

21.22.2 PA ONF Ferry Hill: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

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

Physical Attributes and Values

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

Important landforms and land types:

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

Important hydrological features:

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

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

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

Important land-use patterns and features:

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

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

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

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

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

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

Mana whenua features and their locations:

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

Associative Attributes and Values

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

Mana whenua associations and experience:

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

Important historic attributes and values:

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

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

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

Important recreation attributes and values:

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

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

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

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

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

Particularly important views to and from the area:

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

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

Naturalness attributes and values:

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

Memorability attributes and values:

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

Transient attributes and values:

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

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

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

Aesthetic qualities and values:

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

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

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

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

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

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

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

Landscape Capacity

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Commented [BG9]: Typographical correction.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

21.22.2 Ferry Hill PA ONF Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

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

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

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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