumping and enjoying the view from the café/restaurant facilities on Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak).
66. Walking and running on the Tiki Trail, Ben Lomond Track, Arawata Track and the Moonlight Track.
67. Mountain biking within the Queenstown Mountain Bike Park and trails within and around the Wynyard Jump Park.
68. Walking, running, and picnicking on the Queenstown Time Walk which includes several heritage interpretation panels, lookout points and the 'Basket of Dreams' sculpture by Caroline Robinson.
69. Walking and running on the Matakauri Park boardwalk (near Gorge Road).
- 69a Adventure tourism tracks, facilities and activities in the Gorge Road valley.
70. Trout fishing at Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
71. Glenorchy-Queenstown Road and Gorge Road as key scenic routes in close proximity.

Commented [BG17]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 189.23 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 138.7 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 138.8 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

72. The area's natural landforms, land type, and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial processes.
73. Indigenous gully and wetland plantings which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values throughout the area.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

74. The postcard views from vantage points on Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak) ~~out over Queenstown~~, Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill), Walter Peak, Cecil Peak, the Remarkables, Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), and the broader mountain context.
75. The spectacular panoramic views from the Ben Lomond saddle and Ben Lomond summit out over the Whakatipu Valley to the south (including the lake) and the rugged and dramatic expanse of Harris and Richardson mountains ranges to the north.
76. ~~The postcard views from Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) over Lake Wakatipu, the Remarkables, Ben Lomond and the broader mountain context of Queenstown.~~
77. The highly attractive short to long-range views from the Moonlight Track along the vegetation-clad gorge of the Shotover Corridor, across the rugged and largely undeveloped slopes of Mount Dewar and northwards to The Point.
78. The appealing short to long-range views from the Arawata Track across the mixed bush and scrub-clad lake margins to Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and Cecil Peak.
79. The engaging mid to long-range views from Queenstown, Fernhill, Sunshine Bay, Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights), Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), parts of the Queenstown Trail network, and the Glenorchy-Queenstown Road, in which the largely forested slopes of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) form the backdrop to Queenstown. The bold contrast between the urban development throughout the lower flanks of the hill and the elevated wooded slopes is memorable and of importance to the identity of Queenstown as a settlement tucked into the base of a mountain.
80. The appealing long-range views from more distant elevated vantage points such as the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts) in which the visibility of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) peak and the connection of Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak) and Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) to the broader glacial landscape confers a sense of grandeur to the outlook.
81. Dramatic close and mid-range views from Gorge Road to the rugged and vegetation-pocked slopes of Bowen Peak. The somewhat wild and unkempt character of the slopes where rocky outcrops and patches of scrub and grey shrubland dominate at relatively close range, combined with the broader mountain context (Sugar Loaf and Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill)), add to the spectacle.
82. Dramatic mid and long-range views from Arthurs Point, the Kimiākau (Shotover River) ONF, the western Whakatipu Basin / Littles Stream area and sections of the trail network coinciding with this part of the basin, to the rugged eastern and north-eastern slopes of Bowen Peak and Sugar Loaf. In views the mountainous context within which the largely undeveloped and open mountain-scape is seen, together with its visual dominance (as a consequence of its scale, proximity, and appearance), adds to the appeal of the outlook.

Commented [BG18]: Amended for consistency as the other outlooks are referred to in a general sense.
OS42.5 Sunnyheights Limited.

Commented [BG19]: Combined from [76] to reduce repetition.
OS42.5 Sunnyheights Limited.

Commented [BG20]: Combined with [74] to reduce repetition.
OS42.5 Sunnyheights Limited.

83. Engaging and attractive short to long-range views from the Frankton Arm, Frankton (including the airport), SH6, and Kelvin Peninsula to the smoother south-facing slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and the more irregular profile of Pt 781 (seen in combination with the cone like peak of Ferry Hill which is a separate PA ONF). In more distant views (e.g. Frankton Arm and Kelvin Peninsula), this part of the PA is perceived as a continuous, albeit varied, landform feature with Ferry Hill PA ONF. The almost unbroken patterning of vegetation plantation forest along the southern flanks of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and wilding conifers intermixed with grey shrubland and scrub throughout the southern lower flanks of Pt 781, together with its generally undeveloped character, forms a memorable contrast with the urban development below and the more open pastoral slopes sitting above, which reinforces the impression of coherence. In longer range views from many of the more distant locations to the south, there is a clear appreciation of the roche moutonnée landform profile and the waters of the Frankton Arm seen in the foreground of view, along with the often-snow-capped mountains of Ben Lomond and Coronet Peak in the background add to the appeal. In closer range views (e.g. Frankton and SH6), intervening landforms, vegetation and/or built development curbs the field of view in places. Despite the limited expanse of the feature visible, the contrast established by the natural landform seen within an urban context adds to the memorability and appeal of such views.
84. Attractive mid to long-range views from Queenstown, Lake Whakatipu, and the Glenorchy-Queenstown Road, in which the smoother 'up-glacier' largely forested south-western slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) form the backdrop to Queenstown. The bold contrast between the urban development throughout the lower flanks of the hill and the elevated wooded slopes is memorable and of importance to the identity of Queenstown as a settlement tucked into the base of a mountains. From more distant vantage points, the connection of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) to the broader glacial landscape is more legible and adds a sense of grandeur to the outlook.
85. Attractive mid and long-range views from the Fitzpatrick Basin, Dalefield, Hawthorn Triangle, the elevated flanks and foothills associated with Slope Hill and sections of Queenstown Trail coinciding with this part of the basin, to the more irregular steep profile of Pt 781 and the more rounded, albeit rugged, northern side of Sugar Loaf. In closer range views, the expanse of the PA is curtailed by intervening landform and vegetation; however, there is an increased appreciation of the localised rocky outcrops, scarps, and hummocky terrain of the landforms adding to their appeal. In some of these views, there is an appreciation of the band of rural living development (Tucker Beach) along the north side of the Waipuna (Lake Johnson) saddle along with the poplar shelterbelts, scattered shade trees. Nevertheless, from this orientation, the large-scale and distinctive sculptural form of the landforms and their generally undeveloped character make them memorable.
86. Highly attractive close and mid-range views across Waipuna (Lake Johnson), seen enclosed by the steeply rising roche moutonnée features of Pt 781 and Ferry Hill (ONF). Scattered largely exotic lake edge, shelterbelt, shade tree, and amenity plantings (around dwellings) add to the scenic appeal.
87. Engaging and seemingly 'close-range' views from planes approaching or exiting Queenstown airport via the Frankton Arm. Such views offer an appreciation of the roches moutonnées and the broader glacial landscape context within which the PA ONL is set.
88. In all of the views, the dominance of 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONL, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the ONL and, in the case of the southern and north-eastern sides of the area, the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

Commented [BG21]: Typographical correction.

Naturalness attributes and values:

89. The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL set within a largely urban context (Queenstown and Arthurs Point), which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to its forestry, pastoral, recreational, and infrastructure uses are visible, the very low number of buildings and the limited visibility (excepting the gondola etc described below), limits their influence on the character of the area as a natural landscape.

90. The irregular patterning and proliferation of grey shrubland, exposed rock faces, and scrub in places, adds to the perception of naturalness.
91. While the gondola forms a bold manmade 'cut' up the hillside, with a sizeable terminal building and luge development atop Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak), the movement of the gondola cabins together with the connection the gondola and associated development establishes between the mountain setting and Queenstown adds a degree of interest to the view, meaning that it is not an overwhelmingly negative visual element. Put another way, these landscape modifications make an important contribution to Queenstown's recreational values (see above), suggesting a degree of landscape 'fit'. The scale of the seemingly 'undeveloped' mountain setting within which this development is viewed together with its strong visual connection to Queenstown also play a role in this regard. At night, the patterning of lights up the mountain slopes forms a bold contrast to the darkness of the surrounding mountain slopes. Again, it is the very close proximity of the area to Queenstown that lends a visual fit.
92. The forestry plantings across the south and southeast flanks of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill), Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) and parts of Bowen Peak contribute a reduced perception of naturalness. However, the underlying natural (and largely unmodified) schistose mountain and roche moutonnée landform character remains legible and dominant, thus ensuring this part of the area displays at least a moderate-high level of naturalness. The visual appearance of these parts of the PA during and after harvesting cycles forms a prominent negative visual element within the broader landscape setting and serves to (temporarily) further reduce the perception of naturalness in this part of the PA.

Memorability attributes and values:

93. The appealing and engaging views of the largely undeveloped mountains and largely undeveloped and legible roche moutonnée landforms from a wide variety of public vantage points. The juxtaposition of the mountains and landforms within a largely urban context, along with the magnificent broader mountain and lake context within which they are seen in many views, are also factors that contribute to memorability.
94. The 'close up' experience of the alpine setting that the PA affords for many residents and visitors to Queenstown as a consequence of the relatively high accessibility of the area (via the tracks and gondola in very close proximity to the town centre).
95. The panoramic alpine landscape views afforded from: the Ben Lomond track, saddle and peak; and the top of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
96. The sense of Queenstown and Arthurs Point tucked in at the toe of a majestic mountain setting.
97. The sense of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) as a 'hidden gem' tucked away in the hillslopes by Frankton.

Transient attributes and values:

98. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain and roche moutonnée slopes.
99. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation.

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

100. A strong sense of the sublime as a consequence of the sheer scale, dramatic character and undeveloped appearance of the mountain and roche moutonnée which is evident: on the Ben Lomond track above the Gondola and luge development; along Gorge Road away from existing built development and adventure tourism related activities; and across the northern part of the PA which contributes a sense of remoteness and wildness to the wider setting (including Arthurs Point, Kimiākau (Shotover River) ONF and the western part of the Whakatipu Basin), despite the more developed immediate context.

Commented [BG22]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

Aesthetic qualities and values:

101. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.

102. More specifically, this includes:

- a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the generally undeveloped, vegetation-dominated, mountain landforms and roche moutonnée juxtaposed beside an urban context and/or an (ONF/L) lake or river context.
- b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. The large-scale and dramatic character of the steep mountain landforms backdropping Queenstown and Arthurs Point.
 - ii. The sculptural peaks of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) and Bowen Peak.
 - iii. The ever-changing play of light and weather patterns across the mountain and roche moutonnée slopes.
 - iv. The more rugged and wild character of the eastern side of Bowen Peak.
 - v. The distinctly rugged character of the west, northwest, north and northeast sides of each of the roche moutonnée landforms and the more coherent appearance of the southwest and south of each as a consequence of the landform and vegetation character and patterns.
 - vi. The rounded tops of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and Sugar Loaf, and the more rugged and irregular profile of Pt 781.
 - vii. The open and pastoral character of Pt 781 and the top of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
 - viii. The contained and enclosed nature of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) set within a largely pastoral context interspersed with largely exotic plantings.
 - ix. The general confinement of visible built development to two three distinct locations: Cemetery Hill (gondola, luge, etc.); parts of the Gorge Road valley floor (rural living, rural buildings, and adventure tourism related buildings, facilities and tracks); and near Arthurs Point (limited scattering of rural living development).

Commented [BG23]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

Commented [BG24]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA ONL Western Whakatipu Basin can be summarised as follows:

103. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.

104. **High associative values** relating to:

- a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
- b. The historic features and associations of the area.
- c. The very strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.

- d. The significant recreational attributes of Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak), Ben Lomond and Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) and trout fishing in Lake Johnson.

Commented [BG25]: OS 115.3 Khaylm Marshall.

105. **High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area due to its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Queenstown, Arthurs Point, Sunshine Bay, Fernhill, Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights), the scenic routes of Glenorchy-Queenstown Road and Gorge Road, parts of the Queenstown Trail network, the Ladies Mile corridor, the western side of the Wakatipu Basin, the airport approach path and the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts), along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
- c. A moderate-high to high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of more natural landscape elements and patterns across the PA.
- d. The identity of the PA as a natural and dramatic landscape backdrop to Fernhill, Sunshine Bay, Queenstown, Arthurs Point, Frankton and the western side of the Whakatipu Basin.
- e. The sense of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) as a 'hidden gem' tucked away in the hillslopes by Frankton.
- f. A strong sense of remoteness and wildness throughout the elevated parts of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), along the western and north side of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill), the northern sides of Sugar Loaf and Pt 781 and on the slopes of Bowen Peak near Arthurs Point.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONL Western Whakatipu Basin for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – **some** landscape capacity for small scale and low key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** – **no** landscape capacity; **very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms (including on the low lying southern margins of the PA adjacent Hansen Road) and which are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). No landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA. No landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks** – **very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm, adventure tourism or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.

Commented [BG26]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG27]: OS 109.5 Vineyard Holdings Ltd.

Commented [BG28]: OS 91.3 Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited.
OS 75.11 Peter Clark.
OS 142.2 Hansen Family Partnership.
OS 142.41 Hansen Family Partnership
OS 186.7 Richard Kemp.
OS 186.10 Richard Kemp.
OS 189.2 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 189.3 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 189.32 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 109.5 Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Ltd.
OS 138.30 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Ltd.

Commented [BG29]: OS 71.5 Nathan Pringle.

OS 72.5 Charlotte Pringle.
OS 83.5 Michael McElroy.
OS 87.5 Karen Ramsay.
OS 92.5 Jana Brasch.
OS 107.5 Edward and Anne Halson.
OS 112.5 Claire Hazledine.
OS 13.8 J Semple.
OS 122.5 J Semple.
OS 14.8 M Semple.
OS 69.5 Andrew James Blackford.
OS 131.5 Justine Lee.
OS 150.5 Tracey van Hercul.
OS 187.5 Joshua Nicholas Jones.
OS 197.5 Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin.
OS 202.5 Michael John Boyd.
OS 204.5 Anna-Louise and Paul Hedley and Hollingsworth.

Commented [BG30]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 138.2 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 189.2 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 189.35 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 138.8 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Ltd.

- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, **very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction** – **no** landscape capacity.
- i. **Transport infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protects the area's ONE values. **Very limited to no** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.

Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – **limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- viii. **Renewable energy generation** – **no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. **Very limited to no** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- ix. **Production Forestry** – **no** landscape capacity.
- x. **Rural living** – **Very limited to no** landscape capacity. Where such development is appropriate, it is likely to be: co located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access (where appropriate).
- xi. **Passenger Lift Systems** – **limited** landscape capacity to improve public access to focal recreational areas higher in the mountains via non-vehicular transportation modes such as gondolas, provided they are positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, are co-located with existing gondola infrastructure and designed to be recessive in the landscape.

Commented [BG31]: Roman numeral numbering correction required form here on in the Schedule.

Commented [BG32]: NB Roman numeral numbering error to be corrected in the final version of the Schedule.

Commented [BG33]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG34]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
OS 91.3 Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited.

Commented [BG35]: OS 91.3 Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited.
OS 189.2 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 189.3 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 189.39 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 109.12 Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Ltd.

Commented [BG36]: OS 70.26 Transpower New Zealand Limited.
189.38

Commented [BG37]: OS 109.12 Vineyard Holdings Ltd..
OS 91.3 Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited.

Commented [BG38]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG39]: OS 75.19 Peter Clark.
OS 75.21 Peter Clark.
OS 90.3 Will Hodgson.
OS 142.2 Hansen Family Partnership.
OS 142.44 Hansen Family Partnership.
OS 186.7 Richard Kemp.
OS 189.2 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 189.3 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 109.14 Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Ltd.
OS 91.3 Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited.

21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL Schedule”. New text underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text relates to a submission point that has not been specifically captured in the “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL Schedule Draft (2)”. This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **Forty-nine examples identified.**

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS12.2	Ella Pedley	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required other than to note the relatively minor Schedule 21.22.12 text changes recommended in Response to Submissions version of Schedule 21.22.14 (July 2023).	Accept submission in part.
OS13.2	Jennie Semple	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS13.4	Jennie Semple	Support	That the values and attributes of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS13.6	Jennie Semple	Support	That the Western Whakatipu Basin Outstanding Natural Landscape is protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development in accordance with section 6 of	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			the Resource Management Act 1991.		
OS13.8	Jennie Semple	Support	That the identification of no capacity for urban expansion is retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS13.10	Jennie Semple	Oppose	That any other consequential changes be made to achieve the purpose of sustainable management and protection of the Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape within and around Arthurs Point.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS14.2	Matthew Semple	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS14.4	Matthew Semple	Support	That the values and attributes of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS14.6	Matthew Semple	Support	That the Western Whakatipu Basin Outstanding Natural Landscape is protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development in accordance with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS14.8	Matthew Semple	Support	That the identification of no capacity for urban expansion is retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS14.10	Matthew Semple	Oppose	That any other consequential changes be made to achieve the purpose of sustainable management and protection of the Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape within and around Arthurs Point.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS45.2	Natalie Reeves	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Western Whakatipu Basin is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS61.3	Michelle Rudd	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS69.2	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS69.5	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS69.8	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS70.26	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 Capacity as follows:	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Basin is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point viii utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. <u>In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.</u>	
OS71.2	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS71.5	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS71.8	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS72.2	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS72.5	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS72.8	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS75.1	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be deleted, or that the landscape schedule be amended as otherwise set out in the submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS75.2	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu provide more refined identification of particular parts of the priority area to further distinguish various landscape components.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>This aspect of the submission relates to a request that the PA is 'dissected' to identify landscape character units within the Priority Area (which have shared landscape attributes), and that the attributes, values and landscape capacity in Schedule 21.22.12 are amended applying a more fine-grained landscape character unit approach. Part and parcel of this submission point is the submitter's criticism that the PA is not a landscape in itself and the assertion that due to the large size of the PA there are landscape nested within the PA.</p> <p>The Topic 2.2 Decision (December 2019) directs at [171], that the assessment of the ONF/L Priority Areas be undertaken for the feature or landscape <u>as a whole</u> (rather than at a landscape character unit scale).</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>Prior to the PA Schedules work being undertaken, landscape conferencing was undertaken (Joint Statement arising from Expert Planner and Landscape Conferencing in relation to Strategic Policies and Priority Area Expert Conferencing, TOPIC 2: RURAL LANDSCAPES, dated 29 October 2020) in which the experts agreed that there were likely to be a number of landscape character units within a single PA (see JWS [29]).</p> <p>The expert PA Schedule authors carefully considered the utility of identifying landscape character units within each PA in terms of identifying the important attributes and values that needed to be protected at a landscape scale, and landscape capacity. The PA Methodology Report [5.24] explains the authors did not consider it necessary to undertake landscape character unit delineation to inform an understanding of landscape values (and in turn, capacity). However, this is not to say that localised variances in values and landscape capacity occur across a PA. The PA Schedules have been drafted to acknowledge this variance in two ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) By acknowledging more localised nuances in the main body of the Schedule of Values and Landscape Capacity comments (where appropriate). b) By signalling upfront in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 and Schedule 21.23 that the landscape attributes, values and capacity relate to the PA as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing the attributes, values and capacity of specific sites; and a finer grained site-specific assessment of a plan change or resource consent process may identify different attributes, values and capacity to that identified in the PA Schedule. 	
OS75.3	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin values identification be revisited based on smaller units.	Addressed in response to OS 75.2.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS75.4	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu provide direction that recognises that there is landscape capacity to absorb development on the submitters property (Lot 1 DP 514017 and Lot 2 DP 397058 held in Record of Title 812220), and enable future rural-residential activities to the west of Sunshine Bay.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>For the reasons explained in response to OS 75.2, it is inappropriate to identify site specific capacity within a PA Schedule of Landscape Values.</p> <p>The response to OS 91.3 may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS75.5	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Important land-use patterns and features paragraph 27 be amended to include the sentence: Wilding conifers located to the west of Sunshine Bay.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Wilding conifers are evident around the edges of the PA generally, including at Sunshine Bay. It is considered that the wording of Schedule 21.22.12 [27] adequately acknowledges this (negative) landscape attribute.</p>	Reject submission.
OS75.6	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Important land-use patterns and features paragraph 37 be amended to include suburban residential development at Fernhill and Sunshine Bay, so that it reads: The UGB and suburban residential development at Fernhill and Sunshine Bay associated with Queenstown which	<p>Having carefully reviewed the UGB and zoning mapping for the area, the following amendment is recommended to Schedule 21.22.12 [37]:</p> <p>The UGB associated with Queenstown and the Fernhill/Sunshine Bay suburban area which adjoins the southern edges of the PA, and the Arthurs Point UGB which adjoins the north-western margins of the PA.</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			adjoins the southern edges of the PA... .		
OS75.7	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Important land-use patterns and features be amended by adding an addition paragraph: 38a. Some ONLs that are close to or adjoin urban areas are influenced by land use patterns (sic) arising from established urban development, and have a greater capacity to absorb development, including the area to the west of Sunshine Bay.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation for the PA Schedules work and involvement in several rezoning appeals and resource consent proposals within the District, while I agree that neighbouring urban development can (and does) influence the edges of an ONF/L, I do not consider that this amounts to an increased capacity to absorb development around such edges. Rather, it is my opinion that often the ONF/L land immediately adjacently an urban area has an increased landscape sensitivity to development change due to the role it plays in creating a legible 'edge' to the ONF/L sitting adjacent the urban zoned land. Put another way, such ONF/L - urban interfaces are highly vulnerable to development creep that can threaten the fundamental naturalness of the ONF/L and merit of the area as being part of a RMA s6(b) landscape.</p> <p>For these reasons, I consider that the text change requested by the submitter is inappropriate.</p>	Reject submission.
OS75.8	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Naturalness attributes and values be amended to add: 92a. Lower landscape values and naturalness to the west of Sunshine Bay, which contributes to the ONL being able to absorb some development.	Addressed in response to OS 75.7.	Reject submission.
OS75.9	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Remoteness and wildness attributes and values paragraph 100 be amended to add the words	Schedule 21.22.12 [100] explains that a strong sense of the sublime relates to specific parts of the PA. For this reason, the text change requested by the submitter is considered to be unnecessary.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			'In some places' in from of the first sentence 'A strong sense of sublime...'		
OS75.10	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.i Commercial recreational activities be amended to remove the rating of some capacity, and delete the words 'and protect the area's ONL values', so that it reads: Commercial recreational activities - would need to integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; be located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character; and integrate appropriate landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>In seeking that the word, 'some' is deleted from Schedule 21.22.12 Capacity (i), the amendment requested by the submitter provides no guidance with respect to the landscape capacity of the PA to accommodate commercial recreation. This means that it does not accord with the directions of the Environment Court for the PA Schedules.</p> <p>However, in considering this submission point, I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.12 Capacity (i) are appropriate:</p> <p>Commercial recreational activities – some landscape capacity for activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS75.11	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.ii Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended to delete no landscape capacity and replaced with: Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - activities would need to integrate with and complement existing recreation features; be located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS75.12	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.iii be amended from no landscape capacity to low landscape capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Urban development is inappropriate within ONF/Ls as urban development inevitably means the ONF/L will fail to qualify as a RMA s6(b) landscape in terms of 'naturalness' (see <i>Long Bay</i> and <i>High Country Rosehip</i>).	Reject submission.
OS75.13	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.iv intensive agriculture be amended from no landscape capacity to low landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 189.34.	Reject submission

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS75.14	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.v Earthworks be amended to delete the words 'very limited landscape capacity, and amend wording to read: Earthworks - associated with farm or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, will need to be sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. In seeking that the word, 'very limited' is deleted from Schedule 21.22.12 Capacity (v), the amendment requested by the submitter provides no guidance with respect to the landscape capacity of the PA to accommodate commercial recreation. This means that it does not accord with the directions of the Environment Court for the PA Schedules.	Reject submission.
OS75.15	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.vi. Farm buildings be amended to change from very limited to low landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character and add: Other area Very Low.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS75.16	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.vii. Mineral extraction be amended from no landscape capacity to low landscape capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Reject submission.
OS75.17	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.i Transport infrastructure be amended from limited to moderate landscape capacity for trails, and from no to low landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.	Addressed in response to OS 189.31.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS75.18	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.viii Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended to delete the words: 'limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of' and add 'Low for', so it reads: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure - low for utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened,...	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS75.19	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.ix. Renewable energy generation be amended from no to very limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS75.20	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.x. Production forestry be amended from no to very limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Reject submission.
OS75.21	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.xi. Rural living be amended from no to low landscape capacity and amended to read: Rural living - low landscape capacity within the elevated and remote areas of the PA. Moderate landscape capacity on the lower	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			elevated areas located west of Sunshine Bay. Any rural living development would need to integrate with and complement/enhance existing indigenous vegetation and be located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a very sympathetic scale, appearance, and character.		
OS77.39	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu paragraph 49 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 [49] as follows: Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura is named after Hakitekura, a Kāti Māmoe woman who was the first person to swim across Whakatipu wai māori Whakatipu Waimāori . After watching other young women from the mountains attempting to outswim each other, she decided that she wanted to outdo them. She got a kauati (a stick used to start fire) from her father, and a bundle of dry raupō as kindling. The next morning, Hakitekura set out from Tāhuna (the flat land where Queenstown now stands). With the kauati and raupō bound tightly in harakeke (flax) to keep them dry, she swam across the lake in darkness, with the bundle strapped to her. When Hakitekura was discovered missing, her father remembered his daughter's request for a kauati, and a waka was sent across the lake to bring her back. The mountains where she would look across the lake were thereafter known as Te Taumata-a-Hakitekura (The Resting Place of Hakitekura).	Accept submission.
OS77.48	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 paragraph 49 be amended to correct the spelling of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura.	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 [49] as follows: Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura is named after Hakitekura, a Kāti Māmoe woman who was the first person to swim across Whakatipu wai māori Whakatipu Waimāori . After watching other young women from the mountains attempting to outswim each other, she decided that she wanted to outdo them. She	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				got a kauati (a stick used to start fire) from her father, and a bundle of dry raupō as kindling. The next morning, Hakitekura set out from Tāhuna (the flat land where Queenstown now stands). With the kauati and raupō bound tightly in harakeke (flax) to keep them dry, she swam across the lake in darkness, with the bundle strapped to her. When Hakitekura was discovered missing, her father remembered his daughter's request for a kauati, and a waka was sent across the lake to bring her back. The mountains where she would look across the lake were thereafter known as Te Taumata-a-Hakitekura Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (The Resting Place of Hakitekura).	
OS83.2	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS83.5	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS83.8	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS85.7	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sipka Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that it incorrectly states at [20] that there are 'important ecological features and	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			vegetation types' and lists features that do not have ecological importance such as crack willows which are invasive to native species.	<p>discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the PA ONL (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>However, it is agreed that as currently drafted the Schedules are potentially confusing in this regard as these aspects of the landscape are negative rather than positive.</p> <p>A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter.</p>	
OS85.8	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sipka Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [25] under the heading 'important ecological features and vegetation types' lists animal pest species and plant pest species which are not important ecological features or important vegetation types.	Addressed in response to OS 85.7.	Accept submission in part.
OS85.9	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sipka Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [33] the description of important land-use patterns and features fails to acknowledge other farm buildings which exist but that have not been identified.	<p>No specific location reference or technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 2 Steve Xin (Sunshine Bay ONL mapping) Appeal (which included a site visit to the submitter's land), the submitter is encouraged to provide evidence so that other farm buildings can be appropriately referenced in Schedule 21.22.12.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS85.10	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sipka Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That the relationship between mana whenua associations, Wāhi Tūpuna Chapter and consultation with mana whenua for applications be clarified in the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS85.11	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sipka Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [59] a generic statement is made that the 'descriptions and photographs of the area in tourist publications' while providing no evidence as to what publications or photographs are referred to.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. It is not usual practice to identify which tourist publications make reference to an ONF/L in a Schedule of Landscape Values. However, for example, Queenstown Bike Park and the Skyline Gondola are featured on the Queenstown: Things to Do website https://www.queenstownnz.co.nz/	Reject submission.
OS87.2	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS87.5	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS87.8	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS90.3	Will Hodgson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified, except for landscape capacity as set out in the submission.	The submitter seeks that Schedule 21.22.12 is amended to acknowledge the working rural landscape context of the PA and that reference to 'no landscape capacity' is changed to something like 'very low landscape capacity' to allow consideration of appropriate rural development. Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS90.5	Will Hodgson	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be amended so that; some landscape capacity is changed to high landscape capacity, limited landscape capacity is changed to moderate landscape capacity, very limited landscape capacity is change to low landscape capacity, and no landscape capacity is change to very low landscape capacity	Addressed in response to OS 189.31.	Reject submission.
OS91.2	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be amended to identify that the Gorge Road valley floor area does not contain any particularly outstanding landscape value(s).	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS91.3	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited	Oppose	That for landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin all landscape capacity rating be deleted, or alternatively identify that the submitter's property (229 Gorge Road, OT11B/747, OT18D/476, Middleton Farm/Queenstown Hill) or parts of the Outstanding Natural Landscape including the submitter's property, as having a high landscape capacity for a range of new development and activities including: commercial recreation, visitor accommodation and tourism related activities, intensive agriculture, earthworks, farm buildings, transport infrastructure, utilities and regionally significant infrastructure, renewable energy generation, production forestry, rural living.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>For the reasons explained in response to OS 75.2, it is inappropriate to identify site specific capacity within a PA Schedule of Landscape Values.</p> <p>However, in considering this submission and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 2 Steve Xin (Sunshine Bay ONL mapping) Appeal (which included a site visit to the area in the vicinity of the submitter's land), I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.12 Capacity are appropriate:</p> <p>Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – very limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms (including on the low lying southern margins of the PA adjacent Hansen Road) and which are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). No landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA. No landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA. No landscape capacity.</p> <p>Transport infrastructure – limited landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONF values. Very limited to no landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. Very limited to no landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>Rural living – Very limited to no landscape capacity. Where such development is appropriate, it is likely to be: <u>located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access (where appropriate).</u></p> <p>For completeness, I remain of the view that a rating of no landscape capacity is appropriate for tourism related activities (i.e. resorts), urban development, intensive agriculture, mineral extraction and production forestry.</p> <p>I also note a numbering error in the Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.12 which should be corrected in the final version of the Schedule</p>	
OS92.2	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS92.5	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS92.8	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS106.2	Tim Williams On Behalf Of RD & EM Anderson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to exclude the submitter's property at 91 Oxenbridge Tunnel Road, Arthurs Point (Section 121 Block XIX Shotover SD and Lot 2 DP 19294).	91 Oxenbridge Tunnel Road is entirely located within Shotover River PA ONF. Therefore, this submission is addressed in the Schedule 21.22. Shotover River Summary Table.	Reject submission (in relation to Schedule 21.22.12).
OS107.2	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS107.5	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS107.8	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS109.3	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be amended to remove the Moonlight Block (OT16D/402) from the priority area.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in response to OS 91.2. The submitter queries, (amongst other matters addressed in response to Methodology submissions), the rating of no landscape capacity . The recommended amendments to the Schedule 21.22 Preamble and the Schedule 21.22.12 text in response to OS 75.2 and OS 91.3, may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS109.5	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.ii visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended from no landscape capacity to some landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS109.6	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.iii Urban expansion be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response OS 75.12.	Reject submission.
OS109.7	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.iv Intensive agriculture be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response OS 75.12.	Reject submission.
OS109.8	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.v Earthworks be amended from very limited landscape capacity to some landscape capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS109.9	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.vi Farm buildings be amended from very limited landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response OS 189.36.	Reject submission.
OS109.10	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.vii Mineral extraction be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response OS 91.3.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS109.11	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.i Transport infrastructure be amended from limited landscape capacity to some landscape capacity for trails and from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.	Addressed in response OS 189.37.	Reject submission.
OS109.12	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.ix Renewable energy generation be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS109.13	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.x Production forestry be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Reject submission.
OS109.14	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.xi Rural living be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS112.2	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS112.5	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.		
OS112.8	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS115.3	Khaylm Marshall	Oppose	That the list of associative attributes and values in landscape schedule 21.22.12 be amended to include the recreational attributes of Lake Johnson.	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 [104] (d) as follows: The significant recreational attributes of Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak), Ben Lomond and Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) and trout fishing in Lake Johnson .	Accept submission.
OS119.2	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is opposed and should be rejected as notified.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS119.4	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified as it fails to recognise that the outstanding natural landscape, outstanding natural feature, and rural character landscapes only apply to Rural Zoned landscapes. It is submitted that the Open Space and Recreation Zones cannot be part of the landscape schedule priority area and	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			should be made clear in the mapping of the priority areas.		
OS119.5	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified as at [ii] landscape capacity it is stated that tourism activities have no capacity. It is submitted that the landscape capacity schedules are at a landscape character unit level rather than a site specific level.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>With respect to the submitter's criticism in relation to the landscape capacity rating for tourism activities within the PA, the response to OS 91.3 is of relevance.</p> <p>Further the response to OS 75.2 may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in relation the scale or grain of the landscape assessed in the PA Schedules (including the attributes, values and capacity ratings).</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS119.6	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified and that tourism activities should be defined within Chapter 2 of the Proposed District Plan or clarified within the landscape schedule as it relates to resort development and not tourism activities as a whole.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The submitter is seeking a definition of 'tourism activities' either in Chapter 2 or the PA Schedules. The Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 addresses this matter.</p> <p>With respect to the submitter's criticism in relation to the landscape capacity rating for tourism activities within the PA, see the response to OS 91.3.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS119.7	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified as the wording at [ii] landscape capacity for earthworks associated with public access tracks such as the mountain bike trails the submitter builds and maintains that protect the naturalness and	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>In my experience, public access tracks (and farm tracks) can protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values via the careful use of following 'design tools' such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligning the track to follow the landform. Configuring any mitigation and/or enhancement planting associated with the track to reinforce more natural landform patterns (such as steep slopes or gullies) so 	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing landform patterns is incorrect. It is uncertain how mountain bike tracks protect the naturalness and expressiveness of the attributes and values of the landscape. These words should be removed from this section.	<p>that it reinforces the formative processes of the landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locating the track to minimise (or avoid) retaining structures. • Where retaining structures are unavoidable, designing such structures to be of an appropriate materiality and integrated by locally appropriate plantings. • Avoiding urban style 'furniture' and infrastructure (such as lighting, stormwater management devices) associated with the track. <p>It is acknowledged that not all of the design tools will be relevant in every situation. However, the reference to naturalness and expressiveness values serves to cue careful consideration of these sorts of design tools, which is considered appropriate within a RMA s6(b) context.</p>	
OS122.2	J Semple	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is supported as notified and should be adopted as a matter of priority and importance.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.5	J Semple	Support	That the landscape capacity rating for urban expansions or urban development in landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin being no capacity is supported.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS122.8	J Semple	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure such as bridges or crossings of the Shotover River in the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	Shotover River bridges are not located within the spatial extent of the Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Basin should be amended to have no capacity for such activities.		
OS122.11	J Semple	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is adopted in the Proposed District Plan to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.14	J Semple	Oppose	That the values of the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are appropriately recorded so that those values can be considered in any future resource consent application or plan changes.	Schedule 21.22.12 as amended in the Response to Submissions Version appropriately records the landscape values of the PA.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.17	J Semple	Oppose	That the land included within the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is ultimately protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	<p>To a large degree this submission is addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.</p> <p>The submitter requests a number of changes to the Schedule text, including the addition of a landscape description of the area derived from the QLDC Read Landscape Boundaries Report, April 2014.</p> <p>The submission is also critical that Schedule 21.22.12 forms a one size fits all approach to describing the landscape values and landscape capacity of the Shotover River ONF and wider ONL mountain context.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, I consider that all of the attributes and values signalled in the submission are captured in Schedule 21.22 (subject to the minor refinements, as shown in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.12, July 2023), albeit in a slightly different structure that accords with landscape assessment best practice and the mapped PAs (noting that the ONF/L context of Arthurs Point relates to three PAs). I also note that the particular 'sites' of</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>concern to the submitter are outside of the spatial extent of Western Whakatipu PA ONL.</p> <p>Further, the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the attributes and values, along with landscape capacity of a Priority Area are evaluated at a Priority Area level and that the PA Schedules are intended to be read in full.</p>	
OS122.20	J Semple	Oppose	That any consequential amendments or refinements to the provisions of the Proposed District Plan and/or landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin to better achieve the purpose of sustainable management, and the protection of the Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape is adopted.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS131.2	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS131.5	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS131.8	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.		
OS136.2	Barbara Lusk	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS136.5	Barbara Lusk	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS138.1	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to more accurately recognise that the submitters land and surrounding valley floor at Gorge Road exhibits a range of established and historical activities and is significantly more modified than the elevated hills and mountain peaks of the majority of the priority area. The schedule needs to amended to either exclude the site or to more accurately recognise and provide for these existing uses, their likely and anticipated future upgrade, replacement, or redevelopment.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and careful review of aerial photography of the submitter's land and the submission, I consider that Schedule 21.22.12 should be amended as follows to better reflect the development established in the Gorge Road valley and associated capacity:</p> <p>General Description of the Area</p> <p>The Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL encompasses the steep south-eastern mountain slopes of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), the steep south and eastern mountain slopes of Bowen Peak and the two elevated roche moutonnée landforms of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill and including Sugar Loaf) and Pt 781. The PA ONF also takes in Waipuna (Lake Johnson) sitting in the ice-eroded gully between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill (a separate PA ONF), Collectively, the mountain slopes form the northern backdrop to Sunshine Bay, Fernhill and Queenstown, and the western/north-western backdrop mountain setting to Gorge Road and Arthurs Point. The PA ONL adjoins the Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA ONF along its north-eastern boundary in the vicinity of Arthurs Point.</p> <p>33. The general absence of rural and rural living buildings within the PA, excepting a scattering at the north-western end</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>of Arthurs Point, a scattering along the Gorge Road valley floor (including adventure tourism related facilities and activities), a very small pocket of urban dwellings at the toe of the Queenstown Time Walk, and the small cluster of rural living dwellings at the south end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson).</p> <p>69a Adventure tourism tracks, facilities and activities in the Gorge Road valley.</p> <p>100. A strong sense of the sublime as a consequence of the sheer scale, dramatic character and undeveloped appearance of the mountain and roche moutonnée which is evident: on the Ben Lomond track above the Gondola and luge development; along Gorge Road (away from existing built development and adventure tourism related activities); and across the northern part of the PA which contributes a sense of remoteness and wildness to the wider setting (including Arthurs Point, Kimiākau (Shotover River) ONF and the western part of the Whakatipu Basin), despite the more developed immediate context.</p> <p>102 (b) (ix). The general confinement of visible built development to two three distinct locations: Cemetery Hill (gondola, luge, etc.); parts of the Gorge Road valley floor (rural living, rural buildings, and adventure tourism related buildings, facilities and tracks); and near Arthurs Point (limited scattering of rural living development).</p> <p>Landscape Capacity</p> <p>v. Earthworks – very limited landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm, adventure tourism or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.</p> <p>The response to OS 91.3 is also of relevance in this regard as it recommends a number of other amendments to the Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.12.</p>	
OS138.2	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that if the landscape capacity	<p>Addressed in response to OS 189.3 and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> by the inclusion of additional explanatory text in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to 	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Adventures Queenstown Limited		ratings are retained within the schedules that they include a corresponding scale of development to guide the implementation of this. The term "no landscape capacity" should be deleted.	<p>Schedule 21.12 (July 2023) to better explain the capacity ratings; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the introduction of a fifth rating scale: very limited to no landscape capacity (– refer to the table addressing the response to general landscape submission ‘themes’). 	
OS138.3	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to recognise and provide for the benefits of change, enhancement and remediation of land in the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The focus of the Schedules is to identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected.</p> <p>That said, the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the ONL (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>It is also expected that such matters would be traversed in detail as part of a detailed (and more site specific) landscape assessment in support of a plan change or resource consent process.</p>	Reject submission.
OS138.4	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended in order for landscape values and capacity components to identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The focus of the Schedules is to identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected.</p> <p>That said, the identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>It is expected that such matters would be traversed in detail as part of a detailed (and more site specific) landscape</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				assessment in support of a plan change or resource consent process.	
OS138.5	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include particular attributes and features existing at and around the submitters land. These are (a) Historical and existing farming uses, (b) Fences, (c) Roads, (d) Earthworks (e) Introduced and native vegetation, (f) Introduced species (particularly goats), (g) Pest control, (h) Rural-residential development, (i) Proximity to urban development, and (j) The realignment and modified nature of Horn Creek.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Almost all of the attributes and features requested for inclusion in the Schedule are already mentioned (directly or implicitly) or addressed in the response to OS 138.1. For example, fencing is an accepted part of farming landuse and earthworks are inevitable in relation to adventure tourism buildings, facilities and tracks.</p> <p>The possible exception is the reference to the realigned and modified nature of Horn Creek. Schedule 21.22.12 references the steeply incised section of Horn Creek as an important hydrological feature suggesting that this would likely exclude the realigned and modified section of the creek.</p> <p>The submitter is encouraged to produce evidence if any additional distinction is sought in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS138.6	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the priority area overlay included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is revised to exclude the submitters land and surrounding valley floor from the schedule, or that landscape schedule 21.22.12 and PA overlay be deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 91.2.	Reject submission.
OS138.7	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures	Oppose	That the 'Important landforms and land types' section of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended	Addressed in response to OS 138.1 and OS 189.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Queenstown Limited		to exclude the Gorge Road valley floor including the submitters land, or If the landscape schedule is to be retained as notified, that the low-lying and highly modified Gorge Road and valley floor is excluded from the landscape schedule.		
OS138.8	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the 'Land use patterns and features' section of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to further particularise the broader list of established activities occurring within the outstanding natural landscape which are historically recognised as appropriate and in keeping with the landform. These activities include but are not limited to farming activities, earthworks, rural-residential living and adventure tourism activities.	Addressed in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS138.9	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to delete reference to vegetation such as pasture, plant pest species and animal pest species from the schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 138.4 and OS 189.13.	Accept submission in part.
OS138.10	Maree Baker-Galloway On	Oppose	That paragraph 71 which specifies the Glenorchy-	Addressed in response to OS 189.24.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited		Queenstown Road and Gorge Road as key scenic routes is deleted from landscape schedule 21.22.12 Whakatipu Basin.		
OS138.11	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so that the landscape values for physical values (paragraph 103), associative values (paragraph 104) and perceptual values (paragraph 105) are moderate rather than high.	Addressed in response to OS 189.28, OS 189.29 and OS 189.30.	Reject submission.
OS138.12	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That if the overall landscape values for landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are not amended and the Gorge Road valley floor is not excluded from the Schedule (as per submission points #138.7 and #138.11), the values be amended to assign a low ranking to the lower-lying land, including the submitters land (Lot 1 DP 26780, Section 17 and 17 Block XX SD, and Sections 2-6 SO 24761).	Addressed in response to OS 91.2.	Reject submission.
OS138.13	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so the landscape capacity includes an indication of at what scale	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the Priority Area and	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Queenstown Limited		such potential activities have been considered and specific examples and analysis, or if the landscape capacities cannot be amended the landscape capacity section should be deleted from the schedule.	<p>should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites.</p> <p>Within the 12 landuses identified by the Court for consideration with respect to landscape capacity, there is a very large range of potential development scales and styles (for example, in the case of renewable energy, there are solar farms, wind farms and hydro schemes, each which can be of a widely varying scale). To provide a meaningful analysis for every landuse typology at a range of scales within each PA Schedule would be an enormous task. Rather, it is expected that this detailed analysis would occur as part of a resource consent or plan change application, as explained in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22.</p> <p>Further, to delete the Capacity section of the Schedules would not align with the directions from the Environment Court.</p>	
OS138.14	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that the landscape capacity classifications are consistent with the Wakatipu Basin Landscape Character Units. The term "no landscape capacity" should be deleted from the schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 189.31.	Reject submission.
OS138.15	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that if the landscape capacity sections are retained the submitters land should either be excluded from the schedule, or the schedule be amended to take into account the scale of existing	Addressed in response to OS 138.1. Also see response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			lawfully established activities occurring on the site (including existing and planned rural living opportunities, adventure tourism activities and associated utilities) and also likely future development associated with these existing land uses.		
OS138.17	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the 'General Description of the Area' included in landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove reference to "and the western/north-western backdrop to Gorge Road..." included in the third sentence of this section.	Addressed in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS138.18	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin should be amended at paragraph 15 to read: "The steeply incised and highly modified Horn Creek (or Bush Creek), McCheesney Creek, Domestic Creek.....".	No change required.	Reject submission.
OS138.19	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at subsection b of paragraph 21 to delete reference to areas	Addressed in response to OS 189.13.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Queenstown Limited		of pasture adjacent to Gorge Road / Watties track.		
OS138.20	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 23 to delete reference to "and adjacent Gorge Road...".	Addressed in response to 189.14.	Reject submission.
OS138.21	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to delete paragraph 24.	Addressed in response to OS 85.7.	Reject submission.
OS138.22	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to delete paragraph 25 from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 85.7.	Reject submission.
OS138.23	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to delete paragraph 26.	Addressed in response to OS 189.17.	Reject submission.
OS138.24	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to delete paragraph 27.	Addressed in response to OS 189.18.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Queenstown Limited				
OS138.25	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 33 to replace the words 'excepting a scattering at the north-western end of Arthurs Point, a very small pocket of urban dwellings at the toe of the Queenstown Time Walk, and the small cluster of rural living dwellings at the south end of the Waipuna (Lake Johnson)' with 'elevated mountainous part of the PA'.	Addressed in response to OS 189.20.	Accept submission in part.
OS138.26	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 40 to correct a typographical error and spelling of 'McChesney'.	Addressed in response to OS 189.22.	Accept submission.
OS138.27	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 89 (first sentence) to read: 'The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of the elevated parts of the Western Whakatipu Basin PA...'	Addressed in response to OS 189.25.	Reject submission.
OS138.28	Maree Baker-Galloway On	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	Addressed in response to OS 189.27.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited		Basin is amended at paragraph 100 to delete the words 'along Gorge Road' from the landscape schedule.		
OS138.29	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 105 (subsection b) to delete reference to 'and Gorge Road' from the second sentence.	Addressed in response to OS 189.30.	Reject submission.
OS138.30	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities from 'no' capacity to 'some' capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS138.31	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so the landscape capacity for urban expansions is changed from "no landscape capacity" to "some landscape capacity in the lower-lying parts of the PA, including Gorge Road valley floor. No capacity in the elevated parts of the PA".	Addressed in response to OS 189.33.	Reject submission.
OS138.32	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so that the landscape capacity for	Addressed in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Adventures Queenstown Limited		earthworks is changed from 'very limited' capacity to "Some/high landscape capacity in the lower-lying parts of the PA, including Gorge Road valley floor", and to include the words "In the other parts of the PA".		
OS138.33	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for farm buildings from 'very limited' capacity to 'some' capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 189.36.	Reject submission.
OS138.34	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure from 'limited' capacity to 'some' capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 189.37.	Reject submission.
OS138.35	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so the landscape capacity for urban expansions is changed from "no landscape capacity" to "some landscape capacity in the lower-lying parts of the PA, including Gorge Road valley floor. No capacity in the elevated parts of the PA".	Addressed in response to OS 189.33.	Reject submission.
OS142.2	Maree Baker-Galloway On	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	Addressed in response to OS 91.3. Also see response to OS 138.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership		Basin is amended to more accurately recognise that the submitters land exhibits a range of established and historical activities and is significantly more modified than the elevated parts of the Western Whakatipu outstanding natural landscape. The landscape schedule needs to provide for these existing uses, their likely and anticipated future upgrade, replacement, or redevelopment.		
OS142.13	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the 'Important landforms and land types' section of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to distinguish between the elevated part of Ben Lomond and Queenstown Hill and the lower, highly modified, flatter land which is characterised by farming and rural residential living, or if the landscape schedule is to be retained as notified, that the low-lying land including the submitters land is excluded from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I do not consider that proposed text amendments to the Important Landforms and land Types section of Schedule 21.22.12 are appropriate. The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions) and ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS142.14	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of	Oppose	That the 'Land use patterns and features' section of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	Addressed in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Hansen Family Partnership		Basin is amended to further particularise the broader list of established activities occurring within the outstanding natural landscape which are historically recognised as appropriate and in keeping with the landform.		
OS142.15	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so that the landscape values are low or moderate rather than high.	Addressed in response to OS 189.28, OS 189.29 and OS 189.30.	Reject submission.
OS142.16	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That if the overall landscape values for landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are not amended (as per submission point #142.15), the values need to be amended to assign a low naturalness ranking to the submitters site and other low-lying slopes.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate.</p> <p>The evaluation of naturalness in all of the PA Schedules is guided by the interpretation of 'natural' in <i>Te Tangi a te Manu</i>, [9.44] to [9.46] , drawing from <i>Harrison</i>, <i>WESI</i> and the <i>West Wind</i> Environment Court decisions.</p> <p>With respect to the suggestion that a low naturalness ranking should apply to the submitters site and other lower-lying slopes, it is also noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that attributes and values relate to a PA as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing values for specific sites.</p> <p>For these reasons, it is inappropriate to single out the rating of naturalness (or other landscape values) for individual sites in a PA Schedule of Values. However, it is acknowledged that varying values may emerge via the finer grained landscape assessment that is required as part of resource consent and plan change processes.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS142.17	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so the landscape capacity includes an indication of at what scale such potential activities have been considered and specific examples and analysis, or if the landscape capacities cannot be amended the landscape capacity section should be deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 138.13.	Reject submission.
OS142.18	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That if the landscape capacities for landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin section are retained as notified, then for the submitters land, this should be amended to recognise and provide for likely future development associated with existing land uses.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>This submission point suggests a site-specific grain of detail be included within the PA Schedule.</p> <p>As explained in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22, the landscape capacity is based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites. The preamble also explains that a varying level of capacity may be determined as part of a detailed landscape assessment supporting a resource consent or plan change process.</p> <p>There are a wide range of development scenarios that could be associated with the existing landuses (pastoral farming, rural living). It is expected that the appropriateness of future development associated with existing landuses would be assessed in detail as part of a resource consent application.</p>	Reject submission.
OS142.32	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the 'General Description of the Area' included in landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove the second sentence that states: "The PA ONF also	<p>Addressed in response to OS 91.2.</p> <p>Waipuna (Lake Johnson) is correctly located within 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			takes in Waipuna (Lake Johnson) sitting in the ice eroded gully between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill (a separate PA ONF)".		
OS142.33	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraphs 11 and 12 are deleted from the 'Important ecological features and vegetation types' section included in landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin.	Referencing the response to OS 91.2, the landforms described in Schedule 21.22.12 [11] and [12] are located within the Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL and therefore appropriately referenced in this PA Schedule.	Reject submission.
OS142.34	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That subsections d - f of paragraph 21 on other distinctive vegetation types are deleted from landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin.	Referencing the response to OS 91.2, the other distinctive vegetation types described in Schedule 21.22.12 [21] (d) to (f) are appropriately included within the Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL Schedule.	Reject submission.
OS142.35	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That subsection g of paragraph 21 on other distinctive vegetation types included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended as follows: 'Amenity and shelter plantings around the rural residential living environment at the southern end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) and on the north-western side of Sugar Loaf'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 [21] (g) as follows: Amenity and shelter plantings around the few scattered rural and rural living dwellings at the southern end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) and on the north-western side of Sugar Loaf.	Accept submission in part.
OS142.36	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of	Oppose	That paragraph 26 on 'Important land-use patterns and features' included within	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 [26] as follows: Grazed pasture across the low-lying flatter land on the eastern side of the PA adjacent to Gorge Road, parts of the slopes to	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Hansen Family Partnership		landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include reference to 'farm buildings' as follows: 'Grazed pasture across the low-lying flatter land on the eastern side of the PA adjacent to Gorge Road, parts of the slopes to the west of Arthurs Point and the majority of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill), Sugar Loaf, Pt 781 and around Waipuna (Lake Johnson). Very low-intensity grazing across the elevated pastoral slopes. Associated with this activity are a network of farm tracks, fencing, farm buildings and sheds'	the west of Arthurs Point and the majority of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill), Sugar Loaf, Pt 781 and around Waipuna (Lake Johnson). Very low-intensity grazing across the elevated pastoral slopes. Associated with this activity are a network of farm tracks, fencing and farm buildings sheds .	
OS142.37	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraphs 43 and 44 of 'Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations' are deleted from landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence as to why this accepted aspect of landscape values should be deleted from the PA Schedule. Further ,the notified text of Schedule 21.22.12 was reviewed by a heritage expert who considered the relevant text to be appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS142.38	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph 52 on 'Important historic attributes and values' included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to add the word 'ongoing' as	Schedule 21.22.12[52] relates to historic attributes and values (rather than current). The reference to current farming is repeatedly referenced in Schedule 21.22.12, for example see [21](d), [26], [83], [89]. For these reasons, I do not consider the text change requested by the submitter is necessary or appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			follows: 'Early and ongoing farming around Waipuna (Lake Johnson).		
OS142.39	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph 86 on 'Particularly important views to and from the area' is deleted from landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation for the PA Schedules work and involvement in the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal which included a site visit to Lake Johnson and environs, I consider the character and quality of the views of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) to merit inclusion in Schedule 21.22.12.	Reject submission.
OS142.40	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That subsection e of paragraph 105 is deleted from landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation for the PA Schedules work and involvement in the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal which included a site visit to Lake Johnson and environs, I consider the description in Schedule 21.22.12 [105] (e) to be accurate.	Reject submission.
OS142.41	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph ii on the landscape capacity for 'Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities' included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended as follows: 'Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - no landscape capacity in the elevated parts of the ONL. High landscape capacity in the lower lying parts of the ONL, including the land around Lake Johnson'.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS142.42	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph iii on the landscape capacity for 'Urban expansions' included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended as follows: 'Urban expansions - no landscape capacity in the elevated parts of the ONL. High landscape capacity in the lower lying parts of the ONL, including the land around Lake Johnson'.	Addressed in response to OS 189.33.	Reject submission.
OS142.43	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph vi on the landscape capacity for 'Farm buildings' included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended from 'very limited' to 'some' as follows: 'Farm buildings - in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, some landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character'.	Addressed in response to OS 189.36.	Reject submission.
OS142.44	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph xi on the landscape capacity for 'Rural living' included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended as follows: 'Rural living - no landscape capacity in the elevated parts of the	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			ONL. High landscape capacity in the lower lying parts of the ONL, including the land around Lake Johnson'.		
OS150.2	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS150.5	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS150.8	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS186.1	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is opposed and should be rejected as notified.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS186.2	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include the unformed road that extends up the hill from Wynyard Crescent as well as Designation 237 and 22 as important land use patterns	Having carefully reviewed the Cadastral and Designation mapping the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.12 are recommended. 34. An unformed road leading from Gorge Road up the lower slopes on the east side of Bowen Peak; from Wynyard Crescent up the mountain slopes; and from Lomond Crescent up the mountain slopes (Ben Lomond Track).	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			and features in the landscape schedule.	36. Infrastructure is evident within the PA and includes: Aurora distribution lines around the lower slopes of Ben Lomond to the west of Sunshine Bay, along the Gorge Road corridor and on the south-eastern side of the area, and over the saddle near Waipuna (Lake Johnson); water reservoir designations near Greenstone Place and Scott Place in Fernhill ; and a firefighting pond near the luge.	
OS186.3	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include the Informal Recreation zoned land on the bottom of Ben Lomond, Cemetery Hill and Queenstown Hill as important land use patterns and features in the landscape schedule.	Having carefully reviewed the zone mapping the following amendment to Schedule 21.22.12 is recommended. 29. The swathe of Community Purpose and Informal Recreation zoned land across the slopes of Cemetery Hill facing towards Queenstown (where the Skyline gondola, luge, and mountain bike tracks are) and along either side of the lower reaches of One Mile Creek.	Accept submission.
OS186.4	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin boundary is amended at the irregular shape along the bottom slopes (Fern Hill) of Ben Lomond and the top of Queenstown Hill that currently aligns with the Urban growth Boundary.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions) and ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation. I also note that there are many locations in the District where urban zone directly abuts ONF/Ls.	Reject submission.
OS186.5	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include the urban context with residential development on the lower slopes of Ben Lomond and Queenstown Hill and its influence on the character of the area as a	This is already acknowledged at Schedule 21.22.12 [38]. No change required.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			natural landscape should be acknowledged.		
OS186.6	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include the lower slopes of Ben Lomond and Queenstown Hill where residential development has extended into the plantation forest of the priority area. There is a need to amend them outstanding natural landscape and urban growth boundary line so that it follows landscape features or patterns under paragraphs 101 and 102 of the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and review of aerial mapping with consented platforms and the PA mapping overlaid, I do not agree with the submitter that there is visible built development <u>within</u> the PA ONL across the lower slopes of Ben Lomond and Queenstown Hill that merits mention in Schedule 21.22.12.</p>	Reject submission.
OS186.7	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so that the summary of landscape values in paragraph 103 to 105 reflect the previously mentioned matters.	The amendments to the Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.12 addressed in response to OS 91.3, may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard. The response to OS 186.6 is also of relevance here.	Accept submission in part.
OS186.8	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so that it is clear from the rating scale of landscape capacity how these ratings interrelate with the wording used in the provisions of Chapter 3 of the Proposed District Plan.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Section 3 of the Methodology Report explains the capacity rating scale (and noting that it is recommended that this explanatory detail is incorporated into the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to assist plan users).</p> <p>The recommended amendments to the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				address this submission point to some degree. This matter is also addressed in the table addressing more general landscape related submission 'themes'.	
OS186.9	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin's commercial recreational activities landscape capacity assessment is amended to include the words 'or expand', 'eradicate wilding vegetation and replant native vegetation', and 'enhance visual amenity and landscape values' into the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I consider that the additional terminology requested by the submitter in this regard is unnecessary as the relevant 'principles' are already addressed in the text of Schedule 21.22.12 Capacity (i).	Reject submission.
OS186.10	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin's visitor accommodation and tourism related activities landscape capacity assessment is amended from 'no' capacity to 'limited' capacity, and to include the words 'for visitor accommodation on the lower slopes of the PA. The area can be serviced by Queenstown. Limited capacity for tourism related activities that expand or integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; eradicate wilding vegetation and replant native vegetation; enhance visual amenity and landscape values; enhance public access; and are consistent with the area's ONL values'.</p>		
OS186.11	Richard Kemp	Oppose	<p>That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the capacity of urban expansions from 'no landscape capacity' to 'limited capacity on the lower slopes of the PA, adjacent to or in-between the existing urban development' or to update the priority area mapping, associated boundaries and zoning to exclude areas where there is capacity to absorb urban expansion.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Urban development is inappropriate within ONF/Ls as urban development inevitably means the ONF/L will fail to qualify as a RMA s6(b) landscape in terms of 'naturalness' (see <i>Long Bay</i> and <i>High Country Rosehip</i>).</p>	Reject submission.
OS186.12	Richard Kemp	Oppose	<p>That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include a capacity assessment for Gondolas, towers and cableway with limited landscape capacity for such</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and review of consented gondola development within the PA, I recommend the following addition to the Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.12:</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			activities in the landscape schedule.	Passenger Lift Systems – limited landscape capacity to improve public access to focal recreational areas higher in the mountains via non-vehicular transportation modes such as gondolas, provided they are positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, are co-located with existing gondola infrastructure and designed to be recessive in the landscape.	
OS186.13	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to address the relief set out in the submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS186.14	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That in the alternative to the relief sought the submitter seeks additional or consequential relief necessary or appropriate to address the matters raised in this submission and/or the relief requested in this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS187.2	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS187.5	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS187.8	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS188.39	Elisha Young-Ebert	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu paragraph 49 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Addressed in response to OS 77.39.	Accept submission.
OS188.48	Elisha Young-Ebert	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 paragraph 49 be amended to correct the spelling of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura.	Addressed in response to OS 77.48.	Accept submission.
OS189.1	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove the lower-lying slopes and valley floor from the outstanding natural landscape.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions) and ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS189.2	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to revise the capacity ratings if they are to be included within the schedules, as well as a corresponding scale of development to guide the implementation of the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. To the extent supportable and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and careful review of aerial photography of the submitter's land and the submission, amendments have been made to the Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.12 as explained in response to OS 91.3 and OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS189.3	Maree Baker-Galloway On	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited		Basin's capacity assessments are amended to remove 'no landscape capacity', or alternatively deleted from the landscape schedule.	A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter. The response to OS 91.3 is also of relevance here as re the reporting planner's comments in the S42A Report (with respect to deleting the capacity section of the PA Schedule).	
OS189.4	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to recognise and provide for the benefits of change, enhancement and remediation of land in the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 138.3.	Reject submission.
OS189.5	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include particular features and attributes existing in at the submitters land. These are a) Farming, b) Farm Tracks, c) Fences, d) Introduced pests, including goats, e) Introduced plant species, including wilding pines which are gradually being controlled/removed including through forestry, f) Commercial recreation activities including off road 4wd.	Addressed in response to OS 138.5.	Reject submission.
OS189.6	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to incorporate submitter	The Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.12 incorporates submitter feedback where appropriate from an expert landscape assessment perspective.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Adventure Park (1993) Limited		feedback as to important values.		
OS189.7	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include a clear link between existing character and the conclusions about capacity in the landscape schedule.	The meaning of this submission point is unclear as the PA Landscape Schedules have been prepared in accordance with landscape assessment best practice and it is the attributes and values collectively that inform the capacity comments. The submitter is encouraged to produce technical evidence in support of this aspect of their submission.	Reject submission.
OS189.8	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That any additional, amended, consequential, or further relief in respect of the schedules reflect the intent of the matters raised in this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS189.9	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That if the amendments raised in this submission are not undertaken that the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is deleted from the variation.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS189.10	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended under the general description of the area to remove the words 'and the western/north-western backdrop to Gorge Road'.	Addressed in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS189.11	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 15	Addressed in response to OS 138.5.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Adventure Park (1993) Limited		to include the words 'and highly modified'.		
OS189.12	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 20 to remove point (a.) from the list of important ecological features and vegetation types.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.12 has been reviewed by an ecology expert and no such deletion was deemed necessary.	Reject submission.
OS189.13	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove points (b, c, d, and e) from point 21 of the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that these changes are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.14	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 23 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.15	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 24 from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 85.7.	Reject submission.
OS189.16	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 25 from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 85.7.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS189.17	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 26 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin Appeals, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.18	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 27 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.19	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include a point under important land-use patterns and features which states 'The range of commercial recreation, farming and rural living activities and community gardens'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. To the extent supportable and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and careful review of aerial photography and the submission, amendments have been made to the Land Use section of Schedule 21.22.12 as explained in response to OS 138.1. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence of where the community gardens are in the PA.	Accept submission in part.
OS189.20	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 33 to replace the words 'excepting a scattering at the north-western end of Arthurs Point, a very small pocket of urban dwellings at the toe of the Queenstown Time Walk, and the small cluster of rural	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. To the extent supportable and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and careful review of aerial photography and the submission, amendments have been made to the Schedule 21.22.12 [33] as explained in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			living dwellings at the south end of the Waipuna (Lake Johnson) with 'elevated mountainous part of the PA'.		
OS189.21	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 34 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography with cadastral boundaries, I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.22	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 40 to correct the spelling of Old McChesney Bridge.	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 [40] as follows: Old McChesney Bridge Abutment Remains, Arthurs Point (District Plan reference 104, archaeological site E41/236).	Accept submission.
OS189.23	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include a point under the title important recreation attributes and values which states 'commercial recreation including off road 4wd activities'.	Addressed in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS189.24	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 71 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that this change is appropriate. Both Glenorchy Queenstown Road and Gorge Road are popular scenic routes.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS189.25	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 89 to replace the words 'seemingly undeveloped character of' with 'modified character of the elevated', to replace 'high' with 'moderate', replace 'while' with 'due to visible', and to remove the words 'are visible, the very low number of buildings and the limited visibility (excepting the gondola etc described below), limits their influence on the character of the area as a natural landscape'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that this change is necessary nor appropriate.</p> <p>As explained in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22, the PA Schedules aim to describe the important attributes and values of the PA as a whole. It also acknowledges that different attributes and values may be evident as part of a finer grained assessment as part of a resource consent or plan change application. The Preamble goes on to explain that the Schedules are to be read in full. This approach to the use and interpretation of the PA Schedules, combined with the amendments to Schedule 21.22.12 outlined (particularly in relation to OS 138.1), appropriately signal the areas of modification within the PA. Regardless of this modification, I remain of the view that overall, the PA exhibits a seemingly undeveloped character.</p>	Reject submission.
OS189.26	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 90 to replace the word 'adds' with 'is relevant'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that this change is necessary nor appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.
OS189.27	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 100 to remove the words 'along Gorge Road' from the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I do not consider that this change is necessary nor appropriate due to the sheer scale and close proximity of the mountain landforms framing the Gorge Valley corridor.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS189.28	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 103 to change the landscape physical values are changed from 'high' to 'moderate or low'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I do not consider that this change is necessary nor appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.29	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 104 to change the landscape associative values from 'high' to 'moderate or low'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I do not consider that this change is necessary or appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.30	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 105 to change the landscape perceptual values from 'high' to 'moderate or low', and to remove the words 'and Gorge Road'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I do not consider that this change is necessary or appropriate. I also note that, were the submitter correct in relation to OS 189.28, OS 189.29 and OS 189.30, it is difficult to see how the PA would qualify as an ONL (as endorsed by the Environment Court in the Topic 2 Decisions). Also see OS 189.27 in relation to this submission point.	Reject submission.
OS189.31	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for Commercial recreational activities to 'some/high' in the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The rating of capacity is explained (and defined) in the Section 3 of the PA Methodology Report. This is deliberately distinguished from the rating of landscape values (i.e. the seven point 'very high' to 'very low' scale) for the reasons explained in the report. Further, a number of changes are recommended to the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.23 Preamble (July 2023) to better explain the intended use and	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				meaning of the capacity ratings. This may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	
OS189.32	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities from 'no' capacity to 'some/high' capacity in the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3 and OS 189.31.	Accept submission in part.
OS189.33	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so the landscape capacity for urban expansions is changed from 'no' capacity to 'some/high' landscape capacity in the lower-lying parts of the PA, including Gorge Road valley floor. No capacity in the elevated parts of the PA'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Urban development is inappropriate within ONF/Ls as urban development inevitably means the ONF/L will fail to qualify as a RMA s6(b) landscape in terms of 'naturalness' (see <i>Long Bay</i> and <i>High Country Rosehip</i>).	Reject submission.
OS189.34	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so the landscape capacity for intensive agriculture is changed from 'no' capacity to 'some' capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. A definition of intensive agriculture (and tourism activities) is included in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 July 2023) which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns. In light of this definition and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS189.35	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so that the landscape capacity for earthworks is changed from 'very limited' capacity to 'Some/high landscape capacity in the lower-lying parts of the PA, including Gorge Road valley floor', and to include the words 'In the other parts of the PA'.	Addressed in response to OS 138.1. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I do not consider it appropriate to reference the low-lying Gorge Road valley floor as having a rating of some (rather than very limited) landscape capacity for earthworks change in that part of the PA due to its visibility from an important scenic route.	Reject submission.
OS189.36	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for farm buildings from 'very limited' capacity to 'some/high' capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I consider that farm buildings are relatively scarce within the PA, reflecting the relatively limited extent of rural production activities across the PA as a whole. I also note that much of the pastoral area is exposed to views from a popular scenic route (Gorge Road). For these reasons, I consider that a rating of very limited capacity for farm buildings of the PA where there are pastoral uses is appropriate, as it signals the careful consideration of the location and design of such buildings is necessary for them to be appropriate from a landscape perspective.	Reject submission.
OS189.37	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure from 'limited' capacity to 'some/high' capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PDP Chapter 2 definition for Transport Infrastructure takes in a wide range of elements including: retaining walls, road carriageway widening, engineering measures, shelters, traffic control devices, parking and any other structures. Many of these sorts of elements have the potential to materially compromise the landscape values of the PA if poorly located or designed.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				In light of this definition and relying on my relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	
OS189.38	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for utilities and regionally significant infrastructure from 'limited' capacity to 'some' capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate. Also refer response to OS 70.26.	Reject submission.
OS189.39	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for renewable energy generation from 'no' capacity to 'some' capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS189.40	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for production forestry from 'no' capacity to 'some capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Reject submission.
OS189.41	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for rural living from 'no landscape capacity' to 'some/high landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS197.2	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS197.5	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS197.8	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS202.2	Michael John Boyd	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS202.5	Michael John Boyd	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS202.8	Michael John Boyd	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS204.2	Anna-Louise & Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS204.5	Anna-Louise & Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS204.8	Anna-Louise & Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.2	Dennis Behan	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is adopted as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.5	Dennis Behan	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin should be protected in perpetuity from inappropriate development.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS205.8	Dennis Behan	Support	That the mapping, values identified and capacity assessment of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is strongly supported.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS205.11	Dennis Behan	Support	That paragraphs 103-105 and the landscape capacity assessment of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are supported.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.14	Dennis Behan	Support	That recreational access where it will not erode the values identified in the submission and necessary infrastructure development where the values outlined can be adequately preserved or protected in landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(h) 21.22.13 Queenstown Bay PA ONL

21.22.13 PA ONL Queenstown Bay and Environs: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The Queenstown Bay Environs PA ONL encompasses the waters of Whakatipu Waimāori or Whakatipu wai māori (Lake Whakatipu) adjacent to Queenstown. The western limit of the area is defined by the ridgeline descending from Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) along the western side of Sunshine Bay. The eastern limit coincides with the eastern side of Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course). The PA takes in much of the lake margin between Sunshine Bay and Two Mile Creek, Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course). The PA excludes the inner waters and lake edge (Queenstown Bay Beach) in Central Queenstown and the Frankton Arm.

Commented [BG1]: Consequential amendment in response to OS 77.40 Kai Tahu ki Otago and OS 188.40 Elisha Young-Ebert.

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Mana whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. The glacier carved basin of the Whakatipu Valley, which split into two ice tongues when it met the Remarkables, with the terminal moraine deposited at its southern end (at Kingston) leading to the damming of the valley and creation of the lake.
2. The small peninsula landforms of Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course).
3. Range of lakeshore and fluvial processes and landforms that have modified the largely glacially-derived and dominated landscape. These landforms tend to be of small scale.

Important hydrological features:

4. Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), notable for its largely undeveloped mountain context, scale (at 80 km in length, it is New Zealand's longest lake, and, at 291 km², its third largest), depth (with its floor being below sea level), high water quality (used for urban Queenstown water supply), distinctive shape (dog leg), unmodified lake level (with a seiche period of 26.7 minutes, which causes the water level to rise and fall some 200mm in Queenstown Bay) and highly dynamic character (as a consequence of its scale and the effects of weather).
5. Ornamental pond in Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens).

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

6. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. Small pockets of remnant mountain beech and grey shrubland along the lake edge between Fernhill and Sunshine Bay. In places that are stands of wilding blue gum (*Eucalyptus globulus*).
7. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
 - a. The proliferation of mature exotic specimen trees along the lake shore between Queenstown and Sunshine Bay and at Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens). Species include: *Abies grandis* (grand fir), *Abies nordmanniana* (Algerian fir), *Araucaria araucana* (monkey puzzle), *Populus nigra 'italica'*

(Lombardy poplar), *Quercus velutina* (black oak), *Quercus rubra* (red oak), *Tsuga heterophylla* (western hemlock), *Sequoiadendron giganteum* (wellingtonia), *Salix babylonica* (weeping willow), *Tilia x europaea* (lime). *Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Douglas fir) is a dominant species at Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) forming a protective forest around much of the gardens.

- b. The rose garden and other largely exotic amenity plantings throughout Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens).
 - c. Mown grass areas studded with specimen trees along the lake edge between Queenstown and Fernhill.
 - d. Amenity plantings of indigenous trees and shrubs have been established along the walking track between Sunshine Bay and Queenstown.
 - e. Coniferous and amenity plantings throughout Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course).
 - f. Southern Rata re-establishment on Queenstown Gardens periphery and presence of notable solitary specimen trees.
8. Animal pest species include feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
 9. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, hawthorn, buddleia, broom and gorse.

Important land-use patterns and features:

10. Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course) with a wide range of recreational uses (described below).
11. Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) features include;
 - a. operational facilities to manage the park e.g., the depot;
 - b. Amenity display structures: Conservatory;
 - c. Daytime parking for Freedom Camping.
12. The reserve or open space zoning of almost all of the land-based part of the area under the District Plan.
13. The walkway along the lake edge between Queenstown and Sunshine Bay forms a linkage of the Aotearoa's national walkway, the Te Araroa Trail passing through the ONL along the lakefront via the Wakatipu Track.
14. The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) of Queenstown and Kelvin Heights which adjoins the lake edge within the PA.
15. Uses on the lake (and the lake margin) including water-based transport, tourism and recreation-based activities (e.g., the TSS Earnslaw, kayaking, scenic cruising/touring, jet boating, sailing, parasailing and recreational boating, jet skiing and water sports, water taxis, barges).
16. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include: the commercial development in central Queenstown (which includes wharves and jetties around the inner portion of Queenstown Bay), residential development at Sunshine Bay, Fernhill, Queenstown Hill and Kelvin Heights, Glenorchy Queenstown Road, Bob's Peak and the Skyline gondola and building, the TSS Earnslaw slipway and hard-stand facilities and infrastructure at Kelvin Peninsula.

Commented [BG2]: OS 166.2 RealNZ Limited.
OS 166.28 RealNZ Limited.

Commented [BG3]: OS 135.2 Hydro Attack Ltd.

Commented [BG4]: OS 166.29 RealNZ Limited.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

17. The numerous protected exotic specimen trees throughout Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and along the lake shore between Queenstown and Fernhill.

18. Queenstown Gardens and Plantation Reserve Block, including the Queenstown Gardens Gate (District Plan reference 13).
19. William Rees Memorial, Hakitekura Plaque, and Scott Rock Memorial, Queenstown Gardens (District Plan references 24-26).
20. Queenstown Bowling Club Pavilion, Queenstown Gardens (District Plan reference 65).
21. Shipping navigation beacon at the end of the Gardens Peninsula (District Plan reference 221).
22. Rifle butt adjacent to the lake esplanade (District Plan reference 220, archaeological site E41/305).
23. Kelvin Peninsula midden/oven site (archaeological site E41/13).

Mana whenua features and their locations:

24. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
25. Much of the ONL is within the mapped wāhi tūpuna Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu). Whakatipu Waimāori is a Statutory Acknowledgement under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.
26. It also includes the mapped wāhi tūpuna Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course) and Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens).

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

Mana whenua associations and experience:

27. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
28. The name ~~Whakatipu wai māori~~ (or Whakatipu Waimāori) originates from the earliest expedition of discovery made many generations ago by the tupuna Rākaihautū and his party from the Uruao waka. In tradition, Rākaihautū dug the lakes with his kō known as Tūwhakarōria. The Lake is key in numerous Kāi Tahu pūrakau (stories) and has a deep spiritual significance for mana whenua.
29. For generations, the lake supported nohoaka, kāika, mahika kai as well as transportation routes for pounamu. The knowledge of these associations hold the same value for Kāi Tahu to this day.
30. Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura is related to the feats of Hakitekura, the famous Kāti Māmoe woman who was the first person to swim across ~~Whakatipu Waimāori~~ ~~Whakatipu wai māori~~.
31. Te Kararo was the site of a kāika (permanent settlement).
32. The mana whenua values associated with this ONL include, but may not be limited to wāhi taoka, tauraka waka, kāika, ara tawhito and mahika kai.

Commented [BG5]: OS 77.40 Kai Tahu ki Otago.
OS 188.40 Elisha Young-Ebert.

Commented [BG6]: OS 77.40 Kai Tahu ki Otago.
OS 188.40 Elisha Young-Ebert.

Important historic attributes and values:

33. Early Māori occupation around the lakeshore.
34. Historic recreational use of the lake, lakeshore, and gardens.

- 35. Historic use of the lake for transport (including the TSS Earnslaw).
- 36. The early establishment and continued use of the gardens as a public reserve.

Commented [BG7]: OS 166.31 RealNZ Limited.
OS 166.2 RealNZ Limited.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

- 37. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
- 38. The popularity of the postcard views from Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course), the various lake-edge trails and the waters across the lake to Cecil Peak and Walter Peak and the broader mountain context, as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.
- 39. The very high popularity of the Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens), Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course), the various lake-edge trails and water-based activities on the lake (including the TSS Earnslaw). The very close proximity of this recreational feature to Queenstown urban area also plays a role.
- 40. The critical role of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens), Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course), the various lake-edge trails and water-based activities on the lake in shaping the identity of Queenstown.

Commented [BG8]: OS 166.32 RealNZ Limited.
OS 166.2 RealNZ Limited.

Important recreation attributes and values:

- 41. Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens), botanical gardens by the town centre that is home to a wide range of recreational uses (children’s playground, lawn bowls, frisbee golf, tennis, skate boarding, skating, BMX biking, ice skating, ice hockey, walking and jogging, cycling, picnicking, outdoor events, peaceful contemplation).
- 42. Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course), which includes the golf course and a sculpture walk around the lake edges of the golf course, used by walkers, joggers, cyclists, and picnickers.
- 43. The Queenstown Trail around the lake edge of Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course).
- 44. Walking, running, cycling and picnicking along the lake-edge trail between Queenstown and Sunshine Bay.
- 45. Water-based activities including: swimming, kayaking, sailing, paddle boarding, boating, jet skiing, sightseeing.
- 46. Fishing for rainbow trout, brown trout, and chinook salmon in Whakatipu Waimāori Whakatipu wai māori.
- 47. Glenorchy - Queenstown Road as a key scenic route in close proximity.
- 48. Band rotunda at the Queenstown Gardens; music, contemplation, performance arts.

Commented [BG9]: OS 166.33 RealNZ Limited.
OS 166.2 RealNZ Limited.
OS 135.5 Hydro Attack Ltd.

Commented [BG10]: OS 77.40 Kai Tahu ki Otago.
OS 188.40 Elisha Young-Ebert.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

- 49. The area’s natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and expressive of the landscape’s formative geomorphic processes.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

- 50. The postcard views from Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens), Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course), the various lake-edge trails, Glenorchy - Queenstown Road and the dynamic waters of the lake to Cecil Peak and Walter Peak and the broader mountain context. The frequent movement of vessels on the lake (including the TSS Earnslaw) adds to the interest of the outlook.
- 51. Iconic mid to long-range views from central Queenstown, across the waters of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) to the rugged and dramatic landforms of Cecil Peak, Walter Peak and the broader mountain context framing the lake. The seemingly undeveloped and green finger of Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and almost continuous fringe of green along the northern lake edge (Queenstown to Sunshine Bay) along with marine craft (including the TSS Earnslaw), adds to the appeal of the outlook.
- 52. In all views, the striking juxtaposition of urban development alongside the grandeur of the natural landscape adds to the spectacle.

Commented [BG11]: OS 166.34 RealNZ Limited.
OS 166.2 RealNZ Limited.

Commented [BG12]: OS 166.34 RealNZ Limited.
OS 166.2 RealNZ Limited.

Naturalness attributes and values:

- 53. The very close proximity of urban development and level of human activity within the area inevitably colours the impression of naturalness within the PA ONL. Nonetheless, the contrast created between the area and its urban context due to the dominance of more natural landscape elements (i.e., water or vegetation), together with the largely unmodified underlying landform character (glacial lake and legible peninsulas), means that the area displays at least a moderate-high level of naturalness. Historic forestry land uses throughout the broader mountain context serve to ensure that the exotic vegetation character of much of the landward area is not discordant or incongruous within the wider high-value landscape setting.
- 54. The general avoidance of structures along the lake edge within the PA, excepting the jetties and boat sheds, etc. on the south side of Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens).

Memorability attributes and values:

- 55. The highly memorable experiences associated with using Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), along with views of the Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and its surrounding mountain frame.
- 56. The sense of Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) as a place of beauty and tranquillity close to central Queenstown.

Commented [BG13]: OS 166.35 RealNZ Limited.
OS 166.2 RealNZ Limited.

Transient attributes and values:

- 57. The ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the lake.
- 58. Human activity on the lake (including vessels) and its margins.
- 59. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation around the lake edges and throughout Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course).

Commented [BG14]: OS 135.7 Hydro Attack Limited.

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

- 60. A localised sense of remoteness along parts of the lake edge trails within the PA ONL, where intervening landforms and/or vegetation screen views to nearby development and the focus is confined to the lake and broader undeveloped mountain context.

Commented [BG15]: Consequential amendment in response to OS 135.10 Hydro Attack Limited.

Aesthetic attributes and values:

- 61. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.

62. More specifically, this includes:

- a. The highly attractive and engaging large-scale composition created by the tree-lined glacial lake and 'green' peninsulas set within a broader mountain context seen either individually or collectively, juxtaposed beside an urban context.
- b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. The highly dynamic qualities of the lake waters in terms of natural processes (wind and wave action, etc.) and human activity.
 - ii. The general absence of structures and the dominance of vegetation along the lake edges.
 - iii. The limited level of built modification evident within the landward parts of the PA, which forms a marked contrast to the urban context and imbues an impression of 'green relief'.
 - iv. The mature trees throughout the area which contribute to the scenic appeal.
 - v. Human activity on and around the bay, along with some of the surrounding buildings and marine craft within the bay.

Commented [BG16]: OS 135.9 Hydro Attack Limited.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

The combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA ONL Queenstown Bay and Environs can be summarised as follows:

- 63. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
- 64. **Very High associative values** relating to:
 - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
 - b. The historic features of the area.
 - c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
 - d. The significant recreational attributes of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens), Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course) and the lake-edge trails.
- 65. **High perceptual values** relating to:
 - a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
 - b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and highly appealing composition of natural landscape elements juxtaposed beside Queenstown. The visibility of the area from Queenstown, Glenorchy-Queenstown Road, and sections of the Queenstown Trail network, along with the area's transient values, play an important role.

- c. A sense of tranquillity and green relief at Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens).
- d. A localised sense of remoteness and wildness along parts of the lake edge trails in Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course) where views to nearby urban development are screened by landforms and/or vegetation.

Commented [BG17]: OS 135.10 Hydro Attack Limited.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONL Queenstown Bay Environs for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that integrate with, and complement/enhance, existing recreation features and activities; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements (where appropriate); designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – no** landscape capacity.
- iii. **Urban expansions – no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings – no** landscape capacity.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – no** landscape capacity.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protects the area's ONL values. **Very limited to no** landscape capacity if associated with water-based transport or the TSS Earnslaw. **No** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. **Very limited to no** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Production forestry – no** landscape capacity.
- xii. **Rural living – no** landscape capacity.
- xiii. **Jetties, and boatsheds, lake structures and moorings – very limited** landscape capacity for additional jetties and boatsheds that are co-located with existing features, designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement (where possible); and enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values.

Commented [BG18]: OS 77.6 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG19]: OS 166.39 Hydro Attack.

Commented [BG20]: OS 166.39 Hydro Attack.

Commented [BG21]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 166.39.

Commented [BG22]: OS 166.39 RealNZ Limited.

Commented [BG23]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG24]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG25]: OS 166.42 RealNZ Limited.

Commented [BG26]: OS 70.27 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

Commented [BG27]: OS 166.44 RealNZ Limited.

Commented [BG28]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG29]: OS 77.28 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG30]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG31]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

21.22.13 Queenstown Bay and Environs PA ONL Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.23.3 Queenstown Bay and Environs PA ONL Schedule". New text underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Green wash line item: Submission point re-notified 22 June 2023.

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS70.27	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.13 Queenstown Bay and Environs is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.13 Capacity (ix) as follows: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. <u>In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.</u>	<u>Accept submission.</u>
OS77.40	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Queenstown Bay and environs general description, paragraphs 28, 30 and 46 be amended to correct the spelling from	Amend Schedule 21.22.13 [28] as follows: <i>The name <u>Whakatipu wai māori</u> (or <u>Whakatipu Waimāori</u>) originates from the earliest expedition of discovery made many generations ago by the tupuna Rākaihautū and his party from the Uruao waka. In tradition, Rākaihautū dug the lakes with his kō known as Tūwhakarōria. The Lake is key in</i>	<u>Accept submission.</u>

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	<p>numerous <i>Kāi Tahu pūrakau</i> (stories) and has a deep spiritual significance for <i>mana whenua</i>.</p> <p>Amend Schedule 21.22.13 [30] as follows:</p> <p><i>Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura is related to the feats of Hakitekura, the famous Kāti Māmoe woman who was the first person to swim across Whakatipu Waimāori Whakatipu-wai-māori.</i></p> <p>Amend Schedule 21.22.13 [46] as follows:</p> <p><i>Fishing for rainbow trout, brown trout, and chinook salmon in Whakatipu Waimāori Whakatipu-Wai-Māori.</i></p> <p>Consequential amendment recommended to Schedule 21.22.13 General Description of the Area as follows:</p> <p><i>The Queenstown Bay Environs PA ONL encompasses the waters of Whakatipu Waimāori or Whakatipu-wai-māori (Lake Whakatipu) adjacent to Queenstown. The western limit of the area is defined by the ridgeline descending from Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) along the western side of Sunshine Bay. The eastern limit coincides with the eastern side of Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course). The PA takes in much of the lake margin between Sunshine Bay and Two Mile Creek, Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course). The PA excludes the inner waters and lake edge (Queenstown Bay Beach) in Central Queenstown and the Frankton Arm.</i></p>	
OS135.2	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That 21.22.13 be amended to include an additional description under 'important land-use patterns and features' as follows: 16. The location of wharves/jetties and kiosks in and around Queenstown Bay, and their use for recreation and commercial recreation activity, and the presence of public infrastructure, such as	<p>Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work) and review of the RM200053 Decision, I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.13 [16] are appropriate:</p> <p>Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include: the commercial development in central Queenstown (which includes wharves and jetties around the inner portion of Queenstown Bay), residential development at Sunshine Bay, Fernhill,</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			stormwater outfalls and pumps stations.	Queenstown Hill and Kelvin Heights, Glenorchy Queenstown Road, Bob's Peak and the Skyline gondola and building.	
OS135.3	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That 21.22.13 be amended to include an additional description under 'important land-use patterns and features' as follows: 17. The <u>"all structures and moorings non complying" demarcation in Queenstown Bay.</u>	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work) and review of the RM200053 Decision, I understand that structures and moorings have a discretionary activity in the part of the PA that is outside of the area identified where they have a non-complying activity status. I do not consider that this change in activity status merits reference as a landuse pattern or feature that plays a role in shaping the values of the PA.	Reject submission.
OS135.4	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That 21.22.13 be amended to include an additional description under 'important historic attributes and values' as follows: 39. The historic presence of jetties and wharves in Queenstown Bay and surrounds.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.13 has been reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS135.5	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That 21.22.13 be amended to include an additional description under 'important recreation attributes and values' as follows: 49. Commercial recreation activities, including the use of wharves and jetties.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The recreational attributes and values section of Schedule 21.22.13 addresses existing recreational attributes and values within the PA. Having carefully reviewed the PA mapping, there are no jetties or wharves within the PA and therefore this text change is not supported. I consider that commercial recreation activities are addressed in response to OS 166.2 and 166.33.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS135.6	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That number 54 in 21.22.13 be amended to read as follows: The general lack of structures along the lake edge within the PA as directed by the "all structures and moorings non complying" demarcation in Queenstown Bay, with the exception of Queenstown Bay and its surrounds which contains a number of wharves with kiosks facilitating commercial recreation activities and the jetties and boat sheds, etc. on the south side of Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens).	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work) and review of the RM200053 Decision, I understand that structures and moorings have a discretionary activity in the part of the PA that is outside of the area identified where they have a non-complying activity status. I do not consider that this change in activity status merits reference as a factor that plays a role in shaping the naturalness values of the PA.	Reject submission.
OS135.7	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That 58 in 21.22.13 be amended to read as follows: Human activity on the lake and its margins, including vessels.	Agree with this suggested text amendment. Amend Schedule 21.22.13 [58] as follows: <i>Human activity on the lake (including vessels) and its margins.</i>	Accept submission subject to refinement.
OS135.8	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That 62.b ii in 21.22.13 be amended to: The general absence of structures and the dominance of vegetation along the lake edges with the exception of Queenstown Bay and its immediate surrounds.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work) and review of the RM200053 Decision, I do not consider that the text change is appropriate. The area of Queenstown Bay where existing wharves and jetties are located is outside of the PA.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS135.9	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That a new limb be added to 62 in 21.22.13 which states: The influence of the activities and built form in and around Queenstown Bay and its surrounds.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that human activity on and around the edges of the Queenstown Bay PA ONL, along with some buildings and some marine craft in Queenstown Bay, contribute positively to the aesthetic appeal of the area.</p> <p>It is recommended that 21.22.13 [62](b)(v) is amended to add the following:</p> <p><i>Human activity on and around the bay, along with some of the surrounding buildings and marine craft within the bay.</i></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS135.10	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That 65d in 21.22.13 be amended to: A localised sense of remoteness and wildness along the lake edge trails outside of Queenstown Bay where view to nearby urban development are screened by landforms and/or vegetation.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the Priority Area Schedule work (including field work), it is my view that there are parts of the trail network within Queenstown Bay PA ONL where there is a localised sense of remoteness and wildness despite the urban context. This is particularly apparent in parts of Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course).</p> <p>It is recommended that 21.22.13 [65](d) is amended as follows:</p> <p><i>A localised sense of remoteness and wildness along parts of the lake edge trails in Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course) where views to nearby urban development are screened by landforms and/or vegetation.</i></p> <p>A consequential amendment to Schedule 21.22.13 [60] is recommended as follows:</p> <p><i>A localised sense of remoteness and wildness along parts of the lake edge trails where views to nearby urban development are screened by landforms and/or vegetation.</i></p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS135.11	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That i in the 'landscape capacity' section of 21.22.13 be amended to read as follows: Commercial recreation activities - moderate landscape capacity for activities that integrate with, and complement/enhance, existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values. High landscape capacity in Queenstown Bay and its immediate surrounds.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Section 3 of the PA Schedules Methodology Report explains the capacity rating scale (and noting that this explanatory detail is incorporated into the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to assist plan users). The Methodology Report goes on to explain that 'moderate' is deliberately not a term used in the rating scale.</p> <p>I agree with the submitter that recreation activities (including the use of vessels) are permitted on the lake and commercial recreation activities on the lake and its margins are an important feature of the area.</p> <p>However, relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work) and review of the RM200053 Decision, I consider that the sensitivity of the receiving environment along with the absence of land and lake structures associated with commercial recreation activities (e.g. wharves and kiosks) are not a feature of the PA at present and have the potential to detract from landscape values. For these reasons, I consider that a capacity rating of limited is appropriate (along with the 'qualifications' set out in Schedule 21.22.13 (i)).</p>	Reject submission.
OS135.12	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That ii in the 'landscape capacity' section of 21.22.13 be amended to: Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - moderate landscape capacity. High capacity in Queenstown Bay and its immediate surrounds.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Section 3 of the Methodology Report explains the capacity rating scale (and noting that this explanatory detail is incorporated into the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to assist plan users). The Methodology Report goes on to explain that 'moderate' is deliberately not a term used in the rating scale.</p> <p>Section 3 also explains that tourism related activities is not defined in the PDP, and clarifies that for the purposes of the PA Schedules, such activities are taken to mean resorts. The</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>Preamble to Schedule 21.22 has been amended to clarify this matter.</p> <p>Having carefully reviewed the spatial extent of the mapped Queenstown Bay Priority Area ONL along with the PDP zoning of the lake margins (Informal Recreation, Nature Conservation or Community Purposes zones) and relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the part of the PA Schedules work (including field work) and review of the RM200053 Decision, I remain of the view that a rating of no landscape capacity is appropriate for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities (i.e. resorts). In simple terms, there is no room for such activities within the PA.</p> <p>For completeness, it is also my opinion that a rating of no landscape capacity for urban expansion, intensive agriculture, farm buildings, mineral extraction, large scale renewable energy (see OS 166.44 below), production forestry and rural living is appropriate in this instance.</p>	
OS135.13	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That iii. in the 'landscape capacity' section of 21.22.13 be amended to: Urban expansions - low to moderate landscape activity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Urban development is inappropriate within ONF/Ls as urban development inevitably means the ONF/L will fail to qualify as a RMA s6(b) landscape in terms of 'naturalness' (see <i>Long Bay and High Country Rosehip</i>).</p>	Reject submission.
OS135.14	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That 21.22.13.viii. landscape capacity be amended to read as follows: Transport infrastructure - very limited landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the areas ONF values. No	For the reasons outlined in response to OS 135.3 and OS 135.6, I do not agree with the text change requested by the submitter.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure, except wharves and jetties in Queenstown Bay, outside of the non-complying structures and mooring demarcation.		
OS135.15	Brett Giddens On Behalf Of Hydro Attack Ltd	Oppose	That xiii. in the 'landscape capacity' section of 21.22.13 be amended to read as follows: Jetties, wharves and boatsheds - very limited to moderate landscape capacity for additional jetties and boatsheds that are co-located with existing features, located within the Queenstown Bay environs designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement (where possible); enhance public access; and protect the values of the wider ONL.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>For the reasons explained in response to OS 135.12, a rating of 'moderate' is not supported.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the part of the PA Schedules work (including field work) and review of the RM200053 Decision, I remain of the view that a rating of very limited landscape capacity is appropriate for jetties and boatsheds, subject to the qualifications set out in Schedule 21.22.13 (xiii).</p> <p>The inclusion of 'located within Queenstown Bay' is considered unnecessary given the Schedule 21.22 is intended to be read in combination with the mapping of the PAs.</p> <p>Reference to 'protect ONL values' has been deleted from the PA Schedules as it is unnecessarily repetitive of the Chapter 3 policies which apply to ONLs within the district.</p>	Reject submission.
OS166.1	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Queenstown Bay and environs be amended to clarify which (if any) of the TSS Earnslaw facilities and services are located within the priority area.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Typically, the General Description of a PA is relatively 'high level' and focuses on a broad description of the extent of the area. It is also intended to be read in combination with the spatial mapping of the PA.</p> <p>For these reasons it is unclear as to why site-specific references to land and activities outside the PA are required in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				Also see response to OS 166.29 below which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	
OS166.2	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Queenstown Bay and environs be amended to recognise the iconic and important role of the TSS Earnslaw, inclusive of all associated facilities and services.	Amendments have been made in response to OS 166.28, OS 166.31, OS 166.32, OS 166.33, OS 166.34, and OS 166.35 which go some way to addressing the submitters concerns in this regard.	Accept submission in part.
OS166.26	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Queenstown Bay and environs general description have added at the last sentence in reference to the Priority Area excluding the Frankton Arm: (this exclusion applies to the TSS Earnslaw slipway and hard-stand facilities and infrastructure at Kelvin Peninsula, including existing buildings, structures, parking).	Addressed in response to OS 166.1.	Reject submission.
OS166.27	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Important ecological features and vegetation type paragraph 8 and 9 be deleted to remove reference to animal and plant pest species.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>PA ONL (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>However, it is agreed that as currently drafted the Schedules are potentially confusing in this regard as these aspects of the landscape are negative rather than positive.</p> <p>A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter.</p>	
OS166.28	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	<p>That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Important land-use patterns and features paragraph 15 be amended to include the words '(including the lake margin)' after the word lake, add water-based transport to list of activities, and add TSS in front of Earnslaw, so that it reads:</p> <p>Uses on the lake (including the lake margin) including water-based transport, tourism and recreation-based activities (e.g. the TSS Earnslaw, kayaking, scenic cruising/touring, jet boating, sailing, parasailing and recreational boating, jet skiing and water sports, water taxis, barges).</p>	<p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the Priority Area Schedule work (including field work), I agree with this submission point (subject to minor refinement).</p> <p>Amend Schedule 21.22.13 [15] as follows:</p> <p><i>Uses on the lake (and the lake margin) including water-based transport, tourism and recreation based activities (e.g., the TSS Earnslaw, kayaking, scenic cruising/touring, jet boating, sailing, parasailing and recreational boating, jet skiing and water sports, water taxis, barges).</i></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS166.29	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	<p>That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Important land-use patterns and features paragraph 16 have the following words added at the end of the final sentence: , the TSS Earnslaw slipway</p>	<p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the Priority Area Schedule work (including field work), I agree with this submission point.</p> <p>Amend Schedule 21.22.13 [16] as follows:</p> <p><i>Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale,</i></p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			and hard-stand facilities and infrastructure at Kelvin Peninsula.	<i>character, and/or proximity include: the commercial development in central Queenstown, residential development at Sunshine Bay, Fernhill, Queenstown Hill and Kelvin Heights, Glenorchy Queenstown Road, Bob's Peak and the Skyline gondola and building, <u>the TSS Earnslaw slipway and hard-stand facilities and infrastructure at Kelvin Peninsula.</u></i>	
OS166.30	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Important historic attributes and values at paragraph 35 be amended to include tourism so that it reads: Historic use of the lake for transport and tourism.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The notified version of Schedule 21.22.13 has been reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard. It is also noted that [34] references the historic recreational use of the lake which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns.	Reject submission.
OS166.31	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Important historic attributes and values be amended to add an additional paragraph : 36A. The TSS Earnslaw and associated slipway and hard-stand facilities and infrastructure at Kelvin Peninsula.	Rather than a separate line item as suggested by the submitter, it is recommended that Schedule 21.22.13 [35] is amended as follows to acknowledge the TSS Earnslaw: <i>Historic use of the lake for transport <u>(including the TSS Earnslaw)</u></i>	<u>Accept submission.</u>
OS166.32	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Important shared and recognised attributes and values at paragraph 39 be amended to include after water-based activities on the lake the words: ' including the internationally recognised and unique	Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the Priority Area Schedule work (including field work), I agree in part with this intent of this submission point. Amend Schedule 21.22.13 [39] as follows: <i>The very high popularity of the Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens), Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course), the various lake-edge trails and water-based activities on the lake <u>(including the TSS Earnslaw)</u>. The very</i>	<u>Accept submission in part.</u>

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			experiences provided by the TSS Earnslaw'.	<i>close proximity of this recreational feature to Queenstown urban area also plays a role.</i>	
OS166.33	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.2.13 Important recreation attributes and values at paragraph 45 be amended to include sightseeing in the water-based activities.	Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the Priority Area Schedule work (including field work), I agree with this submission point. Amend Schedule 21.22.13 [45] as follows: <i>Water-based activities including: swimming, kayaking, sailing, paddle boarding, boating, jet skiing, sightseeing.</i>	Accept submission.
OS166.34	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Particularly important views to and from the area add a paragraph: 51A. Iconic and postcard views of the above including recreational boating or the TSS Earnslaw in the foreground.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. While I do not agree with adding a separate line item as requested by the submitter, I consider that referencing marine craft (or vessels) and the TSS Earnslaw as noteworthy aspects of the highquality views is appropriate. Amend Schedule 21.22.13 [50] as follows: <i>The postcard views from Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens), Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course), the various lake-edge trails, Glenorchy - Queenstown Road and the dynamic waters of the lake to Cecil Peak and Walter Peak and the broader mountain context. The frequent movement of vessels on the lake (including the TSS Earnslaw) adds to the interest of the outlook.</i> Amend Schedule 21.22.13 [51] as follows: <i>Iconic mid to long-range views from central Queenstown, across the waters of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) to the rugged and dramatic landforms of Cecil Peak, Walter Peak and the broader mountain context framing the lake. The seemingly undeveloped and green finger of Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and almost continuous fringe of green along the northern lake edge (Queenstown to Sunshine Bay) along with marine craft (including the TSS Earnslaw). adds to the appeal of the outlook.</i>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS166.35	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Memorability attributes and values paragraph 55 be amended to add experience of use and delete 'the' from Whakatipu Waimāori, to read: the highly memorable views of, and experience associated with using, Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and its surrounding mountain frame.	<p>While I do not agree with the wording suggested by the submitter, I consider including reference to the memorability of experiences associated with using Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) to be appropriate.</p> <p>Amend Schedule 21.22.13 [55] as follows:</p> <p><i>The highly memorable experiences associated with using Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), along with views of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and its surrounding mountain frame.</i></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS166.36	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Memorability attributes and values have a paragraph added: 56A. The iconic and unique experiences associated with the TSS Earnslaw and its contribution to Queenstown's sense of place.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the Priority Schedules work (including field work), I do not agree with adding a separate line item for the TSS Earnslaw under the 'Memorability attributes and values' section of Schedule 21.22.13. It is my view that there are a wide range of specific experiences available within Queenstown Bay that are likely to be highly memorable and to list them all would be unhelpfully long.</p> <p>However, it is noted that the response to OS 166.35 may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS166.37	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Very High associative values at paragraph 61 be amended to add clause e. The TSS Earnslaw.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>In response to OS 166.32, the TSS Earnslaw is specifically referenced under Shared and Recognised values. In turn, the 'strong shared and recognised values' are cited in support of the Very High associative values rating at Schedule 21.22.13 [65]. For this reason, it is considered unnecessary to add a separate line item for the TSS Earnslaw as requested by the</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				submitter (and noting that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22.13 explains that each PA Schedule should be read in full).	
OS166.38	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 High perceptual values be amended at paragraph 62.d. to add the words ', and recreating on and within Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu)' at the end of the sentence.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>In response to OS 166.35, recreating on and within Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) has been included in the description of Schedule 21.22.13 'Memorability attributes and values'.</p> <p>In turn, the High memorability values are cited in support of the High perceptual values rating at Schedule 21.22.13 [65](b). For this reason, it is considered unnecessary to make the text amendments suggested by the submitter (and noting that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22.13 explains that each Schedule should be read in full).</p>	Reject submission.
OS166.39	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.13.i Commercial recreational activities be amended from limited to some landscape capacity, amend wording and delete the words 'and protect the area's ONL values', so that it reads: Commercial recreation activities - Some landscape capacity for activities that integrate with, and complement/enhance, recreation activities;... .	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Some aspects of the submitters request are supported (at least in part), to reflect the important role that existing commercial recreation features and activities (including the <i>TSS Earnslaw</i>) play in shaping the landscape values of the PA.</p> <p>However, other aspects are not supported i.e. deletion of the word 'existing'.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the part of the PA Schedules work (including field work) and review of the RM200053 Decision, I remain of the view that a rating of limited landscape capacity is appropriate for commercial recreation activities.</p> <p>Amend 21.22.13 Capacity (i) as follows:</p> <p>Commercial recreational activities – limited landscape capacity for activities that integrate with, and complement/enhance, existing recreation features and activities; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements (where</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<i>appropriate</i>); designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; <i>and</i> enhance public access; <i>and protect the area's ONL values</i> .	
OS166.40	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.13.ii Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended to include the following words: except for limited landscape capacity if associated with the TSS Earnslaw.	Addressed in response to OS 135.12.	Reject submission.
OS166.41	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.13v. Earthworks be amended to add the words: 'recreation (including commercial recreation), or the TSS Earnslaw' after earthworks associated with public access tracks.	The Chapter 2 definition of commercial recreation is as follows: <i>Means the commercial guiding, training, instructing, transportation or provision of recreation facilities to clients for recreational purposes including the use of any building or land associated with the activity, excluding ski area activities.</i> As a consequence, commercial recreation activities in their own right are very unlikely to require earthworks, meaning that acknowledgement of this specific landuse under the reference to the landscape capacity for earthworks is unnecessary.	Reject submission.
OS166.42	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.13.viii Transport infrastructure be amended by adding the words: Some landscape capacity if associated with water-based transport or the TSS Earnslaw.	The PDP Chapter 2 definition for Transport Infrastructure takes in a wide range of elements including: retaining walls, road carriageway widening, engineering measures, shelters, traffic control devices, parking and any other structures. Many of these sorts of elements have the potential to materially compromise the landscape values of the PA if poorly located or designed. However, it is acknowledged that the transport function of the lake along with the <i>TSS Earnslaw</i> itself, contribute positively to the landscape values of the PA.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>For these reasons it is recommended that the no landscape capacity rating is amended to very limited to no landscape capacity.</p> <p>Amend Schedule 21.22.13 Landscape Capacity (viii) as follows:</p> <p>Transport infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONF values. Very limited to no landscape capacity if associated with water based transport or the TSS Earnslaw. No landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.</p>	
OS166.43	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.13ix. Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended to add: Some landscape capacity if associated with water-based transport or the TSS Earnslaw.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission explaining why there should be an increased tolerance from very limited to some, for utilities and regionally significant infrastructure associated with water-based transport or the TSS Earnslaw.</p> <p>For similar reasons to those discussed in relation to OS 166.42, along with the zoning of the land within the PA where such elements are likely to be located (described in response to OS 135.12), a landscape capacity rating of very limited is preferred, excepting in relation to the National Grid (see OS 70.27).</p>	Reject submission.
OS166.44	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.13x. renewable energy generation be amended to add after no landscape capacity: , except Some landscape capacity if associated with water-based transport or the TSS Earnslaw.	<p>Having carefully reviewed the spatial extent of the mapped Queenstown Bay Priority Area ONL, along with the PDP zoning of the lake margins (Informal Recreation, Nature Conservation or Community Purposes zones), and relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the part of the Priority Schedules work (including field work), I consider that Schedule 21.11.13 Capacity (x) should be amended as follows:</p> <p>Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. Very</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				limited to no landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.	
OS166.45	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.13xiii. Jetties and boatsheds be amended to add: Some landscape capacity if associated with water-based transport or the TSS Earnslaw.	Addressed in response to OS 135.15.	Reject submission.
OS188.40	Elisha Young-Ebert	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 Queenstown Bay and environs general description, paragraphs 28, 30 and 46 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Addressed in response to OS 77.40.	Accept submission.
OS194.1	Sue Bradley Southern Lakes Windriders	Support	That the landscape schedule including Woolshed Bay as an Outstanding Natural Landscape be retained.	Woolshed Bay is near Homestead Bay (to the south of Jacks Point) and is outside of the PA mapping confirmed by the Environment Court in the Topic 2 decisions. Changes to the PA mapping are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS194.2	Sue Bradley Southern Lakes Windriders	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 is classified as an ONF within an ONL.	The ONL status of the area has been confirmed by the Environment Court.	Reject submission.
OS194.2	Sue Bradley Southern Lakes Windriders	Support	That Homestead Bay Environs be retained in its natural state.	Homestead Bay is outside of the PA ONL.	Reject submission.

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(i) 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables PA ONL

21.22.14 PA ONL NORTHERN REMARKABLES: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The Northern Remarkables PA/ONL relates to the northern faces of the Remarkable Range framing the southern side of the Wakatipu Basin. The southern boundary of the PA/ONL corresponds with the mountain peaks and ridgelines of that range around, and east of the Remarkables Ski Area Sub-zone – extending through to near Chard Farm. The Northern Remarkables PA/ONL's northern boundary follows the upper edge of the low-lying Kawarau River terraces on the south side of the Kawarau River to near Chard Farm. In so doing, the PA/ONL captures the steep mountain faces above the Kawarau River valley and terraces at the toe of the Northern Remarkables.

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. Steep to very steep mountain slopes with frequent exposed schist outcrops and scree slopes. The northern faces consist principally of large landslides which occurred after the retreat of glaciers at the end of the last glaciation.
2. Alluvial fans and shingle beds associated with the Rastus Burn and Owens Creek.
3. Elevated fans and flat alluvial floodplains and terraces bordered in places by steep escarpments.
4. Located to the north of, and down slope of, the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road, the Remarkables Terrane Boundary and Block Field are identified as a Geopreservation Site of national importance; and the Frankton Block Field is identified as being of regional importance. Both of these features are rated as being robust and not considered to be vulnerable to most human-related activities.
5. This ONL also contains the Lake Alta cirque which is a classic lake-filled cirque with steep rocky sides. There are areas of moraine over the schist bedrock at the front lip.

Important hydrological features:

6. The Rastus Burn.
7. Owens Creek.
8. The cirque lake of Lake Alta (i.e., amphitheatre-shaped basin with precipitous walls at the head of a glacial valley). Identified as a Geopreservation Site of regional significance that is rated as being robust and not considered to be vulnerable to most human-related activities.
9. The series of small tarns in the vicinity of the Remarkables Ski Field.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

10. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. Extensive areas of regenerating indigenous grey shrubland, particularly in the Owens Creek and Rastus Burn valleys. The larger areas of shrubland are designated as SNA's.

- b. Snow tussock grasslands, mixed snow tussock *Dracophyllum* scrub and cushionfields covers the higher slopes generally above c. 900 m, including the Rastus Basin.
 - c. Alpine cushion bogs are a feature of the Basins in the upper Rastus Burn bordering the streams and tarns.
 - d. Expansive areas of mixed short tussock – exotic grassland interspersed with grey shrubland occur above the prominent alluvial fans and terraces of the Rastus Burn and Owens Creek.
 - e. Scattered, locally rare, mature kowhai across the lower and mid slopes especially on bluffy sites.
11. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
- a. Grazed pasture throughout the flat river terraces while extensive grazing occurs on the lower hillslopes.
12. Valued habitat for a range of lizards, New Zealand falcon, New Zealand pipit and grey warbler, and endemic invertebrates. Mingimangi and the tree daisies (*Olearia* sp) are important to endemic invertebrates during parts of their life cycles while rocky areas amongst low stature shrubs and short and exotic grassland is important habitat for skinks and geckos.
13. The upper part of the PA lies in the DOC managed Remarkables Conservation Area.
14. Animal pest species include feral red deer, feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
15. Plant pest species include sweet briar which is often a component of grey shrubland, wildings conifers, buddleia, broom, and gorse.

Commented [BG1]: OS 171.9 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG2]: OS 171.10 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG3]: OS 171.9 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG4]: OS 171.9 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Important land-use patterns and features:

16. Human modification which is concentrated throughout the low-lying river terraces at the base of the mountain slopes (and adjacent the Kawarau River ONF), where pastoral and viticultural land use dominate; in the three elevated basins near Lake Alta within which the ski field is located; and throughout the north-western portion of the PA associated with the ski field access road.
17. Built development patterns which, throughout the lower-lying river terraces includes a farmhouse at Owens Creek, the Chard Farm winery, scattered farm buildings, farm tracks, fencing and a power line (on poles) roughly traversing the toe of the steeper slopes. Generally, development is characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings that have an obvious connection with the working rural landscape, are well integrated by plantings and remain subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Elsewhere, the modest scale of buildings, together with their distinctly working rural character and sparse arrangement, ensures that they sit comfortably into the setting.
18. The location of the Remarkables Ski Field within three interconnected elevated basins which means that it is relatively visually discreet in views from low-lying places in the Wakatipu Basin and Queenstown. The ski field access road, however, is prominent in such views.
19. Gibbston Character Zone in the vicinity of Chard Farm which includes viticulture and commercial activities with and affiliation to viticulture and farming.
- 19a Queenstown Park Station is a large, farmed landholding within the ONL, the continued productive use of this land contributes to pest control and landscape enhancement.

Commented [BG5]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG6]: OS 171.11 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

20. Chard Road (District Plan reference 216) and Chard Farm (archaeological site F41/52).

21. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, dams, and associated domestic sites in the area (for example, archaeological sites E41/204, E41/228, and E41/279).

Mana whenua features and their locations:

22. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
23. The western part of the ONL overlaps the mapped Kawarau wāhi tūpuna. Kawarau is the traditional name for the Remarkables.
24. The very northern extent of the ONL overlaps the mapped Kawarau River wāhi tūpuna.

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

Mana whenua associations and experience:

25. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
26. As one of the highest and most prominent ranges overlooking Whakatipu Waimāori ~~Whakatipu wai māori (Lake Whakatipu)~~, closeness to the Ātua gives significance to Kawarau.
27. The Kawarau River was a traditional travel route that provided direct access between Whakatipu Waimāori ~~Whakatipu wai māori (Lake Whakatipu)~~ and Mata-au (the Clutha River).
28. The Kawarau River is a significant kāika mahika kai where weka, kākāpō, kea and tuna (eel) were gathered.
29. The mana whenua values associated with the ONL include, but may not be limited to, mauka, wāhi taoka, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

Commented [BG7]: OS 77.41 Kai Tahu ki Otago.
OS 188.41 Elisha Young-Ebert.

Commented [BG8]: OS 77.41 Kai Tahu ki Otago.
OS 188.41 Elisha Young-Ebert.

Important historic attributes and values:

30. Gold mining in the area and the associated physical remnants.
31. Historic farming, especially early pastoralism.
32. Chard Road, which was part of the old main coach link between Queenstown and Cromwell. Identified in the PDP Inventory of listed Heritage Features, QLDC Category 2 (three categories, 1 to 3, with Category 1 being the most significant).

Important shared and recognised values:

33. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
34. The popularity of the mountain slopes as an inspiration/subject for art and photography and as a 'key outlook' from Queenstown. The close proximity of the area to Queenstown and its visibility from much of the Whakatipu Basin and Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) play an important role.
35. The high popularity of the recreational 'features' listed below.

Commented [BG9]: OS 165.10 NZSki Ltd.

Important recreation attributes and values:

- 36. The Remarkables Ski Area Field for winter year-round use and recreation; access to the ski area field also offers the general public close-up, first-hand experience of the Northern Remarkables PA ONL.
- 37. The Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts) and SH 6 as key scenic routes either within the PA or in close proximity.
- 38. The popular Queenstown Park Station Fun Ride and Kawarau River Run annual events.
- 39. Walking and cycling along the Twin Rivers Trail on the north side of the Kawarau River. Although the trail is outside the Northern Remarkables PA ONL, its close proximity means that the landscape character experienced on the trail is strongly influenced by the PA.
- 40. The Lake Alta and Wye Creek Route walking tracks.
- 41. Climbing in the Rastus Burn Recreation Reserve.
- 42. Jetboating, kayaking, rafting, and fishing on the Kawarau River (ONF), for the same 'proximity' reasons to those described above.
- 43. Chard Farm winery.

Commented [BG10]: OS 165.43 NZSki Ltd.
Commented [BG11]: OS 165.2 NZSki Limited.
Commented [BG12]: OS 165.43 NZSki Ltd.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

- 44. The area's natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above) which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial and fluvial / alluvial processes.
- 45. Indigenous gully and stream plantings which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values within the Owen and Rastus Burn catchments.
- 46. More generally, the vegetation cover and land uses found within the area which reinforce the landform differences throughout the ONL, with more cultural vegetation patterns evident on the lower-lying flat areas and more natural vegetation cover apparent across elevated areas.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

- 47. Impressive and highly appealing mid to longer-range views from the Twin Rivers Trail across the Kawarau River and its floodplains to the largely open pastoral terraces and dramatic mountain slopes, peaks, ridges and valleys of the PA ONL Northern Remarkables.
- 48. Impressive close-up views across tussock-dominated slopes near the Remarkables Ski Field Road towards the deeply etched valley of the Rastus Burn and up into the valley corridor of the ski field itself.
- 49. Highly attractive close, mid and longer-range views from the Kawarau River to the edges of the pastoral terraces, backdropped by a vast and rugged mountain setting. The complex river edge landforms and vegetation patterns frame and filter views in places, contributing to views that have highly variable content and a variable character.
- 50. Complex and highly attractive mid-range views from Lake Hayes Estate, Bridesdale and Shotover Country over intervening riverside vegetation to the exposed, relatively bare, pastoral terraces and mid slopes, either side of the Rastus Burn valley and the crenelated ridges and peaks that top the range.

51. Dramatic longer-range views from the Whakatipu Basin, the Crown Range Road and Queenstown urban area (including the airport and key scenic routes), to the elevated mountain slopes, peaks and ridges.
52. In all of the views, the dominance of 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes along with the generally subservient nature of built development and impression of openness underpins the high quality of the outlook.
53. From the more distant vantage points (i.e., Queenstown, Whakatipu Basin and Crown Terrace area), views of the jagged alpine peaks and rugged incised mountain slopes comprise signature views that are critical to the identity of the wider area.
54. From more proximate vantage points, the vegetation-fringed, dynamic waters of the Kawarau River add to the locality's spectacle – acting as the centrepiece to an enclosed, U-shaped valley that becomes increasingly incised east of Morven Hill (ONF). In such views, the seemingly 'tamed' pastoral floodplains and elevated terraces on both sides of the river are also apparent, offering attractive contrast with, and counterpoint to, the sheltered river corridor and its mountain backdrop.

Naturalness attributes and values:

55. The mountain slopes which exhibit a very high level of naturalness, except in the more immediate vicinity of the Remarkables Ski Area Field and its access road. This perception is accentuated by the sheer scale and visual grandeur of the mountain range as a whole. While modifications related to the ski area field and its access road are visible from much of the catchment associated with the Kawarau River, Queenstown, and the southern Whakatipu Basin (albeit to varying degrees), their confined location and limited scale – relative to that of the Northern Remarkables in totality – limits impact on those areas and means that they are not dominant elements. These landscape modifications also make an important contribution to Queenstown's recreational values (see above), suggesting a degree of landscape 'fit'.
56. The elevated river terraces closer to the Kawarau River, where pastoral and viticultural land uses dominate, giving rise to a lower level of perceived naturalness within this part of the PA ONL Northern Remarkables. Scattered farm dwellings, rural buildings, shelterbelts, woodlots, power lines, fencing, and tracks add to this impression in places and its 'cultural' dimension is further amplified by the predominance of exotic plant species near the river, including willows, poplars, broom, gorse and rosehip.

Commented [BG13]: OS 165.43 NZSki Ltd.
OS 165.14 NZSki Ltd.

Commented [BG14]: OS 165.43 NZSki Ltd.
OS 165.14 NZSki Ltd.

Commented [BG15]: OS 165.43 NZSki Ltd.
OS 165.14 NZSki Ltd.

Memorability attributes and values:

57. Views of the steep mountain slopes and crenelated ridges and peaks that top the range are highly memorable.
- 57a Experiences associated with accessing and using the Remarkables Ski Area, which are highly memorable.

Commented [BG16]: OS 165.15 NZSki Ltd.

Transient attributes and values:

58. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain slopes.
59. The changing colours of pasture areas, which are green in some seasons and tawny brown in others.
60. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation (river edge poplars in particular).

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

61. A strong sense of the sublime associated with the Northern Remarkables' main slopes, which contribute a sense of remoteness and wildness to their wider setting. Such feelings are less apparent near the valley floor, due to the more obvious influence of rural production and the presence of residential development along the northern edge of the ONL – most notably near Bridesdale, Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country. The valley corridor reveals significant landscape transition; from the sublime and predominantly natural, to the picturesque and cultural.

Aesthetic qualities and values:

- 62. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
- 63. More specifically, this includes:
 - a. The highly attractive and striking composition created by the powerful and dramatic mountain slopes and peaks juxtaposed beside the more modified and 'tamed' river terraces.
 - b. At a broad scale, this 'natural' large-scale landscape scene forms a bold contrast with, and backdrop to, Queenstown and the Wakatipu Basin.
 - c. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. the sculpted exposed schist outcrops and scree slopes throughout the elevated slopes;
 - ii. the steeply incised Rastus and Owen Burns;
 - iii. the bold patterning of elevated fans and flat alluvial floodplains and terraces interspersed with steep escarpments;
 - iv. the picturesque glacial Lake Alta;
 - v. the relatively low-key and 'rural vernacular' or sympathetic style of the majority of built development; and
 - vi. the poplars along the river edge, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

Summary of Landscape Values
 Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

The combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA ONL Northern Remarkables can be summarised as follows:

- 64. **Very High physical values** due to the proliferation of high-value landforms, geological features along with the vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
- 65. **Very High associative values** relating to:
 - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
 - b. The historic features and associations of the area.
 - c. The very strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
 - d. The significant recreational attributes.
 - e. The significant scenic values associated with the Remarkables Ski Area Field Access Road.

Commented [BG17]: OS 165.16 NZSki Ltd.
Commented [BG18]: OS 165.16 NZSki Ltd.

66. **Very High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape’s formative processes.
- b. The very high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its dramatic and highly appealing visual character. The attractive composition of both natural and rural/farmed landscapes, with a strong focus on the mountains (and river), are critical features of the area. The proximity of the area to Queenstown, the Whakatipu Basin, key gateways/scenic routes, accessibility and popular recreational features, which allows the experience of these values along with the area’s transient values, also play a role.
- c. An impression of high naturalness arising from the dominance of the more natural landscape and the generally relatively modest or visually recessive nature of built development.
- d. A strong sense of remoteness and wildness associated with large-scale steep slopes and rugged peaks, which is heightened as a consequence of the area’s close proximity to Queenstown and the Whakatipu Basin.

Commented [BG19]: OS 165.17 NZSki Ltd.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONL Northern Remarkables for a range of activities is set out below.

- 67. **Commercial recreational activities** – some landscape capacity for small scale and low key activities (including at Chard Farm) that: integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; are designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protect the area’s ONL values.
- 68. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** – some landscape capacity for activities on the very gently sloping to flat and low-lying terraces and floodplains (including at Chard Farm) that are: designed to be difficult to see in views from the Kawarau River, Twin River Trail, Bridesdale, Shotover Country and Lake Hayes Estate; are of a modest or sympathetic scale; have a low-key ‘rural’ or ‘non-urban’ character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protect the area’s ONL values. No landscape capacity on the mountain slopes and fans except for sensitively located and designed glamping activities.
- 69. **Urban expansions** – no landscape capacity.
- 70. **Intensive agriculture** – no landscape capacity.
- 71. **Earthworks** – limited landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farming, viticulture, existing recreational facilities (including the Remarkables Ski Area), natural hazard mitigation risk or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- 72. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral and viticultural land uses, limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled or sympathetically located and designed buildings that reinforce existing rural character (including viticultural land use) and maintain openness where openness is an important existing landscape characteristic.
- 73. **Mineral extraction** – no landscape capacity for extraction larger than farm/vineyard-scale quarries. Limited capacity for farm/vineyard-scale quarries that protect the naturalness and aesthetic attributes and values of the ONL.

Commented [BG20]: Numbering to be corrected in the Capacity section so that it is consistent with the other PA Schedules (ie uses roman numerals).

Commented [BG21]: OS 171.17 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG22]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG23]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2

Commented [BG24]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG25]: OS 171.17 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG26]: OS 171.18 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG27]: OS 171.18 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG28]: OS 171.18 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG29]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2

Commented [BG30]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG31]: OS 171.17 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG32]: OS 171.18 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG33]: OS 171.17 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG34]: OS 165.20 NZSki Ltd.

Commented [BG35]: OS 171.19 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG36]: OS 171.17 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG37]: OS 171.20 Queenstown Park Ltd.

Commented [BG38]: OS 171.17 Queenstown Park Ltd.

74. **Transport infrastructure** – **very limited** landscape capacity for trails and 'low key' rural roading that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; **and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement, and protect the area's ONL values. No landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.**
- Commented [BG39]:** OS 171.17 Queenstown Park Ltd.
- Commented [BG40]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2
- Commented [BG41]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
- Commented [BG42]:** OS 171.17 Queenstown Park Ltd.
75. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of **the National Grid and utilities such as overhead lines, or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.**
- Commented [BG43]:** OS 86.10 Melissa Brook OS 70.28 Transpower New Zealand Limited.
- 75a. **Renewable energy generation** – **no** landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation. **Limited capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation. Limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation on the flat and low-lying terraces and floodplains **or in association with existing structures in the Remarkables Ski Area.**
- Commented [BG44]:** OS 165.24 NZSki Ltd.
- Commented [BG45]:** OS 171.17 Queenstown Park Ltd.
- Commented [BG46]:** OS 165.24 NZSki Ltd.
- Commented [BG47]:** OS 171.17 Queenstown Park Ltd.
76. **Production forestry** – **no** landscape capacity.
- Commented [BG48]:** OS 165.24 NZSki Ltd.
77. **Rural living** – **very limited** landscape capacity for activities on the flat and low-lying terraces and floodplains that are: designed to be difficult to see in views from the Kawarau River, Twin River Trail, Bridesdale, Shotover Country and Lake Hayes Estate; are of a modest scale; have a low-key 'rural' character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; **and enhance public access, and protect the area's ONL values. No** landscape capacity on the mountain slopes and fans.
- Commented [BG49]:** Typographical correction.
- Commented [BG50]:** OS 171.17 Queenstown Park Ltd.
78. **Gondolas Passenger Lift Systems** – **limited** landscape capacity to improve public access to focal recreational areas higher in the mountains via non-vehicular transportation modes such as gondolas, provided they are positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, are located and designed to be recessive in the landscape **and protect the area's ONL values.**
- Commented [BG51]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.
- Commented [BG52]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
- Commented [BG53]:** OS 171.17 Queenstown Park Ltd.
- Commented [BG54]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
- Commented [BG55]:** OS 171.17 Queenstown Park Ltd.
- Commented [BG56]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

21.22.14 Northern Remarkables PA ONL Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables PA ONL Schedule”. New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text: relates to a submission point that has not be captured in the “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables PA ONF Schedule”. This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **One example identified.**

Submissions Summary

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS70.28	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point 75 utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.14 Capacity (ix) as follows: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of <u>the National Grid and</u> utilities such as overhead lines, <u>or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.</u> NB the response to OS 86.10 has been coordinated with the response to OS 70.28	Accept submission subject to refinement.
OS77.24	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.14 paragraph 78 gondolas be amended to include the words: ...preserve the natural	Refer B Gilbert EIC for commentary in relation to the request for this standard wording across the PA Schedules.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>character of wetlands, lakes, rivers and their margins; protect mana whenua associations and values, particularly for those areas identified as wāhi tūpuna, statutory acknowledgements or nohoaka;... .</p>		
OS77.41	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	<p>That landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables paragraphs 26 and 27 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.14 as follows:</p> <p>26. As one of the highest and most prominent ranges overlooking Whakatipu Waimāori Whakatipu wai māori (Lake Whakatipu), closeness to the Ātua gives significance to Kawarau.</p> <p>27. The Kawarau River was a traditional travel route that provided direct access between Whakatipu Waimāori Whakatipu wai māori, (Lake Whakatipu) and Mata-au (the Clutha River).</p>	Accept submission.
OS86.10	Melissa Brook	Oppose	<p>That landscape capacity 21.22.14 paragraph 75 utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended to: limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as an overhead lines or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments which cannot be screened, these should be co-located with existing infrastructure or designed and located to reduce their visual</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.14 Capacity (ix) as follows:</p> <p>Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of the National Grid and utilities such as overhead lines, or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.</p> <p>NB the response to OS 86.10 has been coordinated with the response to OS 70.28</p>	Accept submission subject to refinement.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			prominence to the extent practicable, recognising the operational and functional requirements of regionally significant infrastructure means this may not be practicable in all instances.		
OS 165.2	Ben Farrell on behalf of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedules be amended to acknowledge that ski areas are used all year round for a range of activities, not just winter-based activities.	Amend Schedule 21.22.14 [36] as follows: The Remarkables Ski Field for winter year-round use and recreation; access to the ski field also offers the general public close-up, first-hand experience of the Northern Remarkables PA ONL.	Accept submission in part.
OS165.8	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 paragraph 9 be amended to delete reference to the series of small tarns in the vicinity of Remarkables Ski Field to read: Various tarns.	No technical evidence has provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), along with the PA Schedules work, I do not consider that this text change is needed. I also note that the PA Schedules have been reviewed by a geomorphology expert with that expert supporting the notified text.	Reject submission.
OS165.9	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 Important Land-use patterns and features at paragraph 16 be amended to add '; and various communication infrastructure on exposed ridgelines.' at the end of the sentence.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The applicant is encouraged to provide evidence on the location and nature of the existing communication infrastructure so that it can be appropriately referenced in Schedule 21.22.14.	Reject submission.
OS165.10	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 Important shared and recognised values at	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>paragraph 34 be amended to read: The popularity of the mountain slopes as an inspiration for education, conferencing, art, filming and photography and as a 'key outlook' from Queenstown. The very close proximity of this recreational feature to Queenstown's urban areas and its visibility from much of the Whakatipu Basin play an important role.</p>	<p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I consider that the following amendment is appropriate.</p> <p>34. The popularity of the mountain slopes as an inspiration/subject for art and photography and as a 'key outlook' from Queenstown. The close proximity of the area to Queenstown and its visibility from much of the Whakatipu Basin and Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) play an important role.</p> <p>The applicant is encouraged to provide evidence with respect to the widely acknowledged importance of the area as an educational resource, conferencing location and filming location so that here attributes can be appropriately acknowledged in Schedule 21.22.14.</p>	
OS165.11	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	<p>That landscape schedule 21.22.14 Important shared and recognised values at paragraph 35 be amended to remove reference to 'recreational' so that it reads: The high popularity of the 'features' listed below.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is proposed in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I do not consider that this text change is needed. I also note that the PA Schedules have been reviewed by a recreation and tourism expert with that expert supporting the notified text.</p>	Reject submission.
OS165.12	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	<p>That landscape schedule 21.22.14 important recreation attributes and values at paragraph 36 Remarkables Ski Field description be amended to: The Remarkables Ski Area Sub Zone which provides for</p>	<p>No technical evidence is proposed in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I do not consider that this text change is needed.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			the ongoing use and development of that area.		
OS165.13	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 Important recreation attributes and values at paragraph 37 be amended to include access tracks and read as follows: The Remarkables Ski Area Access Road, access tracks (and lookouts) and SH 6 as key scenic routes either within the PA or in close proximity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The applicant is encouraged to provide evidence on the location and nature of existing access tracks (other than the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road) so that they can be appropriately referenced and described in Schedule 21.22.14.	Reject submission.
OS165.14	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 Naturalness attributes and values at paragraph 55 be amended to reference the ski area access road, not ski field road as set out in the third sentence of the paragraph.	Addressed in response to OS 165.43.	Accept submission.
OS165.15	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 Memorability attributes and values have an additional paragraph after paragraph 57 that reads: 57A Experiences associated with accessing and using the Remarkables Ski Area, which are highly memorable.	Amend Schedule 21.22.14 as follows: <u>57A Experiences associated with accessing and using the Remarkables Ski Area, which are highly memorable.</u>	Accept submission.
OS165.16	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 Very High associative values at	Amend Schedule 21.22.14 [65] as follows: (e) The <u>significant</u> scenic values associated with the Remarkables Ski <u>Area and Field</u> Access Road.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			paragraph 65d. and e. are amended to read: d. the very strong and significant recreational attributes. e. The very strong and significant scenic values associated with the Remarkables Ski Area and Access Road.	For completeness, the descriptor 'strong' is not considered necessary, where the term 'significant' is used.	
OS165.17	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 Very High perceptual values at paragraph 66b. be amended to include accessibility as follows: ... key gateways/scenic routes, accessibility and popular recreational features... .	Amend Schedule 21.22.14 [66] as follows: (b) The very high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its dramatic and highly appealing visual character. The attractive composition of both natural and rural/farmed landscapes, with a strong focus on the mountains (and river), are critical features of the area. The proximity of the area to Queenstown, the Whakatipu Basin, key gateways/scenic routes, accessibility and popular recreational features, which allows the experience of these values along with the area's transient values, also play a role.	Accept submission.
OS165.18	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.14 paragraph 67 commercial recreational activities be amended to delete the words 'and protect the area's ONL values'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I do not consider that this text change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS165.19	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.14 paragraph 68 visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended from no landscape capacity to read: Some landscape capacity on the mountain slopes and fans associated with the Remarkables Ski Area.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I do not consider that this text change is appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS165.20	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.14 paragraph 71 earthworks be amended from limited to some and read: Earthworks - Some landscape capacity for earthworks associated with Remarkables Ski Area, farming, viticulture, recreation activities, or public access tracks, that are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I consider the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.14 [71] is appropriate:</p> <p>Earthworks – limited landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farming, viticulture, existing recreational facilities (including the Remarkables Ski Area), or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS165.21	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 paragraph 72 farm buildings be amended from limited to some landscape capacity for modestly scales buildings that reinforce existing rural character (including viticultural land use) and maintain openness where openness is an important existing landscape characteristic.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I do not consider that this text change is appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.
OS165.22	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.14 paragraph 74 Transport infrastructure be amended to change from very limited to some landscape capacity and include the words: associated with commercial recreation including Gondolas, and delete the	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Gondolas are specifically referenced at Schedule 21.22.14 [79] and do not need to be addressed under transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report),</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			words 'and protect the area's ONF values' and 'No landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.	I do not consider that the text changes requested in this submission point are appropriate.	
OS165.23	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.14 paragraph 75 Utilities and significant infrastructure be amended from limited to some landscape capacity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I consider that a rating of limited rather than some landscape capacity is appropriate.</p> <p>The response to OS 86.10 may go some way to addressing the submitters concerns in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS165.24	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.14 paragraph 76 Renewable energy generation be amended from no and limited to some landscape capacity and read: Some landscape capacity for small and community scale renewable energy generation.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I generally do not consider that the text changes requested in this submission point are appropriate. However, I consider that the wording of Schedule 21.22.14 with respect to renewable energy, should be amended as follows to avoid confusion and to allow for the likes of small scale solar or wind energy in association with the existing structures in the Ski Area:</p> <p>75A Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation. Limited capacity for discreetly located and small scale renewable energy generation. Limited landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation on the flat and low-lying terraces and floodplains or in association with existing structures in the Remarkables Ski Area.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS165.25	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.14 paragraph 79 Gondolas be amended from limited to some landscape capacity with the following words deleted: provided they are positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, are located and designed to be recessive in the landscape, and protect the area's ONL values.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I do not consider that the text changes requested in this submission point are appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.
OS165.43	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables be amended to change references from ski field to ski area.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.14 as follows:</p> <p>36. The Remarkables Ski Area Field for winter use and recreation; access to the ski area field also offers the general public close-up, first-hand experience of the Northern Remarkables PA ONL.</p> <p>55. The mountain slopes which exhibit a very high level of naturalness, except in the more immediate vicinity of the Remarkables Ski Area Field and its access road. This perception is accentuated by the sheer scale and visual grandeur of the mountain range as a whole. While modifications related to the ski area field and its access road are visible from much of the catchment associated with the Kawarau River, Queenstown, and the southern Whakatipu Basin (albeit to varying degrees), their confined location and limited scale – relative to that of the Northern Remarkables in totality – limits impact on those areas and means that they are not dominant elements. These landscape modifications also make an important contribution to Queenstown's recreational values (see above), suggesting a degree of landscape 'fit'.</p> <p>NB the requested change in reference to the access road as the 'ski area access road' has not been made as it is technically incorrect.</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS171.9	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Support	That paragraphs 14 and 15 of landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables are retained as notified (with exception of amendment to 'feral red deer' proposed in submission 171.10) .	Addressed in response to OS 171.10.	Accept submission.
OS171.10	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Oppose	That the term red deer used in paragraph 14 of landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables is amended to 'feral red deer'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.14 [14] as follows: Animal pest species include feral red deer, feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.	Accept submission.
OS171.11	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Oppose	That a further paragraph (new paragraph 20) is added to the section on 'Important land-use patterns and features' of landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables to state the following: 20. Queenstown Park Station is a large intensively farmed landholding within the ONL, the continued productive use of this land contributes to pest control and landscape enhancement.	Amend Schedule 21.22.14 as follows: 19a. Queenstown Park Station is a large, farmed landholding within the ONL, the continued productive use of this land contributes to pest control and landscape enhancement. The reference to the station as being intensively farmed has not been accepted due to the poor alignment of the existing landuse with the explanation of 'intensive farming' that has been added to the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble.	Accept submission in part.
OS171.12	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Oppose	That paragraphs 22 and 24 are moved further down the schedule to the 'Associative Attributes and Values' / 'Mana whenua associations and experience' of	No technical evidence has provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.14 has been reviewed by a cultural expert with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables.		
OS171.13	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables paragraphs 27 and 28 and reference to ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka identified in paragraph 29 relate to the Kawarau Outstanding Natural Feature and not the Remarkables Outstanding Natural Landscape and should be amended as follows: The mana whenua values associated with the ONL include, but may not be limited to, manuka, and wahi taoka.	No technical evidence has provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.14 has been reviewed by a cultural expert with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS171.14	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Oppose	That the description of landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables as a 'key outlook' from Queenstown (paragraph 34) is deleted as this confuses the northern Remarkables with the iconic western Remarkables. The reworded paragraph 34 would read as follows: 34. The popularity of the mountain slopes as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I do not consider that this text change is needed. In this context, the broad term of 'Queenstown' is taken to include Frankton, Quail Rise, Shotover Country and Lake Hayes Estate. The northern mountain range is highly visible and plays a key role in shaping visual amenity values from these locales.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS171.15	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Oppose	<p>That paragraph 61 (second sentence) of landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables is amended as follows to recognise the influence of rural production on the south side of the River:</p> <p>'...Such feelings are less apparent near the valley floor, due to the more obvious influence of rural production, mostly on the South side and the presence of residential development along the northern edge of the ONL - most notably near Bridesdale, Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country....'</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>It is expected that the suggested reference to the south side relates to Schedule 21.22.9 Kawarau River ONF as it does not make sense in relation to Schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables.</p>	Reject submission
OS171.16	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Oppose	<p>That paragraph 64 of landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables is amended to the following:</p> <p>Very High physical values due to the proliferation of high-value landforms, geological features along with the vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area, as well as pastoral and viticultural land uses, scattered farm dwellings, rural buildings, shelterbelts,</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I do not consider that this text change is needed as these landscape elements are not critical to the rating of 'very high' physical values. It is also noted that the various landscape modifications suggested for inclusion are referenced elsewhere in Schedule 21.22.14 which may provide the submitter with some comfort in this regard (i.e. they are an acknowledged and accepted part of the landscape).</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			woodlots, power lines, fencing, and tracks, and exotic plant species near the river.		
OS171.17	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Support	That the landscape capacities included in landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables for commercial recreation activities (67), visitor accommodation and tourism related activities (68), earthworks (71), transport infrastructure (74), farm/vineyard-scale quarries (part of 73), farm buildings (72), utilities and regionally significant infrastructure (75), renewable energy generation (i), rural living (77), and gondolas (78) are retained as notified.	In agreement, no response required.	Accept submission.
OS171.18	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Oppose	That paragraph 68 on visitor accommodation and tourism related activities of landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables is amended as follows: Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - some landscape capacity for activities on the easy contour and low-lying terraces and floodplains (including Chard Farm) that are: located to optimise the screening	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I do not consider that all of the text changes suggested are appropriate. I support the following refinements to Schedule 21.22.14 [68] as follows: Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – some landscape capacity for activities on the <u>very gently sloping to</u> flat and low-lying terraces and floodplains (including at Chard Farm) that are: designed to be difficult to see in views from the Kawarau River, Twin River Trail,	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; are of a sympathetic scale; have an appropriate 'non-urban' character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values. No landscape capacity on the steep mountain slopes and fans except for 'glamping' activities.</p>	<p>Bridesdale, Shotover Country and Lake Hayes Estate; are of a modest or sympathetic scale; have a low-key 'rural' or non-urban character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values. No landscape capacity on the mountain slopes and fans, except for sensitively located and designed glamping activities.</p>	
OS171.19	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Oppose	<p>That paragraph 71 of landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables relating to the landscape capacity for earthworks is amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for earthworks necessary to mitigate natural hazard risks as follows:</p> <p>Earthworks - limited landscape capacity for earthworks and trails that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns, or that are necessary to mitigate natural hazard risks.</p>	<p>Accept submission subject to refinement of text to better fit with the intention of appropriately managing the effects of earthworks associated with mitigation natural hazards.</p> <p>Earthworks – limited landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farming, viticulture, existing recreational facilities, natural hazard risk mitigation or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.</p>	<p>Accept submission (subject to refinement).</p>

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS171.20	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Oppose	<p>That paragraph 72 of landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables on farm buildings is amended as follows:</p> <p>Farm buildings - in those areas of the ONL with pastoral and viticultural land uses, limited landscape capacity for sympathetic scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character (including viticultural land use) and maintain openness where openness is an important existing landscape characteristic.</p>	<p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I support the following refinements to Schedule 21.22.14 [72] as follows:</p> <p>Farm buildings – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral and viticultural land uses, limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled or sympathetically located and designed buildings that reinforce existing rural character (including viticultural land use) and maintain openness where openness is an important existing landscape characteristic.</p>	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS171.21	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Oppose	<p>That the reference to 'ONF' in paragraph 74 of landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables is corrected to 'ONL'</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.14 [74] as follows:</p> <p>Transport infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for trails and 'low key' rural roading that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONL values. No landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.</p>	Accept submission.
OS171.22	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Oppose	<p>That paragraph 77 of landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables on rural living is amended as follows:</p> <p>Rural living - some landscape capacity for activities on the easy contour</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), PDP Stage 1 Remarkables Park Limited appeal, and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (which referenced the Coneburn Report), I do not consider that the text changes requested in relation to</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			and low-lying terraces that are: located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; are of a sympathetic scale; have a low-key 'rural' character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONL values. No landscape capacity on the steep mountain slopes and fans.	the 'matters' that are likely to ensure rural living protects the landscape values of the PA are appropriate.	
OS171.23	Rowan Ashton On Behalf Of Queenstown Park Limited	Oppose	That the mapping of the Northern Remarkables Outstanding Natural Landscape is extended to match the reductions in the Outstanding Natural Feature as set out in Annexure B of the submission and relief sought by submission #171.6.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. It is acknowledged that some minor refinement to the boundary between the PA ONF and the PA ONL may be appropriate on the submitter's land. The submitter is encouraged to provide their revised linework for the ONF/L boundary on a plan with 1m contours so that it can be carefully reviewed.	Reject submission.
OS188.25	Elisha Young- Ebert	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.14 paragraph 78 gondolas be amended to include the words: ...preserve the natural character of wetlands, lakes, rivers and their margins; protect mana whenua associations and values, particularly for those areas identified as wāhi tūpuna, statutory acknowledgements or nohoaka;... .	Addressed in response to OS 77.24.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS188.41	Elisha Young-Ebert	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables paragraphs 26 and 27 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Addressed in response to OS 77.41.	Accept submission.

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(j) 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL

21.22.15 PA ONL Central Whakatipu Basin: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL encompasses the steep western end southern slopes of Mount Dewar and the steep south-facing slopes of Coronet Peak, Brow Peak and Pt 1120 near Big Hill, taking in German Hill and Pt 675. Collectively the mountain slopes form the northern backdrop to the Whakatipu Basin and Arrowtown. The western edge of the PA ONL adjoins Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA ONF and the eastern end adjoins the Haehaenui (Arrow River) PA ONF.

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. The steeply sloping, foliated, schistose mountain landforms of Mount Dewar (1,310m), Skippers Saddle (1,036m), Coronet Peak (1,651m), Brow Peak (1,456m) and Pt 1,120 near Big Hill which form part of the wall of mountains framing the northern side of the Whakatipu Basin.
2. Scree slopes throughout the elevated, very steep and rugged areas towards the eastern end of the area.
3. The secondary mountain landforms of German Hill (780m) and Pt 716 that enclose the southern side of Sawpit Gully (north of Arrowtown).
4. The secondary mountain ridgeline on the south side of Bush Creek (to the north of Millbrook), that takes in Pt 897, Pt 929, Pt 842 and Pt 876.
5. The ridgeline descending south-westwards from Mount Dewar summit to Pt 965 and which frame the eastern side of Devils Creek.
6. A small roche moutonnée along the foot of the Coronet Peak slopes between the Skippers Road junction and Willowbank, all on the north side of Malaghans Road. A well-preserved relic glacial landform from the last ice age. This feature exists as several landforms within the PA. Identified as a Geopreservation Site of national scientific, aesthetic, or educational value and being vulnerable to significant damage by human related activities.
7. Exposed schist outcrops and bluffs throughout the south-facing mountain slopes and along the east side of the small ice-melt basin in the vicinity of Littles Road.
8. Glacial till deposits and alluvial fans at the toe of the steep mountain slopes framing the northern side of the Whakatipu Basin and throughout the more gently sloping lower reaches of gullies near German Hill.

Important hydrological features:

9. Devils Creek and its steeply incised tributaries draining the south-western flanks of Mount Dewar and the northern slopes of the secondary ridgeline descending from Mount Dewar to Pt 965, to Kimiākau (Shotover River).
10. The unnamed relatively gently sloping streams and kettle lake in the ice-melt basin around Littles Road which drain south-westward to Kimiākau (Shotover River).

11. The numerous steeply incised streams draining the southern side of the range extending from Mount Dewar across to Coronet Peak, including Dan O'Connell Creek, Station Creek and McMullan Creek.
12. The numerous unnamed streams draining the southern slopes of Brow Peak to Bush Creek, which discharges to the Arrow River.
13. The series of unnamed streams draining to Sawpit Gully and the Haehaenui (Arrow River) from the mountain slopes extending between Brow Peak and Pt 1120 (near Big Hill) and German Hill.
14. The series of small tarns in the vicinity of Coronet Peak ski field and near Skippers Saddle.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

15. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. Pockets of mountain beech forest remnants confined to gullies in the Bush Creek and Sawpit Gully catchments behind Arrowtown, on the Coronet Peak front faces and in the Devils Creek catchment on Mount Dewar.
 - b. Swathes of beech restoration plantings throughout Mount Dewar (as part of consented development).
 - c. Extensive areas of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri (*Discaria toumatou*) and mingimingi (*Coprosma propinqua*) occur in the mid to upper reaches of the Bush Creek catchment, Sawpit Gully catchment and across the steep terrain associated with the lower Haehaenui (Arrow River) Gorge. Scattered patches of grey shrubland occur across the lower slopes of Coronet peak Peak and Mount Dewar.
 - d. Above about 900 m the vegetation is dominated by snow tussock grassland and, in places, patches of *Dracophyllum* shrubland.
 - e. Indigenous vegetation is more extensive and diverse towards the Arrowtown end of the PA.
 - f. Rough to semi-improved pasture occurs on the mid to lower slopes of Coronet Peak mixed with patches of short tussock grasslands and grey shrubland.
 - g. Woody exotic weeds prevail throughout the PA but are most extensive on the lower slopes of Mount Dewar, where there are dense thickets of mature hawthorn, sweet briar, broom, elderberry and scattered wilding conifers.
16. Rocky outcrops, beech forest, grey shrublands and snow tussock grasslands provide a diverse range of habitats for New Zealand falcon, New Zealand pipit, South Island tomtit. Grey warbler, skinks and geckos and a diverse assemblage of native invertebrates.
17. Areas of production forestry (Douglas fir) occur:
 - a. across the south-facing slopes of the secondary mountain ridgeline on the south side of Bush Creek (to the north of Millbrook) that includes Pt 897, Pt 929, Pt 842, and Pt 876.
 - b. on the lower slopes of Mount Dewar.
18. Wilding conifer spread in the Bush Creek and Sawpit Gully catchments, across Big Hill and in the Devils Creek catchment from areas of production of forestry. Control measures are being implemented.
19. Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, mice and rats.

Commented [BG1]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG2]: Typographical correction.

Important land-use patterns and features:

20. Human modification which is concentrated throughout the low-lying glacier carved terrace areas along the northern edge of the Whakatipu Basin; on the western flanks of Mount Dewar and across the south-facing slopes of the secondary mountain ridgeline on the south side of Bush Creek (to the north of Millbrook) that includes Pt 897, Pt 929, Pt 842, and Pt 876 where production forestry dominates; across Mount Dewar more generally, where development is anticipated; on the elevated south-facing slopes of Coronet Peak where the ski area field (including carparks, buildings, structures, infrastructure) and roading (including Skippers Road, which provides access to the Skippers Bungy site, outside the PA) is located; and throughout the western portion of the PA at Coronet Peak Road.
21. Built development patterning which includes a very limited scattering of rural and rural living dwellings around the margins of Arthurs Point; the scattering of small-scale rural living and visitor accommodation development (including commercial recreation uses, cabins, chalets, amenity facilities and a lodge) within regenerating beech forest at across the lower southern slopes of Mount Dewar along with approximately 50km of publicly accessible hiking and biking trails; and the occasional farm building or dwelling towards the eastern end of the unit (adjacent the southern boundary of the PA). Generally, development is characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings that are well integrated by plantings and remain subservient to the more 'natural' landscape patterns. Elsewhere, the modest scale of buildings, together with their distinctly working rural character and sparse arrangement, ensures that they sit comfortably into the setting.
22. Pastoral farming including rural and farm buildings (as described above), fencing, shelterbelts, tracks, ponds and the like.
23. The location of the Coronet Peak Ski Field Area (inclusive of all associated activities and built development) across the elevated south-facing slopes, together with the exposed nature of the access road climbing up the steep slopes at the western end of the area, make this development prominent in views from much of the western and northern portion of the Whakatipu Basin. Night-time lighting of the ski field during the winter season adds to its prominence.
24. The Shotover Canyon Track, the Mount Dewar Track, Hot Rod and Devils Creek track on Mount Dewar; the Dan O'Connell Track and Coronet Face Water Race Trail across the lower slopes of Coronet Peak; the ridgeline track linking between Coronet Peak and Big Hill that runs along the northern edge of the PA; the Bush Creek Track between Coronet Peak and Arrowtown; the Te Araroa Trail that winds its way to the west of German Hill (between Arrowtown and Big Hill) and the Sawpit Gully Track; the Rude Rock, Zoot, DH, XC mountain bike trails within the Coronet Peak ski area. Associated with these tracks are signage, stiles, and seating, typically of a modest scale and low-key character.
25. The general absence of rural and rural living buildings throughout the eastern end of the PA.
26. Infrastructure is evident within the corridor and includes: the power line (on poles) traversing the steep slopes up to Coronet Ski Area and Coronet Peak Field; telecommunication masts at the top of Mount Dewar; forestry tracks; farm fencing; and farm tracks.
27. The Arthurs Point Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) which adjoins the south-western margins of the PA and the Arrowtown UGB which adjoins the south-eastern end of the PA.
28. The Coronet Peak Ski Area Sub Zone which provides for the ongoing use and development of that area for ski field related activities.
29. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include: the urban residential and commercial development adjoining the south-western edge of the PA at Arthurs Point; the urban residential and commercial development adjoining the south-eastern edges of the area at Arrowtown; the rural living development throughout the western and northern sides of the Whakatipu Basin; Millbrook Resort towards the north-eastern end of the Whakatipu Basin; and Malaghans Road which runs along the northern side of the Whakatipu Basin, roughly parallel with the PA.

Commented [BG3]: OS 165.26 NZSki Limited.

Commented [BG4]: OS 84.8 Sir Robert Stewart.
OS 96.3 Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership.

Commented [BG5]: OS 165.27 NZSki Limited.

Commented [BG6]: OS 165.28 NZSki Limited.

Commented [BG7]: OS 165.28 NZSki Limited.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations are:

30. The Macetown Heritage Area Overlay (MHAO) which extends throughout the eastern end of the PA roughly coinciding with Sawpit Gully. This forms part of the much larger area of heritage significance due to its concentration of historic gold mining sites, focussed on the deserted mining town of Macetown, which span from the earliest exploitation of gold in the Arrowtown area in 1862, through to the end of gold mining in the 1930s. Such a continuum of mining activity – first alluvial then hard-rock or quartz – has left a distinct and intelligible landscape with diverse features and stories linked by a series of mining tracks that still allow access to this remote and stunning countryside. Macetown (outside the PA) is highly significant, representing the surviving remains of a remote 19th century mining village to which stories are still attached and some history has been traced to its founders, occupants, and demise. Situated within its larger mining heritage context (which includes part of the PA), Macetown can be interpreted as part of a community of gold mining activity sites, which are a key part of the wider Otago gold mining story.
31. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, dams, etc., and associated domestic sites in the area (for example, archaeological sites F41/288, F41/851, and F41/653).
32. Cockburn Homestead, Malaghans Road (District Plan reference 125).
33. William Fox Memorial, Police Camp Building, and Stone Wall, Arrowtown (District Plan references 309, 375, and 311).
34. Macetown Road (District Plan reference 6).
35. Scholes Tunnel (District Plan reference 304).
36. Coronet Peak ski area.

Mana whenua features and their locations:

37. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

Mana whenua associations and experience:

38. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.

Important historic attributes and values:

39. Gold mining in the area and the associated physical remnants (including Skippers Road). The sites associated with Macetown represent a particularly rich archaeological landscape.
40. Early pastoral farming across the area.
41. The historic significance of Coronet Peak (New Zealand's first commercial ski field) as one of New Zealand's earliest commercial ski fields.

Commented [BG8]: OS 165.30 NZSki Limited.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

42. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.

43. The popularity of the postcard views from Coronet Peak and the ski field access road (which has several lookout points) out over the Whakatipu Basin to the Remarkables, as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.
44. The identity of Coronet Peak Ski Area Field as an integral part of the Whakatipu Basin. The very close proximity of this recreational feature to Queenstown urban area and its visibility from much of the Whakatipu Basin (and including from the airport, particularly at night when the ski field is lit for night skiing) play an important a role.
45. Skippers Road is popular with commercial tourism activity providers using the access road for scenic tours and white-water rafting. The road is used for mountain bike access out of the valley.
46. The identity of the sequence of mountains stretching from Mount Dewar across to Big Hill as a dramatic (northern) backdrop to the Whakatipu Basin (including Arrowtown).
47. The identity of Mount Dewar as part of the dramatic backdrop to Arthurs Point.

Commented [BG9]: OS 165.31 NZSki Ltd.

Important recreation attributes and values:

48. Very popular year-round destination for skiing, walking, running, mountain biking, paragliding, hiking and enjoying the view from the various lookouts and café/restaurant facilities at Coronet Peak.
49. Aotearoa's National Walkway, the Te Araroa Trail passes through the eastern side of the ONL via the Motatapu Alpine Track connecting with the Whakatipu Track heading to Lake Hayes.
50. Walking, running, and mountain biking on trails and tracks in the area.
51. Coronet Peak Road, Skippers Road and Malaghans Road as key scenic routes either within the PA or in close proximity.
52. The recreation area to the north of Millbrook.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

53. The area's natural landforms, land type, and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial processes.
54. Indigenous gully plantings and remnant beech stands which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values throughout the area.
55. Good examples of landscape evolution in response to slope and fluvial processes and alternating climatic conditions.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

56. The postcard views from various lookouts on Coronet Peak Road and the ski area field out over the Whakatipu Basin, Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes), Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), the Remarkables and the broader mountain context.
57. The spectacular panoramic views from Mount Dewar and the summit of Coronet Peak, of the Whakatipu Basin to the south and the rugged and dramatic expanse of the Harris Mountain range to the north.

Commented [BG10]: OS 165.31 NZSki Ltd.

58. The highly attractive short to long-range views from parts of the Devils Creek Track, the Hot Rod, the Mount Dewar Track, the Dan O'Connell Track, the Coronet Face Water Race Trail, the ridgeline track linking Coronet Peak and Big Hill that runs along the northern edge of the PA, the Bush Creek Track, the Te Araroa Trail west of German Hill, and the Sawpit Gully Track out over the Whakatipu Basin, the Remarkables and the broader mountain context.
59. The appealing short to long-range views from the Shotover Canyon Track and parts of the Devils Creek Track along the gorge of the Shotover Corridor, across the rugged and largely undeveloped slopes of Bowen Peak and northwards to The Point.
60. The dramatic mid and long-range views from Arthurs Point, the Kimiākau (Shotover River) ONF, Arrowtown, the western and northern parts of the Whakatipu Basin (including Malaghans Road), and sections of the Queenstown Trail network coinciding with those parts of the basin, to the coherent sequence of mountains framing the northern side of the basin. In these views the continuity of the large-scale and largely open, dramatic landforms, together with their seemingly undeveloped appearance (as a consequence of the diminishing influence of distance in relation to the ski field and access road), means that the PA is of critical importance in shaping the visual amenity values of the area from which they are viewed.
61. The engaging early evening views from Frankton and the airport to the Coronet Peak Ski Area Field when the ski field is lit for night skiing.
62. The appealing long-range views from more distant elevated vantage points such as the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road, Tobins Track (east of Arrowtown), and the Crown Range Zig Zag lookout in which the scale and shape of the glacial valley landscape, of which the PA is a part, is legible in its entirety and confers a sense of grandeur to the outlook.
63. The highly engaging short-range views from Littles Road, Arthurs Point Road and trails in the vicinity across the pastoral ice-melt basin to the dramatic and rugged bluffs and rocky outcrops near Pt 558.
64. In all of the views, the dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONL, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the ONL and, in the case of the western and eastern ends of the area, the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

Commented [BG11]: OS 165.33 NZSki Ltd.

Naturalness attributes and values:

65. The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL set within an urban (Arthurs Point and Arrowtown) or mixed working rural and rural living (Whakatipu Basin) context, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to its forestry, pastoral (including farm buildings, rural dwellings, ponds, fencing, tracks, shelterbelts and the like), rural living/visitor accommodation (including the consented development across the lower southern slopes of Mount Dewar), recreational (including the ski area and access road), and infrastructure uses are visible, the sheer scale of the continuous high mountain-scape and extent of restoration planting that forms part of the consented development at Mount Dewar recreational, and infrastructure uses are visible, the sheer scale of the continuous high mountain-scape ensures that, for the most part, these elements remain subservient to more natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes.
66. The irregular patterning and proliferation of grey shrubland, exposed rock faces and scrub in places adds to the perception of naturalness.
67. While the ski area field and its access road form a bold manmade element on the southern slopes of Mount Dewar and Coronet Peak, the connection this development establishes and enables between the mountain setting and the inhabited Whakatipu Valley adds a degree of interest to the view, meaning that it is not an overwhelmingly negative visual element. The scale of the seemingly 'undeveloped' mountain setting within which this development is viewed, together with its identity as a popular recreational feature, also play a role in this regard. Because these landscape modifications also make an important contribution

Commented [BG12]: OS 84.8 Sir Robert Stewart. OS 96.4 Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership.

Commented [BG13]: OS 165.31 NZSki Ltd.

to Queenstown's recreational values (see above), there is a degree of landscape 'fit' associated with them. During the ski season the patterning of lights throughout the groomed slopes forms an engaging element.

68. The forestry plantings and wilding spread at the western and eastern ends of the area (noting that recreational landuses are anticipated across the slopes at the eastern end, north of Millbrook) contribute a reduced perception of naturalness. However, the underlying natural (and largely unmodified) schistose landform character of the area remains legible and dominant, thus ensuring these parts of the PA display at least a moderate-high level of naturalness. The visual appearance of these parts of the PA during and after harvesting cycles forms a prominent negative visual element within the broader landscape setting and serves to (temporarily) further reduce the perception of naturalness in this part of the PA.

Memorability attributes and values:

69. The appealing and engaging views of the continuous 'wall' of mountains framing the north side of the Whakatipu Basin from a wide variety of public vantage points. The juxtaposition of the large-scale and continuous rugged mountain sequence beside the basin landform, along with the magnificent broader mountain and lake context within which it is seen in many views, are also factors that contribute to its memorability.
70. The 'close up' experience of the alpine setting that the PA affords for many residents and visitors to Queenstown as a consequence of the relatively high accessibility of the area (via the ski field access road, ski field and tracks, gondola and chairlifts in close proximity to Queenstown and Arrowtown)
71. The panoramic alpine landscape views afforded from Mount Dewar, Coronet Peak Road, Coronet Peak Ski Area Field and Coronet Peak.

Commented [BG14]: OS 165.31 NZSki Ltd.

Transient attributes and values:

72. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain slopes.
73. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with exotic vegetation.
74. Night lighting of the ski field during winter months.

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

75. A strong sense of remoteness across the northern slopes at the western end of the PA and at the north-eastern ends of the PA despite their respective proximity to Arthurs Point and Arrowtown, due to the contained nature of the area and the limited level of built development evident.
76. A sense of wildness across much of the PA as a consequence of the large scale and continuity of the majestic mountain range framing the northern side of the basin along with its generally 'undeveloped' and in places, seemingly unkempt character. The contrast with the 'settled' and more manicured character of the basin plays an important role in this regard. Such feelings are lesser in the parts of the PA where forestry and the ski field/access road are located and across the lower southern slopes of Mount Dewar where rural living and visitor accommodation development is consented.

Commented [BG15]: OS 84.8 Sir Robert Stewart.
OS 96.6 Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership.
OS 96.7 Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership.

Commented [BG16]: OS 84.8 Sir Robert Stewart.
OS 96.3 Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership.
OS 96.4 Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership.

Aesthetic qualities and values:

77. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
78. More specifically:
 - a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the continuous 'wall' of rugged and dramatic mountains framing the northern side of the Whakatipu Basin.

- b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
- i. The large scale and dramatic character of the steep mountain landforms backdropping Arthurs Point and Arrowtown.
 - ii. The precipitous bluffs and rocky outcrops along the east side of the small ice-melt basin in the vicinity of Littles Road.
 - iii. The everchanging play of light and weather patterns across the mountain slopes.
 - iv. The openness of the mountain landforms and scree slopes.
 - v. The rugged and wild character of the western and north-eastern ends of the PA.
 - vi. The confinement of appreciably visible built development to the Coronet Peak Ski Area Field and its access road.

Commented [BG17]: OS 165.31 NZSki Ltd.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL can be summarised as follows:

79. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
80. **Very high associative values** relating to:
- a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
 - b. The historic features in the area.
 - c. The very strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
 - d. The significant recreational attributes of Coronet Peak Ski Field, Skippers Road and the network of walking and biking tracks in the area.
 - e. The scenic values associated with Coronet Peak Road.
81. **High perceptual values** relating to:
- a. The high legibility and expressive values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
 - b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area due to its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Arthurs Point, Arrowtown, the Whakatipu Basin, the scenic route of Malaghans Road, parts of the Queenstown Trail network, the Remarkables Ski Area Field Access Road, the Zig Zag lookout, and Tobins Track, along with the areas' transient values, play an important role.
 - c. A moderate-high to high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of natural landscape elements and patterns across the PA.

Commented [BG18]: OS 165.31 NZSki Ltd.

- d. A strong sense of remoteness and wildness throughout the north facing slopes at the western end and the north-eastern portions of the PA.

Commented [BG19]: OS 96.9 Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONL Central Whakatipu Basin for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – limited some landscape capacity for small scale and low key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** – **no** landscape capacity for tourism related activities. **Very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are: co-located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest-scale small scale and have a 'low key' rural character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks** – **very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farming, existing recreational facilities, consented rural living and visitor accommodation development, or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with natural landform patterns. Some landscape capacity for earthworks associated with the Coronet Peak Ski Area that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses **very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction** – **no** landscape capacity.
- i. **Transport infrastructure** – **very limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protects the area's ONL values. Limited landscape capacity for transport infrastructure associated with Coronet Peak Ski Area provided it is positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, is located and designed to be recessive in the landscape and protect the area's ONL values. **No** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.
- viii. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- ix. **Renewable energy generation** – **no** landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy developments. **Very limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- x. **Production Forestry** – **no** landscape capacity.

Commented [BG20]: OS 165.37 NZSki Ltd.

Commented [BG21]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG22]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG23]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
OS 165.37 NZSki Limited.

Commented [BG24]: OS 167.7 Chilcotin Holdings Limited.

Commented [BG25]: OS 96.11 Treespace No. 1 Limited Partnership.
OS 167.8 Chilcotin Holdings Limited.
OS 172.14 Arthurs Point Trustees Limited.

Commented [BG26]: OS 165.39 NZSki Ltd.

Commented [BG27]: Roman numeral numbering correction required (and subsequent numbering correction for the subsequent capacity items).

Commented [BG28]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG29]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG30]: OS 165.40 NZSki Ltd.

Commented [BG31]: OS 70.29 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

Commented [BG32]: OS 96.12 Treespace No. 1 Limited Partnership.
OS 165.42 NZSki Ltd.

Commented [BG33]: Typographical correction.

- xi. **Rural living – very limited to no** landscape capacity. Where such development is appropriate, it is likely to be: co located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access (where appropriate).

Commented [BG34]: OS 96.13 Treespace No. 1 Limited Partnership.
OS 167.6 Chilcotin Holdings Limited.
OS 174.14 Redemption Song LLC.
OS 168.1 Lily Manners Wood.
OS 167.6 Chilcotin Holdings Ltd.

21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONF Schedule”. New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text: relates to a submission point that has not been captured in the “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONF Schedule”. This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments or is repeated by numerous submissions. **Sixty examples identified.**

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS16.2	Richard and Lindsay Macharg	Support	That the landscape within the Whakatipu basin is protected.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS16.3	Richard and Lindsay Macharg	Oppose	That the boundary of landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River be amended at the swerve of the boundary around Ben Lomond Station and its associated development.	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS37.2	Ed Cruikshank On Behalf Of Ed and Tonya Cruikshank	Support	That 21.22.15 be amended to ensure the Whakatipu Basin is protected.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS37.3	Ed Cruikshank On Behalf Of Ed and Tonya Cruikshank	Oppose	That the outstanding natural landscape boundary at the south western corner of landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Basin be amended as they are illogical and display various inconsistencies.		
OS37.4	Ed Cruikshank On Behalf Of Ed and Tonya Cruikshank	Oppose	That the boundary of landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be amended at Ben Lomond Station and its associated development.	Addressed in response to OS 37.3.	Reject submission.
OS37.5	Ed Cruikshank On Behalf Of Ed and Tonya Cruikshank	Oppose	That the boundary of landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be amended around Tremain House above Tremain's Corner.	Addressed in response to OS 37.3.	Reject submission.
OS37.6	Ed Cruikshank On Behalf Of Ed and Tonya Cruikshank	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be amended around Bordeau's Store, accommodation and ancillary buildings.	Addressed in response to OS 37.3.	Reject submission.
OS37.7	Ed Cruikshank On Behalf Of Ed and Tonya Cruikshank	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be amended before the adoption of the proposed landscape values in landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin.	Addressed in response to OS 37.3.	Reject submission.
OS45.3	Natalie Reeves	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required other than to note the relatively minor Schedule 21.22.15 text changes recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.15 (July 2023).	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS69.3	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS69.6	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS69.9	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS70.29	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point viii utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 Capacity (ix) as follows: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS71.3	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS71.6	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS71.9	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS72.3	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS72.6	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS72.9	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS83.3	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS83.6	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS83.9	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS84.7	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that it fails to recognise that outstanding natural landscape, outstanding natural feature and rural character landscape categories only apply to rural zoned landscapes as stated in Policy 6.3.1.1 rural landscape categorisation. Policy 6.3.1.2 also states that the exclusion of areas identified as Ski Area Sub-Zones. It is further reinforced in the Strategic Direction Provision 3.1B.5 which	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report. Schedule 21.22.15 has been drafted to acknowledge the important role that the Ski Area Subzone plays in shaping the landscape values of the PA. For example see [28], [48], [56], [61],[67], [70], [71], [74].	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			explicitly states that these categories do not apply to Ski Area Sub-Zones. It is submitted that the Ski Area Sub Zone cannot be part of the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin and should be made clear in the mapping of the priority areas.		
OS84.8	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that it fails to account for approved resource consents on the southern portion of the landscape priority area which is a highly modified landscape and therefore has very low naturalness and is highly influenced by human activities. The southern slopes of Mount Dewar are more modified than the eastern slopes and therefore has a much greater capacity to absorb development relevant to Arthurs Point. There are site specific situations where the landscape does have capacity to absorb development through placement and recessive design.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.15 as follows:</p> <p>[21] Built development patterning which includes a very limited scattering of rural and rural living dwellings around the margins of Arthurs Point; the scattering of small-scale rural living and visitor accommodation development (including commercial recreation uses, cabins, chalets, amenity facilities and a lodge) within regenerating beech forest at across the lower southern slopes of Mount Dewar along with approximately 50km of publicly accessible hiking and biking trails; and the occasional farm building or dwelling towards the eastern end of the unit (adjacent the southern boundary of the PA). Generally, development is characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings that are well integrated by plantings and remain subservient to the more 'natural' landscape patterns. Elsewhere, the modest scale of buildings, together with their distinctly working rural character and sparse arrangement, ensures that they sit comfortably into the setting.</p> <p>[65] The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL set within an urban (Arthurs Point and Arrowtown) or mixed working rural and rural living (Whakatipu Basin) context, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to its forestry, pastoral (including farm buildings, rural dwellings, ponds, fencing, tracks, shelterbelts and the like), rural living/visitor accommodation (including the consented development across the lower southern slopes of Mount</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p><u>Dewar</u>), recreational <u>(including the ski area and access road)</u>, and infrastructure uses are visible, the sheer scale of the continuous high mountain-scape <u>and extent of restoration planting that forms part of the consented development at Mount Dewar</u> ensures that, for the most part, these elements remain subservient to more natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes.</p> <p>[75] A strong sense of remoteness <u>across the northern slopes</u> at the western end <u>of the PA</u> and <u>at the</u> north-eastern ends of the PA despite their respective proximity to Arthurs Point and Arrowtown, due to the contained nature of the area and the limited level of built development evident.</p> <p>[76] A sense of wildness across much of the PA as a consequence of the large scale and continuity of the majestic mountain range framing the northern side of the basin along with its generally 'undeveloped' and in places, seemingly unkempt character. The contrast with the 'settled' and more manicured character of the basin plays an important role in this regard. Such feelings are lesser in the parts of the PA where forestry and the ski field/access road are located <u>and across the lower southern slopes of Mount Dewar where rural living and visitor accommodation development is consented.</u></p>	
OS84.9	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that it incorrectly states at [18] that there are 'important ecological features and vegetation types' and lists features that do not have ecological importance such as wilding conifer spread.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the PA ONL (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>However, it is agreed that as currently drafted the Schedules are potentially confusing in this regard as these aspects of the landscape are negative rather than positive.</p> <p>A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter.</p>	
OS84.10	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [19] under the heading 'important ecological features and vegetation types' the schedule lists animal pest species, which are not relevant to important ecological features and vegetation types.	Addressed in response to OS 84.9.	Accept submission in part.
OS84.11	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [36] under the heading 'important archaeological and heritage features and their locations' the schedule incorrectly lists Coronet Peak Ski Area which is not an important archaeological or heritage feature.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Coronet Peak was New Zealand's first commercial ski resort (1947) and for this reason was considered noteworthy under this part of Schedule 21.22.15. It is also noted that the notified version of Schedule 21.22.15 was reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the text in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS84.12	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [36] there is no mention of the Bordeaux's Store being a	<p>Bordeaux's Store is outside the mapped extent of the PA ONL.</p> <p>While this information is not disputed, it is not appropriate to include reference to heritage features that are outside the PA ONL unless they play a noteworthy role in the shaping the landscape character and values of the PA. I note that the</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			category 2 heritage listed item (item 57) in the Proposed District Plan Chapter 26 Historic Heritage list. There is also no mention of the 'ruins' located on Part Lot 2 DP16632 which contains heritage items and values. It is submitted that within the vicinity of this priority area there are sites which hold heritage values and room for restoring such buildings should be allowed for.	notified version of Schedule 21.22.15 was reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the existing text in this regard.	
OS84.13	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the relationship between mana whenua associations, Wāhi Tūpuna Chapter and consultation with mana whenua for applications be clarified in the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS84.14	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [65] under the heading 'naturalness attributes and values' the schedule incorrectly states that the Central Whakatipu Basin priority area set within an urban or mixed working rural and rural living context	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submitter appears to disagree that the PA conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness as a consequence of the development consented across the lower reaches of Mount Dewar. It is my understanding that the Mount Dewar development requires extensive landscape restoration well in advance of development construction to ensure the development protects the landscape values of the area, including naturalness values. (For example, much of the planting needs to have reached 3m to 8m height before buildings can be constructed, similar to the approach adopted	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			'conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness'.	by the Environment Court in <i>Upper Clutha Tracks</i> - the Parkins Bay decision.) For these reasons, I consider that the development that has been consented on the southern slopes of Mount Dewar is intended to maintain the existing naturalness values of the area, and the text in Schedule 21.22.15 is appropriate.	
OS84.15	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [xii] landscape capacity it is stated that rural living has 'no capacity'. In this case there may be capacity on specific sites relative to scale of rural living activities proposed. It is submitted that it be made clear that the landscape capacity schedules are at a landscape character unit rather than a site specific level.	Addressed in response to OS 96.13 and OS 167.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS87.3	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS87.6	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			no capacity for urban expansion.		
OS87.9	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS92.3	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS92.6	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS92.9	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS96.1	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended in accordance with the points of relief included in this submission.	Schedule 21.22.15 has been amended where the changes are supported from an expert perspective.	Accept submission in part.
OS96.2	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to give more consideration to the landscape related	I have read the RM181638 Decision. Schedule 21.22.15 has been amended where the changes are supported from an expert perspective.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Limited Partnership		observations that were made by commissioners in terms of RM181638.		
OS96.3	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 21 to remove the words 'the scattering of small scale development within regenerating beach forest at Mount Dewar' with 'the scattering of future visitor accommodation and rural living development within regenerating beach forest on Mount Dewar includes cabins, chalets, amenity facilities and a lodge'.	Addressed in response to OS 84.8.	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS96.4	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 65 to remove the working 'The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL set within an urban (Arthurs Point and Arrowtown) or mixed working rural and rural living (Whakatipu Basin) context, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness.' with 'The sporadic development of Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL contrasts within an urban (Arthurs Point and	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I do not agree with the text changes requested.</p> <p>In my opinion, the consented development on the Treespace expressly seeks to enhance naturalness values via the large scale and comprehensive landscape restoration that forms part of the consented development. I also understand that this was an aspect of the development that played a major role in the Commissioner's approval of the consent both in terms of the landscape enhancement that it affords and the high degree of visual mitigation it will provide for future built development. For these reasons, I consider that the consented development at</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Arrowtown) or mixed working rural and rural living (Whakatipu Basin) context. Since the nodes of development are confined, the remaining mountain slopes convey a relatively high perception of naturalness.'	Mount Dewar aligns reasonably well with an overall description of the PA as being 'seemingly undeveloped', not that this comment is made by reference to the immediately adjacent urban environment. However, I consider that Schedule 21.22.15 [65] would benefit from some amendment as outlined in response to OS 84.8.	
OS96.5	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 69 to replace the words 'wall of mountains' with 'mountain slopes', to make addition to the paragraph with 'with hummocky tops and secluded valleys in the hinterland', and to replace the words 'the juxtaposition of the' with 'These front faces form a'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I do not agree with the text changes requested.	Reject submission.
OS96.6	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be amended at paragraph 75 to remove the words 'A strong sense of remoteness at the western and north-eastern ends of the PA despite their respective proximity to Arthurs Point and Arrowtown, due to the contained nature of the area and the limited level of built development evident.'	Addressed in response to OS 84.8.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS96.7	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be amended at paragraph 76 to replace the paragraph with 'Due the the large scale and continuity of the majestic mountain range framing the northern side side of the basin, the PA contrasts with the 'settled' and more manicured character of the basin. Due to the relatively easy access, presence of a ski field and forestry, as well as visual connection to the settled basin landscape feelings of wildness are limited in this PA'.	Addressed in response to OS 84.8.	Accept submission in part.
OS96.8	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 be amended to replace the paragraph 81 c with the words 'A moderate-high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of natural landscape elements and patterns in parts of the PA that are not affected by forestry and tourism development.'	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I do not agree with the text changes requested.	Reject submission.
OS96.9	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 be amended at the paragraph 81 d to remove the word 'strong' and to replace the words 'throughout the western and	Amend Schedule [81](d) as follows: A strong sense of remoteness and wildness throughout the north facing slopes at the western end and the north-eastern portions of the PA.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			north-eastern portions of the PA.' with 'can be experienced in the hinterland of the PA'.		
OS96.10	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	<p>That the landscape schedule 21.22.15ii Central Whakatipu Basin landscape capacity assessment is amended in the following way:</p> <p>Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – Limited no landscape capacity for tourism related activities and Very Limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are: co-located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale and have a 'low key' rural alpine character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values.</p> <p>That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin landscape capacity assessment for visitor</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I do not consider that the PA has capacity for tourism development (defined as 'resorts' in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22.15).</p> <p>I also consider that the capacity for visitor accommodation activities is appropriately rated as 'very limited' for the Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL given the level of existing and consented development across the area. I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that capacity ratings are assessed at a PA level and that site specific landscape assessments would be required as part of future resource consent or plan change applications that may identify varying landscape (values and) capacities, which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			accommodation and tourism related activities from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity for tourism related activities, and to change the landscape capacity for visitor accommodation from very limited to limited capacity.		
OS96.11	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin landscape capacity for earthworks is amended to change the capacity from very limited to limited and to include 'built development' and 'and tourism related activities' into the capacity assessment.	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 Capacity (v) as follows: Earthworks – very limited landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farming, existing recreational facilities, consented rural living and visitor accommodation development or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with natural landform patterns.	Accept submission in part.
OS96.12	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin landscape capacity for renewable energy generation is amended to include the words ' for large scale commercial renewable energy generation; limited landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale community renewable energy generation that is not visible within the Whakatipu Basin. Small scale is defined as being the supply of renewable energy to 100 residential dwellings or less.'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 Capacity (ix) as follows: Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy developments. Very limited landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS96.13	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin landscape capacity for rural living is amended from no to very limited capacity and the add the words 'where such activities are co-located with existing rural living development, sited to optimize the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale and have a 'low key' alpine character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values; otherwise there is no landscape capacity for rural living.'	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 Capacity (xii) as follows: Rural living - very limited to no landscape capacity. Where such development is appropriate, it is likely to be: co located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access (where appropriate). For completeness, relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I consider that a rating of no landscape capacity is appropriate for: tourism related activities, urban expansion, intensive agriculture mineral activities, commercial scale renewable energy generation and production forestry.	
OS107.3	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS107.6	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			no capacity for urban expansion.		
OS107.9	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS108.1	Tim Williams On Behalf Of Cameron Laird	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to exclude the properties 1 Venus Place (Lot 7 DP 559049) and 10 Venus Place (Lot 1 DP 308109).	ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS112.3	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS112.6	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS112.9	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS119.3	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Mountain Bike Club		Basin is opposed and should be rejected as notified.		
OS119.8	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified as it fails to recognise that outstanding natural landscape, outstanding natural feature, and rural character landscapes only apply to Rural Zoned landscapes. it is submitted that the Coronet Ski Area Sub Zone cannot be part of the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 84.7.	Reject submission.
OS119.9	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [ii] landscape capacity it is stated that tourism activities have no capacity. It is submitted that landscape capacity schedules are at a landscape character unit level rather than a site specific level.	Addressed in response to OS 96.10.	Reject submission.
OS119.10	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that tourism activities should be defined within Chapter 2 of the Proposed District Plan or clarified within the landscape schedule as it relates to	It is recommended that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 is amended to clarify that tourism related activities is defined as resort development. Refer Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble (July 2023).	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			resort development and not tourism activities as a whole.		
OS119.11	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that the wording at [ii] landscape capacity for earthworks associated with public access tracks such as the mountain bike trails the submitter builds and maintains that protect the naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing landform patterns is incorrect. It is uncertain how mountain bike tracks protect the naturalness and expressiveness of the attributes and values of the landscape. These words should be removed from this section.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>In my experience, public access tracks (and farm tracks) can protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values via the careful use of following 'design tools' such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligning the track to follow the landform. Configuring any mitigation and/or enhancement planting associated with the track to reinforce more natural landform patterns (such as steep slopes or gullies) so that it reinforces the formative processes of the landscape. Locating the track to minimise (or avoid) retaining structures. Where retaining structures are unavoidable, designing such structures to be of an appropriate materiality and integrated by locally appropriate plantings. Avoiding urban style 'furniture' and infrastructure (such as lighting, stormwater management devices) associated with the track. <p>It is acknowledged that not all of the design tools will be relevant in every situation. However, the reference to naturalness and expressiveness values serves to cue careful consideration of these sorts of design tools, which is considered appropriate within a RMA s6(b) context.</p>	Reject submission.
OS122.3	J Semple	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is supported as notified and should be adopted as a matter of priority and importance.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS122.6	J Semple	Support	That the landscape capacity rating for urban expansions or urban development in landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin being no capacity is supported.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.9	J Semple	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure such as bridges or crossings of the Shotover River in the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin should be amended to have no capacity for such activities.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Bridges as a landuse activity are likely to be 'captured' via other transport infrastructure or regionally significant infrastructure in Schedule 21.22.15. The former has a rating of very limited landscape capacity for trails, suggesting a very limited rating for bridges associated with trails. The latter has a rating of limited landscape capacity, which is considered appropriate given the wider public benefit that is associated with such infrastructure.	Reject submission.
OS122.12	J Semple	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is adopted in the Proposed District Plan to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.15	J Semple	Oppose	That the values of the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin are appropriately recorded so that those values can be considered in any future resource consent application or plan changes.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.18	J Semple	Oppose	That the land included within the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is ultimately protected from inappropriate	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			subdivision, use, and development.		
OS122.21	J Semple	Oppose	That any consequential amendments or refinements to the provisions of the Proposed District Plan and/or landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin to better achieve the purpose of sustainable management, and the protection of the Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape is adopted.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS131.3	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS131.6	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS131.9	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS136.3	Barbara Lusk	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Basin be retained as notified.		
OS136.6	Barbara Lusk	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS150.3	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS150.6	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS150.9	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS165.26	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 paragraph 20 be amended to include structures, infrastructure and associated earthworks as follows: ...south facing slopes of Coronet Peak where the ski area (inclusive of carparks, buildings, structures, infrastructure, roading (including Skippers Road, which provides access	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 [20] as follows: Human modification which is concentrated throughout the low-lying glacier carved terrace areas along the northern edge of the Whakatipu Basin; on the western flanks of Mount Dewar and across the south-facing slopes of the secondary mountain ridgeline on the south side of Bush Creek (to the north of Millbrook) that includes Pt 897, Pt 929, Pt 842, and Pt 876 where production forestry dominates; across Mount Dewar more generally, where development is anticipated; on the elevated south-facing slopes of Coronet Peak where the ski area field (including carparks, buildings, structures,	Accept submission (subject to minor refinement).

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			to the Skippers Bungy site, outside the PA) and associated earthworks are located;... .	infrastructure) and roading (including Skippers Road, which provides access to the Skippers Bungy site, outside the PA) is located; and throughout the western portion of the PA at Coronet Peak Road.	
OS165.27	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Important land-use patterns and features paragraph 23 be amended to add the bracketed words to read: Coronet Ski Area (inclusive of all associated activities and development).	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 [23] as follows: The location of the Coronet Peak Ski Field Area (inclusive of all associated activities and built development) across the elevated south-facing slopes, together with the exposed nature of the access road climbing up the steep slopes at the western end of the area, make this development prominent in views from much of the western and northern portion of the Whakatipu Basin. Night-time lighting of the ski field during the winter season adds to its prominence.	Accept submission (subject to minor refinement).
OS165.28	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Important land-use patterns and features at paragraph 26 be amended to read: Infrastructure is evident within the corridor and includes: electricity and communication systems traversing the steep slopes up to Coronet Ski Area and Coronet Peak; telecommunication masts at the top of Mount Dewar; other ski area infrastructure, forestry tracks; farm fencing; and farm tracks.	Amend Schedule 21.22.15[26] as follows: Infrastructure is evident within the corridor and includes: the power line (on poles) traversing the steep slopes up to Coronet Ski Area and Coronet Peak Field ; telecommunication masts at the top of Mount Dewar; forestry tracks; farm fencing; and farm tracks.	Accept submission.
OS165.29	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Important land-use patterns and features at paragraph 28 be amended to delete the description of ski field related activities and read: The Coronet Peak Ski	Amend Schedule 21.22.15[28] as follows: The Coronet Peak Ski Area Sub Zone which provides for the ongoing use and development of that area for ski field related activities .	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Area Sub Zone which provides for the ongoing use and development of that area.		
OS165.30	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Important historic attributes and values at paragraph 41 be amended from one of the earliest to the first commercial ski field in New Zealand, so that it reads: The historic significance of Coronet Peak (New Zealand's first commercial ski field).	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 [41] as follows: The historic significance of Coronet Peak (New Zealand's first commercial ski field) as one of New Zealand's earliest commercial ski fields.	Accept submission.
OS165.31	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 be amended to change references from ski field to ski area at paragraph 44, 56, 67, 71, 78.vi, and 81.b.	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 as follows: [44] The identity of Coronet Peak Ski Area Field as an integral part of the Whakatipu Basin. The very close proximity of this recreational feature to Queenstown urban area and its visibility from much of the Whakatipu Basin (and including from the airport, particularly at night when the ski field is lit for night skiing) play an important a role. [56] The postcard views from various lookouts on Coronet Peak Road and the ski area field-out over the Whakatipu Basin, Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes), Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), the Remarkables and the broader mountain context. [67] While the ski area field and its access road form a bold manmade element on the southern slopes of Mount Dewar and Coronet Peak, the connection this development establishes and enables between the mountain setting and the inhabited Whakatipu Valley adds a degree of interest to the view, meaning that it is not an overwhelmingly negative visual element. The scale of the seemingly 'undeveloped' mountain setting within which this development is viewed, together with its identity as a popular recreational feature,	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>also play a role in this regard. Because these landscape modifications also make an important contribution to Queenstown’s recreational values (see above), there is a degree of landscape ‘fit’ associated with them. During the ski season the patterning of lights throughout the groomed slopes forms an engaging element.</p> <p>[71] The panoramic alpine landscape views afforded from Mount Dewar, Coronet Peak Road, Coronet Peak Ski Area Field and Coronet Peak.</p> <p>[78](b)(vi) The confinement of appreciably visible built development to the Coronet Peak Ski Area Field and its access road.</p> <p>[81](b) The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area due to its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Arthurs Point, Arrowtown, the Whakatipu Basin, the scenic route of Malaghans Road, parts of the Queenstown Trail network, the Remarkables Ski Area Field Access Road, the Zig Zag lookout, and Tobins Track, along with the area’s transient values, play an important role.</p>	
OS165.32	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Important recreation attributes and values at paragraph 48 be amended to include general reference to outdoor recreation and read: Very popular year-round destination for outdoor recreation including skiing, walking, mountain biking, paragliding, hiking and enjoying the view from the various lookouts and café/restaurant facilities at Coronet Peak.	This text change is not considered necessary.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS165.33	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Particularly important view to and from the area at paragraph 61 be amended to add the word particularly so that it reads: The engaging and early evening views from Frankton and the airport to the Coronet Peak Ski Area particularly when the ski field is lit for night skiing.	Amend Schedule 21.22.15[61] as follows: The engaging early evening views from Frankton and the airport to the Coronet Peak Ski Area Field when the ski field is lit for night skiing.	Accept submission.
OS165.34	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Naturalness attributes and values at paragraph 67 be amended to remove the words 'During the ski season' from the last sentence so that it reads: The patterning of lights throughout the groomed slopes forms an engaging element.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point explaining why deletion of reference to the ski season is considered appropriate. This text change is not considered necessary, however the submitter is encouraged to provide evidence as to why this text change might be appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS165.35	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Transient attributes and values be amended to make clear it is referencing Coronet Peak Ski area and delete 'during winter months' so that it reads: Night lighting of the Coronet Peak ski area.	Addressed in response to OS 165.34.	Reject submission.
OS165.36	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Very high associative values at paragraph 80.d. include the	The descriptor 'strong' is not considered necessary, where the term 'significant' is used.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			words 'very strong' so that it reads: The very strong and significant recreational attributes of Coronet Peak Ski Area, Skippers Road and the network of walking and biking tracks in the area.		
OS165.37	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.15.i Commercial recreational activities be amended from limited to some capacity, delete the word existing, add the word activities, remove and delete the words 'and protects the area's ONL values' so that it reads: some landscape capacity for activities that integrate with and complement/enhance recreation features and activities; ...; and enhance public access.	<p>No expert evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>I acknowledge that recreation activities are an important feature of the area. For these reasons it is recommended that the rating for commercial recreation activities is amended from limited to some landscape capacity.</p> <p>Amend 21.22.15 Capacity (i) as follows:</p> <p>Commercial recreational activities – limited some landscape capacity for activities that integrate with, and complement/enhance, existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS165.38	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.15.ii Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended from no landscape capacity for tourism related activities to some, amend from very limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation to some and delete the words 'and	Addressed in response to OS 96.10 and OS 165.37 (protect ONL values).	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			protects the area's ONL values'.		
OS165.39	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.15.v. Earthworks be amended from very limited to some landscape capacity, include for association with Coronet Peak Ski Area, delete the word existing from recreational facilities, and delete the words protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values so that it reads: Earthworks - some landscape capacity for earthworks associated with the Coronet Peak Ski Area, farming, recreational facilities, or public access tracks that are sympathetically designed to integrate with natural landform patterns.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I consider the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.15 5 Capacity (v) are appropriate as follows:</p> <p>Earthworks – very limited landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farming, existing recreational facilities, or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with natural landform patterns. Some landscape capacity for earthworks associated with the Coronet Peak Ski Area that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS165.40	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.15.i Transport infrastructure be amended from very limited to some landscape capacity, include infrastructure transport associated with Coronet Peak Ski Area, delete the words 'and protect the area's ONF values', and delete no landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure, so that it reads: Transport	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I consider the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.15 5 Capacity Transport Infrastructure appropriate as follows:</p> <p>(viii) Transport infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing</p>	Accept submission in part. (NB consequential numbering correction to Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.15)

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>infrastructure - some landscape capacity for infrastructure associated with the Coronet Peak Ski Area; and trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement.</p>	<p>networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONF values. Limited landscape capacity for transport infrastructure associated with Coronet Peak Ski Area provided it is positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, is located and designed to be recessive in the landscape and protect the area's ONL values. No landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.</p>	
OS165.41	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	<p>That landscape capacity 21.22.15.viii Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended from limited to some landscape capacity, add reference to association with Coronet Peak Ski Area and add the words 'reasonably practicable' in reference to being designed and located, so that it reads: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure - some landscape capacity for infrastructure that is associated with Coronet Peak Ski area, or is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located as reasonably practicable so that they are not visually</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I consider that a rating of limited rather than some landscape capacity is appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure.		
OS165.42	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.15.ix. Renewable energy generation be amended from no landscape capacity to some landscape capacity with the addition of small and community scale so that it reads: Renewable energy - some landscape capacity for small and community scale renewable energy generation.	Addressed in response to OS 96.12.	Accept submission in part.
OS167.1	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that the landscape schedules do not preclude future development. Site-specific landscape assessments should be given more weight than the schedules.	The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that site specific landscape assessments will be required for resource consent and plan change applications. The question of weighting is addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS167.2	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin landscape capacity section is amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority areas.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I consider that the capacity ratings as shown in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.15 are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS167.3	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that it is clear that the capacity for development identified on the schedules is not to be applied or interpreted at a site-specific level.	The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that landscape capacity is evaluated at a PA level within the Schedule and that site specific landscape assessments will be required for resource consent and plan change applications.	Reject submission.
OS167.4	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to clarify that construction within existing building platforms, variations to building platforms and consented development is not restricted by the landscape schedule.	It is recommended that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 is amended to explain that the Schedules do not apply to permitted activities. This may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard. For completeness, it is not considered appropriate that variations to existing platforms or consented development should be exempted from the Schedules.	Accept submission in part.
OS167.5	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to clarify that variations to existing building platforms should not be precluded by the schedule and instead be assessed on their individual merits.	Addressed in response to OS 167.3 and OS 167.4.	Reject submission.
OS167.6	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to add text to ensure that rural living and farming-related activities are not precluded by the schedules.	The very limited capacity for farm buildings (along with the qualification in the Preamble that a site-specific assessment may identify different values and capacity) signals that this landuse type is not precluded. The response to OS 96.13 addresses amendments to the landscape capacity for rural living.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS167.7	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that the text of the landscape schedule does not preclude residential visitor accommodation in existing or any future residential dwellings.	<p>The very limited capacity for visitor accommodation (along with the qualification in the Preamble that a site-specific assessment may identify different values and capacity) signals that this landuse type is not precluded.</p> <p>However in consideration of this submission point, the following text amendments are recommended for Schedule 21.22.15 Capacity (ii), to better align with the text of other PA Schedules and PDP policy context:</p> <p>Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – no landscape capacity for tourism related activities. Very limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are: co-located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale small scale and have a 'low key' rural character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS167.8	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that earthworks associated with residential or farming related activities are not unreasonably restricted by the landscape schedules.	<p>The very limited capacity for earthworks associated with farming (along with the qualification in the Preamble that a site-specific assessment may identify different values and capacity) signals that this landuse type is not precluded.</p> <p>The response to OS 96.11 is also of relevance here where it is recommended to include reference to rural living related earthworks.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS167.9	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That any other consequential or alternative relief as may be necessary or appropriate to address the issues raised in this submission including changes that may arise from other submissions gives effect to the relief sought in this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS168.1	Lilly Manners Wood	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to provide for a smaller secondary dwelling to be placed on an existing site located at 101 Malaghans Road and within the Malaghans valley provided relevant bulk and location rules can be met, the dwelling fits into the natural landscape and isn't visible from the road.	<p>The acknowledgement of rural living as an established activity in the PA (see Response to Submissions version of Schedule 21.22.15), along with the rating of very limited to no landscape capacity for rural living, signals that extremely carefully located and designed rural living development is not precluded from the PA.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the landscape capacity ratings are at a PA level and that a detailed landscape assessment will be required as part of a resource consent (or plan change) application that may identify different landscape values and capacities which may also go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS172.4	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Arthurs Point Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for 21.22.15 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that the landscape capacity for development currently identified is not applied or interpreted at a site-specific scale.	Addressed in response to OS 167.2 and OS 167.3.	Reject submission.
OS172.6	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Arthurs Point Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for 21.22.15 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that construction within existing building platforms and consented development is not restricted by the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 167.4.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS172.8	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Arthurs Point Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for 21.22.15 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that clarity is provided that variations to existing building platforms should not be precluded by the landscape schedule and instead be assessed on their individual merits through associated site specific landscape assessments.	Addressed in response to OS 167.3 and OS 167.4.	Reject submission.
OS172.10	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Arthurs Point Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.15 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that text be added to landscape schedule to ensure that rural living is not precluded, with these assessed on their merits through site specific landscape assessments.	Addressed in response to OS 96.13.	Accept submission in part.
OS172.12	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Arthurs Point Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for 21.22.15 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that residential visitor accommodation and visitor accommodation be provided	Addressed in response to OS 167.7.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			for within existing and consented development.		
OS172.14	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Arthurs Point Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that earthworks associated with visitor accommodation or residential activity is not unreasonably restricted.	Addressed in response to OS 167.8.	Accept submission in part.
OS174.3	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is opposed and be rejected as notified.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS174.7	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as the Ski Area Sub Zone cannot be part of the Central Whakatipu Basin priority area and should be made clear in the mapping of the priority areas.	Addressed in response to OS 84.7.	Reject submission.
OS174.8	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as notified as it fails to account that the south-eastern reaches of the priority area is a highly modified landscape highly influenced by human activities.	Addressed in response to submissions on behalf of Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership. A number of amendments have been recommended to the text of Schedule 21.22.15 to better acknowledge the consented development in the south-eastern reaches of the PA.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS174.9	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as notified or amended to address that it incorrectly states at [18] that there are 'important ecological features and vegetation types' and lists features that do not have ecological importance.	Addressed in response to OS 84.9.	Accept submission in part.
OS174.10	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [19] under the heading important ecological features and vegetation types the schedule lists animal pest species.	Addressed in response to OS 84.9.	Accept submission in part.
OS174.11	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [36] under the heading important archaeological and heritage features and their locations the schedule incorrectly lists Coronet Peak Ski Area.	Addressed in response to OS 84.11.	Reject submission.
OS174.12	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to clarify the relationship of mana whenua associations, Wahi Tupuna Chapter and	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			consultation with mana whenua for applications.		
OS174.13	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [65] under the heading naturalness attributes and values the schedule incorrectly states that the priority area conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness.	Addressed in response to OS 84.14.	Reject submission.
OS174.14	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [xii] landscape capacity it is stated that rural living has no capacity. In this case there may be capacity on specific sites, relative to the scale of rural living activity Or the activity proposed.	Addressed in response to OS 96.13.	Accept submission in part.
OS187.3	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS187.6	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			no capacity for urban expansion.		
OS187.9	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS197.3	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS197.6	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS197.9	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS202.3	Michael John Boyd	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS202.6	Michael John Boyd	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			no capacity for urban expansion.		
OS202.9	Michael John Boyd	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS204.3	Anna-Louise & Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS204.6	Anna-Louise & Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS204.9	Anna-Louise & Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.3	Dennis Behan	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is adopted as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.6	Dennis Behan	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin should be protected in perpetuity from inappropriate development.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS205.9	Dennis Behan	Support	That the mapping, values identified and capacity assessment of landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.12	Dennis Behan	Support	That paragraphs 79-81 and the landscape capacity assessment of landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin are supported.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.15	Dennis Behan	Support	That recreational access where it will not erode the values identified in the submission and necessary infrastructure development where the values outlined can be adequately preserved or protected in landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be supported.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(k) 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA ONL

21.22.16 PA ONL Eastern Whakatipu Basin: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA ONL encompasses the steep predominantly west-facing slopes of the mountain range framing the east side of the Whakatipu Basin stretching from the Arrow River to the Kawarau River. The PA ONL takes in Pt 1108, Pt 1080, Pt 1331, Crown Peak, and Pt 1426. It also includes Mt Beetham, the New Chum Gully and the Crown Terrace Escarpment, and the lower reaches of feeder gullies on the Crown Terrace.

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Mana whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. The steeply sloping, foliated (in the geological sense, not botanical), schistose mountain landforms of Pt 1108, Pt 1080, Pt 1331, Crown Peak (1,731m), and Pt 1426 (including much of the western sides of Mt Scott), which form part of the wall of mountains framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin.
2. The numerous secondary and varying steep to more rounded ridgeline 'shoulders' extending westwards from the continuous (eastern) mountain 'frame' to the Crown Terrace Escarpment.
3. The cone-shaped roche moutonnée glacial landform of Mt Beetham with the smooth 'up-glacier' face along its west side and a steeper rough 'plucked' 'down-glacier' slope to the east. Rock outcrops throughout the elevated north-eastern flanks. Highest point: 929m.
4. Partly collapsed solifluction slopes above the Crown Terrace. (NB Solifluction is a collective name for gradual processes by which regolith (unconsolidated material overlying bedrock) moves down a slope ("mass wasting") generally caused by freeze-thaw activity.)
5. The steep large-scale and continuous remnant river terrace escarpment landform along the western edge of the Crown Terrace (the majority of which is outside the PA ONL).
6. Glacial till deposits and alluvial fans at the toe of the steep mountain slopes framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin and along the finger of the Crown Terrace that extends between the western side of Mt Beetham and the Crown Escarpment (including New Chums Gully).
7. The distinctive Judge and Jury rock formations near the Kawarau Bridge.
8. Located on the western side of Mt Scott, the Crown Range Superimposed Folds formed in greenschist are identified in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory as a site of national importance and is rated as being robust and not considered to be vulnerable to most human-related activities.

Commented [BG1]: OS 177.14 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

Important hydrological features:

9. The numerous unnamed streams in the northern portion of the PA draining to the Arrow River, including along New Chums Creek along the New Chums Gully.

10. The numerous streams draining from the eastern mountain range across the Crown Terrace and down to the Arrow River via the Crown Escarpment. Including Royal Burn, Swift Burn, along with several unnamed watercourses. Generally the watercourses are steeply incised where they cross the Crown Escarpment.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

11. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. Below approximately 800m on the slopes facing the Arrow River and the lower section of New Chums Gully, a dense mosaic of shrubland with scattered areas of trees. The shrubland is dominated by sweet briar (*Rosa rubiginosa*) and matagouri (*Discaria toumatou*). Other shrub species include mingimingi (*Coprosma propinqua*), *Coprosma rugosa*, tutu (*Coriaria arborea*), NZ broom (*Carmichaelia arborea* var *arborea*), bush lawyer (*Rubus cissoides*) and koromiko (*Veronica salicifolia*).
 - b. Kowhai (*Sophora microphylla*) behind the Glencoe homestead in New Chums Gully.
 - c. Pockets of a diverse range of native shrubs in more inaccessible gullies (such as the narrow gorge at the head of New Chums Creek), including turpentine scrub (*Dracophyllum uniflorum*), *Astelia nervosa*, shrub daisy (*Olearia nummulariifolia*), native broom (*Carmichaelia petriei*), bush snowberry (*Gaultheria antipoda*), and mountain ribbonwood (*Hoheria lyallii*).
 - d. Pockets of matagouri and mingimingi across the Crown Terrace Escarpment and throughout gullies.
 - e. Expansive areas of short and snow tussock grassland throughout the eastern mountain frame between approximately 800m and 1,700m. Tall tussock (*Chionochloa rigida*) dominates on cool aspects with short tussock (*Festuca novae-zelandiae*) increasing in dominance with decreasing altitude. Pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri and mingimingi throughout lower slopes.
 - f. Strong cover of silver tussock (*Poa cita*) throughout the eastern flank of Mt Beetham.
 - g. Narrow leaved snow tussock (*Chionochloa rigida amara*) dominates above 1,000m.
 - h. Cushionfields on ridge crest in vicinity of Crown Peak.
12. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
 - a. Exotic grasses and herbs mixed with tussock throughout the slopes below approximately 1,000m.
 - b. Sycamore and black poplars throughout the Crown Terrace Escarpment in the vicinity of Tobins ~~Track Track~~ and the Arrow River, and in parts of New Chums Gully below the shearing shed.
 - c. Sweet briar, broom, scrub, hawthorn, wilding conifers, and pockets of plantation forestry (larch and Douglas fir) across the Crown Terrace Escarpment.
 - d. Grazed pasture associated with the Glencoe Station land.
13. Diverse vegetation types and rocky terrain associated with the Crown Range and lower landforms including escarpments provide suitable habitat for New Zealand falcon, New Zealand pipit, grey warbler, fantail and silvereye and skink and gecko species.
14. Animal pest species include feral goats, hares, possums, mice, rats, stoats, ferrets, feral cats, and rabbits.
15. Plant pest species include wilding pines, sweet briar, hawthorn, buddleia, sycamore, broom and gorse.

Commented [BG2]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG3]: OS 177.25 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

Important Land-use patterns and features:

16. Human modification which is concentrated: around the Glencoe Station homestead in New Chum Gully (north of Mt Beetham); roughly in the centre of the Crown Terrace Escarpment, where the Crown range (or 'Zig Zag') Road winds its way up the escarpment; and the southern end of the PA where the Crown Range Road winds its way around the southwestern flanks of Mt Scott.
17. Built development patterning which includes a cluster of rural dwellings and farm buildings associated with Glencoe Station in New Chum Gully (to the north of Mt Beetham); a limited scattering of rural living dwellings to the northwest of Mt Beetham (including consented but unbuilt platforms); two rural living dwellings to the north of the Zig Zag Road (one located at the base of the escarpment and one near the top); and a small cluster of rural living dwellings towards the southern end of the PA, northwest of the Kawarau Bridge (and accessed from Gibbston Highway). Generally development is characterised by carefully located and designed buildings that are well integrated by plantings and remain subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Elsewhere, the modest scale of buildings, together with their distinctly working rural character, ensures that they sit comfortably into the setting.
18. Several rural and rural living dwellings and farm buildings are located along the edges of the PA within the Crown Terrace and along the toe of the escarpment, south of the point where the course of Arrow River diverges from the base of the escarpment. With the exception of New Chum Gully environs, generally built development has been carefully located outside of the PA.
19. Tobins Track, Tobins Drop, Mt Beetham Track, the New Chum Gully Track, Peters Way, the New Chum Ridge Track, Miners Route, Brackens Saddle Track, Crown Peak Track (small section). Associated with these tracks are signage, stiles, and seating, typically of a modest scale and low-key character.
20. Infrastructure is evident within the northern and southern portions of the PA and includes: a section of the Cromwell Frankton. A 110kV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid transmission corridor in the vicinity of the Kawarau bridge (southern end of PA); a short section of power lines on poles servicing the rural living cluster near the Kawarau Bridge; the power/telephone lines (on poles) servicing Glencoe station and farm fencing / farm tracks.
21. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character and/or proximity include: the rural living development along the toe of the Crown Terrace Escarpment and the base of the range of mountains framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin (on the Crown Terrace); the close proximity of SH 6 (Gibbston Highway) which is on the western side of the southern end of the Crown Terrace Escarpment and the Crown Range Road, where it runs across the Crown Terrace.

Commented [BG4]: OS 70.30 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

Commented [BG5]: OS177.16 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

Commented [BG6]: OS 70.31 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

22. The Judge and Jury Rocks near the Kawarau Bridge (District Plan reference 9).
23. Historic farmstead at Glencoe Station and associated outbuildings.
24. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, dams, and associated domestic sites in the area (for example, archaeological sites F41/743, F41/632, and F41/633).
25. Notable transport routes and associated infrastructure, including Tobin's Track.

Mana whenua features and their locations:

26. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
27. Parts of the ONL overlap the mapped Haehaenui (Arrow River) wāhi tūpuna. The southern extent of the ONL overlaps the mapped Kawarau River wāhi tūpuna. These wāhi tūpuna were part of a network of mahika kai areas, with the Kawarau River also being a traditional travel route between the Mata-au (Clutha River) and Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Wakatipu).

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

Mana whenua associations and experience:

28. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
29. Kāi Tahu tradition tells of an incident where a 280 strong war party was repelled from the Tititea settlement on the south side of the Kawarau river and chased to the top of the Crown Range, which is now named Tititea in memory of this incident.
30. The mana whenua values associated with the Eastern Wakatipu Basin ONL include, but may not be limited to, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

Important historic attributes and values:

31. Gold mining in the area and the associated physical remnants including sluiced faces and water races.
32. Use of the Crown Terrace for pastoralism.
33. Glencoe homestead and remaining historic buildings from William Paterson's establishment of the Glencoe Run.
34. Historic transport tracks and infrastructure, including Tobins Track (constructed 1874) and features associated with the construction of SH6 (eg. F41/744).

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

35. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
36. The popularity of the postcard views from the Zig Zag lookout (on the Crown Range Road, where it scales the Crown Terrace Escarpment) out over the Whakatipu Basin and surrounding mountains, as an inspiration/subject for photography.
37. The high popularity of Tobins Track in part due to its very close proximity to Arrowtown.
38. The identity of the line of mountains along the eastern side of the PA in forming the dramatic 'eastern frame' of the Whakatipu Basin.
39. The identity of the Crown Terrace Escarpment (and distinctive 'zig zag' section of the Crown Range Road) as marking the transition between the mixed rural and rural residential landscape of the low-lying part of the Whakatipu Basin and the more overtly 'working' rural landscape of the Crown Terrace.
40. The identity of the sequence of mountains and the escarpment at the northern end of the PA as a dramatic (western) backdrop to Arrowtown.

Important recreation attributes and values:

41. Enjoying the view from the Zig Zag lookout on the Crown Range Road.
42. Walking, running, dog walking (where allowed) and mountain biking on Tobins Track, Tobins Drop, Mt Beetham Track, the New Chum Gully Track, Peters Way, the New Chum Ridge Track, Miners Route, Brackens Saddle Track, Crown Peak Track.

43. SH 6 Gibbston Highway and the Crown Range Road as key scenic routes either within the PA or in close proximity.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

44. The area's natural landforms, land type, and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial processes.
45. Indigenous gully plantings and remnant vegetation which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values throughout the area.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

46. The postcard views from the Zig Zag lookout (on the Crown Range Road), out over the Whakatipu Basin, Te Whaka-ata (Lake Hayes), ~~Whakatipu Waimāori~~ ~~Whakātipu Wai Māori~~ (Lake Whakatipu), Morven Ferry roche moutonnée, the Remarkables, Coronet Peak and the broader mountain context. The 'bird's eye' like quality of the vista across a complex mixed rural and rural living/resort landscape adds to its appeal. The accessibility of the vantage point also plays an important role.
47. The spectacular panoramic views from the Crown Peak Track, and the New Chum Ridge Track out over the Whakatipu Basin to the west and/or the rugged and dramatic expanse of the Crown Range to the east and north.
48. The highly attractive and engaging short to long-range views from Tobins Track and Tobins Drop, Mt Beetham Track, Peters Way, the New Chum Ridge Track, Miners Route, Brackens Saddle Track, out over the PA, the Whakatipu Basin, the Remarkables, and the broader glacial valley and mountain context.
49. The dramatic mid and long-range views from Arrowtown, the Arrow River ONF, the scenic routes of the Crown Range Road and SH6 Gibbston Highway, much of the Whakatipu Basin (including sections of the Queenstown Trail network) to the large-scale and coherent river terrace escarpment landform and/or the continuous sequence of mountains that frame the eastern side of the Crown Terrace. From more distant vantage points, the contrast established between these more natural landscape elements seen in combination with the gently sloping (predominantly) working rural 'plinth' of the Crown Terrace adds to the memorability and appeal of such views. At closer range, the large-scale, rugged and unkempt appearance of much of the Crown Terrace Escarpment reinforces its role as a 'break' between the more developed low-lying basin to the west and the (predominantly) working rural landscape of the Crown Terrace.
50. The appealing long-range views from more distant elevated vantage points such as the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road and Coronet Peak Road in which the scale and shape of the glacial valley and river terrace landscape that underpins the PA is legible in its entirety and confers a sense of grandeur to the outlook.
51. The highly engaging mid-range views from Glencoe Road, in which the roche moutonnée profile of Mt Beetham is clearly legible. The contrast between the landform feature and planar working rural context adds to the appeal of the outlook.
52. Engaging and seemingly 'close-range' views from planes approaching or exiting Queenstown airport via the Gibbston Valley. Such views offer an appreciation of the broader glacial landscape context within which the PA ONL is set.

Commented [BG7]: OS 77.42 Kai Tahu ki Otago. OS 188.42 Elisha Ebert-Young.

Commented [BG8]: OS177.37 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

Commented [BG9]: OS177.37 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

Commented [BG10]: OS177.38 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

53. In all of the views, the dominance of 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the PA ONL, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the PA ONL, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

Naturalness attributes and values:

54. The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA ONL set within the mixed working rural and rural living (Whakatipu Basin) context and/or the working rural setting of the Crown Terrace, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to rural living, farming, forestry, recreational, and infrastructure uses are visible, the sheer scale and continuity of the high mountain-scape along the eastern side of the Crown Terrace and the river terrace escarpment landform along its western edge ensures that, for the most part, these elements remain subservient to natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes.
55. The irregular patterning and proliferation of grey shrubland, exposed rock faces and scrub in places adds to the perception of naturalness.
56. While the Crown Range Road forms a bold manmade element within the PA ONL, the connection this development establishes and enables between the mountain setting, the inhabited Whakatipu Valley and further afield, Wanaka, adds a degree of interest to the view, meaning that it is not an overwhelmingly negative visual element. The scale of the seemingly 'undeveloped' escarpment and mountain setting within which this development is viewed, together with its identity as a popular scenic route, also play a role. Put another way, these landscape modifications also make an important contribution to Queenstown's recreational values (see above), suggesting a degree of landscape 'fit'.
57. The localised forestry plantings across parts of the Crown Terrace Escarpment contribute a reduced perception of naturalness in places. However, the underlying natural (and largely unmodified) rugged river terrace landform character of the area remains legible and dominant, thus ensuring these parts of the PA display at least a moderate-high level of naturalness. The visual appearance of these parts of the PA during and after harvesting cycles forms a prominent negative visual element within the broader landscape setting and serves to (temporarily) further reduce the perception of naturalness in this part of the PA.

Memorability attributes and values:

58. The appealing and engaging views of the continuous 'wall' of mountains framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin from a wide variety of public vantage points. The juxtaposition of the large-scale and continuous rugged mountain sequence beside the elevated 'farmed' river terrace landform of the Crown Terrace contributes to its memorability.
59. ~~In some instances, the more developed context of the low-lying basin appreciated within the seemingly untouched mountain-scape beyond that signals the role of this part of the PA ONL as a gateway between the developed basin and seemingly untouched mountain-scape beyond.~~ This factor, along with the magnificent broader mountain setting within which it the PA is seen in many views, are also factors that contribute to its memorability.
60. The dramatic closer-range views from low-lying vantage points throughout the eastern side of the basin to the rugged and large-scale escarpment which forms a bold contrast with the developed setting throughout the basin floor.
61. The distinctive landscape layering that is apparent in longer-range views where the patterning of the escarpment, stepping up to the farmed terrace and backdropped by the line of mountains (along the eastern edge of the terrace) is visible.
62. The 'close up' experience of the alpine setting that the PA affords for many residents and visitors to Queenstown as a consequence of the relatively high accessibility of the area via the Crown Range Road.
63. The panoramic alpine landscape views afforded from ridgeline tracks.

Commented [BG11]: OS177.45 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

Transient attributes and values:

- 64. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain slopes.
- 65. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with exotic vegetation.

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

- 66. A sense of remoteness across the mountains along the eastern side of the Crown Terrace, due to their coherent and continuous large-scale character and the limited level of built development evident.
- 67. A sense of wildness across the Crown Terrace Escarpment portion of the PA as a consequence of its continuous rugged character along with its generally 'undeveloped' and, in places, seemingly unkempt character. The contrast with the 'settled' and more manicured character of the basin plays an important role in this regard.
- 68. Such feelings reduce in the parts of the PA where forestry forestry, rural living, farm dwellings and sheds and the Crown Range Road are located.

Commented [BG12]: OS177.19 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited. OS177.50 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

Aesthetic attributes and values:

- 69. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
- 70. More specifically:
 - a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the continuous 'wall' of rugged and dramatic mountains backdroping the distinctive river terrace escarpment, which together frame the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin.
 - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. The cone like peak of Mt Beetham and its distinctive roche moutonnée profile.
 - ii. The uninterrupted and muscular sequence of predominantly tussock-clad steep to more rounded mountains and ridges along the eastern side of the Crown Terrace.
 - iii. The seemingly wild escarpment landform that forms a 'wall' along the eastern side of the basin floor and serves as a transition between the basin floor and the predominantly working rural landscape of the Crown Terrace.
 - iv. The ever-changing play of light and weather patterns across the mountain slopes.
 - v. The confinement of appreciable visible built development within the PA to lower lying flat to gently sloping land near Glencoe Road the Crown Range Road.
 - vi. The very limited level of built modification evident through the ONL.
- 71. It is noted that control of plant pests species such as wilding pines can temporarily detract from aesthetic values.

Commented [BG13]: OS177.51 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

Commented [BG14]: OS177.52 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

Commented [BG15]: Typographical correction.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA ONL Eastern Whakatipu Basin can be summarised as follows:

- 72. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
- 73. **High associative values** relating to:
 - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
 - b. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
 - c. The significant recreational attributes of the network of walking and biking tracks in the area.
 - d. The scenic values associated with Crown Range Road.
- 74. **High perceptual values** relating to:
 - a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
 - b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Arrowtown, the Whakatipu Basin, the scenic routes of the Crown Range Road and SH6, parts of the Queenstown Trail network, the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road, Coronet Peak Road, and the airport approach path, along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
 - c. A high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of more natural landscape elements and patterns across the PA.
 - d. A strong sense of remoteness and/or wildness across much of the PA. Such feelings are reduced in the parts of the PA where forestry, rural living, farm dwellings and sheds and the Crown Range Road are located.

Commented [BG16]: OS177.60 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited. OS177.19 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONL Eastern Whakatipu Basin for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation in low lying locations and clustered with existing buildings, that is of a modest small scale; have and has a low-key rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhances public access; and protects the area's ONL values. **No** landscape capacity for tourism related activities.
- iii. **Urban expansions – no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – no** landscape capacity.

Commented [BG17]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG18]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG19]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG20]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG21]: OS 177.62 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

Commented [BG22]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG23]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG24]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG25]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG26]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG27]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust. OS 177.62 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm, existing recreational facilities, or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, **very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – no** landscape capacity.
- i. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONLF values. **No** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.
- viii. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. In the case of the National Grid there is landscape capacity for the upgrade of existing infrastructure within the same corridor and limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for the particular location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- ix. **Renewable energy generation – no** landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation. **Limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- x. **Production Forestry – no** landscape capacity.
- xi. **Rural living – very limited** landscape capacity for rural living in low lying locations and clustered with existing buildings, that; is: of a ~~modest scale; have a small scale and~~ low-key rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement; ~~and enhances public access; and protects the area's ONL values.~~

Commented [BG28]: Roman numeral numbering correction required.

Commented [BG29]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG30]: OS 70.32 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

Commented [BG31]: OS 177.66 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

Commented [BG32]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG33]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2 and OS 177.66.

Commented [BG34]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG35]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
OS 177.66 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA ONL Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA ONF Schedule”. New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text: relates to a submission point that has not be captured in the “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA ONF Schedule”. This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **Two examples identified.**

Green wash line item: Submission point re-notified 22 June 2023.

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS70.30	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to include the word 'Important' with the words 'land-use patterns and features'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 as follows: <u>Important</u> land-use patterns and features:	Accept submission.
OS70.31	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 20 to replace the words 'transmission corridor' with '110kV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [20] as follows: Infrastructure is evident within the northern and southern portions of the PA and includes: a section of the Cromwell Frankton. A <u>110kV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid</u> transmission corridor in the vicinity of the Kawarau bridge (southern end of PA); a short section of power lines on poles servicing the rural living cluster near the Kawarau Bridge; the power/telephone lines (on poles) servicing Glencoe station and farm fencing / farm tracks.	Accept submission (along with minor grammar correction).

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS70.32	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape Schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point viii utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid there is landscape capacity for the upgrade of existing infrastructure within the same corridor and limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for the particular location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity for Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure as follows: In the case of the National Grid there is landscape capacity for the upgrade of existing infrastructure within the same corridor and limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for the particular location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.	Accept submission.
OS77.42	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin paragraph 46 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [46] as follows: The postcard views from the Zig Zag lookout (on the Crown Range Road), out over the Whakatipu Basin, Te Whaka-ata (Lake Hayes), Whakatipu Waimāori Whakātipu Wai Māori (Lake Whakatipu), Morven Ferry roche moutonnée, the Remarkables, Coronet Peak and the broader mountain context. The 'bird's eye' like quality of the vista across a complex mixed rural and rural living/resort landscape adds to its appeal. The accessibility of the vantage point also plays an important role.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS118.7	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Robina Bodle Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin be amended to remove the incorrect statement at [12] that there are important ecological features and vegetation types and that lists features that do not have ecological importance such as exotic grasses.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505 and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I consider that exotic grasses, sycamores, black poplars, sweet briar, broom, scrub, hawthorn, wilding conifers and plantation forestry all exotic vegetation types that are worthy of mention under the header "Important ecological features and vegetation types" (emphasis added) due to the role that they play in shaping landscape values in the PA (albeit, in some instances, as a negative landscape element).</p> <p>I also note that Schedule 21.22.2 has been reviewed by an expert ecologist with that expert supporting the notified text.</p>	Reject submission.
OS118.8	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Robina Bodle Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to correct [14 and 15] under the heading important ecological features and vegetation types where the schedule lists animal and plant pest species, which are not relevant to important ecological features and vegetation types.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the PA ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>However, it is agreed that as currently drafted the PA Schedules are potentially confusing in this regard as these aspects of the landscape are negative rather than positive.</p> <p>A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS118.9	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Robina Bodle Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin be amended to clarify the relationship of mana whenua associations, Wāhi Tūpuna Chapter, and consultation with mana whenua for applications.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS118.10	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Robina Bodle Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin be amended at paragraph [35] to address the very generic statement made about the descriptions and photographs of the area in tourist publications while the landscape schedule provides no evidence as to what publications or photographs are referred to.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. It is not usual practice to identify which tourist publications make reference to an ONF/L in a Schedule of Landscape Values. However, by way of example, several views of the area are cited in the Arrowtown tourism website, see: https://www.arrowtown.com/gallery/	Reject submission.
OS118.11	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Robina Bodle Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin amended to make clear that the landscape capacity schedules are at a landscape character unit level rather than a site-specific level, and that there are site specific situations where the landscape does have capacity to absorb development through placement and recessive design.	The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 acknowledges the point raised in this submission as follows: <i>The capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the PA and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</i>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.1	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the mapping of the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove the submitters land on Glencoe Road (Lot 3 DP 493411, Lot 4-6 DP 398297 - held in 756258; Lot 1 DP 398297 held in 392272; and Lot 2 DP 392297 held in 392273).	Amendments to the PA mapping are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS177.2	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove the Outstanding Natural Landscape classification from the submitters land (Lot 3 DP 493411, Lot 4-6 DP 398297 - held in 756258; Lot 1 DP 398297 held in 392272; and Lot 2 DP 392297 held in 392273).	Addressed in response to OS 177.1.	Reject submission.
OS177.3	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to provide for an appropriate exception regime for the submitters land if the schedule is to remain in the variation.	Adopting this approach would not accord with the directions of the Environment Court as set out in the Topic 2 decisions. This matter is also addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	Reject submission.
OS177.4	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to provide for the Glencoe station/submitter land as a separate character unit	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505,	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Company Limited		under the schedule if it is to be retained.	and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that a separate landscape character area is appropriate (or required) for Glencoe Station. Further, an approach of delineating a landscape character area on the basis of landownership alone is problematic from a landscape methodology perspective. However Schedule 21.22.16 makes repeated reference to the characteristics specific to the New Chums Gully where the Glencoe Station homestead etc is located (for example, [16], [17], [18], [19]). It is expected that this information along with the other changes to the Schedule 21.22.16 recommended in response to Submission #174 may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	
OS177.5	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That if amended raised in points 177.1-177.4 are not adopted then the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin should be deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 177.1.	Reject submission.
OS177.6	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to include reference that surrounding undeveloped mountains have much higher landscape values than the developed terrace area.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider it appropriate to distinguish the surrounding mountains from the terrace in the manner requested in this submission point. The response to OS 177.4 is also of relevance here.	Reject submission.
OS177.7	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to include new definitions to provide for the intent of capacity in landscapes with different	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submitter would appear to be suggesting that the capacity ratings used in the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study are applied to the PA ONF/Ls capacity rating work. Section 3 of the PA Methodology Report explains the distinction between	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Company Limited		abilities to absorb appropriate development. Revised capacity ratings are required if these are to be retained within the schedule.	<p>the two, and why an alternate approach is required for the PA Schedules. It is however acknowledged that some refinement to the 'capacity' explanation is required to assist plan users as discussed in the evidence in chief of Bridget Gilbert which addresses the Key Landscape Matters Raised in Submissions.</p> <p>This has resulted in recommended changes to the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to better explain capacity ratings and includes the introduction of a new rating scale of very limited to no landscape capacity.</p> <p>It is expected that this additional text along with the (existing) explanation below, may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p> <p><i>The capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</i></p>	
OS177.8	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to recognise and provide for the benefits of change, enhancement and remediation of land within the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The focus of the Schedules is to identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected.</p> <p>That said, the identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>It is expected that such matters would be traversed in detail as part of a detailed (and more site specific) landscape assessment in support of a plan change or resource consent process.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.9	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation within the priority area.	Addressed in response to OS 177.8.	Reject submission.
OS177.10	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to recognise the particular existing attributes mentioned in point 19 of the submission as part of the values and character of the Outstanding Natural Landscape.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Many of the attributes and features requested for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.6 are already mentioned, albeit under more generic terms such as farm tracks, infrastructure, pastoral farming and the like, which is considered to be appropriate for a PA scale description, rather than a site-by-site description. The exception to this is: pest control. While the submitter may be managing pests at a site-specific level, this is not understood to be a particular characteristic of the PA as a whole, that merits mention in Schedule 21.22.6. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence if this understanding is incorrect, so that this aspect of the Schedule can be corrected.	Reject submission.
OS177.11	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to incorporate submitter feedback into the important values of the landscape schedule.	Amendments to Schedule 21.22.16 sought by all submitters have been made where they are supported by expert advice.	Accept submission in part.
OS177.12	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land	Oppose	That without derogating from the generality of the points in this submission, the submitter seeks any additional, amended,	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Development Company Limited		consequential, or further relief in respect to the schedule reflects the matters raised in this submission.		
OS177.13	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That if the amendments within this submission are not adopted within the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin that it be deleted or otherwise withdrawn from the variation.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS177.14	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at the important landforms and types section to distinguish between the elevated mountainous part of the Outstanding Natural Landscape and the lower-lying and highly modified flatter land at Glencoe Road.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [6] as follows: Glacial till deposits and alluvial fans at the toe of the steep mountain slopes framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin and along the finger of the Crown Terrace that extends between the western side of Mt Beetham and the Crown Escarpment (including New Chums Gully).	Accept submission.
OS177.15	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at the land use patterns and features section to further particularise the broader list of established activities occurring within the Outstanding Natural Landscape which are historically recognised as appropriate and in keeping with the landform, including	Addressed in response to OS 177.10.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			consented development (RM000505).		
OS177.16	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at the naturalness attributes and values section to reflect the rural residential living environment and the visibility of built development along Glencoe Road.	<p>Rural and rural living development is acknowledged in Schedule 21.22.16 [17] and [18]. I note that the rural living development consented in the PA does not appear to have been built yet, so no change is required in this regard in relation to the character of (existing) views.</p> <p>However, for completeness, it is recommended that Schedule 21.22.16 [17] is amended as follows:</p> <p>Built development patterning which includes a cluster of rural dwellings and farm buildings associated with Glencoe Station in New Chum Gully (to the north of Mt Beetham); a limited scattering of rural living dwellings to the northwest of Mt Beetham (including consented but unbuilt platforms); two rural living dwellings to the north of the Zig Zag Road (one located at the base of the escarpment and one near the top); and a small cluster of rural living dwellings towards the southern end of the PA, northwest of the Kawarau Bridge (and accessed from Gibbston Highway). Generally, development is characterised by carefully located and designed buildings that are well integrated by plantings and remain subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Elsewhere, the modest scale of buildings, together with their distinctly working rural character, ensures that they sit comfortably into the setting.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS177.17	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at the landscape values section to change the respective rankings to 'low' and 'moderate' rather than 'high'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider it appropriate to change the values ratings as requested.</p> <p>I also note that were the submitter correct in this regard, relying on caselaw, it is very unlikely that the area would</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				qualify as an ONL and specifically, the test of 'outstanding-ness'. I note that the ONL status of area has been confirmed by the Environment Court.	
OS177.18	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That if the landscape values section of the landscape schedule 21.22.16 is not amended then the values descriptions are amended to reflect the lower value of the modified terrace.	Addressed in response to OS 177.6.	Reject submission.
OS177.19	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the perceptual values section of the landscape values of landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to distinguish between the 'remote and wild' mountain range and the un-remote and un-wild terrace.	Addressed in response to OS 177.50 and OS 177.60.	Accept submission in part.
OS177.20	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to include information of what scale of development has been considered regarding the landscape capacity assessment.	The methodology applied in relation to Capacity is described in the PA Schedules Methodology Report at Section 3. It is acknowledged that some refinement to the 'capacity' explanation is required to assist plan users as discussed in the evidence in chief of Bridget Gilbert which addresses the Key Landscape Matters Raised in Submissions. This has resulted in recommended changes to the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to better explain capacity ratings.	Accept submission in part.
OS177.21	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at the capacity description of visitor accommodation activities to reflect the ability of land at Glencoe Road and the	Addressed in response to OS 177.62.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Company Limited		submitters site to absorb further visitor accommodation.		
OS177.22	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to reflect where there are existing and planned development opportunities and associated amenities and utilities.	Schedule 21.22.16 (broadly) describes existing development within the PA. It is considered that identifying development opportunities across the PA goes beyond what is required in terms of a Schedule of Values. I also consider that identifying development opportunities within the Capacity section of the Schedule would be unhelpfully open ended and that such matters are most appropriately addressed via a detailed landscape assessment as part of a plan change or resource consent process (as signalled in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22).	Reject submission.
OS177.23	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That if the landscape capacity sections are to be retained, then much of the Outstanding Natural Landscape terraces need to be amended to a moderate or high capacity for additional subdivision, visitor accommodation, lifestyle, earthworks and associated and ancillary activities.	Addressed in response to OS 177.62, OS 177.63, OS 177.64, OS 177.65, and OS 177.66.	Reject submission.
OS177.67	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	Amend General Description to include the term 'more modified' in relation to the feeder gullies on the Crown Terrace.	The General Description of each PA seeks to briefly define the spatial extent of the area rather than capture landscape values etc. For this reason, no change is considered necessary in this regard.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.24	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 5 from the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I consider that the remnant river terrace is an important landform in the PA and that it is appropriate to acknowledge that the majority of that continuous landform is outside the PA.</p> <p>I also note that a geomorphology expert supported the notified text in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS177.25	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to include a point under the title important ecological features and vegetation types which states 'Modified and grazed pasture associated with the Glencoe Station land'.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [12] as follows:</p> <p>(d) Grazed pasture associated with the Glencoe Station land.</p>	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS177.26	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to include a point under the title important ecological features and vegetation types which states 'Opportunities to enhance vegetation and/or remove pest plant species are encouraged through subdivision and development proposals'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>This section of Schedule 22.22.16 describes the existing landscape values, rather than future opportunities.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Capacity section of the Schedule signals such opportunities where appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.
OS177.27	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove	Addressed in response to OS 118.8.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited		point 14 from the landscape schedule.		
OS177.28	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 15 from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 118.8.	Reject submission.
OS177.29	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 16 to include the word significant in relation to human modification within the landscape schedule and to include the words 'and broader parts of the Glencoe farmed land'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree with the text changes requested. While there is modification around the homestead and in other parts of the farmland, I would not describe this as 'significant'.	Reject submission.
OS177.30	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 17 to include minor typographical errors and replace the words 'two rural living dwellings to the north of the' with 'A number of dwellings between Mt Beetham and'.	Having reviewed the mapping of the consented building platform mapping and aerial mapping for the Priority Area, I do not consider any change to the text of Schedule 21.22.16 [17] is required in this regard.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.31	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 18 to remove the words 'with the exception of', include the words 'including Glencoe Station, also includes rural living and other', have the word 'generally' removed and replace the words 'has been carefully located outside of the' with 'within'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS177.32	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 23 to include the words 'and other farming features such as modified pasture and planting, utilities, access, and fencing' in relation to the historic farmstead at Glencoe Station.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The features recommended for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.16 [23] (i.e. modified pasture and planting, utilities, access, and fencing) do not relate to 'Important archaeological and heritage features'. I also note that a heritage expert supported the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS177.33	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 32 to include reference to rural living opportunities regarding the Crown Terrace.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The features recommended for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.16 [32] (i.e. rural living) do not relate to 'Important historic attributes and values'. I also note that a heritage expert supported the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS177.34	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 33 to include the words 'used for pastoralism and rural living'	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The features recommended for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.16 [33] (i.e. pastoralism and rural living) do not relate to the Glencoe homestead which is the focus of the Schedule item.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Company Limited		regarding the Glencoe homestead.	Pastoralism is addressed under Schedule 21.22.16 [32] and rural living is not an 'Important historic attribute or value'. I also note that a heritage expert supported the notified text in this regard.	
OS177.35	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 35 from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 118.10.	Reject submission.
OS177.36	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 39 to remove reference to mixed rural and rural residential and replace this with 'Arcadian/resort landscapes', remove reference to 'more overtly working rural' and replace this with 'mixed rural and rural residential', and to include reference to the Glencoe Station/New Chums gully.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree with the text changes requested. For completeness, I do not consider that rural living development is of a scale, extent or character that it makes a noteworthy contribution to the 'Shared and recognised values' (or 'identity') of the PA.	Reject submission.
OS177.37	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 49 to remove reference the large-scale, rugged and unkempt appearance of the Crown Terrance and replace this with 'the mixed rural and rural lifestyle uses of the	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree with the text changes requested.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Crown Terrace', and replace the words 'working rural' with rural/lifestyle.	<p>The reference to the rugged unkempt appearance etc relates to the Crown Escarpment which is very steep land where there is virtually no built development or pastoral uses evident. This means the proposed description of this area as mixed rural and rural lifestyle uses is inaccurate.</p> <p>However, some minor refinement of the second part of [49] is proposed as follows to acknowledge the modest level of rural living development in part of the PA:</p> <p>The dramatic mid and long-range views from Arrowtown, the Arrow River ONF, the scenic routes of the Crown Range Road and SH6 Gibbston Highway, much of the Whakatipu Basin (including sections of the Queenstown Trail network) to the large-scale and coherent river terrace escarpment landform and/or the continuous sequence of mountains that frame the eastern side of the Crown Terrace. From more distant vantage points, the contrast established between these more natural landscape elements seen in combination with the gently sloping (predominantly) working rural 'plinth' of the Crown Terrace adds to the memorability and appeal of such views. At closer range, the large-scale, rugged and unkempt appearance of much of the Crown Terrace Escarpment reinforces its role as a 'break' between the more developed low-lying basin to the west and the (predominantly) working rural landscape of the Crown Terrace.</p>	
OS177.38	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 51 to include mention of the point being in context of a working farm.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [51] as follows:</p> <p>The highly engaging mid-range views from Glencoe Road, in which the roche moutonnée profile of Mt Beetham is clearly legible. The contrast between the landform feature and planar working rural context adds to the appeal of the outlook.</p>	Accept submission (subject to refinement).

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.39	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 52 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree with the deletion of Schedule 21.22.16 [52], as I consider the view from the air on the approach to Queenstown airport to be a noteworthy outlook in a Schedule of Landscape Values for the PA.	Reject submission.
OS177.40	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 53 to replace the word 'natural' with 'working pastoral activities and scattered rural lifestyle', make minor typographical errors, and remove mention of 'the generally subservient nature' of the built environment.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [53] are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS177.41	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 54 to remove mention of the undeveloped character of the landscape and replace it with 'mixed working/rural living character', replace mention of the mixed working rural and rural living with 'more developed Arcadian/resort character of the Whakatipu Basin, remove mention of the context of the rural setting of the Crown Terrace, replace the words	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [54] are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			'perception of naturalness' with quality and attractive appreciation of landscape', make minor typographical errors and remove mention of the subservient nature of mentioned elements.		
OS177.42	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 56 to remove the words 'meaning that it is not an overwhelmingly negative visual element', and replace the words 'seemingly undeveloped' with 'mixed rural/lifestyle'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [56] are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS177.43	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 57 to remove the word 'high' regarding the level of naturalness of the priority area.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [57] are appropriate. For completeness, the evaluation of naturalness is guided by the interpretation of 'natural' in Te Tangi a te Manu, [9.44] to [9.46], drawing from <i>Harrison, WESI</i> and the <i>West Wind</i> Environment Court decisions.	Reject submission.
OS177.44	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 58 to include reference to 'lifestyle development' of the river terrace landform of the Crown Terrace.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [58] are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Company Limited			In my opinion, the rural living development within the PA is of a scale, extent and character that means it remains a subservient element that does not make a noteworthy contribution to the views of the mountain context that is referenced in the schedule item.	
OS177.45	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 59 to make minor typographical errors, replace the words 'gateway between the' with 'transition landscape of mixed rural/lifestyle use between the', remove reference to the 'seemingly untouched' and replace this with 'more natural upper slopes', and remove the words 'along with the magnificent broader mountain setting within which it is seen in many views'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [59] are appropriate.</p> <p>However, I do consider that [59] would benefit from amendment as follows to assist an understanding of the meaning of this schedule item:</p> <p>In some instances, the more developed context of the low-lying basin appreciated within the seemingly untouched mountain-scape beyond that signals the role of this part of the PA ONL as a gateway, between the developed basin and seemingly untouched mountain-scape beyond. This factor, along with the magnificent broader mountain setting within which the PA is seen in many views, are also factors that contribute to its memorability.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS177.46	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 60 to replace the words 'bold contrast with' with 'transition to'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [60] are appropriate.</p> <p>For completeness, I consider that the Crown Escarpment is a bold landscape element that forms a marked contrast (rather than a transition) with the developed setting of the Basin floor.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.47	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 64 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the deletion of Schedule 21.22.16 [64] is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS177.48	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 66 to remove reference to the 'sense of remoteness' of the eastern side of the Crown Terrace and include the words 'are experienced within a modified context'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [66] are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS177.49	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 67 to change the sense of wildness of the Crown Terrace Escarpment to 'low', and to remove reference to the 'continuous rugged character along with its generally undeveloped and, in places, seemingly unkempt character'. Also to remove reference to this being in 'contrast with the settled and more manicured character of the basin'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [67] are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.50	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 68 to include reference to 'areas of working farm/lifestyle development within the priority area.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [68] as follows: Such feelings reduce in the parts of the PA where forestry, rural living, farm dwellings and sheds and the Crown Range Road are located.	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS177.51	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 70(b) iii to include reference to the 'lifestyle' landscape of the Crown Terrace.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [70](iii) as follows: The seemingly wild escarpment landform that forms a 'wall' along the eastern side of the basin floor and serves as a transition between the basin floor and the predominantly working rural landscape of the Crown Terrace.	Accept submission in part (subject to refinement).
OS177.52	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 70(b) v to remove the words 'The confinement of appreciable visible' and to include reference to Glencoe Road.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [70](v) as follows: The confinement of appreciable visible built development within the PA to lower lying flat to gently sloping land near Glencoe Road the Crown Range Road.	Accept submission in part.
OS177.53	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 70(b) vi to remove reference of the 'very limited' level of built modification through the Outstanding Natural Landscape and to include the words 'integrated into the landscape'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [70](iv) are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.54	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 71 to include the words 'however, opportunities to control or eradicate those through future subdivision and development are encouraged' in reference to pest plant species.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The amendment sought to Schedule 21.22.16 [71] amounts to policy direction which is not appropriate in this part of the Schedule of Values. However, it is noted that the Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.16 references the benefits of landscape restoration (which typically includes pest control) as part of appropriate future development for a number of the landuse typologies evaluated.	Reject submission.
OS177.55	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the rating for physical values for the priority area from 'high' to 'moderate', include reference to the 'working character/lifestyle development' within the priority area and to remove reference to 'mana whenua features'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree consider that the text change requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [72] is appropriate. I also note that geomorphology and ecology experts support the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS177.56	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the associative values of the priority area from 'high' to 'moderate'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree consider that the text change requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [73] is appropriate. I also note that heritage and tourism/recreation experts support the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.57	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 73 to include a point on 'the lifestyle opportunities within the area' as an associative values of the priority area.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [72] 'new' (d) are appropriate.</p> <p>While there may be opportunities for rural living within the PA (as acknowledged in the Capacity section), I do not consider that this is a particularly noteworthy existing characteristic for which the PA is valued.</p>	Reject submission.
OS177.58	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the perceptual value rating of the priority area from 'high' to 'moderate'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree consider that the text change requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [74] is appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.
OS177.59	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 74(c) to change the perception of naturalness from 'high' to 'moderate', replace the words 'dominance of' with 'contrast of' in regard to landscape elements in the schedule and to include reference to the 'working rural/lifestyle land uses' taking place.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [74] (c) are appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.60	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 74(d) from the landscape schedule.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [74] (d) as follows: A strong sense of remoteness and/or wildness across <u>much of the PA. Such feelings are reduced in the parts of the PA where forestry, rural living, farm dwellings and sheds and the Crown Range Road are located.</u>	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS177.61	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity of commercial recreational activities in the priority area from 'very limited to 'some', replace the words 'optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of' with 'integrate with', replace the word 'protects' with provide for and include the words 'where appropriate' regarding commercial recreational activities.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity (i) in relation to Commercial Recreation Activities are appropriate. In my opinion, the steep, elevated and visually prominent nature of the majority of the PA steers towards a conservative capacity rating for this landuse.	Reject submission.
OS177.62	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the capacity rating for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities from 'very limited' to 'some', replace the words 'low lying locations' with 'visually recessive locations', replace the word 'or' with 'and', remove reference to 'of a modest scale' and to remove 'No	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity (ii) in relation to Tourism Related Activities (i.e. resorts) are appropriate.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			landscape capacity for tourism related activities'.	<p>In my opinion, the steep, elevated and visually prominent nature of the majority of the PA steers towards a conservative capacity rating for these landuses.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Schedule 21.22.16 Preamble acknowledges that capacity ratings relate to the PA as a whole, rather than a site-specific level, and that detailed landscape assessment as part of the plan change or resource consent application may identify a different capacity rating.</p> <p>However, in considering this submission point, I consider that some refinement of the capacity descriptive comments would be beneficial (noting that some of these suggested changes align with the submitter's changes) and recommend the following amendments to 21.22.16 Capacity (ii) as follows:</p> <p>i. Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – very limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation in low lying locations and clustered with existing buildings, that is of a modest small scale; have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access, and protects the area's ONE values. No landscape capacity for tourism related activities.</p>	
OS177.63	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the capacity rating for earthworks from 'very limited' to 'some' and include capacity for 'mitigation and landscaping associated with future subdivision and development'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity (v) Earthworks are appropriate due to the steep, elevated and visually prominent nature of the majority of the PA.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.64	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the capacity rating for farm buildings from 'very limited' to 'some', remove reference of such buildings being 'modestly scaled' and to include the words 'and assist the functioning of the farming practice'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity (vi) Farm Buildings are appropriate due to the steep, elevated and visually prominent nature of the majority of the PA and the cluster of existing farm buildings on the flatter land in New Chums Gully.	Reject submission.
OS177.65	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the capacity rating for transport infrastructure from 'very limited' to 'limited', include reference for such activities to 'provide enhanced access opportunities' and to replace the word 'protect' with 'are consistent with' the areas Outstanding Natural Feature values.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity for Transport Infrastructure are appropriate due to the steep, elevated and visually prominent nature of the majority of the PA. However I note that this item has been numbered incorrectly and recommend it is changed to (viii) with a consequential amendment to the numbering of the subsequent schedule items.	Reject submission.
OS177.66	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the capacity rating for rural living from 'very limited' to 'some', replace the words 'low lying locations' with 'visually recessive locations', replace the word 'and' with 'or', remove reference to	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity (ii) in relation to Visitor Accommodation and Tourism Related Activities (i.e. resorts) are appropriate.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>such activities being 'of a modest scale', replace the words 'protects' with 'is consistent with', and to include reference to such activities having capacity 'where appropriate'.</p>	<p>In coming to my PA level capacity conclusions on this landuse, I note that an 80ha minimum lot size applies to the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone on the Crown Terrace (outside the PA) and that no appeals were lodged seeking a change to this lot size across the Crown Terrace as part of the PDP Chapter 24 Appeals. In my opinion, this suggests community support for a relatively restrictive approach to rural living land near the PA. I also note that all of the landscape experts involved in the Topic 30 Appeal, agreed that the Crown Terrace (known as LCU20 and corresponds to the balance of the Crown Terrace outside of the PA ONL) had a 'very low' capacity to absorb rural living development change (with 'very low' corresponding to the lowest rating on the seven-point scale applied in Chapter 24).</p> <p>However, in considering this submission point, I consider that some refinement of the capacity descriptive comments would be beneficial (noting that some of these suggested changes align with the submitter's changes) and recommend the following amendments to 21.22.16 Capacity (xi) as follows:</p> <p>Rural living – very limited landscape capacity for rural living in low lying locations and clustered with existing buildings, that is: of a modest scale; have a small scale and low-key rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhances public access ;- and protects the area's ONF values.</p>	

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.67	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at the general description section to include the words 'more modified'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The level of modification referenced in a Schedule of Landscape Values is most appropriately discussed under Naturalness attributes and values (and to a degree, Physical Attributes and values) rather than in the General Description of the Area, which is simply a scene setting paragraph outlining the general location and extent of the PA.</p>	Reject submission.
OS188.42	Elisha Young-Ebert	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin paragraph 46 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Addressed in response to OS 77.42.	Accept submission.

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(l) 21.22.21 West Wanaka PA ONL

21.22.21 PA ONL West Wānaka: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The West Wānaka PA extends from the Mātakitaki (Matukituki River) mouth to Damper Bay on Wānaka (Lake Wānaka). This includes Roys Peninsula, the Motatapu River valley, the roche moutonnée down its eastern side, and much of the Alpha Range. It also encompasses parts of Wānaka (Lake Wānaka), including Paddock Bay, Bishops Bay, Parkins Bay, and Glendhu Bay. The Fern Burn Valley also falls within this area.

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. The Harris Mountains: these form the western boundary of the Fern Burn and Motatapu Valleys. These contain extremely steep and visually rugged landforms, including deeply incised gorges and canyons, extensive rock outcrops, and bluffs. Treble Cone and End Peak are prominent features along the eastern ridge of the range.
2. The Alpha Range: which defines the eastern side of the Fern Burn valley, capped by the distinctive peaks of Mt Alpha and Roys Peak.
3. A series of roche moutonnées to the north-west include:
 - a. Pt 782m between Hospital Flat and Parkins Bay and the Glendhu and Emerald Bluffs;
 - b. Rocky Mountain north of Hospital Flat; and
 - c. Roys Peninsula north of Glendhu/Parkins Bay.
4. A number of moraine outwash areas: which are located below these features, including along the western side of Fern Burn Valley. These contain material deposited by retreating ice and now have the form of long moraine ridges that are characterised by their undulating profiles, together with extensive ablation and terminal moraine material.
5. The fan of the braided Mātakitaki (Matukituki River): comprising fluvial gravels with sand and loess deposits around Paddock Bay and the base of Roys Peninsula. The river flats, delta, and fluvial terraces of the Mātakitaki (Matukituki River) include that system's valley floors and floodplains.
6. The western Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) shoreline: comprising the indented bays of Parkins, Paddock and Glendhu Bays, which are separated from the main lake by Roys Peninsula. A gravel foreshore and low-lying lake and river terraces, resulting from both lake shore deposits and post-glacial river alluvium, are apparent towards the south, interspersed with distinctive steep banks and escarpments. The outwash material of the Fern Burn Fan separates Glendhu Bay from Parkins Bay.

Important hydrological features:

7. The western arm of Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) notable for its scale, largely undeveloped mountain context, intricate patterning, unmanaged lake level, high water quality and clarity, clear visibility, and attractive water colour.

Commented [BG1]: OS 176.38 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

8. The Mātakitaki (Matukituki River). Corresponds to the lower reaches of a largely glacier-fed braided river system draining broadly south eastwards from the Main Divide in Mt Aspiring National Park to Wānaka (Lake Wānaka). Subject to periodic flooding and inundation of the adjacent floodplain.
9. The Motatapu River is part of the lower reaches of a larger river system draining north eastwards from Roses Saddle to Wānaka (Lake Wānaka). Consists of comparatively narrow riverbeds, with extensive fluvial terraces. Subject to periodic flooding and inundation of the adjacent floodplain.
10. The Fern Burn and Alpha Burn rivers which comprise comparatively narrow riverbeds, with extensive fluvial terraces. Subject to periodic flooding and inundation of the adjacent floodplain.
11. Wetland to the west of Damper Bay.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

12. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. The stands of beech forest through the steeply incised gullies on the western side of the Alpha Range.
 - b. The subalpine and alpine vegetation across the Alpha Range, including snow tussocklands, cushionfields and herbfields.
 - c. The diverse broadleaved shrublands throughout the roche moutonnée west of Fern Burn, the steep north-eastern slopes of the Glendhu Bluff Conservation Area, the bluffs and slopes of Roys Peninsula, in gullies around Rocky Mountain and across the Emerald Bluff. The shrublands occur in association with large areas of bracken fernland and to a lesser extent matagouri-mingimingi dominant shrublands.
13. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
 - a. Grazed pasture with shelterbelts and clusters of shade trees typical of the Fern Burn valley floor, the Fern Burn fan, the Alpha Burn, Motatapu River, Fern Burn and the flats either side of Buchanan Road leading out to Roys Peninsula. Willows line much of the Alpha Burn and Fern Burn and parts of the Motatapu River.
 - b. The grazed and gently flat river terraces behind Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay.
 - c. The willows and poplars that dominate the majority of the lake shore between Damper Bay and Roys Peninsula.
14. High value wetlands (sedgelands) are located in natural depressions bordering roche moutonnée west of Damper Bay.
15. The PA possesses a diverse range of valued habitats from the lake to the mountain tops for New Zealand falcon, Australasian harrier, kea, tui, bellbird, New Zealand pipit, grey warbler, fantail, tomtit, NZ New Zealand shoveler, paradise shelduck, grey teal, crested grebe, Black shag, Little shag and New Zealand scaup. Kea are nationally threatened with a threat status of nationally endangered.
16. The lower braided reach of the Mātakitaki (Matukituki River) north of Roys Peninsula is likely to provide favoured feeding and nesting habitat for the nationally threatened black-fronted tern (nationally endangered) and banded dotterel (nationally vulnerable).
17. Valued habitats for koaro, brown trout, rainbow trout, Chinook salmon, common bully, brook char, banded kokopu and long-finned eels.
18. Valued habitat for sports fishing spawning in Fern Burn and Motatapu River.
19. Valued habitat for game birds at Paddock Bay.

Commented [BG2]: OS 176.40 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG3]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG4]: OS 176.42 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG5]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG6]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG7]: OS 115.8 Khaylm Marshall

20. High indigenous invertebrate values associated with high alpine and tussock areas, including a potentially new species of weevil. Aquatic invertebrate communities throughout the high alpine areas are healthy and consistent with a pristine environment.
21. Valued habitat for skink and gecko, particularly in the rock outcrops, boulderfields and rock strewn tussock and exotic grasslands. This includes the nationally threatened Roys Peak (*Haplodactylus* sp. "Roys Peak") and Cromwell geckos (*Hoplodactylis* aff.*maculatus* "Cromwell") have been recorded in the PA. Both species are classified as At-Risk Declining.
22. Animal pest species include red deer, chamois, feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
23. Plant pest species include sweet briar, broom, gorse and wilding pines.

Commented [BG8]: OS 176.43 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG9]: OS 176.43 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Important land-use patterns and features:

24. Human modification which is currently concentrated around Glendhu Bay, with its existing campground, woolshed wedding events venue, Bike Glendhu bike trails and facility development (including bike trails, pump park, bike hub facility), farmhouses (and associated curtilages), driveways/tracks, airstrip and farm buildings, as well as Parkins Bay with its consented golf resort/ homesite development and associated restoration planting strategy.
25. Throughout the remainder of the area, development is largely restricted to isolated farm buildings and a scattering of rural residential dwellings around Emerald Bluff (associated with the pocket of Rural Lifestyle zoned land) and Roys Peninsula. Generally, such development is characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Typically this sees buildings well integrated by existing landform features and a mix of established and more recent vegetation features. In addition, new development is typically accompanied by appreciable landscape enhancement in the form of native restoration plantings and / or improvements to public access.
26. Several moorings at Glendhu Bay and along the western side of Paddock Bay. Marked water ski lanes to the northwest of Parkins Bay. Consented jetty at Parkins Bay.

Commented [BG10]: OS 137.3 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 137.5 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 137.8 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 176.12 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.
OS 176.20 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG11]: OS 116.1 Bike Glendhu.

Commented [BG12]: OS 137.3 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 137.5 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 137.8 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 176.12 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.
OS 176.20 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG13]: OS 137.3 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 137.5 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 137.8 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 176.12 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.
OS 176.20 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG14]: OS 48.2 Second Star

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

27. Sites associated with historic farming in the area. For example, the remains of the Motatapu homestead site (including archaeological sites F40/121-123).
28. Māori archaeological sites (e.g. F40/3 and F40/5).

Mana whenua features and their locations:

29. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
30. Much of the ONL is mapped within the wāhi tūpuna: Wānaka (Lake Wānaka), Mātakitaki (Matukituki River), or Area surrounding Te Poutu Te Raki.
31. Lake Wānaka is highly significant to Kāi Tahu and is a Statutory Acknowledgement under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

Mana whenua associations and experience:

32. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
33. Wānaka is one of the lakes referred to in the tradition of “Ngā Puna Wai Karikari o Rākaihautū” which tells how the principal lakes of Te Wai Pounamu were dug by the rangatira (chief) Rākaihautū. Through these pūrakau (stories), this area holds a deep spiritual significance both traditionally and for Kāi Tahu today.
34. The mapped area covers a vast area with kaika mahika kai which were once part of the extensive mahika kai network in the area. Tuna (eels), kāuru (cabbage tree root), weka, kākāpō and aruhe (fern root) were gathered throughout the area.
35. The mana whenua values associated with this area include, but may not be limited to, wāhi taoka, mahika kai, ara tawhito, urupā, kāika and nohoaka.

Important historic attributes and values:

36. Early Māori occupation associated with the lakeshore and local rivers.
37. Historic farming patterns, especially early pastoralism.
38. Historic recreational use of the lake and lakeshore.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

39. The photographic references and descriptions of the area in tourism publications. Commented [BG15]: OS 176.47 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.
40. The very high popularity of Roys Peak Track (noting that most of the track is in Mount Alpha PA ONL) but parts of it afford views out over the eastern portion of West Wanaka PA ONL). Commented [BG16]: OS 176.47 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.
41. The very high popularity of the Roys Peak Track Lookout as a vantage point for social media photographs.
42. The high popularity of the biking routes, walking trails and camping grounds/spots in the area.
43. The importance of the natural heritage area to the local community as evidenced by the efforts of Wai Wanaka in the area.
- 43(a) The impression of the Fern Burn valley as the entrance to the Motatapu Valley that displays a more structured appearance as a consequence of the pastoral landuse and patterning of shelterbelts, hedges and small conifer plantations. Commented [BG17]: OS 176.39 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Important recreation attributes and values:

44. Aotearoa’s National Walkway, the Te Araroa Trail runs along the lakeshore between Damper Bay and Glendhu Bay, Motatapu Road, and the Motatapu Track (adjacent Fern Burn).
45. The highly popular walking trail of Roys Peak Track.
46. Wānaka Mt Aspiring Road as a key scenic route providing access to Treble Cone ski field and Mt Aspiring National Park.

47. Popular walking trails including: Spotts Creek Track; Roys Peak Track; the Motatapu River track; the northern flanks of Pt 782 (Main Wall Track and Little Big Wall Track); the trail to the crest of Pt 442 (to the east of Paddock Bay); and the trail to the crest of Roys Peninsula.
48. Boating, water skiing, kayaking, fishing, and swimming at Wānaka (Lake Wānaka).
- 48(a) Trails, open space, jetty and (consented but largely unbuilt) golf course amenities at Parkins Bay.
49. Nationally significant fishery at Wānaka (Lake Wānaka), sports fishing spawning habitat in the Fern Burn, recreational angling in the Motatapu River and game bird habitat at Paddock Bay.
50. Picnicking around the lake shoreline.
51. Highly popular mountain and road biking routes throughout the area, including at Bike Glendhu, along the Glendhu Bay Track, and along Wānaka Mt Aspiring Road.
52. Highly popular public campground at Glendhu Bay.
53. Fishing and duck shooting on the Mātakitaki (Matukituki River).
54. Canoeing, tubing, rock climbing, and informal camping on the Motatapu River.
55. Extensive rock climbing at Hospital Flat and Diamond Lake Conservation Area.

Commented [BG18]: OS 176.52 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG19]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG20]: OS 115.9 Khaylm Marshall.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

56. The area's natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above) which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative processes.
57. Indigenous gully and stream plantings reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values in places.
58. More generally the vegetation cover and land uses found within the area reinforce the landform differences throughout the ONL, with more cultural vegetation patterns and human modification evident on the lower-lying areas and natural vegetation cover apparent across more elevated areas.

Commented [BG21]: OS 176.56 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

59. The sequence of highly attractive, frequently dramatic, and varied views from Wanaka-Mt Aspiring Road between Damper Bay and Emerald Bluff of the lake and mountain context.
60. The striking mid and long-range views from Glendhu Bluff lookout (layby on Wanaka-Mt Aspiring Road) out over the lake, Roys Peninsula, Paddock Bay, Parkins Bay, Glendhu Bay, Roys Peak, and the Alpha Range.
61. A series of highly attractive close to long-range views from the Glendhu Bay Track along the largely undeveloped lake margins and across Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) to the surrounding mountain context.
62. The series of appealing views from the 'inland' sections of the Te Araroa Trail across the open pastoral river terraces backdropped by the Alpha Range and the Harris Mountains.
63. Views from Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) within Glendhu / Parkins/ Paddock Bays.

64. The expansive long-range views from the Roys Peak lookout and track over almost the entire area.

65. In many of the views there is an awareness of the Glendhu Bay campground, and to a far lesser degree, development associated with the Parkins Bay development and Bike Glendhu. However, the visual dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes along with the generally subservient nature of built development underpins the high quality of the outlook.

Commented [BG22]: OS 176.24 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.
OS 176.25 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Naturalness attributes and values:

66. Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) as a central feature of the ONL.

67. The mountains framing the ONL are an important feature in their own right and as a counterpart to the lake.

68. The Fern Burn valley floor is the least natural part of the ONL because of the presence of the campground and pastoral farming activities. The campground, with its high level of development, contrasts with the rural character of the farmland on the southern side of the road, notwithstanding the presence of scattered farm buildings and dwellings.

69. Parkins Bay which conveys a sense of transition, away from the rural environs of Glendhu Bay and the lake margins into a more natural landscape: in particular, the managed pasture across the Fern Burn fan and lower terraces transitions into the more vegetated and hummocky terrain around the base of the roche moutonnée. This culminates in the natural shrubland and roche moutonnée landforms of Pt 782m, Glendhu Bluff and Emerald Bluff. The vegetation within this area of change includes the shrubland revegetation that has occurred as part of the Parkins Bay development and the Bike Glendhu development. It also encompasses the development consented by the Environment Court, including:

Commented [BG23]: OS 116.6 Bike Glendhu Ltd.

a. the golf course;

b. a jetty;

c. a clubhouse and visitor accommodation, which is carefully sited amongst existing mature vegetation, set back from the lakefront, and constrained with respect to its height and extent so that it is visually recessive in views from the lakeshore, lake, and road; and

d. residential homesites that are subject to specific controls in relation to their location, integration with natural landforms, and related mounding, building height, roof materials, building extent, curtilage, and native restoration planting, to ensure built development is 'difficult to see' from external locations.

70. Overall, the area displays naturalness values that rate towards the moderate to higher end of the spectrum as a consequence of the dominance of the more natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes. The relatively confined extent of built development and its predominantly visually recessive, modest, and/or relatively low-key character plays an important role in this regard.

Memorability attributes and values:

71. The highly memorable views of the lake and its surrounding mountain frame.

Transient attributes and values:

72. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain slopes and surface of the lake.

73. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation (lake edge poplars and willows in particular).

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

- 74. The parts of the PA that are set apart from the more developed lake shore and immediate hinterland at Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay (which includes the lower reaches of the Fern Burn, and the Bike Glendhu area) display an impression of wildness, and with a distinctly increasing impression of remoteness as one travels westwards along Wānaka – Mount Aspiring Road.
- 75. A localised sense of remoteness along the Parkins Bay lakeshore, where the landform and/or vegetation serves to obscure views of (land based) built development.
- 76. The dark night sky (i.e. lack of light pollution), contributes to the impression of wildness and remoteness.

Commented [BG24]: OS 176.69 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Aesthetic attributes and values:

- 77. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
- 78. More specifically, this includes:
 - a. The highly attractive and striking composition created by the arrangement of the natural waters of the lake framed by the complex and dramatic mountain setting.
 - b. The continuous and large-scale patterning of the alpine ridges and peaks together with the expanse of the lake which form a bold contrast to the more modified and 'tamed' low-lying land at Paddock Bay, Parkins Bay, the Fern Burn Valley and Glendhu Bay that is engaging and appealing.
 - c. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. the bold bluffs and rock outcrops set within a native vegetation context;
 - ii. the indigenous vegetation covered hummocky moraine;
 - iii. the relatively low-key and 'rural vernacular' or visually discreet style of the majority of built development;
 - iv. the contrasting columnar forms of Lombardy poplars at Parkins Bay; and
 - v. the willows and poplars along the lake shore and the Fern Burn, including its delta, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

Commented [BG25]: OS 176.72 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA ONL West Wānaka can be summarised as follows:

- 79. **High physical values** due to the proliferation of high-value and large-scale landforms, landforms reflecting the interaction of a range of geomorphic processes, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features throughout the area .

80. **High associative values** relating to:

- a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
- b. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
- c. The popularity of the area for a wide range of recreational activities.

81. **High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of biophysical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its often dramatic and highly appealing visual character. The attractive composition of both natural and rural/farmed landscapes, with a strong focus on the mountains and lake, are critical features of the area. The public accessibility of much of the area which allows the experience of these values along with the area's transient values also play a role in this regard.
- c. A moderate to high impression of naturalness arising from the dominance of the natural landscape and the generally relatively modest or visually recessive nature of built development.
- d. A sense of remoteness and wildness in places, particularly away from the lake shore and hinterland at Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay, and where the landform and/or vegetation obscures views of built development.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONL West Wānaka for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – **very limited** landscape capacity for **small scale and low key** activities that: integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale and have a 'low key' rural character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; **and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values.**
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** (including campgrounds) – **very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities that: **are co-located with** existing consented facilities; are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks** – **limited** landscape capacity for earthworks that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, **limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.

Commented [BG26]: OS 67.14 Julian Haworth.

Commented [BG27]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG28]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG29]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG30]: OS 67.14 Julian Haworth.

Commented [BG31]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG32]: OS 67.15 Julian Haworth.

Commented [BG33]: OS 67.15 Julian Haworth.

- vii. **Mineral extraction** – no landscape capacity for extraction larger than farm-scale quarries. **Limited** capacity for farm-scale quarries and gravel extraction in riverbeds that protects the naturalness and aesthetic attributes and values of the ONL. **Commented [BG34]:** Typographical correction.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure** – very limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low-key 'rural' roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns. **Limited** **Some landscape** capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protects the area's ONL values. **Commented [BG35]:** OS 73.11 Bike Wanaka Inc. OS 99.4 John Wellington. **Commented [BG36]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2. **Commented [BG37]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks. **Commented [BG38]:** OS 70.39 Transpower New Zealand Limited.
- x. **Renewable energy generation** – no landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation. Limited landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation. **Commented [BG39]:** OS 67.15 Julian Haworth.
- xi. **Production forestry** – no landscape capacity. **Commented [BG40]:** Typographical correction. **Commented [BG41]:** OS 67.15 Julian Haworth. **Commented [BG42]:** OS 67.14 Julian Haworth.
- xii. **Rural living** – very limited landscape capacity for rural living development located on lower-lying terrain and sited so that it is contained by landforms and vegetation – with the location, scale, and design of any proposal ensuring that it is barely discernible from external viewpoints. The exception to this is views from Roys Peak, where rural living development should be extremely visually recessive. Developments should be of a modest scale; have a low key 'rural' character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values. **Commented [BG43]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2. **Commented [BG44]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust. **Commented [BG45]:** OS 77.28 Kai Tahu ki Otago. **Commented [BG46]:** OS 67.15 Julian Haworth.
- xiii. **Jetties, Boatsheds, Lake Structures and Moorings** - no landscape capacity.

21.22.21 West Wanaka PA ONL Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.21 West Wanaka PA ONL Schedule". New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text relates to a submission point that has not been captured in the "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.21 West Wanaka PA ONL Schedule". This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **Forty-nine examples identified.**

Green wash line item: Submission point re-notified 22 June 2023.

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS28.1	Peter Oliver	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka be retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required other than to note the relatively minor amendments in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.12 (July 2023).	Accept submission in part.
OS48.1	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedules be reassessed to include a further layer of capacity mapping that identifies areas within specific ONLs that have the capability to absorb some development, with specific reference to schedules 21.22.19 and 21.22.21	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>It is expected that the explanatory text in the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble, which explains that: the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications, may provide some comfort to the submitter.</p> <p>My EiC also discusses the appropriate grain of landscape assessment for the PA Schedules work in more detail.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS48.2	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedules be reassessed to include a further layer of capacity mapping that identifies areas within specific ONLs that have the capability to absorb some development, with specific reference to schedules 21.22.19 and 21.22.21	Addressed in response to OS 48.1.	Reject submission.
OS48.2	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka be reassessed to acknowledge that rural living, farm buildings and other activities and uses can be appropriate throughout the priority area (including those existing), provided they are appropriate located and subject to comprehensive, site specific landscape assessment.	Addressed in response to OS 46.4. However, in considering this submission point, I recommend the description of the PA under the 'Important land-use patterns and features' is expanded to address the pocket of Rural Lifestyle in the vicinity of Emerald Bluffs. Throughout the remainder of the area, development is largely restricted to isolated farm buildings and a scattering of rural residential dwellings around Emerald Bluff (associated with the pocket of Rural Lifestyle zoned land) and Roys Peninsula. Generally, such development is characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Typically this sees buildings well integrated by existing landform features and a mix of established and more recent vegetation features. In addition, new development is typically accompanied by appreciable landscape enhancement in the form of native restoration plantings and / or improvements to public access.	Accept submission in part..
OS48.6	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That with regard to landscape schedule 21.22.21, that the benefits of visitor accommodation are recognised and appropriately	The potential landscape related benefits of rural living development are appropriately signalled in the factors listed in Schedule 21.22.21 Capacity (ii) that are likely to frame appropriate rural living development.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			anticipated, subject to appropriate design and comprehensive landscape assessment,		
OS48.6	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That the benefits of rural living and other appropriate activities are recognised and appropriately anticipated, subject to appropriate design and comprehensive landscape assessment.	Addressed in response to OS 46.4.	Reject submission.
OS48.8	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 apply a priority area level to guide to guide future development but not preclude it.	The Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the capacity ratings apply to the PA as a whole (rather than at a site specific level) and that the more detailed assessments of the landscape (including capacity) that would be required as part of resource consent and plan change applications may identify a varying landscape capacity rating.	Reject submission.
OS48.9	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That it is clear that the capacity for landscape schedule 21.22.21 is not to be applied or interpreted at a site-specific scale.	The Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the capacity ratings apply to the PA as a whole (rather than at a site specific level) and that the more detailed assessments of the landscape (including capacity) that would be required as part of resource consent and plan change applications may identify a varying landscape capacity rating.	Reject submission.
OS48.10	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That with regard to landscape schedule 21.22.21, any other consequential or alternative changes be made that are necessary to achieve the relief sought in the submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report.	Reject submission.
OS67.14	Julian Haworth	Support	That the landscape capacity rating for commercial	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			recreation, visitor accommodation, tourism and rural living capacity being 'very 'limited' in landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wanaka is supported.		
OS67.15	Julian Haworth	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wanaka is amended so there is 'no landscape capacity' for lake structures or moorings, urban expansion, intensive agriculture, renewable energy generation or production forestry nor any permanent exotic evergreen forests.	In agreement with the capacity ratings for lake structures or moorings, urban expansion, intensive agriculture, renewable energy generation or production forestry, so no comment required. Permanent exotic evergreen forests are not a landuse type directed for consideration by the policy framework. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence that this is a landuse type that is likely to proliferate in the PA, so that consideration can be given as to whether it merits reference in the Capacity section of the PA Schedule.	Accept submission in part.
OS70.39	Ainley McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wanaka is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 Capacity (ix) as follows: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.	Accept submission.
OS73.1	Ian Greaves On Behalf Of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.21 West Wānaka be amended to remove	Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider it appropriate to remove the capacity	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			reference to limited or very limited capacity for new trails.	reference for new trails, as inappropriately located and/or designed trails have the potential to detract from landscape values. Also addressed in response to OS 73.11.	
OS73.11	Ian Greaves On Behalf Of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.21 West Wānaka be amended to include the following - Walking and cycling trails: some landscape capacity for additional trails that are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.	In recognition of the important role that trails play in shaping recreation and shared and recognised values in the PA, amend Schedule 21.22.21 Capacity (viii) as follows: Transport infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low-key 'rural' roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns. Limited Some landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONL values.	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS74.4	Ian Greaves On Behalf Of John May and Longview Environmental Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka be amended to remove reference to the Parkins Bay golf resort consent.	The Parkins Bay development forms part of the existing environment that shapes landscape values, and for this reason merits reference in Schedule 21.22.21.	Reject submission.
OS99.4	John Wellington On Behalf of Upper Clutha Tracks Trust.	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.	Addressed in response to OS 73.11.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS115.7	Khaylm Marshall	Oppose	That both the physical values (para 79) and associative values (para 80) of the West Wanaka Outstanding Natural Landscape are increased from 'high' to 'very high'.	<p>The submitter requests that the rating of the (summary of) Physical and Associative values is changed from High to Very High, particularly on the basis of the importance of the Lake Wanaka fishery.</p> <p>While the importance of the fishery is not disputed, it is difficult to see how the fishery itself elevates landscape values of the PA (as a whole) to 'very high' given that much of the PA relates to land (rather than waterbodies or streams).</p> <p>However, in considering this submission point it is noted that Schedule 21.22.21 [49] acknowledges the nationally significant fishery of Lake Wanaka which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns.</p> <p>As a consequence of reviewing this submission point, it is however recommended that the typographical error in Schedule 21.22.21 [49] is corrected as follows:</p> <p>Nationally significant fishery at Wānaka (Lake Wānaka), sports fishing spawning habitat in the Fern Burn Brun and game bird habitat at Paddock Bay.</p>	Reject submission.
OS115.8	Khaylm Marshall	Oppose	That the list of physical attributes and values for landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka is amended to acknowledge that the Motatapu River is a valued habitat for fish spawning.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [18] as follows:</p> <p>Valued habitat for sports fishing spawning in Fern Burn and <u>Motatapu River</u>.</p>	Accept submission.
OS115.9	Khaylm Marshall	Oppose	That the list of associative attributes and values section (important recreational attributes and values subsection) for landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka is amended to include the recreational angling	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [49] as follows:</p> <p>Nationally significant fishery at Wānaka (Lake Wānaka), sports fishing spawning habitat in the Fern Burn, <u>recreational angling in the Motatapu River</u> and game bird habitat at Paddock Bay.</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			opportunities of the Motatapu River.		
OS116.1	Simon Pierce On Behalf Of Bike Glendhu Limited	Oppose	<p>That paragraph 24 of landscape schedule 21.22.1 West Wanaka be amended to read:</p> <p>Human modification which is currently concentrated around Glendhu Bay, with its existing campground, woolshed wedding venue, Bike Glendhu consented development, including bike trails, pump park, and bike hub facility and farm buildings, as well as Perkins Bay with its consented golf resort / homesite development.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [24] as follows:</p> <p>Human modification which is currently concentrated around Glendhu Bay, with its existing campground, woolshed wedding venue, Bike Glendhu bike trails and facility development (including bike trails, pump park, bike hub facility) and farm buildings, as well as Perkins Bay with its consented golf resort/ homesite development.</p>	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS116.2	Simon Pierce On Behalf Of Bike Glendhu Limited	Support	That paragraph 42 of landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wanaka is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 28.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS116.3	Simon Pierce On Behalf Of Bike Glendhu Limited	Support	That paragraph 51 of landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wanaka is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 28.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS116.4	Simon Pierce On Behalf Of Bike Glendhu Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity assessments for West Wanaka contained in landscape schedule 21.22.21 are reframed away from identifying specific activities (such as commercial recreation and	The requirement to include a capacity rating for specific landuse activities has been directed by the Environment Court's Topic 2 Decisions and consequently, PDP Chapter 3 policy.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			tourism) that the landscape is able (or unable) to absorb. Instead it is suggested that an assessment of activities should be based on the guidance on capacity descriptions included in landscape schedule 21.22 (paragraph 6) for outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscape priority areas.		
OS116.6	Simon Pierce On Behalf Of Bike Glendhu Limited	Oppose	That references to Fern Bern Valley within paragraph 68 of landscape schedule 21.22.21 for West Wanaka be amended to recognise the potential for consented activities at Bike Glendhu to contribute to the protection and enhancement of landscape values.	It is considered that this reference is most appropriately included in Schedule 21.22.21 [69] as follows: Parkins Bay which conveys a sense of transition, away from the rural environs of Glendhu Bay and the lake margins into a more natural landscape: in particular, the managed pasture across the Fern Burn fan and lower terraces transitions into the more vegetated and hummocky terrain around the base of the roche moutonnée. This culminates in the natural shrubland and roche moutonnée landforms of Pt 782m, Glendhu Bluff and Emerald Bluff. The vegetation within this area of change includes the shrubland revegetation that has occurred as part of the Parkins Bay development and the Bike Glendhu development . It also encompasses the development consented by the Environment Court, including:	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS137.1	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That the West Wānaka Priority Area and boundary of the Outstanding Natural Landscape be amended to exclude more modified parts of the Submitter Land.	ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS137.2	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That an appropriate exception regime under the Outstanding Natural Landscape schedule be provided for.	Adopting this approach would not accord with the directions of the Environment Court addressed in the Topic 2 decisions.	Reject submission.
OS137.3	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That the more developed parts of the Submitter Land (Lot 2-3 DP 53917 - ROT 878794, Lot 1 DP 533917 - ROT 878793, Lot 7 DP 564796, Lot 6, 8 DP 457489, Section 2, 18-19, 22-23 SO 347712 - ROT 1007146, and Lot 5 DP 457489, Lot 4 543116 - ROT 917004) are provided for as a separate character unit in landscape schedule 21.22.21.	<p>The existing development within the submitter's land is generally acknowledged in Schedule 21.22.21 at [24], although the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.21 [24] are recommended:</p> <p>Human modification which is currently concentrated around Glendhu Bay, with its existing campground, woolshed wedding/events venue, Bike Glendhu bike trails and facility, farmhouses (and associated curtilages), driveways/tracks, airstrip and farm buildings, as well as Parkins Bay with its consented golf resort/ homesite development and associated restoration planting strategy.</p> <p>The merits of identifying landscape character units within the PA are addressed in response to general landscape submission 'themes'.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS137.4	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 be deleted in its entirety.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS137.5	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended to give appropriate recognition for existing commercial, recreational, farming, and living opportunities within the land such that their future consolidation, enhancement, upkeep and extension can be adequately provided for.	Addressed in response to OS 137.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS137.6	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That in 21.22.21 the term 'no landscape capacity' should be deleted.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>For completeness, relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I remain of the view that a rating of no landscape capacity (at a PA level), is appropriate for the following landuses with in the West Wanaka PA ONL: urban expansion, intensive agriculture, mineral extraction, commercial scale renewable energy, production forestry and lakes structures and moorings.</p> <p>I note that these ratings accord with the West Wanaka PA ONL JWS.</p> <p>The application of a no landscape capacity rating is also discussed in response to general landscape submission 'themes'.</p>	Reject submission.
OS137.7	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended so that farmers and landowners are incentivised to promote the biodiversity of their land and transition towards more sustainable land use activities and/or practices without excessive regulations and expenses.	I agree that development can assist with biodiversity enhancement and it is for this reason that reference to landscape restoration (and other environmental benefits such as public access) is repeatedly mentioned in the Capacity section of the Schedule, as a 'likely' characteristic of appropriate development within the PA.	Reject submission.
OS137.8	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That the following features of the Submitter Land (Lot 2-3 DP 53917 - ROT 878794, Lot 1 DP 533917 - ROT 878793, Lot 7 DP 564796, Lot 6, 8 DP 457489, Section 2, 18-19, 22-23 SO 347712 - ROT 1007146, and Lot 5 DP 457489, Lot 4 543116 - ROT 917004) and wider Priority Area be included in	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>All of the attributes and features requested for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.21 are already mentioned or addressed in response to OS 137.3.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			landscape schedule 21.22.21: Historical farming uses, fences, farm buildings, existing accessways and stock tracks, roads, the Airstrip on Lot 7 DP 564796, walking and biking trails and associated commercial activities, campground facilities, access to Lake Wānaka, introduced and recently planted vegetation, residential development and domestic curtilages, and residential activities associated with the existing dwellings.		
OS137.9	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That the landscape capacity rating for visitor accommodation and tourism earthworks, farm buildings, transport infrastructure, rural living and lake structures and moorings be amended to 'some' or 'moderate' to provide for the existing uses.	The capacity section of the schedule relates to future development rather than existing development. (NB The latter is addressed in the main body of the Schedule.)	Reject submission.
OS173.3	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Motuihe Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.21 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that the landscape capacity for development currently identified is not applied or interpreted at a site-specific scale.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The Capacity section of Schedule frames the sorts of characteristics that are likely to make future development appropriate. This includes referencing typical locations where relevant or practical (e.g. rural living on the lower lying terrain in the PA). The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 acknowledges the point raised in this submission by explaining that the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.	
OS173.4	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Motuihe Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.21 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that the benefits of rural living, farm buildings, structures and moorings in the lake are recognised and appropriately anticipated, subject to good design and comprehensive landscape assessment.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The environmental benefits of development are acknowledged in the Capacity section of the schedule (where appropriate), as characteristics that are likely to frame appropriate development (e.g. landscape restoration and public access).	Reject submission.
OS173.5	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Motuihe Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.21 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that text be added to ensure that rural living, farm buildings, lake structures and moorings are not precluded by the landscape schedule, with these assessed on their merits through site specific landscape assessments.	Addressed in response to OS 173.3.	Reject submission.
OS173.6	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Motuihe Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.21 acknowledges a limited landscape capacity for earthworks. Relying on my landscape evaluation	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that earthworks associated with rural living, farm buildings or access are not unreasonably restricted.	(including field work) as part of the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal and the PA Schedules work, I consider this to be appropriate.	
OS176.1	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended to reflect the distinct landscape quality, character and visual amenity provided by existing development and the consented resort and golf course by either separating this area from the PA overlay, or otherwise providing for that within the schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The landscape quality, character and visual amenity of the existing development and the consented resort and golf course is described in Schedule 21.22.21 [69] with that description corresponding to the description in the ENV 2018-CHC-141 Joint Witness Statement Topic 23 – Rezoning Appeals (Group 2), PA ONL West Wanaka Schedule of Landscape Values dated 24 June 2021 (referred to hereafter as the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS) - see Naturalness (d). The suggestion that the area be separated from the PA ONL is addressed in response OS 137.1.	Reject submission.
OS176.2	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the West Wanaka Schedule 21.22.21 be amended to more accurately recognise and provide for existing uses and their likely and anticipated future upgrade, replacement or development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I consider that the existing uses are accurately described in the Schedule. I also note that the wording of Schedule 21.22.21 with respect to existing uses closely aligns with that use in the West Wanaka PA ONL JWS. With respect to the suggestion that the Schedule 21.22.21 should recognise and provide for the upgrading of existing uses, their replacement or development; this goes beyond the identification of the landscape values of the PA and capacity of the PA as a whole. It does not always follow that the replacement or upgrade of an existing structure or use will protect landscape values. For this reason, it is fitting that the appropriateness or otherwise of such development change is	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				addressed via a detailed assessment, as signalled in the Preamble to the Schedule 21.22.	
OS176.3	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended by changing the Priority Area boundary of the Outstanding Natural Landscape to exclude part of the landform associated within the Parkins Bay Development, in the alternative the schedule should be amended to reflect it.	Addressed in response to OS 137.1. I also note that my involvement in the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal suggests that there is appreciable development pressure in this part of the PA ONL. I understand this to mean that it is exactly the sort of location and context which the Court intended that Schedules of Landscape Values be prepared for.	Reject submission.
OS176.4	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended include an exception regime in the Outstanding Natural Landscape schedule for the landform associated with the Parkins Bay Development.	Addressed in response to OS 137.2.	Reject submission.
OS176.5	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the Parkins Bay development portion of the Outstanding Natural Landscape be provided for as a separate character unit in the schedule, in the alternative the schedule should be amended to reflect it.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I consider that the Parkins Bay development area does not merit a 'distinction' from the rest of the PA ONL.	Reject submission.
OS176.6	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be deleted.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS176.9	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 be amended to address inconsistencies between the schedule and	The West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS was prepared prior to the PA Schedules work. This latter workstream included the preparation of the PA Methodology Statement which addresses in full, the approach to recording and	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited		the landscape expert Joint Witness Statement prepared for this schedule.	<p>evaluating the PAs across the district, in response to the directions of the Environment Court. This means that there are inevitably differences in the way the landscape characteristics and values are described between the two documents and how capacity is described and rated (noting there is no specified landscape capacity rating scale applied in the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS).</p> <p>It is of interest to note that while there are aspects of Schedule 21.22.21 that differ to the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS, the description of the submitter's land (Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay are) in the two documents align reasonably well, as does the analysis of land use typologies with a no landscape capacity rating.</p>	
OS176.12	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended to recognise and provide for human influence on the landscape of recreational, residential, lifestyle and associated activities including: 1. existing accessways and stock tracks, 2. walking and biking trails, 3. campground facilities, 4. access to Lake Wanaka, 5. historical farming uses, 6. introduced and recently planted vegetation, 7. residential dwellings and domestic curtilages, 8. The consented golf course and associated facilities such as the clubhouse, shearers quarters and visitor accommodation	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>I consider that the notified text of Schedule 21.22.21 along with the amendments recommended in response to OS 137.3 address all of the attributes referenced in this submission point.</p>	Accept submission part.
OS176.20	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of	Oppose	That 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in 21.22.21 be	Addressed in response to OS137.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited		amended to add the following: Recognise that some of the area to the west of the Fern Burn has been retired from grazing and on its hummocky moraine landforms. Large areas of regenerating matagouri and bracken fernland are now found, together with some weeds. Some of the moraine area to the south of the Parkins Bay development continues to be extensively grazed, while within the homesite development area, native restoration planting has been established.		
OS176.21	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 'important land-use patterns and features' be amended to recognise that most human modification is currently concentrated around Glendhu Bay, with its existing campground, woolshed wedding venue, Bike Glendhu facility and farm buildings, as well as Parkins Bays with its consented golf resort/visitor accommodation residences.	These characteristics are acknowledged throughout Schedule 21.22.21, and particularly in [24] and [69]. No change is required.	Reject submission.
OS176.22	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That in 21.22.21 the existing forms of modification and development with the Outstanding Natural Landscape be contextualised	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			by describing the future ability to consolidate and enhance or develop existing uses over time.	This submission point relates to a policy intention rather than landscape values and therefore is not relevant to a description of landscape values per se. It is noted however that such matters are alluded to under the reference to landscape restoration being a typical characteristic of future development in the Capacity section of the Schedule.	
OS176.24	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the section 'particularly important views to and from the area' in 21.22.21 be amended to recognise the Glendhu Bay Campground and Parkins Bay resort, in particular the term "largely undeveloped lake margins".	Amend Schedule 21,22,21 [65] as follows: <u>In many of the views there is an awareness of the Glendhu Bay campground, and to a far lesser degree, development associated with the Parkins Bay development and Bike Glendhu. However, the visual dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes along with the generally subservient nature of built development underpins the high quality of the outlook.</u>	Accept submission in part.
OS176.25	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the section 'particularly important views to and from the area' in 21.22.21 be amended to promote consistency with the Joint Witness Statement agreed to by the landscape experts and recognise that the built form approved is an attractive visible characteristic of the area.	Addressed in response to OS176.24.	Accept submission in part.
OS176.26	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the 'summary of landscape values' section of 21.22.21 be amended to remove reference to sense of remoteness and wildness which are primarily experienced outside Glenhu and Parkins Bay.	Addressed in response to OS 176.69.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.27	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the 'summary of landscape values' section of 21.22.21 be amended to reflect the reasonably modified nature of the vegetation and habitats.	Addressed in response to OS 176.75.	Reject submission.
OS176.28	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the 'landscape capacity' section of 21.22.21 be amended to recognise all activities generally anticipated by or associated with the Parkins Bay Resort development.	Reference to the consented development at Glendhu Bay and Parkins Bay is most appropriately referenced in the description of existing landscape values, rather than in the Capacity section of the schedule, which focuses on the ability of the PA to absorb future development.	Reject submission.
OS176.30	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the 'landscape capacity' section of 21.22.21 be amended to specify the types of activities against which the capacity for the Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) to absorb or ranked or listed and at what scale.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The range of land uses to be addressed in the Priority Area Schedules was confirmed by the Environment Court in the Topic 2 Decisions. The PA capacity terminology is deliberately different to the Chapter 24 LCU capacity ratings as the latter related to one specific development typology: rural living (see PA Methodology Report, Section 3). The submitter is also referred to the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble which may go some way to addressing the concerns raised in this submission point.	Reject submission.
OS176.31	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the 'landscape capacity' section of 21.22.21 be amended to include existing and planned development opportunities and associated amenities and utilities in capacity.	Reference to the existing consented development is most appropriately referenced in the description of existing landscape values. The Capacity section of the schedule focuses on the ability of the PA to absorb future development and identifies the PA to have a very limited landscape capacity for rural living. I consider that this rating broadly accords with the thinking of the Environment Court, noting that the Court's focus was on a	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				specific part of the PA only (i.e. the hinterland of Glendhu Bay) where they signalled that rural living development was acceptable, largely as a consequence of its extremely limited visibility (i.e. described by the Court as being 'difficult to see'), extensive landscape restoration and public access strategy.	
OS176.32	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That if the 'landscape capacity' is retained as notified, that much of the Outstanding Natural Landscape lower lying areas be amended to moderate or high capacity for additional subdivision, industrial and service activities, lifestyle, earthworks and associated and ancillary activities.	Addressed in response to OS 176.81 to 176.87.	Reject submission.
OS176.33	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule provides opportunities for industrial and other land development and associated enhancements through landscaping pest management and planting to improve biodiversity and conservation values.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I am not aware of industrial landuses being particularly sought in the PA which is no surprise to me given its ONL classification. I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS176.34	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the division of the Priority Area into further units would assist in defining where features are being discussed and better inform future land use and subdivision proposals.	The merits of identifying landscape character units within the PA are addressed in response to general landscape submission 'themes'.	Reject submission.
OS176.35	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of	Oppose	That the general description of the area section in 21.22.21 have the following	Aspects of this submission point relate to a level of detail that is not appropriate in a General Description of the Area, which	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited		added at the end: Parkins Bay includes the comprehensive consented golf course resort and associated development approved by the Environment Court.	focuses on broadly defining the spatial extent of the PA, to orient the plan user.	
OS176.36	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 paragraph 6. be amended with additional text at the end of the statement to read as follows: The western Wanaka (Lake Wanaka) shoreline: comprising the indented bays of Parkins, Paddock and Glendhu Bays, which are separated from the main lake by Roys Peninsula. A gravel foreshore and low-lying lake and river terraces, resulting from both lake shore deposits and post-glacial river alluvium, are apparent towards the south, interspersed with distinctive steep banks and escarpments. The outwash material of the Fern Burn Fan separates Glendhu Bay from Parkins Bay with the water/land interface defined by exotic tree plantings such as poplars.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The inclusion of vegetation characteristics under the "Important Landform and land types" section of the PA Schedule is methodologically confusing. I also note that this vegetation is referenced at Schedule 21.22.21 [13](c).	Reject submission.
OS176.37	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the 'important landforms and land types' section of 21.22.22 be amended by a new limb (below), and if not,	No technical evidence is provided in support this submission point. The ONL status of the area in question has been confirmed by the Environment Court in the Topic 2 Decisions. Further, the	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			that the area of consented development is excluded from the PA entirely. New limb 7) The Fern Burn valley flats and Glendhu/Parkings Bay lake shore display characteristics of a visual amenity landscape with a level of modification that is not generally expected in an ONL, however sits within the broader ONL expanse.	Topic 2.5 [164] states: <i>We disagree with Mr Ferguson that the Values' Identification Frameworks should extend to giving direction to QLDC to undertake a District-wide landscape assessment or to progress ONF/L values scheduling beyond specified Priority Areas or to re-visit the ONF/L or RCL overlays on the planning maps. Rather, on all these matters, we find in favour of leaving these matters to QLDC's discretionary judgment as the planning authority.</i> Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I consider that the area in question qualifies as an ONL.	
OS176.38	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 paragraph 7 under 'important hydrological features' be amended by removing clear visibility and adding clarity to read as follows: The western arm of Wanaka (Lake Wanaka) notable for its scale, largely undeveloped mountain context, intricate patterning, unmanaged lake level, high water quality, clarity and attractive water colour.	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [7] as follows: The western arm of Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) notable for its scale, largely undeveloped mountain context, intricate patterning, unmanaged lake level, high water quality and clarity, clear visibility , and attractive water colour.	Accept submission.
OS176.39	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 paragraph 10 'important hydrological features' be amended to read as follows: The Fern Burn and Alpha Burn rivers which comprise comparatively narrow riverbeds, with extensive fluvial terraces. Subject to periodic flooding and inundation of the adjacent	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The requested amendments to Schedule 21.22.21 [10] do not relate to hydrological features and it would be confusing to include this detail in this part of the PA Schedule. However, the following amendments are recommended to other parts of Schedule 21.22.21 to address some of the matters raised in this submission point. (For completeness, I consider that the other requested text changes are adequately referenced in the notified version of Schedule 21.22.21.)	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			floodplain. The Fern Burn flats form the entrance to the Motatapu Valley with the largely willow-lined Fern Burn riverbed. The terraces on the true right of the Fern Burn and on the Parkins Bay flats are used for more intensive farming than the steeper surrounding slopes. Within this valley landscape shelterbelts, hedges and small exotic conifer plantations are distinctive features, give it a more structured and modified appearance. The willows along the riverbed of lower Alpha Burn are a distinct part of the developed farmland in this area. Visually the moraine landform along the true left of Fern Burn above Parkins Bay separates the upper Fern Burn flats from the lake.	[43] (a) The impression of the Fern Burn valley as the entrance to the Motatapu Valley that displays a more structured appearance as a consequence of the pastoral landuse and patterning of shelterbelts, hedges and small conifer plantations.	
OS176.40	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That section 13 a under the 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in 21.22.21 be amended to read as follows: Grazed pasture with shelterbelts, willows line the waterways along the Alpha Burn, Motatapu River and Fern Burn, and clusters of shade trees typical of the	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [13] (a) as follows: Grazed pasture with shelterbelts and clusters of shade trees typical of the Fern Burn valley floor, the Fern Burn fan, the Alpha Burn, Motatapu River, Fern Burn and the flats either side of Buchanan Road leading out to Roys Peninsula. Willows line much of the Alpha Burn and Fern Burn and parts of the Motatapu River.	Accept submission (subject to minor refinement).

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Fern Burn valley floor, the Fern Burn fan, the Alpha Burn, Mototapu River, Fern Burn and the flats either side of the Buchanan Road leading out to Roys Peninsula.		
OS176.41	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That section 13b in the 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in 21.22.21 be amended to the following:</p> <p>The grazed and gently flat river terraces behind Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay. Some of the area to the west of the Fern Burn has been retired from grazing and on its hummocky moraine landforms, large areas of regenerating matagouri and bracken fernland are now found, together with some weeds. Some of the morained area to the south of the Perkins Bay development continues to be extensively grazed, while within the homesite development area, native restoration planting has been established.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I consider that the matters raised in this submission point are adequately addressed in the notified version of Schedule 21.22.21.</p>	Reject submission.
OS176.42	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That section 15 under 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [15] as follows (including correcting other grammatical errors in this schedule item text):</p> <p>The PA possesses a diverse range of valued habitats from the lake to the mountain tops for New Zealand falcon,</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			21.22.21 be amended to include the crested Grebe.	Australasian harrier, kea, tui, bellbird, New Zealand pipit, grey warbler, fantail, tomtit, NZ New Zealand shoveler, paradise shelduck, grey teal, crested grebe , Black shag , Little shag and New Zealand scaup. Kea are nationally threatened with a threat status of nationally endangered.	
OS176.43	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21 under 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in 21.22.21 be amended to read as follows: Valued habitat for skink and gecko, particularly at the rock outcrops, boulderfields and rock strewn tussock and exotic grasslands. The nationally threatened Roys Peak (<i>Haplodactylus</i> sp. "Roys Peak") and Cromwell geckos (<i>Hoplodactylis</i> aff. <i>maculatus</i> "Cromwell") Both species are classified as At-Risk Declining.	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [21] as follows: Valued habitat for skink and gecko, particularly in the rock outcrops, boulderfields and rock strewn tussock and exotic grasslands. This includes the nationally threatened Roys Peak (<i>Haplodactylus</i> sp. "Roys Peak") and Cromwell geckos (<i>Hoplodactylis</i> aff. <i>maculatus</i> "Cromwell") have been recorded in the PA . Both species are classified as At-Risk Declining.	Accept submission (subject to minor refinement) .
OS176.44	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That section 22 in 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in 21.22.21 be amended to read as follows with new text beginning from the second sentence: Animal pest species include red deer, chamois, feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums and mice. Opportunities for their removal and eradication are encouraged through future	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. This submission point relates to a policy intention rather than landscape values and therefore is not relevant to a description of landscape values per se. It is noted however that such matters are alluded to under the reference to landscape restoration being a typical characteristic of future development in the Capacity section of the Schedule.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			subdivision and development.		
OS176.45	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That section 23 in 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in 21.22.21 be amended to read as follows with new text beginning from opportunities: Plant pest species include sweet briar, broom, gorse and wilding pines opportunities for their removal and eradication are encouraged through future subdivision and development.	The same comments in response to OS 176.44 apply to this submission point.	Reject submission.
OS176.46	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended to add under 'important land-use patterns and features as follows: Human modification which is currently concentrated around Glendhu Bay, with its existing campground, woolshed wedding venue, Bike Glendhu bike trails and facility and farm building, as well as Parkins Bay with its consented golf resort/homesite development.	No comment required as this text is already included in Schedule 21.22.21 [24].	Reject submission.
OS176.47	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 39, 40 and 41 in the 'important shared and recognised attributes and	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 as follows: [39] The photographic references and description of the area in tourism publications.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			values section of 21.22.21 be deleted.	[40] The very high popularity of Roys Peak Track (noting that most of the track is in Mount Alpha PA ONL but parts of it afford views out over the eastern portion of West Wanaka PA ONL).	
OS176.48	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 paragraph 42 'important shared and recognised attributes and values' be amended to read as follows, with new text starting with PA: The high popularity of the biking routes, walking trails and camping grounds/spots in the PA and resulting from development and subdivision opportunities.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. In my experience it is unnecessary to include the provenance of landscape elements in the shared and recognised values part of a Landscape Schedule unless they are particularly unique. While I acknowledge that the trails and bike routes referenced in this schedule item are typically the consequence of subdivision, in my experience, this is not an usual outcome in the District (or development within ONLs elsewhere in New Zealand). I also note that the campground is the consequence of Council policy, but for similar reasons the provenance of that item does not merit specific mention here.	Reject submission.
OS176.49	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended be adding a new limb under the important shared and recognized attributes and values section as follows: Recreation and visitor industry opportunities through the future construction of anticipated development such as the Parkins Bay Golf Course, Clubhouse, jetty and visitor accommodation.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The text change requested amounts to a potential future outcome rather than an existing landscape value and is therefore not appropriate for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.21 under Important shared and recognised attributes and values.	Reject submission.
OS176.50	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 43 in important shared and recognised attributes and values in 21.22.21 be deleted.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I consider that the notified text is appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.51	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 45 in the important recreation attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be deleted.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Having carefully reviewed the track mapping overlaid with the PA mapping, I confirm that parts of the Roys Peak track are located within the West Wanaka PA ONL and therefore this feature merits reference under the Important recreation attributes and values associated with the PA.	Reject submission.
OS176.52	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended by a new limb being inserted under the important recreation attributes and values section as follows: Recreation opportunities associated with the Parkins Bay development including easement walking and access trails, open space, foreshore access, jetty and golf course amenities.	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 as follows: <u>[48](a) Trails, open space, jetty and (consented but largely unbuilt) golf course amenities at Parkins Bay.</u>	Accept submission in part.
OS176.52	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That's a new line item is added: Recreation opportunities associated with the Parkins Bay development including easement walking and access trails, open space, foreshore access, jetty and golf course amenities	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 as follows: <u>[48](a) Trails, open space, jetty and (consented but largely unbuilt) golf course amenities at Parkins Bay.</u>	Accept submission in part.
OS176.53	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 50 under important recreation attributes and values in 21.22.21 be deleted.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I consider that the notified text is appropriate.	Reject submission.

Commented [DD1]: Duplicate submission number but different summary etc., see previous row

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				Schedule 21.22.21 has been reviewed by a recreation and tourism expert with that expert supporting the notified text.	
OS176.54	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That 56 in the legibility and expressiveness attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended, with new text beginning with the second sentence:</p> <p>The area's natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above) which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative processes. Except for the more modified flats of Parkins Bay/Glendhu Lakeshore and including the Parkins Bay resort development.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the requested text changes are appropriate. Although there has been modification in the lower lying areas, I consider that the fundamental formative processes of the landscape are still legible (i.e. glacial, alluvial and fluvial processes).</p>	Reject submission.
OS176.55	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That 57 in the legibility and expressiveness attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended with the addition of and vegetation in the first sentence, and additional new text in the second sentence</p> <p>Indigenous gully and stream plantings and vegetation reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values in place. Opportunities to further enhance this through future subdivision and</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the requested text changes are appropriate. The response to OS 176.44 is also of relevance here.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			development are recognised.		
OS176.56	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That 58 in the legibility and expressiveness attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended with the addition of human modified, as well as the text beginning with including at the end of the statement as shown below.</p> <p>More generally the vegetation cover and land uses found within the area reinforce the landform differences throughout the ONL, with more cultural/human modified vegetation patterns evident on those lower-lying areas and natural vegetation cover apparent across more elevated areas, including those recently planted in association with the Parkins Bay resort development.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [58] as follows:</p> <p>More generally the vegetation cover and land uses found within the area reinforce the landform differences throughout the ONL, with more cultural vegetation patterns and human modification evident on the lower-lying areas and natural vegetation cover apparent across more elevated areas.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS176.57	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That any views which are not important public views should be deleted.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that any of the views referenced in Schedule 21.22.21 should be deleted.</p>	Reject submission.
OS176.58	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of	Oppose	That 59 in the Particularly important views to and from the area section in 21.22.21	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited		<p>be amended by adding elevated parts of as shown below.</p> <p>The sequence of highly attractive, frequently dramatic, and varied views from Wanaka-Mt Aspiring Road between Damper Bay and Emerald Bluff of the lake and elevated parts of mountain context.</p>	<p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate as the views from the road take in far more than the lake and elevated mountains and include the flats, terrace risers, stream gullies and moraine areas.</p>	
OS176.59	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That 60 in the Particularly important views to and from the area section in 21.22.21 be amended by removing striking and lookout, and adding text at the end starting with which, as shown below.</p> <p>The mid and long-range views from the Glendhu Bluff (layby on Wanaka-Mt Aspiring Road) out over the lake, Roys Peninsula, Paddock Bay, Parkins Bay, Glendhu Bay, Roys Peak and the Alpha Range, which includes the context of the Parkins Bay resort development.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. In my opinion, the outlook from the lookout is striking. Further, I understand that the development consented at Parkins Bay anticipates a sympathetic outcome in which built development is difficult to see, earthworks are naturalised and much of the area is restored to native vegetation cover. As such, I understand that the design intention underpinning the consented development is that it is not prominent in views and is sympathetically integrated into the natural landscape setting. For these reasons I do not consider it merits reference in the description of this outlook.</p>	Reject submission.
OS176.60	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That 61 in the Particularly important views to and from the area section in 21.22.21 be amended by deleting largely undeveloped and</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined in response to OS 176.59 and relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal and the PA Schedules work, I</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			adding new text starting with which as shown below. A series of highly attractive close to long-range views from the Glendhu Bay Track along the lake margins and across Wanaka (Lake Wanaka) to the surrounding mountain context which includes the context of the Parkins Bay resort development.	do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	
OS176.61	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 63 and 64 in the Particularly important views to and from the area section in 21.22.21 be deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 176.57.	Reject submission.
OS176.62	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 65 in the Particularly important views to and from the area section in 21.22.21 be deleted and replaced with the following Overall, the ONL displays a high level of aesthetic appeal from a range of public viewpoints due to the values identified below, and including the high quality master planned design of the Parkins Bay resort development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS176.63	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 68 in the naturalness attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended by adding 'and more akin to a visual amenity section 7	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>landscape' in the first sentence, and 'access tracks and recreation'. Also replacing notwithstanding with including as well as other minor grammatical edits to read as follows:</p> <p>The Fern Burn valley floor is the least natural part of the ONL, and more akin to a visual amenity (section 7) landscape, because of the presence of the campground, pastoral farming activities, access tracks and recreation. The campground, with its high level of development, contrasts with the rural character of the farmland on the southern side of the road, including the presence of scattered farm buildings and dwellings.</p>	<p>appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.</p> <p>The response to OS 176.37 explains the reasons why I consider it inappropriate to describe the area as a visual amenity landscape.</p> <p>Access tracks and recreation are evident in other parts of the PA ONL (and referenced in other parts of Schedule 21.22.21) and therefore are not in my opinion, a noteworthy characteristic of the Fern Burn floor that merits reference here.</p> <p>The use of the term 'notwithstanding;' is deliberate, as the important point here is that the area displays a contrasting character to the campground, despite the existing level of modification and built form.</p>	
OS176.64	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 69 in the Naturalness attributes and values section of 21.22.2 is amended to add 'shearers quarters' as a limb.	It is understood that the shearers quarters relate to Visitor Accommodation which is referenced under Schedule 21.22.21 [69] (c), so no change is required here. However, if this is incorrect (noting that the same description of this part of the PA is in the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS), the submitter is encouraged to provide evidence so that this can be corrected.	Reject submission.
OS176.65	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 69c in the Naturalness attributes and values section of 21.22.2 is amended by deleting all the text after accommodation and	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			replaced with the buildings as shown below. A clubhouse and visitor accommodation buildings,	appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. I also note that the majority of the text that is requested by the submitter to be deleted from Schedule 21.22.21 [69] matches the relevant description in the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS.	
OS176.66	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 69d in the Naturalness attributes and values section of 21.22.2 is amended to: residential homesites, and a new limb added below as follows: x. Mounding, planting, mitigation works, landscaping tracks, trails, and fencing associated with the above	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. I also note that the majority of the text that is requested by the submitter to be deleted from Schedule 21.22.21 [69] matches the relevant description in the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS.	Reject submission.
OS176.67	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 69 in the Naturalness attributes and values section of 21.22.2 is amended by adding a new limb as follows: Overall, the area displays naturalness values that rate towards the moderate end of the spectrum as a consequence of the dominance of the more natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes. The relatively confined extent of built development and its predominantly low-key character plays an important role in this regard.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.68	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 72 in the Transient attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be deleted.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The notified wording matches the relevant description in the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS.</p> <p>It is also unclear why the submitter requests that an accepted aspect of landscape values (i.e. Transient Values) be deleted from the Schedule.</p>	Reject submission.
OS176.69	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 74 in the Remoteness and wildness attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended to delete 'and with a distinctly increasing impression of remoteness as one travels westwards along Wanaka' and replace it with 'are within the context of comprehensive consented development'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.</p> <p>I also consider that the notified text reflects the 'thinking' of the relevant description in the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS.</p> <p>However, I consider that the meaning of Schedule 21.22.21 [74] would be improved by the following amendments:</p> <p>The parts of the PA that are set apart from the more developed lake shore and immediate hinterland at Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay (which includes the lower reaches of the Fern Burn, and the Bike Glendhu area) display an impression of wildness, and with a distinctly increasing impression of remoteness as one travels westwards along Wānaka – Mount Aspiring Road.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS176.70	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 75 in the Remoteness and wildness attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended by deleting 'a localised sense of remoteness along the' and replacing it with 'including along' and deleting obscure and replacing it with soften to	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			read as follows Including along Parkins Bay lakeshore, where the landform an/or vegetation serves to soften views of (land based) built development.		
OS176.71	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 77 in the aesthetic attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended by adding 'important' and 'excluding tracks and trails' to read as follows: The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of important public viewpoints, excluding tracks and trails.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. I understand that under the PDP, the reference to public viewpoints would exclude consideration of views from trails on private land.	Reject submission.
OS176.72	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 78b in the aesthetic attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended by adding consenting and development and Fern Burn Valley as follows; The continuous and large-scale patterning of the alpine ridges and peaks together with the expanse of the lake which form a bold contrast to the more modified, consented development and 'tamed' low-lying land at Fern Burn Valley, Paddock Bay, Parkins Bay, and Glendhu Bay that is engaging and appealing.	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [78] (b) as follows: The continuous and large-scale patterning of the alpine ridges and peaks together with the expanse of the lake which form a bold contrast to the more modified and 'tamed' low-lying land at Paddock Bay, the Fern Burn Valley , Parkins Bay, and Glendhu Bay that is engaging and appealing.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.73	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 78c ii in the aesthetic attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended by replacing 'the' with 'limited' and 'covered' with 'partially peppering' so that it reads as: Limited indigenous vegetation partially peppering hummocky moraine	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. For completeness, having carefully reviewed the consent documents, it is my understanding that the native restoration planting across the moraine as part of the Parkins Bay development is intended to be extensive and comprehensive (rather than a 'peppering').	Reject submission.
OS176.74	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 78c iii in the aesthetic attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be deleted and replaced with the following High quality master planned development associated with the Parkins Bay resort development	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. Having carefully reviewed the consent documents, I remain of the view that the description of the consented development as 'relatively low-key', being of a 'rural vernacular' or 'visually discreet' is accurate.	Reject submission.
OS176.75	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 paragraph 79 summary of landscape values be deleted and replaced with the following: High physical values due to the structure created by the lake, Matukituki River delta, and mountain/rouche moutonee landforms including Roys Peninsula, together with areas of natural vegetation cover.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.76	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 80.c of the summary of landscape values for 21.22.21 be amended to include 'and public access opportunities' as follows: The popularity of the area for a wide range of recreational activities and public access opportunities.	Addressed in response to OS 176.44, noting that the reference to public access enhancement is repeatedly mentioned in the Capacity section of the Schedule where appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS176.77	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 81a in the summary of landscape values of 21.22.21 be refined relative to where within the PA it relates.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. For completeness, I consider that high legibility and expressiveness values are evident across all of the PA despite the level of modification evident or anticipated at Glendhu Bay, the Fern Burn Valley, Parkins Bay or around Roys Peninsula.	Reject submission.
OS176.78	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 81b of 21.22.21 be amended to remove 'both natural and' and add an additional sentence to the end so it reads as follows: The aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its often dramatic and highly appealing visual character. The attractive composition of rural/farmed landscapes, with a strong focus on the mountains and lake, that are critical features of the area. The public accessibility of much of the area which	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			allows the experience of these values along with the area's transient values also play a role in this regard and have been created through subdivision and development opportunities.		
OS176.79	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 81c of 21.22.21 be amended with 'low' replacing 'moderate to high' and additional amendments related to Parkins Bay development, to read as shown below: A low impression of naturalness arising from the dominance of the natural landscape within the lower lying land through consented and built development, in particular the extent of the Parkins Bay resort development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS176.80	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 81d of 21.22.21 be deleted and replaced with: The area is associated with rural land uses, recreational activities and use of the Glendhu Bay Campground. As a result, its remoteness and wildness is limited. Feelings of remoteness and wildness are primarily experiences outside of Glendhu and Parkins Bay,	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.81	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That i in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be deleted and replaced with:</p> <p>Commercial recreational activities- moderate landscape capacity for activities that are co-located with existing consented facilities, designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale, have a low key 'rural' character and be consistent with the area's ONL values.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.</p> <p>More specifically, I particularly disagree with the removal of reference to landscape restoration as being a typical characteristic of appropriate development and consider this change conflicts with the submitter's suggested changes elsewhere in the Schedule, which reference the environmental benefits associated with development.</p>	Reject submission.
OS176.82	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That ii in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be amended by replacing very limited with moderate, and with new text beginning from 'designed' as shown below:</p> <p>Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities (including campgrounds) - Moderate landscape capacity for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities that: are co-located with existing consented facilities; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale, have a low key 'rural' character and be consistent with the area's ONL values.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.</p> <p>More specifically, I particularly disagree with the removal of reference to landscape restoration as being a typical characteristic of appropriate development and consider this change conflicts with the submitter's suggested changes elsewhere in the Schedule which reference the environmental benefits associated with development.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.83	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That v in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be deleted and replaced with the following: Earthworks - Moderate landscape capacity for earthworks that provide for naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values. High landscape capacity for earthworks associated with the golf course construction.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. I do not consider it is necessary to reference earthworks associated with the golf course here, as I understand that change to the landform to be allowed for by the existing resource consent. This part of the PA Schedule relates to the capacity for new development.	Reject submission.
OS176.84	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That vi in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be amended by replacing 'limited' with 'moderate' and 'modestly scaled' with 'appropriately sited', to read as follows Farm buildings - in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, moderate landscape capacity for appropriately sited buildings that reinforce existing rural character.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS176.85	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That viii in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be amended by replacing 'limited' with 'moderate' and 'protect' with 'provide for' as well as insert 'enhance recreation or access	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. I consider the inclusion of text guiding that new trails should enhance recreation or access opportunities is unnecessary, as	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>opportunities so it reads as follows</p> <p>Transport infrastructure - very limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low-key 'rural' roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns. Moderate capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; enhance recreation or access opportunities, integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and provide for the area's ONL values.</p>	<p>such benefits are implicit with trail networks. It should be noted that via OS 74.2 it is proposed to delete the reference to 'protect the areas ONF values.</p>	
OS176.86	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That xii in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be amended by deleting 'very limited' and replacing it with 'moderate' as well a series of other amendments so that it reads as follows:</p> <p>Rural living - Moderate landscape capacity for rural living development located on lower-lying terrain and generally within the vicinity of consented homesites through the Parkins Bay resort development and sites so that it is constrained by landforms and vegetation -</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			with the location, scale, and design of any proposal ensuring that it is reasonably difficult to see from public roads and visually recessive from other viewpoints beyond the site.		
OS176.87	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That xiv of the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be amended by replacing 'no' with 'moderate' as well as additional explanatory text to read: Lake Structures and Moorings - moderate landscape capacity. For a club house, visitor accommodation buildings, and jetty as anticipated by the Parkins Bay resort development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

**Appendix 2(m) 21.22.23 Hawea South North
Grandview PA ONL**

21.22.23 PA ONL Hāwea South North Grandview: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The Hāwea South North Grandview PA takes in the eastern slopes of Mt Maude, the south end of Lake Hāwea (including the undeveloped lake shore), the lake terrace in the vicinity of Bushy Creek (on the eastern side of the lake) and the western faces of the range of mountains approximately extending from Pt 1359 in the north, to Lagoon Valley in the south (and including Pt 1316, Breast Peak, Pt1453, Pt 1414, Pt 916, and Pt 812).

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Mana whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. The line of mountains along the western side of Lake Hāwea in which Mt Maude is located at the southern end. These steep foliated schist landforms separate Lake Hāwea from Lake Wanaka and are capped by the distinctive peaks of Mt Maude, Mt Burke, and Isthmus Peak (latter two peaks are outside the PA). Extensive rocky areas.
2. The Grandview Range, which defines the eastern side of the southern end of Lake Hāwea and the Upper Clutha valley, capped by the distinctive peaks of Breast Hill, Grandview Mountain and Trig Hill (the latter is outside PA). These landforms comprise a dissected pattern of rugged and very steep schist slopes, bluffs and sculpted spurs; and form part of the steep and broken headwall of the Hāwea glacier. Slumps, sheet wash and gully erosion are features on the upper slopes. Extensive rocky areas, rock bluffs, prominent spurs, and sheer rock faces and buttresses shaped by ice action.
3. Colluvial slopes and fans extending from the mountain 'walls' on either side of the lake to the water edge to create lake-edge terraces.
4. Two rocky glacial knolls on the western side of the lake (Pt 414 and Pt 412, Round Hill) separated by a narrow terrace (noting that Round Hill is subject to a QE II Covenant).
5. The terminal moraine at the southern end of the lake deposited by the glacier that formed the depression now occupied by the lake.
6. Varying wide to narrow stony beaches of greywacke and schist around the lake edge which contain a range of 'coastal' wave-generated landforms.
7. The Grandview Fault which is parallel to the lake and is active.

Important hydrological features:

8. The southern portion of Lake Hāwea notable for its scale, largely undeveloped mountain context, high water quality, clear visibility, and attractive water colour. The lake outlet was dammed in the 1950s as part of the Roxburgh hydroelectric scheme, which raised the lake level by approximately 20m. Hence the lake edge, shoreline and proximity of the lake to the surrounding terraces are relatively recent artifacts of lake level management.
9. The several unnamed, steeply incised streams draining the eastern slopes of Mt Maude.

Commented [BG1]: OS 182.45 Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson.

10. The network of deeply incised streams draining the mountains on the eastern side of the lake including: the lower reaches of Bushy Creek, Johns Creek, Grandview Creek, Drakes Creek, Cameron Gully, Hospital Creek and numerous unnamed streams and tributaries.

Commented [BG2]: OS 195.3 John and Helen Langley and Clarke

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

11. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:

- a. Slim snow tussock grassland (*Chionochloa macra*) and depleted herbfields dominated by false Spaniard (*Celmisia lyallii*) on the mountain tops.
- b. Remnant isolated (fire relic) stands of mountain beech (*Fuscospora cliffortioides*) forest in Grandview catchments.
- c. The subalpine and alpine vegetation across the mountains to the west and east of the lake, featuring short (fescue) tussocklands, narrow leaved snow tussocklands (*Chionochloa rigida*), patches of *Dracophyllum* dominant scrub shrub or woodland and herbfields.
- d. Swathes and patches of regenerating kānuka, mānuka, *Coprosma sp. matagouri* and grey shrubland across the lower and mid slopes and spurs of the mountains on either side of the PA.
- e. Bracken, matagouri and kānuka and mānuka scrub woodlands throughout rocky slopes of mountains on either side of the PA.
- f. Kānuka scrub woodlands, manuka scrub woodlands, grey shrubland and bracken cover large parts of the lower slopes of the glacial knolls on the western side of the lake.
- g. The grey shrubland on a rocky outcrop on Kane Road, near Hāwea Back Road that is identified as an SNA in the District Plan. Species include: *Coprosma intertexta*, *Coprosma propinqua*, *Coprosma tayloriae*, *Coprosma rigida*, *Coprosma crassifolius*, *Carmichaelia petriei*, *Melicytus alpinus*, *Discaria tomatou*, *Pteridium esculentum*, *Muehlenbeckia complexa* and *Cordyline australis*.
- h. A woodland on the eastern slopes of Mt Maude that is an SNA in the District Plan. Dominated by halls totara (*Podocarpus cunninghamii*) and mountain toatoa (*Phyllocladus alpinus*).
- i. Areas of regenerating matagouri, mingimīngi grey *Coprosma sp.* dominant shrublands, kānuka and bracken fernland in places across the fans and lake terraces.
- j. Species listed as at risk/declining status include native broom (*Carmichaelia petriei*), matagouri. Threatened - Nationally vulnerable species include: small leaved tree daisy (*Oleria fimbriata*). Also present: alpine wineberry, *Corokia cotoneaster* and *Kowhai microphylla*.

Commented [BG3]: OS 195.4 John and Helen Langley and Clarke.

12. Other distinctive vegetation types include:

- a. Grazed pasture with shelterbelts and clusters of shade trees throughout the fans and terraces on the western and eastern sides of the lake.
- b. The mixed plantings of exotic evergreen and deciduous species around rural homesteads and buildings, throughout The Camp the Lake Hāwea Holiday Park and throughout the southern lake margins.
- c. Exotic grasses and herbs mixed with short tussock grassland throughout the slopes below approximately 1,000m.
- d. ~~Plantation forestry on the lower mountain slopes of Mt Maude near the Control Dam.~~
- e. Wilding conifers and *Betula sp.* across the mountain slopes.

Commented [BG4]: OS 47.7 Glen Dene Ltd.

Commented [BG5]: OS 23.1 Geoff and Maureen Kernick.

Commented [BG6]: OS 195.5 John and Helen Langley and Clarke.

13. The Hāwea area is generally regarded as a transition zone between the wetter Wanaka ecological district and the drier Central Otago ecological district.

14. Valued habitat for New Zealand falcon, New Zealand pipit, bellbird, grey warbler, fantail, tomtits, tui, shining cuckoo, Australasian crested grebe, Southern Alps gecko and McCann's skinks and silvereye.
15. Animal pest species include chamois, red deer, fallow deer, wallabies, pigs, feral goats, hares, possums, mice, rats, stoats, ferrets, feral cats, hedgehogs and rabbits.
16. Plant pest species include sweet briar, broom, wilding pines, hawthorn, buddleia, hawkweed, gooseberry, bittersweet, European broom, silver birch and gorse.

Commented [BG7]: OS 23.2 Geoff and Maureen Kernick.

Commented [BG8]: OS 195.7 John and Helen Langley and Clarke.

Commented [BG9]: OS 23.3 Geoff and Maureen Kernick.

Commented [BG10]: OS 195.8 John and Helen Langley and Clarke.

Important land-use patterns and features:

17. Built modification which is currently generally concentrated around the Glen Dene homestead (western side of the lake), The Camp the Lake Hāwea Holiday Park (including a nearby boat ramp and jetty/pontoon), a cluster of rural living buildings on the mountain slopes near the control dam, and the modest cluster of dwellings at the end of Nook Road.
18. Modifications at Lake Hāwea Station which includes farm buildings, farming and farm tracks within the ONL as well as accommodation, tourism recreation activities (mountain biking, hunting) and event services outside of but on the boundary of the ONL.
19. Pastoral farming throughout much of the remainder of the PA, and associated farm tracks, fencing, dams, farm buildings and rural dwellings.
20. Throughout the remainder of the area, built development is largely restricted to a scattering of rural residential dwellings on the eastern side of Cameron Hill, and two rural residential dwellings along the southern margins of the lake.
21. Generally, built development is characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways and infrastructure, which is subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Typically buildings are well integrated by existing landform features and a mix of established and more recent vegetation features. In addition, new development is typically accompanied by appreciable landscape enhancement in the form of native restoration plantings and / or improvements to public access.
22. SH 6 Makarora Lake Hāwea Road which is roughly along the base of the Mt Maude slopes.
23. The reserve land along almost all much of the lake margins adjoining Hāwea township (and which coincide with Te Araroa, a network of trails and picnic spots).
24. The network of rural roads (generally single-lane and formed in metal) that coincide with the eastern side of the PA.
25. The boat ramp and pontoon at the southern end of the Lake Hāwea Holiday Park.
26. The Camp Holiday Park to Round Hill Track, the Te Araroa Trail, the John's Creek track, the Gladstone Track, the Grandview Creek track, the Grandview Ridge, and the unnamed loop track around the west side of Pt 812 that links to Lagoon Creek. Associated with these tracks are signage, stiles, and seating, typically of a modest scale and low-key character.
27. Recreational uses associated with the lake including swimming, fishing, paddle boarding, boating, water skiing, jet skiing, kite boarding and kayaking.
28. Infrastructure is evident within the eastern portion of the area and includes power and telephone lines along the highway and local road network and a farm quarry on the west side of SH6 near Pt 414.
29. Neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include: the very close proximity of Hāwea township which extends along the south-western margins of the lake and abuts the PA; the cluster of dwellings at John Creek Gladstone, and the Control Dam booms, dam wall, etc.) at the start of the Hāwea River.

Commented [BG11]: OS 47.7 Glen Dene Ltd.

Commented [BG12]: OS 47.3 Glen Dene Ltd.

Commented [BG13]: OS 182.28 Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson.

Commented [BG14]: OS 47.7 Glen Dene Ltd.

Commented [BG15]: OS 195.9 John and Helen Langley and Clarke.

Commented [BG16]: OS 195.9 John and Helen Langley and Clarke.

Commented [BG17]: OS 23.4 Geoff and Maureen Kernick.

Commented [BG18]: OS 195.10 John and Helen Langley and Clarke.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

30. The protected exotic *Eucalyptus sp* (gum) specimen trees throughout the lake margin adjacent Hāwea township.
31. Early survey marks on Mt Grandview (archaeological sites G40/215 and FG0/216).
32. Māori occupation around lake foreshore (archaeological sites G40/2, G40/64, G40/208).

Commented [BG19]: Typographical correction.

Mana whenua features and their locations:

33. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
34. The ONL overlaps with the Hāwea (Lake Hāwea) and Paetarariki & Timaru wāhi tūpuna.
35. Lake Hāwea is highly significant to Kāi Tahu and is a Statutory Acknowledgement under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.
- 35a A contemporary nohoaka (camping site to support traditional mahika kai activities provided as a redress under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlements Act 1998) is located at The Camp.

Commented [BG20]: OS 77.30 Kai Tahu ki Otago. OS 188.49 Elisha Young-Ebert.

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

Mana whenua associations and experience:

36. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
37. Hāwea is one of the lakes referred to in the tradition of “Ngā Puna Wai Karikari o Rākaihautū” which tells how the principal lakes of Te Wai Pounamu were dug by the rangatira (chief) Rākaihautū. Through these pūrakau (stories), this area holds a deep spiritual significance both traditionally and for Kāi Tahu today.
38. The Lake was traditionally considered rich with tuna (eel) that were caught, preserved, and transported to kāika nohoaka of coastal Otago. The knowledge of whakapapa, traditional trails, tauraka waka, mahika kai and other taoka associated with Lake Hāwea remain important to Kāi Tahu today.
39. Several sites within this area such as Kokotane and Pakituhi were known as rich kāika mahika kai. Kokotane is an old hāpua (lagoon) where pūtakitaki (paradise duck), pārerā (duck sp.) and turnips were gathered. Te Whakapapa is also considered a pā site.
40. The mana whenua values associated with this area include, but may not be limited to, wāhi taoka, mahika kai, ara tawhito, kāika, nohoaka.

Important historic attributes and values:

41. Contextual significance as a key reference point within the early survey of the area.
42. Association with early pastoral farming.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

43. The descriptions of the area in tourism publications.

44. The very high profile and popularity of Te Araroa Trail.
45. The postcard views available from the reserve area and Hāwea township at the southern end of the lake and SH6 Makarora Lake Hāwea Road.
46. The high popularity of the biking routes, walking trails, and holiday park in the area.
47. The local popularity of the lake as a peaceful swimming, kayaking, boating, and fishing spot.
48. The critical role in the outlook northwards across Lake Hāwea to the surrounding mountains in shaping the identity of Lake Hāwea township.
49. The identity of the south-western portion of the PA as the entrance or gateway to the relatively low-key lakeside settlement of Lake Hāwea township.

Important recreation attributes and values:

50. The popular and nationally important Te Araroa Trail that is along the southern and south-eastern edges of the lake beyond John Creek Gladstone, via the Gladstone to Wānaka Track, where it veers eastwards to climb a ridge to the Pakituhi Hut (near Pt 1316).
51. The popular walking/biking trails, including: The Camp the Holiday Park to Round Hill Track; the reserve tracks along the southern edge of the lake adjacent Hāwea township; the John's Creek track; the Grandview Creek track; the Grandview Ridge; and the unnamed loop track around the west side of Pt 812 that links to Lagoon Creek.
52. SH6 Makarora Lake Hāwea Road as a key scenic route providing access between the West Coast and the Otago Lakes.
53. Boating, kayaking, fishing, and swimming at Lake Hāwea. Nationally significant fishery.
54. Picnicking along the lake shoreline.
55. The highly popular campground at The Camp, Cross Hill Lodge and Domes (formerly The Lake Hāwea Holiday Park).
56. Hunting throughout the mountains.

Commented [BG21]: OS 195.11 John and Helen Langley and Clarke.

Commented [BG22]: OS 47.7 Glen Dene Ltd.

Commented [BG23]: OS 195.12 John and Helen Langley and Clarke.

Commented [BG24]: OS 47.7 Glen Dene Ltd.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

57. The area's natural landforms, land type, and hydrological features (described above) which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative processes acknowledging that the level and extent of Lake Hāwea is the result of human modification.
58. Indigenous gully and stream plantings which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values in places.
59. More generally, the vegetation cover and land uses found within the area reinforce the landform differences throughout the ONL, with more cultural vegetation patterns evident on the lower-lying areas and more natural vegetation cover apparent across more elevated areas.

Commented [BG25]: OS 182.37 Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson.
OS 47.10 Glen Dene Ltd.
OS 49.9 Richard Burdon.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

- 60. The sequence of highly attractive, frequently dramatic and varied views from SH6 Makarora Lake Hāwea Road between the entrance to Hāwea township/the Control Dam area and the lake terrace north of the Glen Dene homestead of: the dynamic waters of the lake; the glacial knolls along the western side of the lake; the distinctive transition between the mountains, lake terraces and waters of the lake; and the broader undeveloped and open mountain context framing the lake.
- 61. The striking close to long-range views from the lake margins (including the Te Araroa Trail, reserve land and Lake Hāwea township at the southern end of the lake) out over the lake, framed by the Mt Burke range to the west, the wall of sharply dissected mountains to the east, and the distant often snow-capped mountain range to the north including Sentinel Peak and Terrace Peak. The openness of the surrounding mountain context makes an important contribution to the quality of the outlook.
- 62. The series of highly appealing and memorable mid and longer-range views from the various trails in the area that, in many instances, afford expansive views across the dynamic waters of the lake to the broader glacial and open mountain context. The seemingly undeveloped mountain context juxtaposed beside the relatively modest settlement of Lake Hāwea adds to the interest of the outlook from many vantage points.
- 63. The attractive and engaging north and south bound views from SH6 Makarora Lake Hāwea Road in the vicinity of the Control Dam, in which the road across the control dam reads as a distinctive gateway and edge to the settlement on the eastern side of the dam/Hāwea River, with the land on the western side of the control dam retaining a markedly less developed, spacious rural character.
- 64. The highly appealing views from the waters of Lake Hāwea to the largely undeveloped lake terrace and dramatic open mountain context. The confinement of sizeable built development to Lake Hāwea township, its generally modest appearance and the very limited visibility of other development by virtue of its scale, appearance and/or the screening by landform or vegetation (for example, Gladstone, The Camp the Lake Hāwea Holiday Park, and the Glen Dene homestead) are of importance to the impression of Lake Hāwea as a relatively undeveloped lake.
- 65. In all of the views, the visual dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes along with the generally subservient nature of built development underpins the high quality of the outlook.

Commented [BG26]: OS 47.7 Glen Dene Ltd.

Naturalness attributes and values:

- 66. Lake Hāwea as a central feature of the ONL acknowledging that the level and extent of Lake Hāwea is the result of human modification.
- 67. The mountains framing the ONL are an important feature in their own right and as a counterpart to the lake.
- 68. The lake terraces on either side of the lake are the least natural parts of the ONL because of the presence of The Camp the holiday park, rural and rural living related development, the damming of the lake, and pastoral farming activities. The limited scale and visibility of built development within The Camp the holiday park (from SH6, the lake and the township) and farm dwellings and buildings, ensures that naturalness values rate as at least moderate-high in those parts of the PA.
- 69. Overall, the area displays naturalness values that rate towards the higher end of the spectrum as a consequence of the dominance of the natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes. The relatively confined extent of built development and its predominantly visually recessive, modest and/or relatively low-key character plays an important role.

Commented [BG27]: OS 47.11 Glen Dene Ltd.
OS 182.40 Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson.
OS 47.10 Glen Dene Ltd.
OS 47.11 Glen Dene Ltd.
OS 49.9 Richard Burdon.
OS 49.10 Richard Burdon.

Commented [BG28]: OS 47.7 Glen Dene Ltd.
OS 47.10 Glen Dene Ltd.

Commented [BG29]: OS 182.41 Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson.

Commented [BG30]: OS 47.7 Glen Dene Ltd.

Memorability attributes and values:

- 70. The highly memorable views of the lake and its surrounding mountain frame.

Transient attributes and values:

71. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain slopes and surface of the lake.
72. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation.
73. Human activity on the lake.

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

74. A high degree of remoteness and wildness along the mountain trails towards the edges of the PA and from much of the waters of the lake where there is a strong sense of separation from Lake Hāwea township and the farmed lake terraces and the sheer scale of the natural mountain and lake setting, means that it is the dominant perception.
75. A localised sense of remoteness along the lake-edge trails and shoreline within the PA ONL, where intervening landforms and/or vegetation screen views to nearby development and the focus is confined to the lake and broader undeveloped mountain context.

Aesthetic attributes and values:

76. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
77. More specifically, this includes:
 - a. The highly attractive and striking composition created by the arrangement of the natural waters of the lake framed by the complex and dramatic mountain setting.
 - b. The continuous and large-scale patterning of the alpine ridges and peaks together with the expanse of the lake which form a bold contrast to the more modified and 'tamed' low-lying lake terraces that is engaging and appealing.
 - c. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. The distinctive peaks, bold bluffs, rock outcrops, and sculpted spurs of the surrounding mountain ranges.
 - ii. The two glacial knolls on the western side of the lake.
 - iii. The transition of vegetation patterns from exotic to indigenous across the PA.
 - iv. The terminal moraine landform at the southern end of the lake.
 - v. The relatively low-key and 'rural vernacular' or visually discreet style of the majority of built development within the PA.
 - vi. The highly dynamic qualities of the lake waters in terms of natural processes (wind and wave action, etc.) and human activity.
 - vii. The general absence of structures and dominance of natural landscape elements along the western and eastern lake edges.
 - viii. The limited level of built modification evident within the landward parts of the PA, which forms a marked contrast to the Lake Hāwea settlement context and imbues an impression of a natural landscape context.
 - ix. The mature trees throughout the area which contribute to the scenic appeal.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

The combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA ONL Hāwea South North Grandview can be summarised as follows:

78. **High physical values** because of the assemblages of landforms, at a range of scales and formed by a range of interacting geomorphic processes, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features throughout the area.
79. **High associative values** relating to
 - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
 - b. The historic associations of the area.
 - c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
 - d. The popularity of the area for a wide range of recreational activities.
80. **High perceptual values** relating to:
 - a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of biophysical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
 - b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its often dramatic and highly appealing visual character. The attractive composition of both natural and rural/farmed landscapes, with a strong focus on the mountains and lake, are critical features of the area. The public accessibility of much of the area which allows the experience of these values along with the area's transient values and proximity to Lake Hāwea settlement, SH6 and Te Araroa Trail also play a role.
 - c. A high impression of naturalness arising from the dominance of the more natural landscape and the generally relatively modest or visually recessive nature of built development.
 - d. A strong sense of remoteness and wildness across much of the PA due to the distance from, or limited awareness of, development.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONL Hāwea South North Grandview West Wanaka for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – some** landscape capacity for small scale and low key activities that: integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a 'low-key' rural character and are difficult to see in views from the lake, lake edge, SH6 and

Commented [BG31]: OS 23.5 Geoff and Maureen Kernick.
OS 47.14 Glen Dene Ltd.
OS 49.14 Richard Burdon.

Commented [BG32]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

- Lake Hāwea settlement; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; ~~and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values.~~
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** (including campgrounds) – **some** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that: are co-located with existing consented facilities; are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale; have a 'low-key' rural character and are difficult to see in views from the lake, lake edge, SH6 and Lake Hāwea settlement; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values. **No** landscape capacity for tourism related activities.
 - iii. **Urban expansions** – **no** landscape capacity.
 - iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **no** landscape capacity.
 - v. **Earthworks** – **limited** landscape capacity for earthworks that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
 - vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, **limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character and maintain the openness and legibility attributes and values of ONL.
 - vii. **Mineral extraction** – **no** landscape capacity for extraction larger than ~~farm-scale quarries.~~
 - viii. **Transport infrastructure** – **very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low-key 'rural' roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns. ~~Limited Some landscape capacity for trails that are; located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONL values.~~
 - ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. ~~In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.~~
 - x. **Renewable energy generation** – **no** landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation. **Limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
 - xi. ~~Production #Forestry~~ – **no** landscape capacity.
 - xii. **Rural living** – **very limited** landscape capacity for activities that ~~are~~ located on the lower-lying terrain ~~that and are is~~ located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a 'low key' rural character and ~~is are~~ difficult to see in views from the lake, lake edge, SH6 and Lake Hāwea settlement; integrates appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; ~~and enhances public access; and protects the area's ONL values.~~
 - xiii. **Jetties, boatsheds, Lake structures and moorings** – **no** landscape capacity.

Commented [BG33]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG34]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG35]: OS 195.2 John and Helen Langley Clarke.

Commented [BG36]: OS 73.14 Bike Wanaka Inc. OS 99.6 John Wellington.

Commented [BG37]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG38]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG39]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG40]: OS 70.41 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

Commented [BG41]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG42]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG43]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG44]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG45]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG46]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG47]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG48]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG49]: OS 77.28 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview PA ONL Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview PA ONL Schedule”. New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text: relates to a submission point that has not be captured in the “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview PA ONL Schedule”. This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **Three examples identified.**

Green wash line item: Submission point re-notified 22 June 2023.

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS23.1	Geoff and Maureen Kernick	Oppose	That reference to plantation forestry be removed from schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview section 12(d).	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [12] as follows:</p> <p>Other distinctive vegetation types include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Grazed pasture with shelterbelts and clusters of shade trees throughout the fans and terraces on the western and eastern sides of the lake. b. The mixed plantings of exotic evergreen and deciduous species around rural homesteads and buildings, throughout the Lake Hāwea Holiday Park and throughout the southern lake margins. c. Exotic grasses and herbs mixed with short tussock grassland throughout the slopes below approximately 1,000m. d. Plantation forestry on the lower mountain slopes of Mt Maude near the Control Dam. e. Wilding conifers across the mountain slopes. 	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS23.2	Geoff and Maureen Kernick	Oppose	That 21.22.23 section 14 be amended to include tomtits, tui, shining cuckoo, Australasian crested grebe, Southern Alps gecko, McCann's skinks, and many others.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [14] as follows: Valued habitat for New Zealand falcon, New Zealand pipit, bellbird, grey warbler, fantail, <u>tomtits, tui, shining cuckoo, Australasian crested grebe, Southern Alps gecko and McCann's skinks</u> and silvereye.	Accept submission.
OS23.3	Geoff and Maureen Kernick	Oppose	That 21.22.23 section 15 be amended to include hedgehogs.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [15] as follows: Animal pest species include chamois, red deer, pigs, feral goats, hares, possums, mice, rats, stoats, ferrets, feral cats, <u>hedgehogs</u> and rabbits.	Accept submission.
OS23.4	Geoff and Maureen Kernick	Oppose	That 21.22.23 section 27 be amended to include: boating, water-skiing, jet skiing, and kite boarding.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [27] as follows: Recreational uses associated with the lake including swimming, fishing, paddle boarding, <u>boating, water skiing, jet skiing, kite boarding</u> and kayaking.	Accept submission.
OS23.5	Geoff and Maureen Kernick	Oppose	That the typographical error in the first sentence of the landscape capacity section of landscape schedule 21.22.23 be corrected from "Priority Area Outstanding Natural Landscape West Wanaka" to "Priority Area Outstanding Natural Landscape Hāwea South North Grandview".	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 Capacity section as follows: The landscape capacity of the PA ONL <u>Hawea South North Grandview West Wanaka</u> for a range of activities is set out below.	Accept submission.
OS23.6	Geoff and Maureen Kernick	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.23 sections i, and ii, landscape capacity be amended to consider effects of noise.	The capacity for commercial recreation activities and visitor accommodation within the PA, advises that appropriate development will be of a small scale and have a low key rural character. I consider that development that displays such characteristics is likely to sit comfortably into the setting in terms of aural	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				characteristics relevant to landscape values, such as peacefulness and tranquility.	
OS23.7	Geoff and Maureen Kernick	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.23 landscape capacity section require pest eradication / control programs as part of any Resource Consent application for i. commercial recreation activities, and ii. visitor accommodation and tourism related activities.	Pest eradication and control programs are implicit in the reference to 'landscape restoration and enhancement' for these activities, so no text change is required in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS23.8	Geoff and Maureen Kernick	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.23 section xi. Production forestry not preclude the removal of wilding pines and other pest trees.	The reference to no landscape capacity for production forestry does not preclude the removal of wilding conifers and other pest species (as encouraged by regional and district plan policy).	Reject submission.
OS47.2	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	That the category 'no landscape capacity' is removed and any areas or activities that are identified as having no landscape capacity be reclassified as having 'very limited landscape capacity'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal, I consider that the capacity ratings set out in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.23 and appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS47.3	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South - North Grandview landscape capacity assessment include 'tourism related activities' with Visitor Accommodation (the accommodation component and directly associated activities or	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Assumptions with respect to the character of tourism related activities are described in the PA Methodology Report (i.e. relates to resort development). In considering this submission point it is recommended that the wording of Schedule 21.22.23 [18] is amended as follows to avoid confusion:	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>services and facilities as defined by the Proposed District Plan) or Commercial Recreation (if the visitor attraction). Or alternative relief that a definition for Tourism Related Activities be included within the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<p>Modifications at Lake Hāwea Station which includes farm buildings, farming and farm tracks within the ONL as well as accommodation, tourism recreation activities (mountain biking, hunting) and event services outside of but on the boundary of the ONL.</p> <p>For completeness, relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal, along with the consideration of landscape related matters in relation to existing or proposed resort zones within the District (e.g. Millbrook, and The Hills) and role of the Open Space (Campground) zone, I consider that a rating of no landscape capacity is appropriate for tourism related activities within the PA.</p>	
OS47.7	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	<p>That in landscape schedule 21.22.23 all references to 'Lake Hāwea Holiday Park' or similar including 'The Holiday Park' be changed to 'The Camp'.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.23 as follows:</p> <p>12. Other distinctive vegetation types include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Grazed pasture with shelterbelts and clusters of shade trees throughout the fans and terraces on the western and eastern sides of the lake. b. The mixed plantings of exotic evergreen and deciduous species around rural homesteads and buildings, throughout the The Camp Lake Hāwea Holiday Park and throughout the southern lake margins. c. Exotic grasses and herbs mixed with short tussock grassland throughout the slopes below approximately 1,000m. d. Plantation forestry on the lower mountain slopes of Mt Maude near the Control Dam. e. Wilding conifers across the mountain slopes. <p>17. Built modification which is currently generally concentrated around the Glen Dene homestead (western side of the lake), The Camp Lake Hāwea Holiday Park (including a nearby boat ramp and jetty/pontoon), a cluster of rural living buildings on the mountain slopes near the control</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>dam, and the modest cluster of dwellings at the end of Nook Road.</p> <p>26. The Camp Holiday Park to Round Hill Track, the Te Araroa Trail, the Johns Creek track, the Grandview Creek track, the Grandview Ridge, and the unnamed loop track around the west side of Pt 812 that links to Lagoon Creek. Associated with these tracks are signage, stiles, and seating, typically of a modest scale and low-key character.</p> <p>51. The popular walking/biking trails, including: The Camp Holiday Park to Round Hill Track; the reserve tracks along the southern edge of the lake adjacent Hāwea township; the Johns Creek track; the Grandview Creek track; the Grandview Ridge; and the unnamed loop track around the west side of Pt 812 that links to Lagoon Creek.</p> <p>55. The highly popular campground at The Camp, Cross Hill Lodge and Domes (formerly The Lake Hāwea Holiday Park).</p> <p>64. The highly appealing views from the waters of Lake Hāwea to the largely undeveloped lake terrace and dramatic open mountain context. The confinement of sizeable built development to Lake Hāwea township, its generally modest appearance and the very limited visibility of other development by virtue of its scale, appearance and/or the screening by landform or vegetation (for example, Gladstone, The Camp, the Lake Hāwea Holiday Park, and the Glen Dene homestead) are of importance to the impression of Lake Hāwea as a relatively undeveloped lake.</p> <p>68. The lake terraces on either side of the lake are the least natural parts of the ONL because of the presence of The Camp the holiday park and pastoral farming activities. The limited scale and visibility of built development within The Camp the holiday park (from SH6, the lake and the township) and farm dwellings and buildings, ensures that naturalness values rate as at least moderate-high in those parts of the PA.</p>	

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS47.8	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	That in 21.22.23 'The Camp' is not included as part of the Hāwea South North Grandview Priority Area. Or alternatively that The Camp is excluded from the priority area landscape capacity.	ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS47.9	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	That in landscape schedule 21.22.23 the engineering aspects of the damming and raising of Lake Hāwea are included in the associative values.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The reference to the modified nature of the lake is appropriately referenced under the physical and perceptual values parts of the Schedule (see response to OS 49.2).	Reject submission.
OS47.10	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	That in landscape schedule 21.22.23 it be noted that the lake is manmade in relation to the legibility of the natural processes.	Addressed in response to OS 49.2.	Accept submission.
OS47.11	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.23 paragraph 66 be amended to note that the lake is manmade.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [66] as follows: Lake Hāwea as a central feature of the ONL acknowledging that the level and extent of Lake Hāwea is the result of human modification .	Accept submission.
OS47.12	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	That the use of 'natural waters' in landscape schedule 21.22.23 paragraph 77.a. is amended to recognise that the water is manmade.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. This text change is considered unnecessary as the Schedule item relates to a description of the visual composition and the water itself is correctly described as a natural landscape element within that context. Further, the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the Schedules are to be read in full. The repeated mention to the modified nature of the extent and level of the lake elsewhere in the Schedule should provide the submitter with some comfort that the modified nature of the lake would be factored into any evaluation of the effects of a resource consent or plan change	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				application on the PA's landscape values will be given appropriate consideration.	
OS47.13	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	That in landscape schedule 21.22.23 the history of the human engineering of creating the landscape is included at paragraph 80.a. of the summary of landscape values.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>This text change is considered unnecessary as the Schedule item relates to a summary of perceptual values. While the lake has been modified, relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal, I consider that the legibility and expressiveness values of the PA still rate as 'high'.</p> <p>Further, the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the Schedules are to be read in full. The repeated mention to the modified nature of the extent and level of the lake elsewhere in the Schedule should provide the submitter with some comfort that the modified nature of the lake would be factored into any evaluation of the effects of a resource consent or plan change application on the PA's landscape values will be given appropriate consideration.</p>	Reject submission.
OS47.14	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.23 be amended to remove the words 'West Wānaka' and read 'The landscape capacity of the Hāwea South North Grandview PA ONL for a range of activities is set out'.	Addressed in response to OS 23.5.	Accept submission.
OS47.15	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	That in landscape schedule 21.22.23 the reference to 'difficult to see from the lake, lake edge, SH6, and Lake Hāwea settlement' is removed.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider that this text change is appropriate. Existing development is 'difficult to see' from</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				these vantage points. In my opinion, this characteristic plays an important role in shaping landscape values.	
OS47.16	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	That in landscape schedule 21.22.23 where it states that there is no landscape capacity for tourism related activities this be amended to state that there is some landscape capacity for tourism activities.	Addressed in response to OS 47.3.	Reject submission.
OS47.17	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Glen Dene Limited	Oppose	That the difficult to see test is removed in relation to views from the lake and the road in landscape schedule 21.22.23.	Addressed in response to OS 47.15.	Reject submission.
OS49.2	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That the category 'no landscape capacity' is removed and any areas or activities that are identified as having no landscape capacity be reclassified as having 'very limited landscape capacity'.	Addressed in response to OS 47.2.	Reject submission.
OS49.6	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That the land owned by Glen Dene Limited is not included as part of the Hāwea South North Grandview Priority Area. Or alternatively that Glen Dene is excluded from the priority area landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 47.8.	Reject submission.
OS49.7	Paterson Pitts Group On	Oppose	That the Glen Dene farm base area is mentioned alongside the homestead, including the home paddocks	Addressed in response to OS 49.11.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Behalf Of Richard Burdon		and area of improved pasture.		
OS49.8	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That in landscape schedule 21.22.23 the engineering aspects of the damning and raising of Lake Hāwea are included in the associative values.	Addressed in response to OS 49.8.	Reject submission.
OS49.9	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That in landscape schedule 21.22.23 it be noted that the lake is manmade in relation to the legibility of the natural processes.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [57] as follows: The area's natural landforms, land type, and hydrological features (described above) which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative processes acknowledging that the level and extent of Lake Hāwea is the result of human modification .	Accept submission.
OS49.10	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.23 paragraph 66 be amended to note that the lake is manmade.	Addressed in response to OS 47.11.	Accept submission.
OS49.11	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That in landscape schedule 21.22.23 the farm base nodes with associated trees are included in relation to the pastoral farming activities.	The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the PA Schedules are to be read in full. Schedule 21.22.23 includes reference to existing pastoral farming and exotic tree plantings in several locations (e.g. [12](a), [12](b), [19], [42], [59], [68]). For this reason the text change to Schedule 21.22.23 [17] requested by the submitter is not considered necessary.	Reject submission.
OS49.12	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That the use of 'natural waters' in landscape schedule 21.22.23 paragraph 77.a. is amended to recognise that the water is manmade.	Addressed in response to OS 47.12.	Reject submission.
OS49.13	Paterson Pitts Group On	Oppose	That the history of the human engineering of creating the landscape is	Addressed in response to OS 47.13.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Behalf Of Richard Burdon		included at paragraph 80.a. of the summary of landscape values.		
OS49.14	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.23 be amended to remove the words 'West Wānaka' and read 'The landscape capacity of the Hāwea South North Grandview PA ONL for a range of activities is set out'.	Addressed in response to OS 23.5.	Accept submission.
OS49.15	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That the difficult to see test is removed in relation to views from the lake and the road in landscape schedule 21.22.23.	Addressed in response to OS 47.15.	Reject submission.
OS49.16	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That in landscape schedule 21.22.23 the reference to 'difficult to see from the lake, lake edge, SH6, and Lake Hāwea settlement' is removed.	Addressed in response to OS 47.15.	Reject submission.
OS49.17	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That in landscape schedule 21.22.23 where it states that there is no landscape capacity for tourism related activities this be amended to state that there is some landscape capacity for tourism activities.	Addressed in response to OS 47.3.	Reject submission.
OS49.18	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.23 iv. for intensive agriculture be amended to add the words 'except in areas where there is existing	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble clarifies the definition of Intensive Agriculture.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			agricultural use of the land' after no landscape capacity.	<p>It is expected that this change may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard, as the existing farming activities within the PA would not qualify as 'intensive agriculture'.</p> <p>For completeness, relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal, along with the consideration the definition of intensive agriculture that is proposed to be included in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22, I consider that a rating of no landscape capacity is appropriate for intensive agriculture within the PA.</p>	
OS49.19	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.23 xi. production forestry be amended to remove no landscape capacity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal, I consider that a rating of no landscape capacity is appropriate for production forestry within the PA.</p>	Reject submission.
OS49.20	Paterson Pitts Group On Behalf Of Richard Burdon	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.23 xii. rural living be amended to remove 'difficult to see from the lake, lake edge, SH6 and Lake Hāwea Settlement.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider that this text change is appropriate. Existing rural living development is 'difficult to see' from these vantage points. In my opinion this characteristic plays an important role in shaping landscape values.</p>	Reject submission.
OS67.18	Julian Haworth	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended to identify the physical attributes and values of carbon sequestration activities.	<p>The submitter would appear to be requesting that reference to the potential for mountain slopes to naturally transition to indigenous shrubland (assuming cessation of browsing, fire or chemical management), and the potential for such vegetation to assist with carbon sequestration should be referenced in Schedule 21.22.23.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>I agree with the points made in so far as they are technically correct, however am unconvinced that they merit reference in the Schedule in the manner alluded to.</p> <p>The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the PA Schedules are to be read in full. Landscape restoration and enhancement is repeatedly mentioned as a characteristic of appropriate development where there is landscape capacity identified. I consider that this would signal the consideration of existing bracken as a nurse crop and changes in land management (browsing etc) to assist with indigenous plant succession processes as part of future plan change or resource consent processes.</p> <p>With respect to the benefit of indigenous vegetation to assist with carbon sequestration, again this is not disputed. However it is unclear how this characteristic contributes to landscape values per se, and the approach of the PA Schedules to reference landscape restoration and enhancement where there is some degree of capacity identified for many of the landuses, aligns well with this outcome. I also note that the definition of Forestry and consideration of other types of forestry (such as carbon sequestration) is discussed in more detail in the s42A Report.</p> <p>The submitter is encouraged to provide detailed advice with respect to the text changes that they consider are required in relation to this submission point so that they can be considered for inclusion in the PA Schedule.</p>	
OS67.19	Julian Haworth	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended to review other vegetation type attributes referred to as distinctive in paragraph 12 in terms of their landscape values. Also to review paragraphs 15 and 16 for the same purpose.	Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the PA ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>However, it is agreed that as currently drafted the PA Schedules are potentially confusing in this regard as these aspects of the landscape are negative rather than positive.</p> <p>A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter.</p>	
OS67.20	Julian Haworth	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is largely supported but needs to be amended to change the capacity rating for rural living to 'extremely limited' as it is likely to have significant and adverse effects on current largely un-built naturalness.	<p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider that the landscape capacity for rural living in the PA needs to be reduced from 'very limited' to 'extremely limited'. This is due to the large scale (i.e. extent) of the PA along with the extensive areas of pastoral farmland within the PA. In my opinion, the 'qualifications' set out in Schedule 21.22.23 capacity (xii) also play an important role in this regard, as they serve to 'curb' the inappropriate proliferation of rural living development within the PA.</p> <p>The submitter is also referred to the recommended changes to the Schedule 21.12 Preamble which includes the addition of the capacity definitions to assist plan users. The definition for 'very limited' capacity is set out below:</p> <p><u>Very limited landscape capacity: typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is very close to its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only a very small amount of sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.</u></p> <p>This suggested amendment may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS67.21	Julian Haworth	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended so there is no capacity for exotic	<p>In agreement with the submitter's comments in relation to production forestry so no further comment required.</p> <p>Native forestry is a permitted activity and was not identified by the Environment Court as a landuse typology to be addressed in the PA Schedules.</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			forestry and substantial capacity for native forestry.		
OS70.41	Ainsley McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 Capacity (ix) as follows: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.	Accept submission.
OS73.4	Ian Greaves On Behalf Of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview be amended to remove reference to limited or very limited capacity for new trails.	Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider it appropriate to remove the capacity reference for new trails, as inappropriately located and/or designed trails have the potential to detract from landscape values. Also addressed in response to OS 73.14.	Reject submission.
OS73.14	Ian Greaves On Behalf Of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview be amended to include the following - Walking and cycling trails: some landscape capacity for additional trails that are sympathetically designed to	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 Capacity (viii) as follows: Transport infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low-key 'rural' roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns. Limited Some landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONL values.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			integrate with existing natural landform patterns.		
OS77.30	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That 21.22.23 'important mana whenua features and their locations' be amended to include: A contemporary nohoaka (camping site to support traditional mahika kai activities provided as a redress under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlements Act 1998) is located at Lake Hāwea Camp Ground.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 as follows: <u>[35a] A contemporary nohoaka (camping site to support traditional mahika kai activities provided as a redress under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlements Act 1998) is located at The Camp.</u>	Accept submission.
OS99.6	John Wellington On Behalf of Upper Clutha Tracks Trust.	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.	Addressed in response to OS 73.14.	Accept submission.
OS115.12	Khaylm Marshall	Oppose	That both the physical values (paragraph 78) and associative values (paragraph 79) in landscape schedule 21.22.23 are increased from high to 'very high'.	The submitter requests that the rating of the (summary of) Physical and Associative values is changed from 'High' to 'Very High' on the basis of the importance of the Lake Hāwea fishery. While the importance of the fishery is not disputed, it is difficult to see how the fishery itself elevates landscape values of the PA (as a whole) to 'Very High' given that much of the PA relates to land (rather than waterbodies or streams). However, in considering this submission point it is noted that Schedule 21.22.23 [53] acknowledges the nationally significant fishery of Lake Hāwea which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS179.3	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Graeme and Leah Causer	Oppose	That 21.22. 23 be rejected.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS179.4	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Graeme and Leah Causer	Oppose	That the Priority Areas (PAs) are further distinguished by identifying the various landscape areas or units within the PA.	Addressed in response to OS 206.2.	Reject submission.
OS179.5	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Graeme and Leah Causer	Oppose	That the landscape schedule identifies the key attributes and distinguishing features within each landscape area or unit of the Priority Area.	Addressed in response to OS 206.2.	Reject submission.
OS179.6	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Graeme and Leah Causer	Oppose	That the landscape schedule is accompanied by a map of each Priority Area identifying the distinguishable landscape units within it, and the related landscape capacity of each of those areas.	Addressed in response to OS 206.2.	Reject submission.
OS179.7	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Graeme and Leah Causer	Oppose	That appropriate terminology is used to describe the relative landscape capacity of the landscape unit/areas within the PA, and the appropriateness of finer grained assessments to determine landscape capacity within specific landscape units or sites.	The Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS182.1	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview be amended to either exclude the land of the submitter, or to more accurately recognise and provide for existing uses, their likely anticipated future upgrade, replacement, or redevelopment.	ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation. The existing uses query is addressed in response to OS 182.7.	Reject submission.
OS182.2	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview be amended to delete the term 'no capacity'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to assist plan user's understanding of capacity ratings in the PA Schedules. The qualifications as to scale etc in relation to capacity ratings discussed in response to OS 182.48 are also of relevance here. For completeness, relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I consider that a rating of no landscape capacity is appropriate for the following landuse typologies within the PA: tourism related activities (i.e. resorts), urban expansion, intensive agriculture, mineral extraction, large scale commercial renewable energy generation, production forestry and lake structures.	Accept submission in part.
OS182.3	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview be amended to recognise and provide for benefits of change, enhancement and	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The focus of the Schedules is to identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected. That said, the identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			remediation of the landscape.	landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level). It is expected that such matters would be traversed in detail as part of a detailed (and more site specific) landscape assessment in support of a plan change or resource consent process.	
OS182.5	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview's boundary be amended to reflect the high degree of modification of the landscape.	Addressed in response to OS 182.5.	Reject submission.
OS182.6	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview be amended to distinguish between the elevated mountain environment which exhibits high landscape values and the low-lying and highly modified submitter land. Remove the submitter land, and the land below the state highway from the outstanding natural landscape.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I consider the mountain slopes, lake terraces and lake to be a coherent and contiguous landscape. Importantly, I do not consider that the lower lying lake margins display lower landscape values that merit distinction within Schedule 21.22.23. Amendments to the PA mapping are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS182.7	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to further particularise the broader list of established activities occurring within the lower-lying parts of the	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The established activities and modifications occurring within the lower-lying parts of the ONL are generally referenced in Schedule 21.22.23 via the repeated references to pastoral	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	and Andrea Donaldson		outstanding natural landscape which are historically recognised as appropriate and in keeping with the landform.	farming, rural buildings, exotic plantings, rural living dwellings, farm tracks, fencing etc.	
OS182.8	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview be amended to reflect that the holiday park and Round Hill Track is overgrown and no longer walkable.	Having viewed the track from the northern end of The Camp, it appears to be reasonably open (at least in places), and I understand that the track is used by visitors at The Camp. However, the submitter is encouraged to provide technical evidence in support of this submission point, to allow the track to be appropriately described in Schedule 21.22.23.	Reject submission.
OS182.9	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to delete references to vegetation types such as pasture, plant pest species and animal pest species from the important ecological and vegetation types section of the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the PA ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level). However, it is agreed that as currently drafted the PA Schedules are potentially confusing in this regard as these aspects of the landscape are negative rather than positive. A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter.	Accept in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS182.10	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview be amended so the boundary of the priority area is based on State Highway 6 along the base of the Mount Maude slopes.	ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS182.11	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended so that the description regarding postcard views is not misinterpreted as applying more broadly.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider changes are required to the description of postcard views from the reserve area, Hāwea township and SH6 in the manner requested by the submitter. I also note that part of the submitter's land is seen from SH6. It should also be noted that the specific relevance of this aspect of landscape values germane to a development application on the submitter's land would be appropriately evaluated as part of a resource consent or plan change application.	Reject submission.
OS182.12	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended so that the landscape values are moderate rather than high.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider that the rankings of landscape values in Schedule 21.22.23 should be altered. I also note that were the submitter correct in this regard, relying on caselaw, it is very unlikely that the area would qualify as an ONL and specifically, the test of 'outstanding-ness'. The ONL status of the area has been confirmed by the Environment Court.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS182.13	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended if the overall landscape ranking for the outstanding natural landscape is not amended that the values should be specifically amended to assign a low ranking to the lower-lying land, including the submitters land.	Addressed in response to OS 182.6.	Reject submission.
OS182.14	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended so the capacity sections list particular types of activities against which capacity for the outstanding natural landscape to absorb is ranked or listed.	<p>The Schedule 21.22.23 Capacity section identifies the landscape capacity rating for each landuse type as directed by the Environment Court.</p> <p>The PA Methodology Report explains the capacity ratings at Section 3, explaining that the Schedules also include the characteristics that are likely to be associated with appropriate development where landscape capacity is identified for a landuse.</p> <p>It should be noted that refinement of the capacity ratings is proposed and the recommended changes to the Schedule 21.22 Preamble text which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS182.15	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended to exclude the submitters land or the schedule should take into account the scale of existing and likely future development associated with existing land uses.	Addressed in response to OS 182.6 and OS 182.7.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS182.16	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to incorporate submitter feedback as to important values.	Submitter feedback has been carefully reviewed and Schedule 21.22.23 has been modified where considered appropriate from an expert perspective.	Accept submission in part.
OS182.17	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That if landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended the submitter seeks any additional, amended, consequential, or further relief in respect of the schedules to reflect the intent of the matters raised in this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS182.18	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That if the amendments included within this submission are not included within the schedule, then the submitter seeks that it be deleted or otherwise withdrawn from the variation.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS182.19	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the boundary of the outstanding natural landscape is not defensible and should be amended to reflect the high degree of modification of the landscape.	Addressed in response to OS 182.6, OS 182.10 and OS 182.12.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS182.23	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended by removing point 13 under the heading important ecological features and vegetation types from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.23 has been reviewed by an ecology expert with the notified text supported by that expert.	Reject submission.
OS182.24	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended by removing point 15 under the heading important ecological features and vegetation types from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 182.9.	Accept submission in part.
OS182.25	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended by removing point 16 under the heading important ecological features and vegetation types from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 182.9.	Accept submission in part.
OS182.26	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 18 by including the words 'and surrounding low-lying environment', and replacing the word 'includes' with 'include'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider the changes requested by the submitter in this regard are necessary to ensure an understanding of the landscape values of the PA.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS182.27	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 20 to replace the word 'largely' with 'somewhat' and removing the word 'two' in the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider the changes requested by the submitter in this regard are necessary to ensure an understanding of the landscape values of the PA.	Reject submission.
OS182.28	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 23 replace the word 'The' with the words 'There is', and to replace the words 'almost all' with 'some'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [23] as follows: The reserve land along almost all much of the lake margins adjoining Hāwea township (and which coincide with Te Araroa, a network of trails and picnic spots).	Accept submission in part.
OS182.29	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 26 to include the words 'overgrown and unwalkable' in the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 182.8.	Reject submission.
OS182.30	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 27 to include the words 'These uses are limited by the prevailing northwest and southeast winds and are mostly undertaken between Christmas and late-January due to the low temperature of the water'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. While I accept that use of the lake is likely to be greater during settled weather in the peak summer season, my experience is that the lake is used year-round for a range of recreational activities such as fishing. For this reason, I do not consider that the qualification requested by the submitter is necessary in a Schedule of Landscape Values for the PA.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS182.31	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended at point 45 to include the words 'of the mountains, lake, and some of the lake shore'.	Addressed in response to OS 182.11.	Reject submission.
OS182.32	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended at point 47 to remove the word 'peaceful' and to include the words 'when weather permits'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider the changes requested by the submitter in this regard are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS182.33	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended at point 51 to remove the word 'popular' and to include the words 'overgrown and unwalkable'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider the changes requested by the submitter in this regard are appropriate. Also see response to OS 182.8.	Reject submission.
OS182.34	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended to remove point 52 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>the changes requested by the submitter in this regard are appropriate.</p> <p>SH6 Makarora Lake Hāwea Road is a key scenic route providing access between the West Coast and the Otago Lakes.</p>	
OS182.35	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 53 to remove the word 'Nationally' from the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider the changes requested by the submitter in this regard are appropriate.</p> <p>Lake Hāwea is identified as a Nationally Significant fishery by Otago Fish and Game, and this aspect of Schedule 21.22.23 has been reviewed by a recreation and tourism expert with the notified text supported by that expert.</p>	Reject submission.
OS182.36	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 54 to include the words 'highly modified', 'noting that very few parts of the beach are suitable to picnicking due to bluffs, course stones, and exposure to weather'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider the changes requested by the submitter in this regard are appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.
OS182.37	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 57 to include the words 'excluding the modified lake shore'.	Addressed in response to OS 49.2.	Accept submission (subject to refinement).

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS182.38	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 60 to replace the words 'from SH6 Makarora Lake Hawea Road between the entrance to Hawea township/the Control Dam area and the lake terrace north' with 'north'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider the changes requested by the submitter in this regard are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS182.39	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to remove point 64 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider the changes requested by the submitter in this regard are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS182.40	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 66 to remove the words 'noting that the lake itself is not in its "natural" state'.	Addressed in response to OS 47.11.	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS182.41	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 68 to include the words 'rural residential development', 'and the damming of the lake', and to replace the word 'high' with 'low' in the landscape schedule.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [68] as follows: The lake terraces on either side of the lake are the least natural parts of the ONL because of the presence of the holiday park, rural and rural living related development, the damming of the lake and pastoral farming activities. The limited scale and visibility of built development within the holiday park (from SH6, the lake and the township) and farm dwellings and buildings, ensures that naturalness values rate as at least moderate-high in those parts of the PA.	Accept submission (subject to refinement).

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS182.42	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 69 to replace the word 'higher' with 'low-moderate', include the words 'damming of the lake undermining the', and to remove 'The relatively confined extent of built development and its predominantly visually recessive, modest and/or relatively low-key character plays an important role'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider the changes requested by the submitter in this regard are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS182.43	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 74 to replace the words 'mountain trails towards the' with 'mountainous', and remove the words 'and the farmed lake terraces'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider the changes requested by the submitter in this regard are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS182.44	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 75 to replace the word 'localised' with 'low', include the words 'farmed lake terraces', and remove the words ',where intervening landforms and/or vegetation screen views to nearby development and the focus is confined to the lake and broader undeveloped mountain context'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider the changes requested by the submitter in this regard are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS182.45	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 77 to include 'Round Hill is protected by a QEII covenant'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [4] as follows: Two rocky glacial knolls on the western side of the lake (Pt 414 and Pt 412, Round Hill) separated by a narrow terrace (noting that Round Hill is subject to a QE II Covenant) . It is considered that reference to the QE II Covenant that applies to Round Hill is most appropriately included under 'physical values', rather than 'aesthetic values' in the PA Schedule.	Accept submission subject to minor refinement.
OS182.46	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at point 77 to include 'and the western edges north of Glen Dene'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I do not consider the changes requested by the submitter in this regard are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS182.47	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to include 'Hawea South and North Grandviews' and to remove 'West Wanaka' from the landscape capacity section of the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 23.5.	Accept submission.
OS182.48	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to change the capacity rating for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities from 'no' capacity to 'limited' capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Noting that tourism related activities are defined as resorts, and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I remain of the view that there is no landscape capacity for this activity within the PA. However, the explanatory text in the Preamble to	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>Schedule 21.22.23 explains that capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the PA and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through plan change and consent applications. This explanatory text may go some way to providing comfort to the submitter in this regard.</p> <p>With respect to visitor accommodation, Schedule 21.22.23 identifies the landscape capacity for this landuse within the PA to be 'some', so no change is required.</p>	
OS182.49	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to change the capacity rating for urban expansions to include 'some landscape capacity within the lower-lying terrain. No landscape capacity in other areas'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Urban development is inappropriate within ONF/Ls as urban development inevitably means the ONF/L will fail to qualify as a RMA s6(b) landscape in terms of 'naturalness' (see <i>Long Bay</i> and <i>High Country Rosehip</i>).</p>	Reject submission.
OS182.50	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to change the capacity rating of earthworks from 'limited' to 'some'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I remain of the view that there is limited landscape capacity for earthworks within the PA. This is largely the consequence of the very steep mountain terrain or the limited scale (extent) of the lake terraces along with the proximity of these parts of the PA to the lake itself and/or key scenic routes/public trails.</p> <p>It is recommended that the Preamble to Schedule 22.23 is amended to include the definition of limited landscape capacity (as set out below), which may provide the submitter with some comfort in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>Limited landscape capacity: typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is near its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values and where only a modest amount of sensitively located and designed development is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.</p> <p>The qualifications as to scale etc in relation to capacity ratings discussed in response to OS 182.48 are also of relevance here.</p>	
OS182.51	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to change the capacity rating for farm buildings from 'limited' to 'some'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I remain of the view that there is limited landscape capacity for farm buildings in pastoral areas within the PA.</p>	Reject submission.
OS182.52	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to change the capacity rating for rural living from 'very limited' to 'some'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I remain of the view that there is very limited landscape capacity for rural living development on the lower lying terrain within the PA.</p>	Reject submission.
OS182.53	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Jeremy Burdon, Jo Batchelor and Andrea Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended to change the capacity rating for lake structures from 'no' capacity to 'limited' capacity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), I remain of the view that there is no landscape capacity for lake structures within the PA. I note that the characteristic of lake structures (jetties, pontoons, ramps and the like) being co-located in</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				close proximity to Hāwea settlement and The Camp is sympathetic to the objective of protecting the landscape values of the PA.	
OS188.49	Elisha Young-Ebert	Oppose	That 21.22.23 'important mana whenua features and their locations' be amended to include: A contemporary nohoaka (camping site to support traditional mahika kai activities provided as a redress under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlements Act 1998) is located at Lake Hāwea Camp Ground.	Addressed in response to OS 77.30.	Accept submission.
OS195.1	John and Helen Langley and Clarke	Support	That the summary of landscape values included in landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview are retained as notified.	In agreement, no further comment required.	Accept submission.
OS195.2	John and Helen Langley and Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended to include the quarry on the western end of the Burdon's property into the landscape capacity assessment for mineral extraction in the landscape schedule.	Schedule 21.22.23 Capacity (vii) acknowledges a tolerance for farm scale quarries, so no text change required in this regard.	Accept submission.
OS195.3	John and Helen Langley and Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended at paragraph 10 to remove the 's' from 'Johns Creek'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [10] as follows: The network of deeply incised streams draining the mountains on the eastern side of the lake including: the lower reaches of Bushy Creek, Johns Creek, Grandview Creek, Drakes Creek, Cameron Gully, Hospital Creek and numerous unnamed streams and tributaries.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS195.4	John and Helen Langley and Clarke	Oppose	<p>That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended at paragraph 11 to include the words 'Fuscospora cliffortioides' at point b, replace the word scrub for shrub or woodland at point c, include macrons and 'coprosma sp. Matgouri' at point d, replace the word 'scrub' for 'woodlands' at points e and f, replace 'mingimingi' with grey "Cosprosmas sp. dominant" shrublands, add a point (j) 'species listed as at risk/declining status include Native broom Carmichaelia petriei', Matagouri. Threatened- Nationally vulnerable Small leaved tree daisy (Oleria fimbriata) Also present alpine wineberry Corokia cotoneaster and Kowhai microphylla' into the landscape schedule'.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [11] as follows: Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Slim snow tussock grassland (<i>Chionochloa macra</i>) and depleted herbfields dominated by false Spaniard (<i>Celmisia lyallii</i>) on the mountain tops. b. Remnant isolated (fire relic) stands of mountain beech (<i>Fuscospora cliffortioides</i>) forest in Grandview catchments. c. The subalpine and alpine vegetation across the mountains to the west and east of the lake, featuring short (fescue) tussocklands, narrow leaved snow tussocklands (<i>Chionochloa rigida</i>), patches of <i>Dracophyllum</i> dominant scrub shrub or woodland and herbfields. d. Swathes and patches of regenerating kānuka, mānuka, coprosma sp. matagouri and grey shrubland across the lower and mid slopes and spurs of the mountains on either side of the PA. e. Bracken, matagouri and kānuka and mānuka scrub woodlands throughout rocky slopes of mountains on either side of the PA. f. Kānuka scrub woodlands, mānuka scrub woodlands, grey shrubland and bracken cover large parts of the lower slopes of the glacial knolls on the western side of the lake. g. The grey shrubland on a rocky outcrop on Kane Road, near Hāwea Back Road that is identified as an SNA in the District Plan. Species include: <i>Coprosma intertexta</i>, <i>Coprosma propinqua</i>, <i>Coprosma tayloriae</i>, <i>Coprosma rigida</i>, <i>Coprosma crassifolius</i>, <i>Carmichaelia petriei</i>, <i>Melicytus alpinus</i>, <i>Discaria toumatou</i>, <i>Pteridium esculentum</i>, <i>Muehlenbeckia complexa</i> and <i>Cordyline australis</i>. 	<p>Accept submission.</p>

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>h. A woodland on the eastern slopes of Mt Maude that is an SNA in the District Plan. Dominated by halls totara (<i>Podocarpus cunninghamii</i>) and mountain totoa (<i>Phyllocladus alpinus</i>).</p> <p>i. Areas of regenerating matagouri, mingimangi grey Coprosma sp. dominant shrublands, kānuka and bracken fernland in places across the fans and lake terraces.</p> <p>j. Species listed as at risk/declining status include native broom (<i>Carmichaelia petriei</i>), matagouri. Threatened- Nationally vulnerable species include: small leaved tree daisy (<i>Oleraia fimbriata</i>). Also present: alpine wineberry, <i>Corokia cotoneaster</i> and <i>Kowhai microphylla</i>.</p>	
OS195.5	John and Helen Langley and Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended at paragraph 12 to include the word 'exotic' at point (a), include that the forestry above the dam is wilding forest at point (d), and include 'Silver Birch' and 'Betula sp.' amongst the wildings at point (e).	<p>Inclusion of reference to 'exotic' at [12](a) is not considered necessary.</p> <p>The description of the 'plantation forestry' near the control dam in [12] (d) is addressed in response to OS 23.1.</p> <p>Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [12] (e) as follows:</p> <p>Wilding conifers and <i>Betula sp.</i> across the mountain slopes.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS195.6	John and Helen Langley and Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended to include the 'Tui', the 'McCann skink', and 'Southern Alps Gecko' to paragraph 14.	Addressed in response to OS 23.2.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS195.7	John and Helen Langley and Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended to include 'Fallow deer', 'hedgehog' and 'wallaby' to paragraph 15 of the landscape schedule.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [15] as follows: Animal pest species include chamois, red deer, fallow deer, wallabies , pigs, feral goats, hares, possums, mice, rats, stoats, ferrets, feral cats, and rabbits.	Accept submission.
OS195.8	John and Helen Langley and Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended at paragraph 16 to include 'European broom', and 'Silver birch'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [16] as follows: Plant pest species include sweet briar, broom, wilding pines, hawthorn, buddleia, hawkweed, gooseberry, bittersweet, European broom, silver birch and gorse.	Accept submission.
OS195.9	John and Helen Langley and Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended at paragraph 26 to replace 'John Creek' with 'Gladstone track'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [26] as follows: The Holiday Park to Round Hill Track, the Te Araroa Trail, the John Creek track, the Gladstone track , the Grandview Creek track, the Grandview Ridge, and the unnamed loop track around the west side of Pt 812 that links to Lagoon Creek. Associated with these tracks are signage, stiles, and seating, typically of a modest scale and low-key character. It should be noted that both the John Creek track and the Gladstone track are referenced in local trail maps etc.	Accept submission.
OS195.10	John and Helen Langley and Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview is amended at paragraph 29 to change 'Gladstone' with 'John Creek'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [29] as follows: Neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include: the very close proximity of Hāwea township which extends along the south-western margins of the lake and abuts the PA; the cluster of dwellings at John Creek Gladstone ; and the Control Dam booms, dam wall, etc.) at the start of the Hāwea River.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS195.11	John and Helen Langley and Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at paragraph 50 to replace 'Gladstone' with 'John Creek'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [50] as follows: The popular and nationally important Te Araroa Trail that is along the southern and south-eastern edges of the lake beyond <u>John Creek Gladstone</u> , via the Gladstone to Wānaka Track, where it veers eastwards to climb a ridge to the Pakituhi Hut (near Pt 1316).	Accept submission.
OS195.12	John and Helen Langley and Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended at paragraph 51 to remove the 's' from 'Johns Creek'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.23 [51] as follows: The popular walking/biking trails, including: Holiday Park to Round Hill Track; the reserve tracks along the southern edge of the lake adjacent Hāwea township; the John's Creek track; the Grandview Creek track; the Grandview Ridge; and the unnamed loop track around the west side of Pt 812 that links to Lagoon Creek.	Accept submission.
OS206.1	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Sally and Braden Currie	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is opposed and should be rejected as notified.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS206.2	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Sally and Braden Currie	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to include a further layer of capacity mapping that identifies areas within specific outstanding natural landscapes that have capacity to absorb some development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of tis submission point. The Topic 2.5 Decision (September 2020) directs at [171], that the assessment of the ONF/L Priority Areas be undertaken for the feature or landscape <u>as a whole</u> (rather than at a landscape character unit scale). <u>Prior to the PA Schedules work being undertaken</u> , landscape conferencing was undertaken (Joint Statement arising from Expert Planner and Landscape Conferencing in relation to Strategic Policies and Priority Area Expert Conferencing, TOPIC 2: RURAL LANDSCAPES, dated 29 October 2020) in which the experts agreed that there were likely to be a number of landscape character units within a single PA (see JWS [29]). The expert PA Schedule authors carefully considered the utility of identifying landscape character units within each PA in terms of identifying the important attributes and values that	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>needed to be protected at a landscape scale, and landscape capacity. The PA Methodology Report [5.24] explains the authors did not consider it necessary to undertake landscape character unit delineation to inform an understanding of landscape values (and in turn, capacity). However, this is not to say that localised variances in values and landscape capacity occur across a PA. The PA Schedules have been drafted to acknowledge this variance in two ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) By acknowledging more localised nuances in the main body of the Schedule of Values and Landscape Capacity comments (where appropriate). b) By signalling upfront in the Preamble to Schedule 21.12 that the landscape attributes, values and capacity relate to the PA as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing the attributes, values and capacity of specific sites; and a finer grained site-specific assessment of a plan change or resource consent process may identify different attributes, values and capacity to that identified in the PA Schedule. 	
OS206.3	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Sally and Braden Currie	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended so that it does not restrict appropriate activities in the priority area due to the assessed landscape capacity outlined.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), and subject to the amendments with respect to landscape capacity recommended in relation to other submissions on Schedule 21.22.23, I consider that the landscape capacity ratings are appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.
OS206.4	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Sally and Braden Currie	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is rejected as notified and reassessed to acknowledge rural living, visitor accommodation/rural	Addressed in response to OS 206.3.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			tourism and other appropriate activities provided they are appropriately located, and subject to comprehensive, site specific landscape assessment.		
OS206.5	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Sally and Braden Currie	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to ensure the landscape schedules apply at a priority area level to guide future development but not preclude it.	The Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the capacity ratings apply to the PA as a whole (rather than at a site specific level) and that the more detailed assessments of the landscape (including capacity) that would be required as part of resource consent and plan change applications may identify a varying landscape capacity rating.	Reject submission
OS206.6	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Sally and Braden Currie	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to ensure it is clear that the capacity for development identified on the schedules is not to be applied or interpreted at a site-specific scale.	Addressed in response to OS 206.5.	Reject submission
OS206.7	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Sally and Braden Currie	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to ensure the benefits of rural living and other appropriate activities are recognised and appropriately anticipated, subject to appropriate design, location, and comprehensive landscape assessment,	The potential landscape related benefits of rural living development are appropriately signalled in the factors listed in Schedule 21.22.23 Capacity (xii) that are likely to frame appropriate rural living development.	Reject submission

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS206.8	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Sally and Braden Currie	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview amended so any other consequential or alternative relief that otherwise addresses the matters raised in this submission are adopted.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS206.9	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Sally and Braden Currie	Oppose	That within landscape schedule 21.22.23, rural living, visitor accommodation and rural tourism are not limited provided they are appropriately located and subject to comprehensive, site-specific landscape assessment.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Topic 23 Burdon Appeal and the PDP Stage 3 RVZ Glen Dene Appeal (including field work on the land and water), and subject to the refinements with respect to landscape capacity recommended in relation to other submissions on Schedule 21.22.23, I consider that the landscape capacity ratings are appropriate.</p> <p>I also note that the landuse of rural tourism is not a landuse directed for consideration by PDP 3.3.38.</p> <p>Further, the recommended amendments in the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(n) 21.23.3 West of Hawea River PA RCL

21.23.3 PA RCL West of Hāwea River: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The West of Hāwea River PA takes in the river terraces on the true right (i.e. west) of the Hāwea River, extending from approximately Horseshoe Bend in the south to Hāwea settlement in the north. SH6 Lake Hāwea Albert Town Road forms the western boundary except at the northern end, where the PA extends westwards from the road to encompass the low-lying land along the toe of the south-eastern flanks of Mount Maude.

Commented [BG1]: Notified text of Schedule 21.23.3 supported by OS 67.30 Julian Haworth.

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. The flat glacial outwash plain of the historic Hāwea Glacier, modified by the fluvial erosion and sedimentation of the Hāwea River that characterises the general area.
2. Maungawera Hill, roughly in the centre of the PA, separates the area into a northern and southern terrace. The hill itself comprises a terminal moraine of the Hāwea Glacier and extends broadly south-westwards from the south end of Mount Maude.
3. The patterning of shallow scarps and paleochannels throughout the northern terrace.

Important hydrological features:

4. The ephemeral water courses from the mountains to the northwest, which flow only after prolonged or intense rainfall, that are artificially channelled in places and discharge to the Hāwea River.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

5. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. Swathes and patches of regenerating kanuka, manuka, grey shrubland and bracken fernland across the lower slopes of Mount Maude.
 - b. Localised patches of kanuka and grey shrubland along with wilding conifers occupy the river terraces and escarpments bordering the Hāwea River.
 - c. Localised stands of kanuka and patches of short tussock grassland and matagouri shrubland occur on the expansive terraces between SH6 and the Hāwea River.
 - d. SNAs near edge of river terrace at end of Te Awa Road encompass small kanuka stands and patches of short tussock grassland and matagouri shrubland.
6. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
 - a. Grazed and cropped pasture with conifer and poplar shelterbelts. The latter are predominantly aligned west to east, perpendicular to the prevailing winds, and can be very long.
 - b. Forestry blocks throughout the sloping land in the centre of the PA, on the lower-lying gravel soils on the southern terrace adjacent the river and at the toe of Mount Maude.

- c. Amenity plantings around rural and rural living dwellings and farm buildings.
- d. Wilding conifers in places, particularly throughout areas of regenerating scrub.

Important land use patterns and features:

7. Low-density rural living, and hobby farming dominate land use throughout the PA. Rural living/hobby farming lots are generally between 4 and 20ha in size, with a few larger lots greater than 50ha.
8. Throughout the northern terrace, dwellings are set back from SH6, exploiting the integrating benefits of the low terrace riser extending throughout the area or configured along the true right bank of the river. Many of the consented building platforms in this area are yet to be built on. There is a relatively consistent patterning of rural living lots adjacent the river; and throughout which there has been extensive use of shelterbelt and specimen tree plantings to achieve visual integration and privacy. While this area is not visible from the highway, it forms a contrasting and more finely grained character to the more open and pastoral land to the west.
9. Built development throughout the gentle slopes flanking Mount Maude and the central moraine area are generally well integrated by the hummocky topography and/or existing vegetation; comprise a distinctly working rural character; and/or are not prominent in views from the road. The area of elevated moraine on the eastern side of SH6 is predominantly in pastoral and forestry use.
10. Across the southern terrace, a more working rural landscape prevails, with pastoral, cropping, and forestry evident. Rural lifestyle lots are clustered towards the north-eastern edge of the terrace adjacent the river (accessed via Camp Hill Road) and throughout the south-western quadrant (accessed via Kennels Lane). Many of the consented building platforms in this area are yet to be built on.
11. The Maungawera Rural Visitor Zone throughout the elevated central area of moraine on the east side of SH6. This provides for carefully located and visually discreet pods of visitor focussed development including hot tubs, motorhome sites and cycle trails. Future plans include other developments such as hospitality venues.
12. The Hāwea Flat Whitewater Park (The Wave) is a popular surfing, kayaking, swimming, and picnicking spot adjacent the PA and accessed via the PA (Camp Hill Road).
13. The margins of the Hāwea River along the eastern edge of the PA which are identified as a Marginal Strip.
14. The Hāwea River track on the opposite (true left) side of the river.
15. The Hāwea River ONL notation that applies to the stretch of the river adjoining the southern part of the PA.
16. SH6 which passes through the western side of the PA.
17. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include:
 - a. The generally open and flat expanse of the intensively farmed Hāwea Flats on the eastern side of the Hāwea River.
 - b. The reasonably close proximity of Hāwea settlement to the northern end of the PA.

Mana whenua features and their locations:

18. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
19. The RCL overlaps the mapped wāhi tūpuna Hāwea River (including Camp Hill). overlay which applies to the Hāwea River and its margins.

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values •

Mana whenua associations and experiences:

20. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas
21. The Hāwea was part of a traditional mahika kai network.
22. The mana whenua values associated with this area include, but may not be limited to, awa, nohoaka and ara tawhito.

Important historic attributes and values:

23. The historical and contextual association of the river as a landscape feature, which shaped the development of early local infrastructure and acted as a natural boundary.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

24. The identity of the area as 'breathing space' or a somewhat untamed 'green belt' between Albert Town and Hāwea settlement.
25. The popularity of the Hāwea River Track, The (Hāwea River) Wave, and SH6.

Important recreation attributes and values

25A Recreational angling on the Hāwea River.

Commented [BG2]: OS115 Otago Fish and Game Council.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values •

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

26. The flat expanse of the outwash plain and river terraces, along with the hummocky moraine, are expressive of the interaction of the glacial and fluvial processes that have shaped the Upper Clutha valley.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

27. The sequence of attractive and varied 'rural' views from SH6 across the PA. In places (and particularly towards the southern end of the PA), the seemingly untamed or rough appearance of vegetation throughout the area contributes the impression of a spacious and relatively undeveloped rural landscape. Elsewhere (and towards the northern end of the PA), the more open pastoral character of the PA enables views westwards to the proximate lower flanks of Mount Maude and the peaks beyond (ONL), and eastwards across the open expanse of the PA and Hāwea Flats beyond, to the Grandview Range (ONL), including Breast Hill and Corner Peak. However, such views are intermittent due to the screening effect of the frequent shelterbelts across the terraces along the eastern side of the highway. The shelterbelts and pastoral land of the PA contributes a strong 'working farm' rural character, with most built development

displaying a distinctly working rural character or obscured by vegetation in views from public places. The localised openness of the rural landscape to the east of the highway confers a memorable sense of a 'big sky' landscape.

28. Views to the PA from the Hāwea River track along its eastern edge (noting that the river corridor adjoining the southern end of the PA is ONL).

Naturalness attributes and values:

29. Perceptions of naturalness and of working rural character are largely maintained for people visiting the landscape, although this is undermined to some extent by the number of partially visible houses.
30. Overall, there is a moderate level of naturalness with a predominance of natural, rather than built, elements; but human intervention as managed farmland and rural living is evident.

Memorability attributes and values:

31. Memorable to residents and locals as a 'green belt' between Albert Town and Hāwea settlement.

Transient attributes and values:

32. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation.
33. Seasonal pasture colours.
34. The changing shadow patterns from shelter belts and the presence of stock and wildlife such as hawks.

Remoteness/wildness attributes and values:

35. Impressions of rural tranquillity and quietness are localised to parts of Camp Hill Road and environs away from rural living uses.

35A A dark night sky impression contributes to feelings of wildness.

Commented [BG3]: Numbering correction.

Aesthetic qualities and values:

36. The attractive and distinctly rural views to the (ONL) mountain ranges surrounding the Upper Clutha Basin. The dominance of natural elements in the form of pasture and tree, and subservience of built elements, play an important role in shaping the quality of these views.
37. Visual connection with the Hāwea River corridor along the eastern side of the PA.
38. Juxtaposition between the tamed rural land, the rougher rural character in places and the urban grain of Hāwea settlement (and the golf course) and Albert Town further afield.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Perceptual (Sensory) • Associative

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

The combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA RCL West of Hāwea River can be summarised as follows:

- 39. **Moderate physical values** relating to the glacially formed outwash plain/alluvial fans of the valley floor, being continually reworked by the Hāwea River, the strong patterns of rural land use and the ~~mana whenua~~ mana whenua features of the area.
- 40. **Moderate associative values** relating the mana whenua associations of the area, and the shared and recognised values of the area for residents and locals as a spacious 'green belt' between Albert Town and Lake Hāwea settlement.
- 41. **Moderate perceptual values** relating to the expressiveness of the moraine, river terraces (including both their treads and risers), the coherent rural character, the scenic rural views across pasture to the surrounding mountain context, and the moderate level of naturalness, with built development remaining subservient to natural landscape elements and patterns.

Commented [BG4]: Typographical correction.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA RCL West of Hāwea River for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** capacity for small-scale and low-key activities that: integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale; have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate); and maintain or enhance the landscape values of the PA.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – limited** landscape capacity for activities that are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale; have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate); and maintain or enhance the landscape values of the PA. **Very limited to no** landscape capacity for tourism related activities unless such activities are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale; have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).
- iii. **Urban expansions – no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – some** landscape capacity where soils and available water allocation support the activity, and where the quality of views and aesthetic attributes and values are maintained or enhanced.
- v. **Earthworks – limited** landscape capacity to absorb earthworks associated with farming and rural living/visitor accommodation activities that maintain naturalness and expressiveness values and integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings – some** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce the existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – very limited** landscape capacity for farm scale quarries that maintain or enhance the quality of views, naturalness values and aesthetic values.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity to absorb additional infrastructure that is of a modest scale and low key rural character for modestly scaled and low-key 'rural' roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns. Limited capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement.

Commented [BG5]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG6]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG7]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG8]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG9]: OS 127.4 Tony Berben. OS 154.13 Camp Hill Road Limited.

Commented [BG10]: OS 127.4 Tony Berben. OS 154.13 Camp Hill Road Limited.

Commented [BG11]: OS 77.19 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG12]: S 73.18 Bike Wanaka Inc. OS 99.10 John Wellington.

- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for additional district-scale infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks. **Very limited** capacity for other larger-scale regionally significant infrastructure.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – some** landscape capacity for small-scale wind or solar generation located where topography ensures it is not highly visible from public places. **Very limited** landscape capacity for larger-scale commercial renewable energy generation.
- xi. ~~Production~~ **Forestry** – **limited** landscape capacity for scattered woodlots of up to 2 hectares in area.
- xii. **Rural living – very limited** landscape capacity to absorb additional rural living without cumulative adverse effects on associative and perceptual values. The rural character of the PA is vulnerable to fragmentation and 'domestication' through rural living development. Any additional rural living should be ~~set well back~~ from roads and public tracks; co-located with existing development; located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale; have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); enhance public access (where appropriate); and should maintain the impression of expansive rural views from public vantage points.

Commented [BG13]: OS 40.45 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

Commented [BG14]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG15]: Typographical correction.

21.23.3 West of Hāwea River PA RCL Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.23.3 West of Hāwea River PA RCL Schedule”. New text underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text: relates to a submission point that has not been captured in the “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONF Schedule”. This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments or is repeated by numerous submissions.

Green wash line item: Submission point re-notified 22 June 2023.

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS9.1	Susan Gathercole (Maungawera Hill Group) On Behalf Of Anderson, Mactaggert, Hinds and Gathercole families.	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River RCL be rejected.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42 A Report.	N/A
OS 31.2	Rebecca and Jimmy Cotter	Oppose	That the landscape schedules allow for firebreaks with careful planting on Outstanding Natural Landscape land.	While the intention of this submission is supported in that it is appropriate to have firebreaks around buildings in densely vegetated areas, this is a matter for a consideration as part of a resource consent or plan change application, or general land management, rather than as part of a Schedule of Landscape Values.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS67.30	Julian Haworth	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is largely supported, with the landscape capacity rating for rural living of 'very limited' being supported.	In agreement so no comments required, other than to note the changes to the Schedule text in response to OS 73.18, OS 77.19, OS 99.10, OS 127.4, OS 154.13, OS 70.45 and OS 188.20.	Accept submission in part.
OS70.45	Ainsley McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River be amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Amend Schedule 21.23.3 Capacity (ix) as follows: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited landscape capacity for additional district-scale infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks. Very limited capacity for other larger-scale regionally significant infrastructure.	Accept submission.
OS73.8	Ian Greaves On Behalf Of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.3 West of Hāwea be amended to remove reference to limited or very limited capacity for new trails.	Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider it appropriate to remove the capacity reference for new trails, as inappropriately located and/or designed trails have the potential to detract from landscape values. Also addressed in response to OS 73.18.	Reject submission.
OS73.18	Ian Greaves On Behalf Of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.3 West of Hāwea River be amended to include the following - Walking and cycling trails: some landscape capacity for additional trails that are	Amend Schedule 21.23.3 Capacity (viii) as follows: Transport infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity to absorb additional infrastructure that is of a modest scale and low-key rural character for modestly scaled and low-key 'rural' roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns. Limited capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.	<u>networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement.</u>	
OS77.19	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.3.vii. mineral extraction be amended to: very limited landscape capacity for small scale extraction of aggregate for use on the same farm property that maintains or enhances the PA's landscape character and visual amenity values; preserves the natural character of wetlands, lakes, rivers and their margins; avoids location on the beds of lakes and rivers, elevated slopes or skylines; and protects mana whenua associations and values, particularly for those areas identified as wāhi tūpuna, statutory acknowledgements or nohoaka.	I agree with this submission, subject to refinement of the wording to better fit with text used in the other PA Schedules in this regard. Amend Schedule 21.23.3.Capacity (vii) as follows: <i>Mineral extraction – very limited landscape capacity for farm-scale quarries that maintain or enhance the quality of views, naturalness values and aesthetic values.</i>	Accept submission subject to refinement.
OS99.10	John Wellington On Behalf of Upper Clutha Tracks Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hāwea River be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.	Addressed in response to OS 73.18.	Accept submission.
OS 115.14	Khaylm Marshall (Otago Fish	Oppose	That the list of associative attributes and values section for landscape schedule 21.23.3 be	Amend Schedule 21.23.3 as follows: <u>Important recreation attributes and values</u> <u>25A Recreational angling on the Hāwea River.</u>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	and Game Council)		amended to include the recreational angling opportunities of the Hawea River.		
OS127.4	Maddy FAMILTON On Behalf Of Tony Berben	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to remove the 'no capacity' rating unless individual sites within the priority area have been examined in detail. The submitter seeks that the lowest rating of 'no capacity' is amended to reflect this, such as by using terminology such as 'extremely low capacity' or 'unlikely to have capacity'.	<p>In light of these comments and relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedule work (including field work), the following amendments are recommended to Schedule 21.23.3 Capacity section. It should also be noted that the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22.23 incorporates a number of amendments to improve clarity for plan users with respect to the capacity ratings in the PA RCL Schedules.</p> <p>Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – limited landscape capacity for activities that are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale; have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); enhance public access (where appropriate); and maintain or enhance the landscape values of the PA. Very limited to no landscape capacity for tourism related activities unless such activities are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).</p> <p>For completeness, I remain of the view that a rating of no landscape capacity is appropriate for urban expansion, due to the important role the PA plays in maintaining the impression of a spacious greenbelt between Albert Town and Lake Hāwea settlement.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS 127.8	Maddy FAMILTON on behalf of Tony Berben	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended so the values identified for the priority area reflect the level	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I consider that the</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			of existing rural living character of the area. The schedule should have a greater a greater acknowledgment about the presence and extent of rural living. Examples of this are seen in Paragraph 7, Paragraph 24, Paragraph 27, and Paragraph 30.	attributes and values recorded in Schedule 21.23.3 accurately reflects the landscape values of the area, including repeated reference to the established rural living development within the PA.	
OS 127.9	Maddy Familton on behalf of Tony Berben	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to change the landscape capacity for small scale and low-key tourism related activities from 'Very limited' to 'limited'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider it appropriate to amend the capacity for tourism related activities from very limited to limited. This is largely due to the risk of cumulative adverse landscape effects.	Reject submission.
OS 127.10	Maddy Familton on behalf of Tony Berben	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to change the capacity for rural living from 'very limited' to 'limited'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider it appropriate to amend the capacity for rural living from very limited to limited. This is largely due to the risk of cumulative adverse landscape effects given the level of rural living development evident in the area.	Reject submission.
OS128.8	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bernard Kennedy	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to include a greater acknowledgement about the presence and extent of rural living in the priority area. Examples raised in this submission are in Paragraph 7, Paragraph	Addressed in response to OS 127.8.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			24, Paragraph 27, and Paragraph 30.		
OS128.9	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bernard Kennedy	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to change the capacity of small scale and low-key tourism related activities from 'very limited' to 'limited'.	Addressed in response to OS 127.9.	Reject submission.
OS128.10	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bernard Kennedy	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to change the capacity of rural living in the priority area from 'very limited' to 'limited'.	Addressed in response to OS 127.10.	Reject submission.
OS143.5	Diane Lesley Kenton	Oppose	That 21.23.3 (11) be more explicit about what types of trees are acceptable for production forestry in scattered woodlots.	Guidance with respect to the types of trees for production forestry in scattered woodlots is beyond the scope of a Schedule of Landscape Values.	Reject submission.
OS143.6	Diane Lesley Kenton	Oppose	That 21.23.3 be updated to reflect that there is no landscape capacity for production forestry.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I consider the rating for forestry to be appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS143.7	Diane Lesley Kenton	Oppose	That the Landscape Schedules be amended to acknowledge that in some instances, rural living may be appropriately located close to roads or public tracks, subject to comprehensive, site-specific landscape	The Schedule 21.23 Preamble acknowledges that as site specific will be needed as part of a resource consent or plan change application.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			assessment by a Landscape Architect.		
OS143.8	Diane Lesley Kenton	Support	That the 'no landscape capacity for production forestry in the Hawea South Grandview area' under the heading 'important land use patterns and features' in landscape schedule 21.22.23 be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 143.6.	Reject submission.
OS143.9	Diane Lesley Kenton	Oppose	That the use of the terms related to pines and wildings such as woodlots, plantation or production forestry need to be reviewed and refined to be aligned with parts of the PDP which do not support wilding pines.	Schedule 21.23.3. has been corrected to use the PDP terminology with respect to forestry.	Accept submission in part.
OS143.10	Diane Lesley Kenton	Oppose	That the inclusion of bracken fernland in 21.23.3 should be removed from being included alongside genuine natives such as kanuka and manuka.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I consider that the Schedule text is appropriate. I also note that the PA Schedules have been reviewed by an ecology expert with that expert supporting the notified text.	Reject submission.
OS143.11	Diane Lesley Kenton	Oppose	That bracken fernland should be referenced as a plant pest species.	The Preamble to Schedule 21.23 has been amended to better explain this aspect.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS154.5	Dan Curley on behalf of Camp Hill Road Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to more appropriately identify various landscape types that are nested within the priority area, identify their landscape attributes and values as perceived and related capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in BG EIC.	Reject submission.
OS154.6	Dan Curley on behalf of Camp Hill Road Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended so the assessment should not only seek to limit capacity/restrain land use, but where it is found to be appropriate, capacity ratings should identify opportunities for greater capacity at those location where associated attributes, values and rural amenity have moved toward being dominated by such.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I consider that the capacity ratings identified in the Response to Submsssions Version of Schedule 21.23.3 are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS154.7	Dan Curley on behalf of Camp Hill Road Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to identify that many parts of the priority area offer landscapes that area able to absorb and consolidate effects related to further rural living development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I consider that the level of information, description of landscape attributes and values and landscape capacity ratings identified in the Response to Submsssions Version of Schedule 21.23.3 are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS154.8	Dan Curley on behalf of Camp Hill Road Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to include existing and approved developments in the assessment of the current landscape attributes at a micro level.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submitter is requesting a grain of analysis that is inappropriate in a Schedule of Landscape Values. Refer BG EiC.	Reject submission.
OS154.9	Dan Curley on behalf of Camp Hill Road Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to include effects related to further development of these areas to be considered as incremental additions to those environments rather than effects on the broader notions of amenity that is offered by the priority area.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The meaning of this submission point is unclear. However, the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 acknowledges that the landscape is dynamic and will change over time.	Reject submission.
OS154.10	Dan Curley on behalf of Camp Hill Road Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address capacity for commercial recreational activities.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I consider that a rating of very limited landscape capacity for commercial recreation activities is appropriate, noting that this is assessed at a PA level, and the Preamble acknowledges that site specific assessments as part of resource consent and plan change applications may identify a varying capacity.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS154.11	Dan Curley on behalf of Camp Hill Road Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address the incorrect statement of no capacity for tourism related activities.	Addressed in response to OS 154.11.	Accept submission in part.
OS154.13	Dan Curley On Behalf Of Camp Hill Road Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address that the schedules do not properly reflect the landscape capacity of areas within the priority area.	<p>Addressed in response to OS 127.4.</p> <p>It is also recommended that the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 is amended to explain that the Schedules do not apply to permitted activities under the PDP. It is expected that this may do some way to addressing the concerns raised by the submitter in these regards.</p> <p>Further, the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 acknowledges that:</p> <p><i>the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</i></p> <p>The far more fine-grained landscape assessment that the submitter is suggesting should inform Schedule 21.23.3 is appropriate as part of a resource consent or plan change process.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS 154.14	Dan Curley On Behalf Of Camp Hill Road Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address that the stated capacity is too conclusive and lacks consideration of what parts of the priority area can provide greater capacity for rural living, while ratings related to commercial recreational and tourism related activities appears nonsensical given the priority areas proximity to Hawea, Albert Town and Wanaka.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in BG EIC and in response to OS 154.10 and OS 154.11 above.	Accept submission in part.
OS155.6	Dan Curley on behalf of Brodie & Phillips Pender	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended so where is found appropriate, capacity ratings should identify opportunities for greater capacity at those locations where associated attributes, values and rural amenity have already moved toward being dominated by such.	Addressed in response to OS 154.6.	Reject submission.
OS155.7	Dan Curley on behalf of Brodie & Phillips Pender	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended so the schedule identifies many parts of the priority area as offering landscapes that are able to absorb and consolidate effects related to	Addressed in response to OS 154.7.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			further rural living development.		
OS155.8	Dan Curley on behalf of Brodie & Phillips Pender	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to include existing and approved development in the assessment of current landscape attributes at a micro level.	Addressed in response to OS 154.8.	Reject submission.
OS155.9	Dan Curley on behalf of Brodie & Phillips Pender	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended so effects related to further development of these areas requires to be considered as incremental additions to those environments rather than effects on the broader notions of amenity.	Addressed in response to OS 154.9.	Reject submission.
OS155.10	Dan Curley on behalf of Brodie & Phillips Pender	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address that the schedules do not properly reflect the landscape capacity of areas within the priority area, nor in founding assessment, the environment anticipated by the District Plan.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in BG EIC.	Reject submission.
OS155.11	Dan Curley on behalf of Brodie & Phillips Pender	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address that	Addressed in response to OS 154.14.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			the stated capacity is too conclusive and lacks consideration of what parts of the priority area can provide greater capacity for rural living, while the ratings related to commercial recreational and tourism related activities also appear nonsensical considering the priority areas proximity to Hawea, Albert Town and Wanaka.		

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS155.12	Dan Curley on behalf of Brodie & Phillips Pender	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended so capacity is considered at a micro/landscape unit level, and final wording for capacity ratings is required to be carefully chosen to provide contemplation for suitable cases approved by resource consent.	Addressed in response to OS 154.8.	Reject submission.
OS156.4	Dan Curley on behalf of John and Colleen Leith	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended so the assessment does not only seek to limit/ restrain land use, but where found appropriate, capacity ratings should identify opportunities for greater capacity and consolidation.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I consider that the level of information, description of landscape attributes and values and landscape capacity ratings identified in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.23.3 are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS156.5	Dan Curley on behalf of John and Colleen Leith	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to more appropriately identify various landscape types that are nested within the priority area, identify their landscape attributes and values as perceived and related capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in BG EIC.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS156.6	Dan Curley on behalf of John and Colleen Leith	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to include, where it is found appropriate, capacity ratings identifying opportunities for greater capacity at locations where landscape attributes, values and rural amenity provide for further establishment and consolidation of uses alternate to traditional agriculture.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I consider that the level of information, description of landscape attributes and values and landscape capacity ratings identified in the Response to Submssions Version of Schedule 21.23.3 are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS156.7	Dan Curley on behalf of John and Colleen Leith	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to identify that many parts of the priority area as offering landscapes that are able to absorb and consolidate effects related to further rural living development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I consider that the level of information, description of landscape attributes and values and landscape capacity ratings identified in the Response to Submssions Version of Schedule 21.23.3 are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS156.8	Dan Curley on behalf of John and Colleen Leith	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to include existing and approved developments in the assessment of the current landscape attributes at a micro level.	Addressed in response to OS 154.8.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS156.9	Dan Curley on behalf of John and Colleen Leith	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to include effects related to further development to be considered as incremental additions to those developments rather than effects on the broader notions of amenity.	Addressed in response to OS 154.9.	Reject submission.
OS156.10	Dan Curley on behalf of John and Colleen Leith	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address the incorrect determination of there being very little capacity for commercial recreational activities.	Addressed in response to OS 154.9.	Reject submission.
OS156.11	Dan Curley on behalf of John and Colleen Leith	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address the incorrect determination of no capacity for tourism related activities.	Addressed in response to OS 154.11.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS156.12	Dan Curley on behalf of John and Colleen Leith	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address that the schedules do not properly reflect the landscape capacity of areas within the priority area, nor in founding assessment, the environment anticipated by the District Plan.	Addressed in response to OS 154.12.	Reject submission.
OS156.13	Dan Curley on behalf of John and Colleen Leith	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address that the stated capacity is too conclusive and lacks consideration of what parts of the priority area can provide greater capacity for rural living, while the ratings related to commercial recreational and tourism activities appears nonsensical given the proximity to Hawea, Albert Town and Wanaka.	Addressed in response to OS 154.14.	Accept submission in part.
OS156.14	Dan Curley on behalf of John and Colleen Leith	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to consider capacity at a micro/landscape unit level, and final wording for capacity ratings requires to be carefully chosen to provide contemplation for suitable	Addressed in response to OS 154.8 and BG EIC.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			cases approved by resource consent.		
OS157.4	Dan Curley on behalf of Cameron Michael Jowitt	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended so the assessment does not only seek to limit capacity/restrain land use, but where found appropriate, capacity ratings should identify opportunities for greater capacity for rural living development.	Addressed in response to OS 156.4.	Reject submission.
OS157.5	Dan Curley on behalf of Cameron Michael Jowitt	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to more appropriately identify various landscape types that are nested within the priority area, identify their landscape attributes and values as perceived and related capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 156.5.	Reject submission.
OS157.6	Dan Curley on behalf of Cameron Michael Jowitt	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended so, that where is is found appropriate, capacity ratings should identify opportunities for greater capacity at those locations where associated attributes, values and rural amenity have already moved toward being dominated by such.	Addressed in response to OS 154.6.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS157.7	Dan Curley on behalf of Cameron Michael Jowitt	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to identify that many parts of the priority area offer landscapes that are able to absorb and consolidate effects related to further rural living development.	Addressed in response to OS 154.7.	Reject submission.
OS157.8	Dan Curley on behalf of Cameron Michael Jowitt	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to include existing and approved development in the assessment of the current landscape attributes at a micro level.	Addressed in response to OS 154.8.	Reject submission.
OS157.9	Dan Curley on behalf of Cameron Michael Jowitt	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to include effects related to further development of these areas to be considered as incremental additions to those environments rather than as effects on the broader notions of amenity that is offered by the priority area at a macro level.	Addressed in response to OS 154.9.	Reject submission.
OS157.10	Dan Curley on behalf of Cameron Michael Jowitt	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address the incorrect determination of there being very little	Addressed in response to OS 154.10.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			capacity for commercial recreational activities.		
OS157.11	Dan Curley on behalf of Cameron Michael Jowitt	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address the incorrect determination of no capacity for tourism related activities.	Addressed in response to OS 154.11.	Accept submission in part.
OS157.12	Dan Curley on behalf of Cameron Michael Jowitt	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address that the schedules do not properly reflect the landscape capacity of areas within the priority area, nor in founding assessment, the environment anticipated by the District Plan.	Addressed in response to OS 155.10.	Reject submission.
OS157.13	Dan Curley on behalf of Cameron Michael Jowitt	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is rejected as notified or amended to address that the stated capacity is too conclusive and lacks consideration of what parts of the priority area can provide greater capacity for rural living, while the ratings related to commercial recreational and tourism activities appears nonsensical given the proximity to Hawea, Albert Town and Wanaka.	Addressed in response to OS 154.14.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS157.14	Dan Curley on behalf of Cameron Michael Jowitt	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River is amended to consider capacity at a micro/landscape unit level, and final wording for capacity ratings requires to be carefully chosen to provide contemplation for suitable cases approved by resource consent.	Addressed in response to OS 154.8.	Reject submission.
OS188.20	Elisha Young-Ebert	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.3.vii. mineral extraction be amended to: very limited landscape capacity for small scale extraction of aggregate for use on the same farm property that maintains or enhances the PA's landscape character and visual amenity values; preserves the natural character of wetlands, lakes, rivers and their margins; avoids location on the beds of lakes and rivers, elevated slopes or skylines; and protects mana whenua associations and values, particularly for those areas identified as wāhi tūpuna, statutory acknowledgements or nohoaka.	Addressed in response to OS 77.19.	Accept submission in part.

EVIDENCE IN CHIEF OF B GILBERT FOR QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL

Appendix 2(o) 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road PA RCL

21.23.4 PA RCL Church Road – Shortcut Road: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The Church Road – Shortcut Road PA generally takes in the area known as the Clutha Triangle immediately to the north of Luggate and defined by SH6, Church Road, and Shortcut Road. The mapped extent of the PA also includes the flat land on the west side of SH6 and the rural land to the east of Church Road adjoining the Clutha River.

Commented [BG1]: Notified text of Schedule 21.23.3 generally supported by OS 67.30 Julian Haworth.

Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

Important landforms and land types:

1. The flat terraced glacial outwash plain with a patterning of shallow scarps which collectively form a series of degradational river terraces stepping down from the west to the east.
2. Sandy areas, boulder rises and shallow dry swales of former paleochannels in places.
3. An area where more recent fluvial processes of erosion and sedimentation have reworked older alluvium associated with historic glaciations affecting the landscape.

Important hydrological features:

4. Luggate Creek, which is a complex winding channel along the south-eastern edge of the PA (to the east of Church Road).
5. The ephemeral water courses draining from the mountains to the south across and around the terrace edges that are artificially channelled in places and discharge to the Clutha River. These channels tend to flow only during prolonged rainfall.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

6. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. Mature crack willow and broom along the margins of Luggate Creek.
7. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
 - a. Grazing and cropping with scattered exotic shelterbelts throughout the land straddling SH6.
 - b. Tree crops, flower crops and orchards on the lower terrace.
 - c. Amenity and shelter plantings around rural and rural living dwellings and farm buildings.
 - d. Poplar and willow plantings across terraces bordering the true right bank of Luggate Creek.

Important land use patterns and features:

8. Low-density rural living, horticultural and hobby farming dominate land use throughout the PA. Lot sizes are generally between 2 and 20ha in size.

9. Church Road and Shortcut Road as local rural roads.
10. The margins of the Luggate Creek along the south-eastern edge of the PA which are identified as a Marginal Strip.
11. SH6 which passes through the western side of the PA.
12. An small area of rural industrial type landuse extending along the east side of Church Road to near the Grandview Bridge.
13. Neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include:
 - a. The very close proximity of Luggate settlement which extends across the river terraces to the southeast of the PA, with some of the more elevated terraces having a visual connection to the PA.
 - b. The Te Rua Tupāpaku (Clutha River near Luggate) ONL and associated DoC Reserve and river track extending along the eastern side of the PA.
 - c. The Luggate River Track along the south (true right) side of Luggate Creek extending along the south-eastern side of the PA.
 - d. The open and flat expanse of the intensively farmed Hāwea Flats to the north of the PA.
 - e. The forestry plantings throughout the terrace escarpment along the western side of the PA.

Commented [BG2]: OS 146.2 Alpine Deer NZ LP.

Commented [BG3]: OS 146.2 Alpine Deer NZ LP.

Mana whenua features and their locations:

14. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
15. Parts of the RCL overlap with the mapped wāhi tūpuna Mata-au (Clutha River) and Te Rua Tūpāpaku.
16. The Mata-au (Clutha River) is a Statutory Acknowledgement under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.
17. Te Rua Tūpāpaku is recorded as a fortified permanent pā.

Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values •

Mana whenua associations and experiences are:

18. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
19. The Mata-au (Clutha River) takes its name from a Kāi Tahu whakapapa that traces the genealogy of water. On that basis, the Mata-au is seen as a descendant of the creation traditions.
20. The Mata-au was part of inland mahika kai trails and was also a key transportation route for pounamu from inland areas to settlements on the coast.

21. Te Rua Tūpāpaku is a kāika mahika kai located on the Mata-au where weka, tuna (eels) and kauru (cabbage tree root) were gathered. It is also recorded as a fortified permanent pā.
22. The mana whenua values associated with this area include, but may not be limited to, wāhi taoka, ara tawhito, mahika kai, nohoaka, urupā, pā, wāhi tapu.

Important historic attributes and values:

23. Association with early pastoral land use and gold mining.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

24. The identity of the area as a green edge to Luggate and, in the case of the land to the east of Church Road, an established rural industry area supporting the adjacent settlement.
25. The popularity of the area as an entry/exit point on the Upper Clutha River Track.
26. The close proximity of the PA to the Grandview Bridge (or the 'red bridge') to the north of the PA (which is described as one of the most attractively proportioned steel bridges in Aotearoa).

Commented [BG4]: OS 146.2 Alpine Deer NZ LP.

Important recreation attributes and values:

27. SH6 Wanaka Luggate Highway as a key scenic route linking between Wanaka and Cromwell.
28. Shortcut Road as a key scenic route linking between Wanaka (and the West Coast) and the Lindis Pass.
29. The Upper Clutha River Track in close proximity to the PA.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values •

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

30. The flat expanse of the outwash plain and river terraces are expressive of the interaction of the glacial and fluvial processes that have shaped, and are continuing to shape, the Upper Clutha valley.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

31. The sequence of attractive long-range and expansive 'rural' views from SH6, parts of Church Road and Shortcut Road across the PA to the northern end of the Pisa Range and across to the Grandview Range. In views east from Church Road, the established rural industry area contributes to the outlook. The cropping and pastoral land of the majority of the PA contributes a strong 'working farm' rural character, with most built development displaying a distinctly working rural character or obscured by vegetation. The appearance of an almost continuous patterning of rural landuse across the PA and beyond to the north and west reinforces the coherence of the underlying river terrace landforms. The openness of the rural landscape to the east of the highway confers a memorable sense of a 'big sky' landscape.
32. The expansive very long-range, predominantly rural views from the elevated urban areas of Luggate to the southeast, in which the PA forms part of the broad sweep of the Upper Clutha Basin rural plains, framed by a continuous circle of dramatic mountains (ONL). The established rural industry east of Church Road also contributes to the character of these views.
33. Attractive rural views to the PA from the river tracks (ONL) around its eastern and south-eastern edges. These include localised views of the established rural industry area east of Church Road.

Commented [BG5]: OS 146.2 Alpine Deer NZ LP.

Commented [BG6]: OS 146.2 Alpine Deer NZ LP.

Commented [BG7]: OS 146.2 Alpine Deer NZ LP.

Commented [BG8]: OS 146.2 Alpine Deer NZ LP.

Commented [BG9]: OS 146.2 Alpine Deer NZ LP.

Commented [BG10]: OS 146.2 Alpine Deer NZ LP.

Naturalness attributes and values:

34. Perceptions of naturalness and of a working rural character are largely maintained for people visiting the landscape, although this is compromised to some extent by the number of partially visible houses and the rural industry (east of Church Road).
35. Overall, there is a moderate level of naturalness with a predominance of natural, rather than built, elements; but human intervention as managed farmland, horticultural blocks, rural industry, and rural living is evident.

Commented [BG11]: OS 146.2 Alpine Deer NZ LP.

Memorability attributes and values:

36. Memorable to residents and locals as a 'green edge' to Luggate.

Transient attributes and values:

37. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation.
38. Seasonal horticultural crop foliage and pasture colours.
39. The changing shadow patterns from shelter belts and the presence of stock and wildlife such as hawks.

Remoteness/wildness attributes and values:

40. Impressions of rural tranquillity and quietness which are localised to parts of Church Road away from rural living and rural industry uses and along stretches of the river edge tracks adjoining the PA where intervening landform and vegetation patterns screen views to buildings within the PA and further afield in Luggate.

Commented [BG12]: OS 146.2 Alpine Deer NZ LP.

Aesthetic qualities and values:

41. The attractive and distinctly rural 'big sky' views to the mountain ranges surrounding the Upper Clutha Basin. The dominance of natural elements including pasture, crops, and trees and the subservience of built elements play an important role in shaping the quality of these views.
42. The juxtaposition between the tamed rural land, the rougher character along the river and creek corridors and the urban grain of Luggate further afield.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Perceptual (Sensory) • Associative

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

The combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA RCL Church Road – Shortcut Road can be summarised as follows:

43. **Moderate physical values** relating to the productive soils and associated agricultural and horticultural land uses, the glacially formed outwash plain/alluvial fans of the valley floor that have subsequently been reworked, the mana whenua features in the area and the strong patterns of rural land use and, to a lesser degree, rural industry landuse.

Commented [BG13]: OS 146.2 Alpine Deer NZ LP.

44. **Moderate associative values** relating to the mana whenua associations of the area, the recreational use of Te Rua Tupāpaku (Clutha River near Luggate) and Luggate Creek, and the shared and recognised values of the area for residents and locals as a green edge to Luggate.
45. **Moderate perceptual values** relating to the expressiveness of the river terrace 'tread and riser' landforms, the coherence of land use patterns, the strong rural character, the expansive and scenic rural views, and the moderate level of naturalness, with built development remaining subservient to more natural landscape elements and patterns.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA RCL Church Road – Shortcut Road for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small-scale and low-key activities that: integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate); and maintain or enhance the landscape values of the PA.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – limited** capacity for activities that are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate); and maintain or enhance the landscape values of the PA. **Very limited to No** landscape capacity for tourism related activities unless such activities are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).
- iii. **Urban expansions – very limited to no** landscape capacity unless such development can: integrate a strong defensible boundary to avoid the potential future risk of settlement sprawl; is located and designed to connect with the existing settlement; protects ONF/L values; and complements the existing character of Luggate.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – very limited to no** landscape capacity where soils and available water allocation support the activity, and where aesthetic attributes and values are maintained.
- v. **Earthworks – limited** landscape capacity to absorb earthworks associated with farming and rural living/visitor accommodation activities that maintain naturalness and expressiveness values and integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings – some** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce the existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – very limited** landscape capacity for farm-scale quarries that maintain or enhance the quality of views, naturalness values and aesthetic values.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – some** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and maintain or enhance the landscape values of the PA. **No** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for additional district-scale infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, limited

Commented [BG14]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG15]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG16]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG17]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG18]: OS 169.5 CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd.

Commented [BG19]: OS 169.5 CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd.

Commented [BG20]: OS 169.5 and OS 169.6 CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd.

Commented [BG21]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG22]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
Very limited capacity for other larger-scale regionally significant infrastructure

Commented [BG23]: OS 40.45 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

- x. **Renewable energy generation** – some **landscape** capacity for small-scale wind or solar generation located where topography ensures it is not highly visible from public places. **Very limited** landscape capacity for larger-scale commercial renewable energy generation.

Commented [BG24]: OS 70.46 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

- xi. **Production & Forestry** – **very limited** landscape capacity for scattered small woodlots of up to 2 hectares in area.

Commented [BG25]: Typographical correction.

- xii. **Rural living** – **very limited** landscape capacity to absorb additional rural living without cumulative adverse effects on associative and perceptual values. The rural character of the PA is vulnerable to fragmentation and 'domestication' through rural living development. Any additional rural living should be set well back from roads and public tracks; co-located with existing development; located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale; have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); enhance public access (where appropriate); and should maintain the impression of expansive rural views from public vantage points.

Commented [BG26]: Supported by OS 67.31 Julian Haworth.

- xiii. **Rural Industrial Activity** – **very limited** landscape capacity for rural industry that is: co-located with existing rural industry development; avoids the impression of development sprawl; protects ONF/L values; maintains the quality of views and aesthetic values; and complements the existing character of Luggate.

Commented [BG27]: OS 146.3 Alpine Deer NZ LP.

21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road PA RCL Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road PA RCL Schedule”. New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text: relates to a submission point that has not be captured in the “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road PA RCL Schedule”. This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **Two examples identified.**

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS67.31	Julian Haworth	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is largely supported, with the capacity rating for rural living of 'very limited' being supported.	No comment required, as supports Schedule 21.23.4.	<u>Accept submission.</u>
OS70.46	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual	Amend Schedule 21.23.4 Capacity (ix) as follows: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited landscape capacity for additional district-scale infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. <u>In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.</u> Very limited	<u>Accept submission.</u>

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			prominence, including associated earthworks'.	capacity for other larger-scale regionally significant infrastructure.	
OS73.9	Ian Greaves On Behalf Of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road be amended to remove reference to limited or very limited capacity for new trails.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. There is no reference to the capacity for trails as a separate landuse item in Schedule 21.23.4. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedule work (including field work), I do not consider it appropriate to remove the capacity reference for new trails, as inappropriately located and/or designed trails have the potential to detract from landscape values.	Reject submission.
OS73.19	Ian Greaves On Behalf Of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road be amended to include the following - Walking and cycling trails: some landscape capacity for additional trails that are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The capacity for trails is appropriately addressed under (viii) Transport Infrastructure (i.e. some landscape capacity). It should also be noted that for many of the landuse activities discussed in the Capacity section of Schedule 21.23.4, the consideration of public access (i.e. trails) is signalled as being of relevance for future landuse change.	Reject submission
OS77.20	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.4.vii. mineral extraction be amended to: very limited landscape capacity for small scale extraction of aggregate for use on the same farm property that maintains or enhances the PA's landscape character and visual amenity values; preserves the natural character of wetlands, lakes,	I agree with this submission subject to refinement of the proposed wording to better fit with text used in the other schedules in this regard. Amend Schedule 21.23.4.Capacity (vii) as follows: Mineral extraction – very limited landscape capacity for farm-scale quarries that maintain or enhance the quality of views, naturalness values and aesthetic values.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			rivers and their margins; avoids location on the beds of lakes and rivers, elevated slopes or skylines; and protects mana whenua associations and values, particularly for those areas identified as wāhi tūpuna, statutory acknowledgements or nohoaka.		
OS99.11	John Wellington On Behalf of Upper Clutha Tracks Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.	Addressed in response to OS 73.19.	Reject submission.
OS146.1	Scott Edgar On Behalf Of Alpine Deer NZ LP	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road be amended to exclude the Rural Industrial Subzone land at Church Road from the priority area, or if the subzone is not removed from the schedule that the landscape schedule is amended to better reflect and provide for the existing and zoned rural industrial activities along the eastern side of Church Road.	The extent of the Priority Area RCL mapping was confirmed by the Environment Court in the Topic 2 decisions. Priority Area RCL mapping changes are beyond the scope of the Variation. A number of amendments are suggested to Schedule 21.23.4 to address the matters raised by the submitter.	Accept submission in part.

OS146.2	Scott Edgar On Behalf Of Alpine Deer NZ LP	Oppose	<p>That landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road be amended to better acknowledge rural industrial activities within the descriptions of important land use patterns and features, shared and recognised attributes and values, particularly important views, naturalness and remoteness values and attributes, in the event that the Rural Industrial Sub-zoned land is not removed from the schedules area.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 21.23.4 as follows:</p> <p>12. <u>An small area of rural industrial type landuse extending along the east side of Church Road to</u> near the Grandview Bridge.</p> <p>24. The identity of the area as a green edge to Luggate <u>and, in the case of the land to the east of Church Road, an established rural industry area supporting the adjacent settlement.</u></p> <p>31. The sequence of attractive long-range and expansive 'rural' views from SH6, <u>parts of</u> Church Road and Shortcut Road across the PA to the northern end of the Pisa Range and across to the Grandview Range. <u>In views east from Church Road, the established rural industry area contributes to the outlook.</u> The cropping and pastoral land of <u>the majority of the</u> PA contributes a strong 'working farm' rural character, with most built development displaying a distinctly working rural character or obscured by vegetation. The appearance of an almost continuous patterning of rural landuse across the PA and beyond to the north and west reinforces the coherence of the underlying river terrace landforms. The openness of the rural landscape to the east of the highway confers a memorable sense of a 'big sky' landscape.</p> <p>32. The expansive very long-range <u>predominantly</u> 'rural' views from the elevated urban areas of Luggate to the southeast, in which the PA forms part of the broad sweep of the Upper Clutha Basin rural plains, framed by a continuous circle of dramatic mountains (ONL). <u>The established rural industry east of Church Road also contributes to the character of these views.</u></p> <p>33. Attractive rural views to the PA from the river tracks (ONL) around its eastern and south-eastern edges. <u>These include localised views of the established rural industry area east of Church Road.</u></p> <p>34. Perceptions of naturalness and of a working rural character are largely maintained for people visiting the landscape, although this is compromised to some extent by the number of partially visible houses and the rural industry <u>(east of Church Road).</u></p> <p>40. Impressions of rural tranquillity and quietness which are localised to <u>parts of Church Road away from rural living and</u></p>	<p><u>Accept submission in part.</u></p>
---------	--	--------	---	---	--

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>rural industry uses and along stretches of the river edge tracks adjoining the PA where intervening landform and vegetation patterns screen views to buildings within the PA and further afield in Luggate.</p> <p>Moderate physical values relating to the productive soils and associated agricultural and horticultural land uses, the glacially formed outwash plain/alluvial fans of the valley floor that have subsequently been reworked, the mana whenua features in the area and the strong patterns of rural land use and, to a lesser degree, rural industry landuse.</p> <p>No amendment has been made to Schedule 21.23 with respect to aesthetic qualities and values as the rural industry to the east of Shortcut Road does not make a noteworthy positive contribution to the landscape values in this regard.</p> <p>No amendment has been made to the summary landscape values with respect to Associative Values as this is now captured under the recommended amendment in relation to shared and recognised values outlined above (and noting that the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 explains that the Schedules are intended to be read in full).</p>	
OS146.3	Scott Edgar On Behalf Of Alpine Deer NZ LP	Oppose	That landscapes capacity 21.23.4 be amended to address rural industrial activities and rural industrial buildings (being two distinct activities) within the Rural Industrial Sub-Zoned and wider landscape priority area.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.23.4 as follows:</p> <p>(xiii) Rural Industry – very limited landscape capacity for rural industry that is: co-located with existing rural industry development; avoids the impression of development sprawl; protects ONF/L values; maintains the quality of views and aesthetic values; and complements the existing character of Luggate.</p>	Accept submission.
OS146.4	Scott Edgar On Behalf Of Alpine Deer NZ LP	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.4 be amended to provide for high landscape capacity for substantial buildings and associated rural industrial activities	<p>Addressed in response to OS 146.3.</p> <p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedule work (including field work), assisting QLDC with</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			within the Rural Industrial Sub-zone to reflect the permitted activity status of these buildings.	rezoning appeals on land to the east of Church Road and along the eastern side of Luggate, I consider that a rating of very limited landscape capacity is appropriate, given the capacity rating applies for future development that is not a permitted activity. This rating also factors in the character and level of development that is currently contemplated in the area under the Rural Industrial Sub-Zone (PDP 21.13 and 21.14).	
OS149.1	Scott Edgar On Behalf Of UCT Properties Ltd	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road be amended to exclude the Rural Industrial Subzone land at Church Road from the priority area, or if the subzone is not removed from the schedule that the landscape schedule is amended to better reflect and provide for the existing and zoned rural industrial activities along the eastern side of Church Road.	Addressed in response to OS 146.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS149.2	Scott Edgar On Behalf Of UCT Properties Ltd	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road be amended to better acknowledge rural industrial activities within the descriptions of important land use patterns and features, shared and recognised attributes and values, particularly important views, naturalness and remoteness values and attributes, in the event that the Rural Industrial Sub-	Addressed in response to OS 146.2.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			zoned land is not removed from the schedules area.		
OS169.2	Dan Curley On Behalf Of CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is amended to give effect to the submitters' relief outline in this submission.	Addressed by reporting panner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS169.4	Dan Curley On Behalf Of CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is amended so the schedule can identify variations in landscape types that are nested within the priority area, identify their landscape attributes and values and related capacity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedule work (including field work), it is my view that the general similarity of landform, landcover and landuse across the PA, along with the spatial scale of the area is sufficient for it be addressed in the schedule as one 'landscape area'. It is however acknowledged that there are variations in landcover and landuse across the PA which give rise to variations in terms of landscape character and visual amenity attributes and values. Schedule 21.23.4 identifies these more localised variations where appropriate.</p> <p>Further, the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 explains that the schedules are a tool to assist with the identification of the landscape character and visual amenity values that are to be maintained or enhanced within each priority area and related landscape capacity.</p> <p>The Preamble also explains that the schedules contain both factual information and evaluative content and that the description of each priority area must be read in full. Each description, as a whole, expresses the landscape character and visual amenity values.</p> <p>The Preamble explains that landscape attributes and values identified, relate to the priority area as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing the attributes and values of specific sites.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>It also acknowledges that the landscape attributes and values may change over time.</p> <p>Further, the Preamble explains that a finer grained location-specific assessment of landscape attributes and values would be required for any plan change or resource consent. Other landscape values may be identified through these finer grained assessment processes.</p> <p>In my opinion, this (appropriately) signals to plan users that finer grained and/or site-specific landscape attributes and values may be identified as part of a finer grained assessment.</p>	
OS169.5	Dan Curley On Behalf Of CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is rejected as notified or amended to address that the conclusions reached in the schedule to describe the related capacity of potential land uses are too conclusive.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedule work (including field work) and assisting QLDC with rezoning appeals on land to the east of Church Road and along the eastern side of Luggate, the following amendments are recommended to Schedule 21.23.4 Capacity section.</p> <p>ii. Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – limited capacity for activities that are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); enhance public access (where appropriate); and maintain or enhance the landscape values of the PA. Very limited to No landscape capacity for tourism related activities unless such activities are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).</p> <p>iii. Urban expansions – very limited to no landscape capacity unless such development can: integrate a strong defensible boundary to avoid the potential future risk of settlement sprawl; is located and designed to connect with</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p><u>the existing settlement; protects ONF/L values; and complements the existing character of Luggate.</u></p> <p>iv. Intensive agriculture – very limited to no landscape capacity where soils and available water allocation support the activity, and where aesthetic attributes and values are maintained.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22.23 incorporates a number of amendments to improve clarity for plan users with respect to the capacity ratings in the PA RCL Schedules.</p> <p>Further, the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 acknowledges that:</p> <p><i>The capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</i></p> <p>The far more fine-grained landscape assessment that the submitter is suggesting should inform Schedule 21.23.3 is appropriate as part of a resource consent or plan change process.</p>	
OS169.6	Dan Curley On Behalf Of CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is amended to change the capacity rating for intensive agriculture in the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 169.5.	<u>Accept submission.</u>
OS169.7	Dan Curley On Behalf Of CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is amended so the capacity rating for rural living does not include cumulative effects in the capacity rating.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the area as part of the PA Schedule work (including field work), assisting QLDC with rezoning appeals on land to the east of Church Road and along the eastern side of Luggate, and my peer review of rural living resource consent applications near the PA, I consider</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				that the issue of cumulative effects in relation to future rural living development is of relevance.	
OS169.8	Dan Curley On Behalf Of CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is rejected as notified or amended to address that the schedules do not properly reflect the landscape capacity of the priority area, nor in founding assessment, the environment anticipated by the District Plan.	Addressed in response to OS 169.5.	Accept submission in part.
OS169.9	Dan Curley On Behalf Of CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is rejected as notified or amended to address that the stated capacity is too conclusive and lacks sufficient contemplation of potentially suitable future land uses within parts of the priority area.	Addressed in response to OS 169.5.	Accept submission in part.
OS169.10	Dan Curley On Behalf Of CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is amended so the terminology that describes the degree of visibility adopted by the schedules is required to be consistent with wording applied by the Proposed District Plan.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Further, the submitter does not explain which PDP terminology they prefer in this regard. As explained more fully in the PA Schedules Methodology Report, the PA Schedules have been prepared in accordance with landscape assessment best practice.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS169.11	Dan Curley On Behalf Of CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is amended so identified landscapes within the Wāhi Tūpuna Chapter are not reassessed in the landscape schedule and stretch beyond those identified under the proposed Wāhi Tūpuna mapping exercise.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. As explained more fully in the PA Schedules Methodology Report, the PA Schedules work has been prepared in accordance with landscape assessment best practice which includes consideration of Te Ao Māori dimension of landscape attributes and values.	Reject submission.
OS169.12	Dan Curley On Behalf Of CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is rejected as notified or amended to address that the cultural assessment undertaken appears to lack any assessment of activity landscape which contributes to landscape character units.	The meaning of this submission point is unclear. The PA Schedules work has integrated review of the schedules by a cultural expert (refer PA Schedules Methodology Report). Further, the PA Schedules acknowledge important landuse patterns and features, which often captures reference to activities of relevance to the landscape character and visual amenity values of the area.	Reject submission.
OS169.13	Dan Curley On Behalf Of CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is amended so describing views of and over sites should include empirical accounts of visual characteristics such as colour, line, form, texture, actual focal points and scale.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The suggestion by the submitter that view descriptions should include empirical accounts of visual characteristics such as colour, line, form, texture, actual focal points and scale amounts to a level of detail that is typically associated with a landscape assessment for a resource consent or plan change application. The aim of Landscape Schedules to assist PDP policy implementation and inevitably involves a relatively high level description of the key attributes and values that, in the case of RCL areas, needs to be maintained or enhanced. The response to OS 169.4 is also of relevance here.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS169.14	Dan Curley On Behalf Of CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is rejected as notified or amended to address that the proposed visual descriptions lack detail and therefore a determination of possible future activities that may maintain, develop or enhance current attributes and/or values.	Addressed in response to OS 169.13.	Reject submission.
OS169.15	Dan Curley On Behalf Of CPC Trustee Ltd, Timely Giving Ltd and Black Peak Farming Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road is rejected as notified or amended to address that any form of conclusive landscape capacity rating will become outdated in potentially a very short time period, subject to human demand for land resource utility/strategic value. Landscape capacity is better assessed within the consenting process and removed from the schedule of attributes and values.	The Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22.23 acknowledges that: landscape capacity is not a fixed concept and may change over time; site specific landscape assessment siwll be required for resource consent and plan change applications which may identify different landscape attributes and values to those referenced in the PA RCL Schedule. The matters raised in this submission point are also addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	Reject submission.
OS188.21	Elisha Young-Ebert	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.4.vii. mineral extraction be amended to: very limited landscape capacity for small scale extraction of aggregate for use on the same farm property that maintains or enhances the PA's	Addressed in response to OS 77.20.	Accept submission subject in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			landscape character and visual amenity values; preserves the natural character of wetlands, lakes, rivers and their margins; avoids location on the beds of lakes and rivers, elevated slopes or skylines; and protects mana whenua associations and values, particularly for those areas identified as wāhi tūpuna, statutory acknowledgements or nohoaka.		
OS201.1	Graham David Taylor	Oppose	That the submitter is kept in the loop regarding the landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road overlay and its possible effects on the property.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A