

## 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 Kimiākau (Shotover River), in particular the following features and attributes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Waterbody with a gravel and schist bed.</li> <li>b. The fast-flowing waters with numerous rapids.</li> <li>c. <u>Emerald green colouring</u> Clarity of the waters <u>in the vicinity of the gorge</u>.</li> </ul>	Accept submission in part.
OS59.4	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That in 21.22.3 Kimiakau 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 Kimiakau 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 <a href="#">and gravel extraction</a> 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: <a href="#">the Queenstown Wastewater Treatment Plant</a>, 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>	<a href="#">Accept submission.</a>

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
				<b>end of the PA</b> : 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.</p> <p>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 <b>no landscape capacity</b> 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 – <b>Very limited to n</b> landscape capacity <b>for</b> 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. <b>Farm buildings – very limited to no</b> landscape capacity <u>for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.</u></p> <p>x. <b>Renewable energy generation – no</b> 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 <b>no landscape capacity</b> 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 Kimitiākau 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 Kimitiākau 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 Kimitiākau 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 Kimitiākau 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 <a href="https://www.newzealand.com/in/plan/business/shotover-jet/">https://www.newzealand.com/in/plan/business/shotover-jet/</a> 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, <a href="#">wilding conifers</a>, 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. <b>Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – <del>no landscape capacity.</del> <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> <del>No landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA.</del> <u>No landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA.</u></b></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 <b>is takes in</b> the river corridor <b>and context</b> 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><b>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.</b></p> <p>The mapped PA <b>ONF</b> 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>	<b>Accept in part submission.</b>



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.	