

## 21.22.16 PA ONL Eastern Whakatipu Basin: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA ONL encompasses the steep predominantly west-facing slopes of the mountain range framing the east side of the Whakatipu Basin stretching from the Arrow River to the Kawarau River. The PA ONL takes in Pt 1108, Pt 1080, Pt 1331, Crown Peak, and Pt 1426. It also includes Mt Beetham, the New Chum Gully and the Crown Terrace Escarpment, and the lower reaches of feeder gullies on the Crown Terrace.

### Physical Attributes and Values

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

### Important landforms and land types:

1. The steeply sloping, foliated (in the geological sense, not botanical), schistose mountain landforms of Pt 1108, Pt 1080, Pt 1331, Crown Peak (1,731m), and Pt 1426 (including much of the western sides of Mt Scott), which form part of the wall of mountains framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin.
2. The numerous secondary and varying steep to more rounded ridgeline 'shoulders' extending westwards from the continuous (eastern) mountain 'frame' to the Crown Terrace Escarpment.
3. The cone-shaped roche moutonnée glacial landform of Mt Beetham with the smooth 'up-glacier' face along its west side and a steeper rough 'plucked' 'down-glacier' slope to the east. Rock outcrops throughout the elevated north-eastern flanks. Highest point: 929m.
4. Partly collapsed solifluction slopes above the Crown Terrace. (NB Solifluction is a collective name for gradual processes by which regolith (unconsolidated material overlying bedrock) moves down a slope ("mass wasting") generally caused by freeze-thaw activity.)
5. The steep large-scale and continuous remnant river terrace escarpment landform along the western edge of the Crown Terrace (the majority of which is outside the PA ONL).
6. Glacial till deposits and alluvial fans at the toe of the steep mountain slopes framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin and along the finger of the Crown Terrace that extends between the western side of Mt Beetham and the Crown Escarpment (including New Chums Gully).
7. The distinctive Judge and Jury rock formations near the Kawarau Bridge.
8. Located on the western side of Mt Scott, the Crown Range Superimposed Folds formed in greenschist are identified in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory as a site of national importance and is rated as being robust and not considered to be vulnerable to most human-related activities.

**Commented [BG1]:** OS 177.14 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

### Important hydrological features:

9. The numerous unnamed streams in the northern portion of the PA draining to the Arrow River, including along New Chums Creek along the New Chums Gully.

10. The numerous streams draining from the eastern mountain range across the Crown Terrace and down to the Arrow River via the Crown Escarpment. Including Royal Burn, Swift Burn, along with several unnamed watercourses. Generally the watercourses are steeply incised where they cross the Crown Escarpment.

#### Important ecological features and vegetation types:

11. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Below approximately 800m on the slopes facing the Arrow River and the lower section of New Chums Gully, a dense mosaic of shrubland with scattered areas of trees. The shrubland is dominated by sweet briar (*Rosa rubiginosa*) and matagouri (*Discaria toumatou*). Other shrub species include mingimingi (*Coprosma propinqua*), *Coprosma rugosa*, tutu (*Coriaria arborea*), NZ broom (*Carmichaelia arborea var arborea*), bush lawyer (*Rubus cissoides*) and koromiko (*Veronica salicifolia*).
  - b. Kowhai (*Sophora microphylla*) behind the Glencoe homestead in New Chums Gully.
  - c. Pockets of a diverse range of native shrubs in more inaccessible gullies (such as the narrow gorge at the head of New Chums Creek), including turpentine scrub (*Dracophyllum uniflorum*), *Astelia nervosa*, shrub daisy (*Olearia nummulariifolia*), native broom (*Carmichaelia petriei*), bush snowberry (*Gaultheria antipoda*), and mountain ribbonwood (*Hoheria lyallii*).
  - d. Pockets of matagouri and mingimingi across the Crown Terrace Escarpment and throughout gullies.
  - e. Expansive areas of short and snow tussock grassland throughout the eastern mountain frame between approximately 800m and 1,700m. Tall tussock (*Chionochloa rigida*) dominates on cool aspects with short tussock (*Festuca novae-zelandiae*) increasing in dominance with decreasing altitude. Pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri and mingimingi throughout lower slopes.
  - f. Strong cover of silver tussock (*Poa cita*) throughout the eastern flank of Mt Beetham.
  - g. Narrow leaved snow tussock (*Chionochloa rigida amara*) dominates above 1,000m.
  - h. Cushionfields on ridge crest in vicinity of Crown Peak.
12. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. Exotic grasses and herbs mixed with tussock throughout the slopes below approximately 1,000m.
  - b. Sycamore and black poplars throughout the Crown Terrace Escarpment in the vicinity of Tobins ~~Track Track~~ and the Arrow River, and in parts of New Chums Gully below the shearing shed.
  - c. Sweet briar, broom, scrub, hawthorn, wilding conifers, and pockets of plantation forestry (larch and Douglas fir) across the Crown Terrace Escarpment.
  - d. Grazed pasture associated with the Glencoe Station land.
13. Diverse vegetation types and rocky terrain associated with the Crown Range and lower landforms including escarpments provide suitable habitat for New Zealand falcon, New Zealand pipit, grey warbler, fantail and silvereye and skink and gecko species.
14. Animal pest species include feral goats, hares, possums, mice, rats, stoats, ferrets, feral cats, and rabbits.
15. Plant pest species include wilding pines, sweet briar, hawthorn, buddleia, sycamore, broom and gorse.

Commented [BG2]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG3]: OS 177.25 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

### **Important Land-use patterns and features:**

16. Human modification which is concentrated: around the Glencoe Station homestead in New Chum Gully (north of Mt Beetham); roughly in the centre of the Crown Terrace Escarpment, where the Crown range (or 'Zig Zag') Road winds its way up the escarpment; and the southern end of the PA where the Crown Range Road winds its way around the southwestern flanks of Mt Scott.
17. Built development patterning which includes a cluster of rural dwellings and farm buildings associated with Glencoe Station in New Chum Gully (to the north of Mt Beetham); a limited scattering of rural living dwellings to the northwest of Mt Beetham (including consented but unbuilt platforms); two rural living dwellings to the north of the Zig Zag Road (one located at the base of the escarpment and one near the top); and a small cluster of rural living dwellings towards the southern end of the PA, northwest of the Kawarau Bridge (and accessed from Gibbston Highway). Generally development is characterised by carefully located and designed buildings that are well integrated by plantings and remain subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Elsewhere, the modest scale of buildings, together with their distinctly working rural character, ensures that they sit comfortably into the setting.
18. Several rural and rural living dwellings and farm buildings are located along the edges of the PA within the Crown Terrace and along the toe of the escarpment, south of the point where the course of Arrow River diverges from the base of the escarpment. With the exception of New Chum Gully environs, generally built development has been carefully located outside of the PA.
19. Tobins Track, Tobins Drop, Mt Beetham Track, the New Chum Gully Track, Peters Way, the New Chum Ridge Track, Miners Route, Brackens Saddle Track, Crown Peak Track (small section). Associated with these tracks are signage, stiles, and seating, typically of a modest scale and low-key character.
20. Infrastructure is evident within the northern and southern portions of the PA and includes: a section of the Cromwell Frankton. A 110kV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid transmission corridor in the vicinity of the Kawarau bridge (southern end of PA); a short section of power lines on poles servicing the rural living cluster near the Kawarau Bridge; the power/telephone lines (on poles) servicing Glencoe station and farm fencing / farm tracks.
21. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character and/or proximity include: the rural living development along the toe of the Crown Terrace Escarpment and the base of the range of mountains framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin (on the Crown Terrace); the close proximity of SH 6 (Gibbston Highway) which is on the western side of the southern end of the Crown Terrace Escarpment and the Crown Range Road, where it runs across the Crown Terrace.

**Commented [BG4]:** OS 70.30 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

**Commented [BG5]:** OS177.16 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

**Commented [BG6]:** OS 70.31 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

### **Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

22. The Judge and Jury Rocks near the Kawarau Bridge (District Plan reference 9).
23. Historic farmstead at Glencoe Station and associated outbuildings.
24. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, dams, and associated domestic sites in the area (for example, archaeological sites F41/743, F41/632, and F41/633).
25. Notable transport routes and associated infrastructure, including Tobin's Track.

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

26. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
27. Parts of the ONL overlap the mapped Haehaenui (Arrow River) wāhi tūpuna. The southern extent of the ONL overlaps the mapped Kawarau River wāhi tūpuna. These wāhi tūpuna were part of a network of mahika kai areas, with the Kawarau River also being a traditional travel route between the Mata-au (Clutha River) and Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Wakatipu).

## Associative Attributes and Values

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

### Mana whenua associations and experience:

28. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
29. Kāi Tahu tradition tells of an incident where a 280 strong war party was repelled from the Tititea settlement on the south side of the Kawarau river and chased to the top of the Crown Range, which is now named Tititea in memory of this incident.
30. The mana whenua values associated with the Eastern Wakatipu Basin ONL include, but may not be limited to, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

### Important historic attributes and values:

31. Gold mining in the area and the associated physical remnants including sluiced faces and water races.
32. Use of the Crown Terrace for pastoralism.
33. Glencoe homestead and remaining historic buildings from William Paterson's establishment of the Glencoe Run.
34. Historic transport tracks and infrastructure, including Tobins Track (constructed 1874) and features associated with the construction of SH6 (eg. F41/744).

### Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

35. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
36. The popularity of the postcard views from the Zig Zag lookout (on the Crown Range Road, where it scales the Crown Terrace Escarpment) out over the Whakatipu Basin and surrounding mountains, as an inspiration/subject for photography.
37. The high popularity of Tobins Track in part due to its very close proximity to Arrowtown.
38. The identity of the line of mountains along the eastern side of the PA in forming the dramatic 'eastern frame' of the Whakatipu Basin.
39. The identity of the Crown Terrace Escarpment (and distinctive 'zig zag' section of the Crown Range Road) as marking the transition between the mixed rural and rural residential landscape of the low-lying part of the Whakatipu Basin and the more overtly 'working' rural landscape of the Crown Terrace.
40. The identity of the sequence of mountains and the escarpment at the northern end of the PA as a dramatic (western) backdrop to Arrowtown.

### Important recreation attributes and values:

41. Enjoying the view from the Zig Zag lookout on the Crown Range Road.
42. Walking, running, dog walking (where allowed) and mountain biking on Tobins Track, Tobins Drop, Mt Beetham Track, the New Chum Gully Track, Peters Way, the New Chum Ridge Track, Miners Route, Brackens Saddle Track, Crown Peak Track.

43. SH 6 Gibbston Highway and the Crown Range Road as key scenic routes either within the PA or in close proximity.

### Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

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

#### Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

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

#### Particularly important views to and from the area:

46. The postcard views from the Zig Zag lookout (on the Crown Range Road), out over the Whakatipu Basin, Te Whaka-ata (Lake Hayes), ~~Whakatipu Waimāori~~ ~~Whakātipu Wai Māori~~ (Lake Whakatipu), Morven Ferry roche moutonnée, the Remarkables, Coronet Peak and the broader mountain context. The 'bird's eye' like quality of the vista across a complex mixed rural and rural living/resort landscape adds to its appeal. The accessibility of the vantage point also plays an important role.
47. The spectacular panoramic views from the Crown Peak Track, and the New Chum Ridge Track out over the Whakatipu Basin to the west and/or the rugged and dramatic expanse of the Crown Range to the east and north.
48. The highly attractive and engaging short to long-range views from Tobins Track and Tobins Drop, Mt Beetham Track, Peters Way, the New Chum Ridge Track, Miners Route, Brackens Saddle Track, out over the PA, the Whakatipu Basin, the Remarkables, and the broader glacial valley and mountain context.
49. The dramatic mid and long-range views from Arrowtown, the Arrow River ONF, the scenic routes of the Crown Range Road and SH6 Gibbston Highway, much of the Whakatipu Basin (including sections of the Queenstown Trail network) to the large-scale and coherent river terrace escarpment landform and/or the continuous sequence of mountains that frame the eastern side of the Crown Terrace. From more distant vantage points, the contrast established between these more natural landscape elements seen in combination with the gently sloping (predominantly) working rural 'plinth' of the Crown Terrace adds to the memorability and appeal of such views. At closer range, the large-scale, rugged and unkempt appearance of much of the Crown Terrace Escarpment reinforces its role as a 'break' between the more developed low-lying basin to the west and the (predominantly) working rural landscape of the Crown Terrace.
50. The appealing long-range views from more distant elevated vantage points such as the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road and Coronet Peak Road in which the scale and shape of the glacial valley and river terrace landscape that underpins the PA is legible in its entirety and confers a sense of grandeur to the outlook.
51. The highly engaging mid-range views from Glencoe Road, in which the roche moutonnée profile of Mt Beetham is clearly legible. The contrast between the landform feature and planar working rural context adds to the appeal of the outlook.
52. Engaging and seemingly 'close-range' views from planes approaching or exiting Queenstown airport via the Gibbston Valley. Such views offer an appreciation of the broader glacial landscape context within which the PA ONL is set.

**Commented [BG7]:** OS 77.42 Kai Tahu ki Otago. OS 188.42 Elisha Ebert-Young.

**Commented [BG8]:** OS177.37 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

**Commented [BG9]:** OS177.37 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

**Commented [BG10]:** OS177.38 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

53. In all of the views, the dominance of 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the PA ONL, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the PA ONL, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

#### Naturalness attributes and values:

54. The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA ONL set within the mixed working rural and rural living (Whakatipu Basin) context and/or the working rural setting of the Crown Terrace, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to rural living, farming, forestry, recreational, and infrastructure uses are visible, the sheer scale and continuity of the high mountain-scape along the eastern side of the Crown Terrace and the river terrace escarpment landform along its western edge ensures that, for the most part, these elements remain subservient to natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes.
55. The irregular patterning and proliferation of grey shrubland, exposed rock faces and scrub in places adds to the perception of naturalness.
56. While the Crown Range Road forms a bold manmade element within the PA ONL, the connection this development establishes and enables between the mountain setting, the inhabited Whakatipu Valley and further afield, Wanaka, adds a degree of interest to the view, meaning that it is not an overwhelmingly negative visual element. The scale of the seemingly 'undeveloped' escarpment and mountain setting within which this development is viewed, together with its identity as a popular scenic route, also play a role. Put another way, these landscape modifications also make an important contribution to Queenstown's recreational values (see above), suggesting a degree of landscape 'fit'.
57. The localised forestry plantings across parts of the Crown Terrace Escarpment contribute a reduced perception of naturalness in places. However, the underlying natural (and largely unmodified) rugged river terrace landform character of the area remains legible and dominant, thus ensuring these parts of the PA display at least a moderate-high level of naturalness. The visual appearance of these parts of the PA during and after harvesting cycles forms a prominent negative visual element within the broader landscape setting and serves to (temporarily) further reduce the perception of naturalness in this part of the PA.

#### Memorability attributes and values:

58. The appealing and engaging views of the continuous 'wall' of mountains framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin from a wide variety of public vantage points. The juxtaposition of the large-scale and continuous rugged mountain sequence beside the elevated 'farmed' river terrace landform of the Crown Terrace contributes to its memorability.
59. ~~In some instances, the more developed context of the low-lying basin appreciated within the seemingly untouched mountain-scape beyond that signals the role of this part of the PA ONL as a gateway between the developed basin and seemingly untouched mountain-scape beyond.~~ This factor, along with the magnificent broader mountain setting within which it the PA is seen in many views, are also factors that contribute to its memorability.
60. The dramatic closer-range views from low-lying vantage points throughout the eastern side of the basin to the rugged and large-scale escarpment which forms a bold contrast with the developed setting throughout the basin floor.
61. The distinctive landscape layering that is apparent in longer-range views where the patterning of the escarpment, stepping up to the farmed terrace and backdropped by the line of mountains (along the eastern edge of the terrace) is visible.
62. The 'close up' experience of the alpine setting that the PA affords for many residents and visitors to Queenstown as a consequence of the relatively high accessibility of the area via the Crown Range Road.
63. The panoramic alpine landscape views afforded from ridgeline tracks.

**Commented [BG11]:** OS177.45 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

**Transient attributes and values:**

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

**Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

- 66. A sense of remoteness across the mountains along the eastern side of the Crown Terrace, due to their coherent and continuous large-scale character and the limited level of built development evident.
- 67. A sense of wildness across the Crown Terrace Escarpment portion of the PA as a consequence of its continuous rugged character along with its generally 'undeveloped' and, in places, seemingly unkempt character. The contrast with the 'settled' and more manicured character of the basin plays an important role in this regard.
- 68. Such feelings reduce in the parts of the PA where forestry forestry, rural living, farm dwellings and sheds and the Crown Range Road are located.

**Commented [BG12]:** OS177.19 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited. OS177.50 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

**Aesthetic attributes and values:**

- 69. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
- 70. More specifically:
  - a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the continuous 'wall' of rugged and dramatic mountains backdropping the distinctive river terrace escarpment, which together frame the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin.
  - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. The cone like peak of Mt Beetham and its distinctive roche moutonnée profile.
    - ii. The uninterrupted and muscular sequence of predominantly tussock-clad steep to more rounded mountains and ridges along the eastern side of the Crown Terrace.
    - iii. The seemingly wild escarpment landform that forms a 'wall' along the eastern side of the basin floor and serves as a transition between the basin floor and the predominantly working rural landscape of the Crown Terrace.
    - iv. The ever-changing play of light and weather patterns across the mountain slopes.
    - v. The confinement of appreciable visible built development within the PA to lower lying flat to gently sloping land near Glencoe Road the Crown Range Road.
    - vi. The very limited level of built modification evident through the ONL.
- 71. It is noted that control of plant pests species such as wilding pines can temporarily detract from aesthetic values.

**Commented [BG13]:** OS177.51 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

**Commented [BG14]:** OS177.52 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

**Commented [BG15]:** Typographical correction.

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

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

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

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

- 72. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
- 73. **High associative values** relating to:
  - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
  - b. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
  - c. The significant recreational attributes of the network of walking and biking tracks in the area.
  - d. The scenic values associated with Crown Range Road.
- 74. **High perceptual values** relating to:
  - a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
  - b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Arrowtown, the Whakatipu Basin, the scenic routes of the Crown Range Road and SH6, parts of the Queenstown Trail network, the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road, Coronet Peak Road, and the airport approach path, along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
  - c. A high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of more natural landscape elements and patterns across the PA.
  - d. A strong sense of remoteness and/or wildness across much of the PA. Such feelings are reduced in the parts of the PA where forestry, rural living, farm dwellings and sheds and the Crown Range Road are located.

**Commented [BG16]:** OS177.60 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited. OS177.19 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

## Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation in low lying locations and clustered with existing buildings, that is of a modest small scale; have and has a low-key rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhances public access; and protects the area's ONL values. **No** landscape capacity for tourism related activities.
- iii. **Urban expansions – no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – no** landscape capacity.

**Commented [BG17]:** OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

**Commented [BG18]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

**Commented [BG19]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

**Commented [BG20]:** Typographical correction.

**Commented [BG21]:** OS 177.62 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

**Commented [BG22]:** Typographical correction.

**Commented [BG23]:** Typographical correction.

**Commented [BG24]:** Typographical correction.

**Commented [BG25]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

**Commented [BG26]:** Typographical correction.

**Commented [BG27]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust. OS 177.62 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm, existing recreational facilities, or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, **very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – no** landscape capacity.
- i. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONL values. **No** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.
- viii. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. In the case of the National Grid there is landscape capacity for the upgrade of existing infrastructure within the same corridor and limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for the particular location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- ix. **Renewable energy generation – no** landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation. **Limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- x. **Production Forestry – no** landscape capacity.
- xi. **Rural living – very limited** landscape capacity for rural living in low lying locations and clustered with existing buildings, that; is: of a ~~modest scale; have a small scale and~~ low-key rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement; ~~and enhances public access; and protects the area's ONL values.~~

**Commented [BG28]:** Roman numeral numbering correction required.

**Commented [BG29]:** Typographical correction.

**Commented [BG30]:** OS 70.32 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

**Commented [BG31]:** OS 177.66 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

**Commented [BG32]:** Typographical correction.

**Commented [BG33]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2 and OS 177.66.

**Commented [BG34]:** Typographical correction.

**Commented [BG35]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.  
OS 177.66 Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited.

# 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA ONL Schedule

## August 2023 FINAL

**Blue highlighted text:** captured in “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA ONF Schedule”. New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

**Red text:** relates to a submission point that has not be captured in the “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA ONF Schedule”. This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **Two examples identified.**

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

## Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS70.30	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to include the word 'Important' with the words 'land-use patterns and features'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 as follows: <b>Important</b> land-use patterns and features:	<b>Accept submission.</b>
OS70.31	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 20 to replace the words 'transmission corridor' with '110kV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [20] as follows: Infrastructure is evident within the northern and southern portions of the PA and includes: a section of the Cromwell Frankton. A <b>110kV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid</b> <del>transmission corridor</del> in the vicinity of the Kawarau bridge (southern end of PA); a short section of power lines on poles servicing the rural living cluster near the Kawarau Bridge; the power/telephone lines (on poles) servicing Glencoe station and farm fencing / farm tracks.	<b>Accept submission (along with minor grammar correction).</b>

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS70.32	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape Schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point viii utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid there is landscape capacity for the upgrade of existing infrastructure within the same corridor and limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for the particular location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity for <b>Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure</b> as follows:  <b>In the case of the National Grid there is landscape capacity for the upgrade of existing infrastructure within the same corridor and limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for the particular location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.</b>	Accept submission.
OS77.42	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin paragraph 46 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [46] as follows:  The postcard views from the Zig Zag lookout (on the Crown Range Road), out over the Whakatipu Basin, Te Whaka-ata (Lake Hayes), <b>Whakatipu Waimāori</b> <del>Whakātipu Wai Māori</del> (Lake Whakatipu), Morven Ferry roche moutonnée, the Remarkables, Coronet Peak and the broader mountain context. The 'bird's eye' like quality of the vista across a complex mixed rural and rural living/resort landscape adds to its appeal. The accessibility of the vantage point also plays an important role.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS118.7	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Robina Bodle Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin be amended to remove the incorrect statement at [12] that there are important ecological features and vegetation types and that lists features that do not have ecological importance such as exotic grasses.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505 and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I consider that exotic grasses, sycamores, black poplars, sweet briar, broom, scrub, hawthorn, wilding conifers and plantation forestry all exotic vegetation types that are worthy of mention under the header "Important ecological features and <b>vegetation types</b>" (emphasis added) due to the role that they play in shaping landscape values in the PA (albeit, in some instances, as a negative landscape element).</p> <p>I also note that Schedule 21.22.2 has been reviewed by an expert ecologist with that expert supporting the notified text.</p>	Reject submission.
OS118.8	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Robina Bodle Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to correct [14 and 15] under the heading important ecological features and vegetation types where the schedule lists animal and plant pest species, which are not relevant to important ecological features and vegetation types.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the PA ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>However, it is agreed that as currently drafted the PA Schedules are potentially confusing in this regard as these aspects of the landscape are negative rather than positive.</p> <p>A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS118.9	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Robina Bodle Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin be amended to clarify the relationship of mana whenua associations, Wāhi Tūpuna Chapter, and consultation with mana whenua for applications.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS118.10	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Robina Bodle Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin be amended at paragraph [35] to address the very generic statement made about the descriptions and photographs of the area in tourist publications while the landscape schedule provides no evidence as to what publications or photographs are referred to.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. It is not usual practice to identify which tourist publications make reference to an ONF/L in a Schedule of Landscape Values. However, by way of example, several views of the area are cited in the Arrowtown tourism website, see: <a href="https://www.arrowtown.com/gallery/">https://www.arrowtown.com/gallery/</a>	Reject submission.
OS118.11	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Robina Bodle Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin amended to make clear that the landscape capacity schedules are at a landscape character unit level rather than a site-specific level, and that there are site specific situations where the landscape does have capacity to absorb development through placement and recessive design.	The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 acknowledges the point raised in this submission as follows:  <i>The capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the PA and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</i>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.1	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the mapping of the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove the submitters land on Glencoe Road (Lot 3 DP 493411, Lot 4-6 DP 398297 - held in 756258; Lot 1 DP 398297 held in 392272; and Lot 2 DP 392297 held in 392273).	Amendments to the PA mapping are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS177.2	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove the Outstanding Natural Landscape classification from the submitters land (Lot 3 DP 493411, Lot 4-6 DP 398297 - held in 756258; Lot 1 DP 398297 held in 392272; and Lot 2 DP 392297 held in 392273).	Addressed in response to OS 177.1.	Reject submission.
OS177.3	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to provide for an appropriate exception regime for the submitters land if the schedule is to remain in the variation.	Adopting this approach would not accord with the directions of the Environment Court as set out in the Topic 2 decisions. This matter is also addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	Reject submission.
OS177.4	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to provide for the Glencoe station/submitter land as a separate character unit	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505,	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Company Limited		under the schedule if it is to be retained.	and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that a separate landscape character area is appropriate (or required) for Glencoe Station. Further, an approach of delineating a landscape character area on the basis of landownership alone is problematic from a landscape methodology perspective.  However Schedule 21.22.16 makes repeated reference to the characteristics specific to the New Chums Gully where the Glencoe Station homestead etc is located (for example, [16], [17], [18], [19]). It is expected that this information along with the other changes to the Schedule 21.22.16 recommended in response to Submission #174 may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	
OS177.5	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That if amended raised in points 177.1-177.4 are not adopted then the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin should be deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 177.1.	Reject submission.
OS177.6	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to include reference that surrounding undeveloped mountains have much higher landscape values than the developed terrace area.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider it appropriate to distinguish the surrounding mountains from the terrace in the manner requested in this submission point.  The response to OS 177.4 is also of relevance here.	Reject submission.
OS177.7	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to include new definitions to provide for the intent of capacity in landscapes with different	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  The submitter would appear to be suggesting that the capacity ratings used in the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study are applied to the PA ONF/Ls capacity rating work. Section 3 of the PA Methodology Report explains the distinction between	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Company Limited		abilities to absorb appropriate development. Revised capacity ratings are required if these are to be retained within the schedule.	<p>the two, and why an alternate approach is required for the PA Schedules. It is however acknowledged that some refinement to the 'capacity' explanation is required to assist plan users as discussed in the evidence in chief of Bridget Gilbert which addresses the Key Landscape Matters Raised in Submissions.</p> <p>This has resulted in recommended changes to the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to better explain capacity ratings and includes the introduction of a new rating scale of <b>very limited to no</b> landscape capacity.</p> <p>It is expected that this additional text along with the (existing) explanation below, may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p> <p><i>The capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</i></p>	
OS177.8	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to recognise and provide for the benefits of change, enhancement and remediation of land within the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The focus of the Schedules is to identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected.</p> <p>That said, the identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>It is expected that such matters would be traversed in detail as part of a detailed (and more site specific) landscape assessment in support of a plan change or resource consent process.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.9	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation within the priority area.	Addressed in response to OS 177.8.	Reject submission.
OS177.10	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to recognise the particular existing attributes mentioned in point 19 of the submission as part of the values and character of the Outstanding Natural Landscape.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Many of the attributes and features requested for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.6 are already mentioned, albeit under more generic terms such as farm tracks, infrastructure, pastoral farming and the like, which is considered to be appropriate for a PA scale description, rather than a site-by-site description. The exception to this is: pest control. While the submitter may be managing pests at a site-specific level, this is not understood to be a particular characteristic of the PA as a whole, that merits mention in Schedule 21.22.6. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence if this understanding is incorrect, so that this aspect of the Schedule can be corrected.	Reject submission.
OS177.11	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to incorporate submitter feedback into the important values of the landscape schedule.	Amendments to Schedule 21.22.16 sought by all submitters have been made where they are supported by expert advice.	Accept submission in part.
OS177.12	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land	Oppose	That without derogating from the generality of the points in this submission, the submitter seeks any additional, amended,	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Development Company Limited		consequential, or further relief in respect to the schedule reflects the matters raised in this submission.		
OS177.13	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That if the amendments within this submission are not adopted within the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin that it be deleted or otherwise withdrawn from the variation.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS177.14	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at the important landforms and types section to distinguish between the elevated mountainous part of the Outstanding Natural Landscape and the lower-lying and highly modified flatter land at Glencoe Road.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [6] as follows:  Glacial till deposits and alluvial fans at the toe of the steep mountain slopes framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin and along the finger of the Crown Terrace that extends between the western side of Mt Beetham and the Crown Escarpment (including New Chums Gully).	Accept submission.
OS177.15	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at the land use patterns and features section to further particularise the broader list of established activities occurring within the Outstanding Natural Landscape which are historically recognised as appropriate and in keeping with the landform, including	Addressed in response to OS 177.10.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			consented development (RM000505).		
OS177.16	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at the naturalness attributes and values section to reflect the rural residential living environment and the visibility of built development along Glencoe Road.	<p>Rural and rural living development is acknowledged in Schedule 21.22.16 [17] and [18]. I note that the rural living development consented in the PA does not appear to have been built yet, so no change is required in this regard in relation to the character of (existing) views.</p> <p>However, for completeness, it is recommended that Schedule 21.22.16 [17] is amended as follows:</p> <p>Built development patterning which includes a cluster of rural dwellings and farm buildings associated with Glencoe Station in New Chum Gully (to the north of Mt Beetham); a limited scattering of rural living dwellings to the northwest of Mt Beetham (including consented but unbuilt platforms); two rural living dwellings to the north of the Zig Zag Road (one located at the base of the escarpment and one near the top); and a small cluster of rural living dwellings towards the southern end of the PA, northwest of the Kawarau Bridge (and accessed from Gibbston Highway). Generally, development is characterised by carefully located and designed buildings that are well integrated by plantings and remain subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Elsewhere, the modest scale of buildings, together with their distinctly working rural character, ensures that they sit comfortably into the setting.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS177.17	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at the landscape values section to change the respective rankings to 'low' and 'moderate' rather than 'high'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider it appropriate to change the values ratings as requested.</p> <p>I also note that were the submitter correct in this regard, relying on caselaw, it is very unlikely that the area would</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				qualify as an ONL and specifically, the test of 'outstanding-ness'. I note that the ONL status of area has been confirmed by the Environment Court.	
OS177.18	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That if the landscape values section of the landscape schedule 21.22.16 is not amended then the values descriptions are amended to reflect the lower value of the modified terrace.	Addressed in response to OS 177.6.	Reject submission.
OS177.19	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the perceptual values section of the landscape values of landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to distinguish between the 'remote and wild' mountain range and the un-remote and un-wild terrace.	Addressed in response to OS 177.50 and OS 177.60.	Accept submission in part.
OS177.20	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to include information of what scale of development has been considered regarding the landscape capacity assessment.	The methodology applied in relation to Capacity is described in the PA Schedules Methodology Report at Section 3. It is acknowledged that some refinement to the 'capacity' explanation is required to assist plan users as discussed in the evidence in chief of Bridget Gilbert which addresses the Key Landscape Matters Raised in Submissions. This has resulted in recommended changes to the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to better explain capacity ratings.	Accept submission in part.
OS177.21	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at the capacity description of visitor accommodation activities to reflect the ability of land at Glencoe Road and the	Addressed in response to OS 177.62.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Company Limited		submitters site to absorb further visitor accommodation.		
OS177.22	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to reflect where there are existing and planned development opportunities and associated amenities and utilities.	Schedule 21.22.16 (broadly) describes existing development within the PA. It is considered that identifying development opportunities across the PA goes beyond what is required in terms of a Schedule of Values. I also consider that identifying development opportunities within the Capacity section of the Schedule would be unhelpfully open ended and that such matters are most appropriately addressed via a detailed landscape assessment as part of a plan change or resource consent process (as signalled in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22).	Reject submission.
OS177.23	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That if the landscape capacity sections are to be retained, then much of the Outstanding Natural Landscape terraces need to be amended to a moderate or high capacity for additional subdivision, visitor accommodation, lifestyle, earthworks and associated and ancillary activities.	Addressed in response to OS 177.62, OS 177.63, OS 177.64, OS 177.65, and OS 177.66.	Reject submission.
OS177.67	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	Amend General Description to include the term 'more modified' in relation to the feeder gullies on the Crown Terrace.	The General Description of each PA seeks to briefly define the spatial extent of the area rather than capture landscape values etc. For this reason, no change is considered necessary in this regard.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.24	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 5 from the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I consider that the remnant river terrace is an important landform in the PA and that it is appropriate to acknowledge that the majority of that continuous landform is outside the PA.</p> <p>I also note that a geomorphology expert supported the notified text in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS177.25	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to include a point under the title important ecological features and vegetation types which states 'Modified and grazed pasture associated with the Glencoe Station land'.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [12] as follows:</p> <p><b>(d) Grazed pasture associated with the Glencoe Station land.</b></p>	<b>Accept submission (subject to refinement).</b>
OS177.26	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to include a point under the title important ecological features and vegetation types which states 'Opportunities to enhance vegetation and/or remove pest plant species are encouraged through subdivision and development proposals'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>This section of Schedule 22.22.16 describes the existing landscape values, rather than future opportunities.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Capacity section of the Schedule signals such opportunities where appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.
OS177.27	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove	Addressed in response to OS 118.8.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited		point 14 from the landscape schedule.		
OS177.28	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 15 from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 118.8.	Reject submission.
OS177.29	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 16 to include the word significant in relation to human modification within the landscape schedule and to include the words 'and broader parts of the Glencoe farmed land'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree with the text changes requested. While there is modification around the homestead and in other parts of the farmland, I would not describe this as 'significant'.	Reject submission.
OS177.30	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 17 to include minor typographical errors and replace the words 'two rural living dwellings to the north of the' with 'A number of dwellings between Mt Beetham and'.	Having reviewed the mapping of the consented building platform mapping and aerial mapping for the Priority Area, I do not consider any change to the text of Schedule 21.22.16 [17] is required in this regard.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.31	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 18 to remove the words 'with the exception of', include the words 'including Glencoe Station, also includes rural living and other', have the word 'generally' removed and replace the words 'has been carefully located outside of the' with 'within'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS177.32	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 23 to include the words 'and other farming features such as modified pasture and planting, utilities, access, and fencing' in relation to the historic farmstead at Glencoe Station.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The features recommended for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.16 [23] (i.e. modified pasture and planting, utilities, access, and fencing) do not relate to 'Important archaeological and heritage features'. I also note that a heritage expert supported the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS177.33	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 32 to include reference to rural living opportunities regarding the Crown Terrace.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The features recommended for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.16 [32] (i.e. rural living) do not relate to 'Important historic attributes and values'. I also note that a heritage expert supported the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS177.34	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 33 to include the words 'used for pastoralism and rural living'	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The features recommended for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.16 [33] (i.e. pastoralism and rural living) do not relate to the Glencoe homestead which is the focus of the Schedule item.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Company Limited		regarding the Glencoe homestead.	Pastoralism is addressed under Schedule 21.22.16 [32] and rural living is not an 'Important historic attribute or value'. I also note that a heritage expert supported the notified text in this regard.	
OS177.35	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 35 from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 118.10.	Reject submission.
OS177.36	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 39 to remove reference to mixed rural and rural residential and replace this with 'Arcadian/resort landscapes', remove reference to 'more overtly working rural' and replace this with 'mixed rural and rural residential', and to include reference to the Glencoe Station/New Chums gully.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree with the text changes requested. For completeness, I do not consider that rural living development is of a scale, extent or character that it makes a noteworthy contribution to the 'Shared and recognised values' (or 'identity') of the PA.	Reject submission.
OS177.37	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 49 to remove reference the large-scale, rugged and unkempt appearance of the Crown Terrance and replace this with 'the mixed rural and rural lifestyle uses of the	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree with the text changes requested.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>Crown Terrace', and replace the words 'working rural' with rural/lifestyle.</p>	<p>The reference to the rugged unkempt appearance etc relates to the Crown Escarpment which is very steep land where there is virtually no built development or pastoral uses evident. This means the proposed description of this area as mixed rural and rural lifestyle uses is inaccurate.</p> <p>However, some minor refinement of the second part of [49] is proposed as follows to acknowledge the modest level of rural living development in part of the PA:</p> <p>The dramatic mid and long-range views from Arrowtown, the Arrow River ONF, the scenic routes of the Crown Range Road and SH6 Gibbston Highway, much of the Whakatipu Basin (including sections of the Queenstown Trail network) to the large-scale and coherent river terrace escarpment landform and/or the continuous sequence of mountains that frame the eastern side of the Crown Terrace. From more distant vantage points, the contrast established between these more natural landscape elements seen in combination with the gently sloping <b>(predominantly)</b> working rural 'plinth' of the Crown Terrace adds to the memorability and appeal of such views. At closer range, the large-scale, rugged and unkempt appearance of much of the Crown Terrace Escarpment reinforces its role as a 'break' between the more developed low-lying basin to the west and the <b>(predominantly)</b> working rural landscape of the Crown Terrace.</p>	
OS177.38	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	<p>That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 51 to include mention of the point being in context of a working farm.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [51] as follows:</p> <p>The highly engaging mid-range views from Glencoe Road, in which the roche moutonnée profile of Mt Beetham is clearly legible. <b>The contrast between the landform feature and planar working rural context adds to the appeal of the outlook.</b></p>	<p><b>Accept submission (subject to refinement).</b></p>

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.39	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 52 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree with the deletion of Schedule 21.22.16 [52], as I consider the view from the air on the approach to Queenstown airport to be a noteworthy outlook in a Schedule of Landscape Values for the PA.	Reject submission.
OS177.40	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 53 to replace the word 'natural' with 'working pastoral activities and scattered rural lifestyle', make minor typographical errors, and remove mention of 'the generally subservient nature' of the built environment.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [53] are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS177.41	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 54 to remove mention of the undeveloped character of the landscape and replace it with 'mixed working/rural living character', replace mention of the mixed working rural and rural living with 'more developed Arcadian/resort character of the Whakatipu Basin, remove mention of the context of the rural setting of the Crown Terrace, replace the words	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [54] are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			'perception of naturalness' with quality and attractive appreciation of landscape', make minor typographical errors and remove mention of the subservient nature of mentioned elements.		
OS177.42	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 56 to remove the words 'meaning that it is not an overwhelmingly negative visual element', and replace the words 'seemingly undeveloped' with 'mixed rural/lifestyle'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [56] are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS177.43	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 57 to remove the word 'high' regarding the level of naturalness of the priority area.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [57] are appropriate. For completeness, the evaluation of naturalness is guided by the interpretation of 'natural' in Te Tangi a te Manu, [9.44] to [9.46], drawing from <i>Harrison, WESI</i> and the <i>West Wind</i> Environment Court decisions.	Reject submission.
OS177.44	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 58 to include reference to 'lifestyle development' of the river terrace landform of the Crown Terrace.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [58] are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Company Limited			In my opinion, the rural living development within the PA is of a scale, extent and character that means it remains a subservient element that does not make a noteworthy contribution to the views of the mountain context that is referenced in the schedule item.	
OS177.45	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 59 to make minor typographical errors, replace the words 'gateway between the' with 'transition landscape of mixed rural/lifestyle use between the', remove reference to the 'seemingly untouched' and replace this with 'more natural upper slopes', and remove the words 'along with the magnificent broader mountain setting within which it is seen in many views'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [59] are appropriate.</p> <p>However, I do consider that [59] would benefit from amendment as follows to assist an understanding of the meaning of this schedule item:</p> <p><del>In some instances, the more developed context of the low-lying basin appreciated within the seemingly untouched mountain-scape beyond that signals the role of this part of the PA ONL as a gateway between the developed basin and seemingly untouched mountain-scape beyond.</del> This factor, along with the magnificent broader mountain setting within which <del>the PA</del> is seen in many views, <del>are also factors that</del> contribute to its memorability.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS177.46	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 60 to replace the words 'bold contrast with' with 'transition to'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [60] are appropriate.</p> <p>For completeness, I consider that the Crown Escarpment is a bold landscape element that forms a marked contrast (rather than a transition) with the developed setting of the Basin floor.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.47	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 64 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the deletion of Schedule 21.22.16 [64] is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS177.48	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 66 to remove reference to the 'sense of remoteness' of the eastern side of the Crown Terrace and include the words 'are experienced within a modified context'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [66] are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS177.49	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 67 to change the sense of wildness of the Crown Terrace Escarpment to 'low', and to remove reference to the 'continuous rugged character along with its generally undeveloped and, in places, seemingly unkempt character'. Also to remove reference to this being in 'contrast with the settled and more manicured character of the basin'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [67] are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.50	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 68 to include reference to 'areas of working farm/lifestyle development within the priority area.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [68] as follows:  Such feelings reduce in the parts of the PA where forestry, rural living, farm dwellings and sheds and the Crown Range Road are located.	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS177.51	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 70(b) iii to include reference to the 'lifestyle' landscape of the Crown Terrace.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [70](iii) as follows:  The seemingly wild escarpment landform that forms a 'wall' along the eastern side of the basin floor and serves as a transition between the basin floor and the predominantly working rural landscape of the Crown Terrace.	Accept submission in part (subject to refinement).
OS177.52	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 70(b) v to remove the words 'The confinement of appreciable visible' and to include reference to Glencoe Road.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [70](v) as follows:  The confinement of appreciable visible built development within the PA to lower lying flat to gently sloping land near Glencoe Road the Crown Range Road.	Accept submission in part.
OS177.53	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 70(b) vi to remove reference of the 'very limited' level of built modification through the Outstanding Natural Landscape and to include the words 'integrated into the landscape'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [70](iv) are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.54	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 71 to include the words 'however, opportunities to control or eradicate those through future subdivision and development are encouraged' in reference to pest plant species.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The amendment sought to Schedule 21.22.16 [71] amounts to policy direction which is not appropriate in this part of the Schedule of Values. However, it is noted that the Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.16 references the benefits of landscape restoration (which typically includes pest control) as part of appropriate future development for a number of the landuse typologies evaluated.	Reject submission.
OS177.55	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the rating for physical values for the priority area from 'high' to 'moderate', include reference to the 'working character/lifestyle development' within the priority area and to remove reference to 'mana whenua features'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree consider that the text change requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [72] is appropriate. I also note that geomorphology and ecology experts support the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS177.56	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the associative values of the priority area from 'high' to 'moderate'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree consider that the text change requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [73] is appropriate. I also note that heritage and tourism/recreation experts support the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.57	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 73 to include a point on 'the lifestyle opportunities within the area' as an associative values of the priority area.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [72] 'new' (d) are appropriate.</p> <p>While there may be opportunities for rural living within the PA (as acknowledged in the Capacity section), I do not consider that this is a particularly noteworthy existing characteristic for which the PA is valued.</p>	Reject submission.
OS177.58	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the perceptual value rating of the priority area from 'high' to 'moderate'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not agree consider that the text change requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [74] is appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.
OS177.59	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 74(c) to change the perception of naturalness from 'high' to 'moderate', replace the words 'dominance of' with 'contrast of' in regard to landscape elements in the schedule and to include reference to the 'working rural/lifestyle land uses' taking place.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 [74] (c) are appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.60	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 74(d) from the landscape schedule.	Amend Schedule 21.22.16 [74] (d) as follows:  A strong sense of remoteness and/or wildness across <u>much of the PA. Such feelings are reduced in the parts of the PA where forestry, rural living, farm dwellings and sheds and the Crown Range Road are located.</u>	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS177.61	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity of commercial recreational activities in the priority area from 'very limited to 'some', replace the words 'optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of' with 'integrate with', replace the word 'protects' with provide for and include the words 'where appropriate' regarding commercial recreational activities.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity (i) in relation to Commercial Recreation Activities are appropriate.  In my opinion, the steep, elevated and visually prominent nature of the majority of the PA steers towards a conservative capacity rating for this landuse.	Reject submission.
OS177.62	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the capacity rating for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities from 'very limited' to 'some', replace the words 'low lying locations' with 'visually recessive locations', replace the word 'or' with 'and', remove reference to 'of a modest scale' and to remove 'No	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity (ii) in relation to Tourism Related Activities (i.e. resorts) are appropriate.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>landscape capacity for tourism related activities'.</p>	<p>In my opinion, the steep, elevated and visually prominent nature of the majority of the PA steers towards a conservative capacity rating for these landuses.</p> <p>It is also noted that the Schedule 21.22.16 Preamble acknowledges that capacity ratings relate to the PA as a whole, rather than a site-specific level, and that detailed landscape assessment as part of the plan change or resource consent application may identify a different capacity rating.</p> <p>However, in considering this submission point, I consider that some refinement of the capacity descriptive comments would be beneficial (noting that some of these suggested changes align with the submitter's changes) and recommend the following amendments to 21.22.16 Capacity (ii) as follows:</p> <p><b>i. Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – very limited</b> landscape capacity for visitor accommodation in low lying locations and clustered with existing buildings, that <del>is of a modest</del> <b>small</b> scale; have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; <del>and enhance public access, and protects the area's ONE values.</del> <b>No</b> landscape capacity for tourism related activities.</p>	
OS177.63	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	<p>That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the capacity rating for earthworks from 'very limited' to 'some' and include capacity for 'mitigation and landscaping associated with future subdivision and development'.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity (v) Earthworks are appropriate due to the steep, elevated and visually prominent nature of the majority of the PA.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.64	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the capacity rating for farm buildings from 'very limited' to 'some', remove reference of such buildings being 'modestly scaled' and to include the words 'and assist the functioning of the farming practice'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity (vi) Farm Buildings are appropriate due to the steep, elevated and visually prominent nature of the majority of the PA and the cluster of existing farm buildings on the flatter land in New Chums Gully.	Reject submission.
OS177.65	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the capacity rating for transport infrastructure from 'very limited' to 'limited', include reference for such activities to 'provide enhanced access opportunities' and to replace the word 'protect' with 'are consistent with' the areas Outstanding Natural Feature values.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity for Transport Infrastructure are appropriate due to the steep, elevated and visually prominent nature of the majority of the PA.  However I note that this item has been numbered incorrectly and recommend it is changed to (viii) with a consequential amendment to the numbering of the subsequent schedule items.	Reject submission.
OS177.66	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the capacity rating for rural living from 'very limited' to 'some', replace the words 'low lying locations' with 'visually recessive locations', replace the word 'and' with 'or', remove reference to	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area for the PA Schedules (including field work), along with work in relation to the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, RM 000505, and PDP Chapter 24 appeals, I do not consider that the text changes requested to Schedule 21.22.16 Capacity (ii) in relation to Visitor Accommodation and Tourism Related Activities (i.e. resorts) are appropriate.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>such activities being 'of a modest scale', replace the words 'protects' with 'is consistent with', and to include reference to such activities having capacity 'where appropriate'.</p>	<p>In coming to my PA level capacity conclusions on this landuse, I note that an 80ha minimum lot size applies to the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone on the Crown Terrace (outside the PA) and that no appeals were lodged seeking a change to this lot size across the Crown Terrace as part of the PDP Chapter 24 Appeals. In my opinion, this suggests community support for a relatively restrictive approach to rural living land near the PA. I also note that all of the landscape experts involved in the Topic 30 Appeal, agreed that the Crown Terrace (known as LCU20 and corresponds to the balance of the Crown Terrace outside of the PA ONL) had a 'very low' capacity to absorb rural living development change (with 'very low' corresponding to the lowest rating on the seven-point scale applied in Chapter 24).</p> <p>However, in considering this submission point, I consider that some refinement of the capacity descriptive comments would be beneficial (noting that some of these suggested changes align with the submitter's changes) and recommend the following amendments to 21.22.16 Capacity (xi) as follows:</p> <p><b>Rural living – very limited</b> landscape capacity for rural living in low lying locations and clustered with existing buildings, that is: of a <del>modest scale;</del> <b>have a small scale and</b> low-key rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement; <b>and</b> enhances public access <del>;</del> <b>and protects the area's ONF values.</b></p>	

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS177.67	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at the general description section to include the words 'more modified'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  The level of modification referenced in a Schedule of Landscape Values is most appropriately discussed under Naturalness attributes and values (and to a degree, Physical Attributes and values) rather than in the General Description of the Area, which is simply a scene setting paragraph outlining the general location and extent of the PA.	Reject submission.
OS188.42	Elisha Young-Ebert	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin paragraph 46 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Addressed in response to OS 77.42.	Accept submission.