

21.22.15 PA ONL Central Whakatipu Basin: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

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

Physical Attributes and Values

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

Important landforms and land types:

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

Important hydrological features:

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

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

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

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

Commented [BG1]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG2]: Typographical correction.

Important land-use patterns and features:

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

Commented [BG3]: OS 165.26 NZSki Limited.

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

Commented [BG5]: OS 165.27 NZSki Limited.

Commented [BG6]: OS 165.28 NZSki Limited.

Commented [BG7]: OS 165.28 NZSki Limited.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations are:

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

Mana whenua features and their locations:

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

Associative Attributes and Values

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

Mana whenua associations and experience:

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

Important historic attributes and values:

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

Commented [BG8]: OS 165.30 NZSki Limited.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

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

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

Commented [BG9]: OS 165.31 NZSki Ltd.

Important recreation attributes and values:

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

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

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

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

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

Particularly important views to and from the area:

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

Commented [BG10]: OS 165.31 NZSki Ltd.

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

Commented [BG11]: OS 165.33 NZSki Ltd.

Naturalness attributes and values:

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

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

Commented [BG13]: OS 165.31 NZSki Ltd.

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

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

Memorability attributes and values:

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

Commented [BG14]: OS 165.31 NZSki Ltd.

Transient attributes and values:

72. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain slopes.
73. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with exotic vegetation.
74. Night lighting of the ski field during winter months.

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

75. A strong sense of remoteness across the northern slopes at the western end of the PA and at the north-eastern ends of the PA despite their respective proximity to Arthurs Point and Arrowtown, due to the contained nature of the area and the limited level of built development evident.
76. A sense of wildness across much of the PA as a consequence of the large scale and continuity of the majestic mountain range framing the northern side of the basin along with its generally 'undeveloped' and in places, seemingly unkempt character. The contrast with the 'settled' and more manicured character of the basin plays an important role in this regard. Such feelings are lesser in the parts of the PA where forestry and the ski field/access road are located and across the lower southern slopes of Mount Dewar where rural living and visitor accommodation development is consented.

Commented [BG15]: OS 84.8 Sir Robert Stewart.
OS 96.6 Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership.
OS 96.7 Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership.

Commented [BG16]: OS 84.8 Sir Robert Stewart.
OS 96.3 Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership.
OS 96.4 Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership.

Aesthetic qualities and values:

77. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
78. More specifically:
 - a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the continuous 'wall' of rugged and dramatic mountains framing the northern side of the Whakatipu Basin.

- b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
- i. The large scale and dramatic character of the steep mountain landforms backdropping Arthurs Point and Arrowtown.
 - ii. The precipitous bluffs and rocky outcrops along the east side of the small ice-melt basin in the vicinity of Littles Road.
 - iii. The everchanging play of light and weather patterns across the mountain slopes.
 - iv. The openness of the mountain landforms and scree slopes.
 - v. The rugged and wild character of the western and north-eastern ends of the PA.
 - vi. The confinement of appreciably visible built development to the Coronet Peak Ski Area Field and its access road.

Commented [BG17]: OS 165.31 NZSki Ltd.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

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

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

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

79. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
80. **Very high associative values** relating to:
- a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
 - b. The historic features in the area.
 - c. The very strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
 - d. The significant recreational attributes of Coronet Peak Ski Field, Skippers Road and the network of walking and biking tracks in the area.
 - e. The scenic values associated with Coronet Peak Road.
81. **High perceptual values** relating to:
- a. The high legibility and expressive values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
 - b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area due to its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Arthurs Point, Arrowtown, the Whakatipu Basin, the scenic route of Malaghans Road, parts of the Queenstown Trail network, the Remarkables Ski Area Field Access Road, the Zig Zag lookout, and Tobins Track, along with the areas' transient values, play an important role.
 - c. A moderate-high to high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of natural landscape elements and patterns across the PA.

Commented [BG18]: OS 165.31 NZSki Ltd.

- d. A strong sense of remoteness and wildness throughout the north facing slopes at the western end and the north-eastern portions of the PA.

Commented [BG19]: OS 96.9 Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership.

Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – limited some landscape capacity for small scale and low key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** – **no** landscape capacity for tourism related activities. **Very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are: co-located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest-scale small scale and have a 'low key' rural character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks** – **very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farming, existing recreational facilities, consented rural living and visitor accommodation development, or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with natural landform patterns. Some landscape capacity for earthworks associated with the Coronet Peak Ski Area that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses **very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction** – **no** landscape capacity.
- i. **Transport infrastructure** – **very limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement ; and protects the area's ONL values. Limited landscape capacity for transport infrastructure associated with Coronet Peak Ski Area provided it is positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, is located and designed to be recessive in the landscape and protect the area's ONL values. **No** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.
- viii. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- ix. **Renewable energy generation** – **no** landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy developments. **Very limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- x. **Production Forestry** – **no** landscape capacity.

Commented [BG20]: OS 165.37 NZSki Ltd.

Commented [BG21]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG22]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG23]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
OS 165.37 NZSki Limited.

Commented [BG24]: OS 167.7 Chilcotin Holdings Limited.

Commented [BG25]: OS 96.11 Treespace No. 1 Limited Partnership.
OS 167.8 Chilcotin Holdings Limited.
OS 172.14 Arthurs Point Trustees Limited.

Commented [BG26]: OS 165.39 NZSki Ltd.

Commented [BG27]: Roman numeral numbering correction required (and subsequent numbering correction for the subsequent capacity items).

Commented [BG28]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG29]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG30]: OS 165.40 NZSki Ltd.

Commented [BG31]: OS 70.29 Transpower New Zealand Limited.

Commented [BG32]: OS 96.12 Treespace No. 1 Limited Partnership.
OS 165.42 NZSki Ltd.

Commented [BG33]: Typographical correction.

- xi. **Rural living – very limited to no** landscape capacity. Where such development is appropriate, it is likely to be: co located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access (where appropriate).

Commented [BG34]: OS 96.13 Treespace No. 1 Limited Partnership.
OS 167.6 Chilcotin Holdings Limited.
OS 174.14 Redemption Song LLC.
OS 168.1 Lily Manners Wood.
OS 167.6 Chilcotin Holdings Ltd.

21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONF Schedule”. New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text: relates to a submission point that has not been captured in the “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONF Schedule”. This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments or is repeated by numerous submissions. **Sixty examples identified.**

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS16.2	Richard and Lindsay Macharg	Support	That the landscape within the Whakatipu basin is protected.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS16.3	Richard and Lindsay Macharg	Oppose	That the boundary of landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River be amended at the swerve of the boundary around Ben Lomond Station and its associated development.	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS37.2	Ed Cruikshank On Behalf Of Ed and Tonya Cruikshank	Support	That 21.22.15 be amended to ensure the Whakatipu Basin is protected.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS37.3	Ed Cruikshank On Behalf Of Ed and Tonya Cruikshank	Oppose	That the outstanding natural landscape boundary at the south western corner of landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Basin be amended as they are illogical and display various inconsistencies.		
OS37.4	Ed Cruikshank On Behalf Of Ed and Tonya Cruikshank	Oppose	That the boundary of landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be amended at Ben Lomond Station and its associated development.	Addressed in response to OS 37.3.	Reject submission.
OS37.5	Ed Cruikshank On Behalf Of Ed and Tonya Cruikshank	Oppose	That the boundary of landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be amended around Tremain House above Tremain's Corner.	Addressed in response to OS 37.3.	Reject submission.
OS37.6	Ed Cruikshank On Behalf Of Ed and Tonya Cruikshank	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be amended around Bordeau's Store, accommodation and ancillary buildings.	Addressed in response to OS 37.3.	Reject submission.
OS37.7	Ed Cruikshank On Behalf Of Ed and Tonya Cruikshank	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be amended before the adoption of the proposed landscape values in landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin.	Addressed in response to OS 37.3.	Reject submission.
OS45.3	Natalie Reeves	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required other than to note the relatively minor Schedule 21.22.15 text changes recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.15 (July 2023).	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS69.3	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS69.6	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS69.9	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS70.29	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point viii utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 Capacity (ix) as follows: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. <u>In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.</u>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS71.3	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS71.6	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS71.9	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS72.3	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS72.6	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS72.9	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS83.3	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS83.6	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS83.9	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS84.7	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that it fails to recognise that outstanding natural landscape, outstanding natural feature and rural character landscape categories only apply to rural zoned landscapes as stated in Policy 6.3.1.1 rural landscape categorisation. Policy 6.3.1.2 also states that the exclusion of areas identified as Ski Area Sub-Zones. It is further reinforced in the Strategic Direction Provision 3.1B.5 which	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report. Schedule 21.22.15 has been drafted to acknowledge the important role that the Ski Area Subzone plays in shaping the landscape values of the PA. For example see [28], [48], [56], [61],[67], [70], [71], [74].	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			explicitly states that these categories do not apply to Ski Area Sub-Zones. It is submitted that the Ski Area Sub Zone cannot be part of the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin and should be made clear in the mapping of the priority areas.		
OS84.8	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that it fails to account for approved resource consents on the southern portion of the landscape priority area which is a highly modified landscape and therefore has very low naturalness and is highly influenced by human activities. The southern slopes of Mount Dewar are more modified than the eastern slopes and therefore has a much greater capacity to absorb development relevant to Arthurs Point. There are site specific situations where the landscape does have capacity to absorb development through placement and recessive design.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.15 as follows:</p> <p>[21] Built development patterning which includes a very limited scattering of rural and rural living dwellings around the margins of Arthurs Point; the scattering of small-scale rural living and visitor accommodation development (including commercial recreation uses, cabins, chalets, amenity facilities and a lodge) within regenerating beech forest at across the lower southern slopes of Mount Dewar along with approximately 50km of publicly accessible hiking and biking trails; and the occasional farm building or dwelling towards the eastern end of the unit (adjacent the southern boundary of the PA). Generally, development is characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings that are well integrated by plantings and remain subservient to the more 'natural' landscape patterns. Elsewhere, the modest scale of buildings, together with their distinctly working rural character and sparse arrangement, ensures that they sit comfortably into the setting.</p> <p>[65] The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL set within an urban (Arthurs Point and Arrowtown) or mixed working rural and rural living (Whakatipu Basin) context, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to its forestry, pastoral (including farm buildings, rural dwellings, ponds, fencing, tracks, shelterbelts and the like), rural living/visitor accommodation (including the consented development across the lower southern slopes of Mount</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p><u>Dewar</u>), recreational <u>(including the ski area and access road)</u>, and infrastructure uses are visible, the sheer scale of the continuous high mountain-scape <u>and extent of restoration planting that forms part of the consented development at Mount Dewar</u> ensures that, for the most part, these elements remain subservient to more natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes.</p> <p>[75] A strong sense of remoteness <u>across the northern slopes</u> at the western end <u>of the PA</u> and <u>at the</u> north-eastern ends of the PA despite their respective proximity to Arthurs Point and Arrowtown, due to the contained nature of the area and the limited level of built development evident.</p> <p>[76] A sense of wildness across much of the PA as a consequence of the large scale and continuity of the majestic mountain range framing the northern side of the basin along with its generally 'undeveloped' and in places, seemingly unkempt character. The contrast with the 'settled' and more manicured character of the basin plays an important role in this regard. Such feelings are lesser in the parts of the PA where forestry and the ski field/access road are located <u>and across the lower southern slopes of Mount Dewar where rural living and visitor accommodation development is consented.</u></p>	
OS84.9	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that it incorrectly states at [18] that there are 'important ecological features and vegetation types' and lists features that do not have ecological importance such as wilding conifer spread.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the PA ONL (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>However, it is agreed that as currently drafted the Schedules are potentially confusing in this regard as these aspects of the landscape are negative rather than positive.</p> <p>A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter.</p>	
OS84.10	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [19] under the heading 'important ecological features and vegetation types' the schedule lists animal pest species, which are not relevant to important ecological features and vegetation types.	Addressed in response to OS 84.9.	Accept submission in part.
OS84.11	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [36] under the heading 'important archaeological and heritage features and their locations' the schedule incorrectly lists Coronet Peak Ski Area which is not an important archaeological or heritage feature.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Coronet Peak was New Zealand's first commercial ski resort (1947) and for this reason was considered noteworthy under this part of Schedule 21.22.15. It is also noted that the notified version of Schedule 21.22.15 was reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the text in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS84.12	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [36] there is no mention of the Bordeaux's Store being a	<p>Bordeaux's Store is outside the mapped extent of the PA ONL.</p> <p>While this information is not disputed, it is not appropriate to include reference to heritage features that are outside the PA ONL unless they play a noteworthy role in the shaping the landscape character and values of the PA. I note that the</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			category 2 heritage listed item (item 57) in the Proposed District Plan Chapter 26 Historic Heritage list. There is also no mention of the 'ruins' located on Part Lot 2 DP16632 which contains heritage items and values. It is submitted that within the vicinity of this priority area there are sites which hold heritage values and room for restoring such buildings should be allowed for.	notified version of Schedule 21.22.15 was reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the existing text in this regard.	
OS84.13	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the relationship between mana whenua associations, Wāhi Tūpuna Chapter and consultation with mana whenua for applications be clarified in the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS84.14	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [65] under the heading 'naturalness attributes and values' the schedule incorrectly states that the Central Whakatipu Basin priority area set within an urban or mixed working rural and rural living context	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submitter appears to disagree that the PA conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness as a consequence of the development consented across the lower reaches of Mount Dewar. It is my understanding that the Mount Dewar development requires extensive landscape restoration well in advance of development construction to ensure the development protects the landscape values of the area, including naturalness values. (For example, much of the planting needs to have reached 3m to 8m height before buildings can be constructed, similar to the approach adopted	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			'conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness'.	by the Environment Court in <i>Upper Clutha Tracks</i> - the Parkins Bay decision.) For these reasons, I consider that the development that has been consented on the southern slopes of Mount Dewar is intended to maintain the existing naturalness values of the area, and the text in Schedule 21.22.15 is appropriate.	
OS84.15	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sir Robert Stewart	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [xii] landscape capacity it is stated that rural living has 'no capacity'. In this case there may be capacity on specific sites relative to scale of rural living activities proposed. It is submitted that it be made clear that the landscape capacity schedules are at a landscape character unit rather than a site specific level.	Addressed in response to OS 96.13 and OS 167.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS87.3	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS87.6	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			no capacity for urban expansion.		
OS87.9	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS92.3	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS92.6	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS92.9	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS96.1	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended in accordance with the points of relief included in this submission.	Schedule 21.22.15 has been amended where the changes are supported from an expert perspective.	Accept submission in part.
OS96.2	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to give more consideration to the landscape related	I have read the RM181638 Decision. Schedule 21.22.15 has been amended where the changes are supported from an expert perspective.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Limited Partnership		observations that were made by commissioners in terms of RM181638.		
OS96.3	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 21 to remove the words 'the scattering of small scale development within regenerating beach forest at Mount Dewar' with 'the scattering of future visitor accommodation and rural living development within regenerating beach forest on Mount Dewar includes cabins, chalets, amenity facilities and a lodge'.	Addressed in response to OS 84.8.	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS96.4	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 65 to remove the working 'The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL set within an urban (Arthurs Point and Arrowtown) or mixed working rural and rural living (Whakatipu Basin) context, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness.' with 'The sporadic development of Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL contrasts within an urban (Arthurs Point and	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I do not agree with the text changes requested.</p> <p>In my opinion, the consented development on the Treespace expressly seeks to enhance naturalness values via the large scale and comprehensive landscape restoration that forms part of the consented development. I also understand that this was an aspect of the development that played a major role in the Commissioner's approval of the consent both in terms of the landscape enhancement that it affords and the high degree of visual mitigation it will provide for future built development. For these reasons, I consider that the consented development at</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Arrowtown) or mixed working rural and rural living (Whakatipu Basin) context. Since the nodes of development are confined, the remaining mountain slopes convey a relatively high perception of naturalness.'	Mount Dewar aligns reasonably well with an overall description of the PA as being 'seemingly undeveloped', not that this comment is made by reference to the immediately adjacent urban environment. However, I consider that Schedule 21.22.15 [65] would benefit from some amendment as outlined in response to OS 84.8.	
OS96.5	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 69 to replace the words 'wall of mountains' with 'mountain slopes', to make addition to the paragraph with 'with hummocky tops and secluded valleys in the hinterland', and to replace the words 'the juxtaposition of the' with 'These front faces form a'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I do not agree with the text changes requested.	Reject submission.
OS96.6	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be amended at paragraph 75 to remove the words 'A strong sense of remoteness at the western and north-eastern ends of the PA despite their respective proximity to Arthurs Point and Arrowtown, due to the contained nature of the area and the limited level of built development evident.'	Addressed in response to OS 84.8.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS96.7	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be amended at paragraph 76 to replace the paragraph with 'Due the the large scale and continuity of the majestic mountain range framing the northern side side of the basin, the PA contrasts with the 'settled' and more manicured character of the basin. Due to the relatively easy access, presence of a ski field and forestry, as well as visual connection to the settled basin landscape feelings of wildness are limited in this PA'.	Addressed in response to OS 84.8.	Accept submission in part.
OS96.8	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 be amended to replace the paragraph 81 c with the words 'A moderate-high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of natural landscape elements and patterns in parts of the PA that are not affected by forestry and tourism development.'	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I do not agree with the text changes requested.	Reject submission.
OS96.9	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 be amended at the paragraph 81 d to remove the word 'strong' and to replace the words 'throughout the western and	Amend Schedule [81](d) as follows: A strong sense of remoteness and wildness throughout the north facing slopes at the western end and the north-eastern portions of the PA.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			north-eastern portions of the PA.' with 'can be experienced in the hinterland of the PA'.		
OS96.10	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	<p>That the landscape schedule 21.22.15ii Central Whakatipu Basin landscape capacity assessment is amended in the following way:</p> <p>Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – Limited no landscape capacity for tourism related activities and Very Limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are: co-located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale and have a 'low key' rural alpine character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values.</p> <p>That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin landscape capacity assessment for visitor</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I do not consider that the PA has capacity for tourism development (defined as 'resorts' in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22.15).</p> <p>I also consider that the capacity for visitor accommodation activities is appropriately rated as 'very limited' for the Central Whakatipu Basin PA ONL given the level of existing and consented development across the area. I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that capacity ratings are assessed at a PA level and that site specific landscape assessments would be required as part of future resource consent or plan change applications that may identify varying landscape (values and) capacities, which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			accommodation and tourism related activities from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity for tourism related activities, and to change the landscape capacity for visitor accommodation from very limited to limited capacity.		
OS96.11	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin landscape capacity for earthworks is amended to change the capacity from very limited to limited and to include 'built development' and 'and tourism related activities' into the capacity assessment.	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 Capacity (v) as follows: Earthworks – very limited landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farming, existing recreational facilities, consented rural living and visitor accommodation development or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with natural landform patterns.	Accept submission in part.
OS96.12	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin landscape capacity for renewable energy generation is amended to include the words ' for large scale commercial renewable energy generation; limited landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale community renewable energy generation that is not visible within the Whakatipu Basin. Small scale is defined as being the supply of renewable energy to 100 residential dwellings or less.'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 Capacity (ix) as follows: Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy developments. Very limited landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS96.13	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Treespace No.1 Limited Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin landscape capacity for rural living is amended from no to very limited capacity and the add the words 'where such activities are co-located with existing rural living development, sited to optimize the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale and have a 'low key' alpine character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values; otherwise there is no landscape capacity for rural living.'	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 Capacity (xii) as follows: Rural living - very limited to no landscape capacity. Where such development is appropriate, it is likely to be: co located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access (where appropriate). For completeness, relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I consider that a rating of no landscape capacity is appropriate for: tourism related activities, urban expansion, intensive agriculture mineral activities, commercial scale renewable energy generation and production forestry.	
OS107.3	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS107.6	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			no capacity for urban expansion.		
OS107.9	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS108.1	Tim Williams On Behalf Of Cameron Laird	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to exclude the properties 1 Venus Place (Lot 7 DP 559049) and 10 Venus Place (Lot 1 DP 308109).	ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS112.3	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS112.6	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS112.9	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS119.3	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Mountain Bike Club		Basin is opposed and should be rejected as notified.		
OS119.8	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified as it fails to recognise that outstanding natural landscape, outstanding natural feature, and rural character landscapes only apply to Rural Zoned landscapes. it is submitted that the Coronet Ski Area Sub Zone cannot be part of the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 84.7.	Reject submission.
OS119.9	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [ii] landscape capacity it is stated that tourism activities have no capacity. It is submitted that landscape capacity schedules are at a landscape character unit level rather than a site specific level.	Addressed in response to OS 96.10.	Reject submission.
OS119.10	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that tourism activities should be defined within Chapter 2 of the Proposed District Plan or clarified within the landscape schedule as it relates to	It is recommended that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 is amended to clarify that tourism related activities is defined as resort development. Refer Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble (July 2023).	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			resort development and not tourism activities as a whole.		
OS119.11	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that the wording at [ii] landscape capacity for earthworks associated with public access tracks such as the mountain bike trails the submitter builds and maintains that protect the naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing landform patterns is incorrect. It is uncertain how mountain bike tracks protect the naturalness and expressiveness of the attributes and values of the landscape. These words should be removed from this section.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>In my experience, public access tracks (and farm tracks) can protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values via the careful use of following 'design tools' such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligning the track to follow the landform. Configuring any mitigation and/or enhancement planting associated with the track to reinforce more natural landform patterns (such as steep slopes or gullies) so that it reinforces the formative processes of the landscape. Locating the track to minimise (or avoid) retaining structures. Where retaining structures are unavoidable, designing such structures to be of an appropriate materiality and integrated by locally appropriate plantings. Avoiding urban style 'furniture' and infrastructure (such as lighting, stormwater management devices) associated with the track. <p>It is acknowledged that not all of the design tools will be relevant in every situation. However, the reference to naturalness and expressiveness values serves to cue careful consideration of these sorts of design tools, which is considered appropriate within a RMA s6(b) context.</p>	Reject submission.
OS122.3	J Semple	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is supported as notified and should be adopted as a matter of priority and importance.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS122.6	J Semple	Support	That the landscape capacity rating for urban expansions or urban development in landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin being no capacity is supported.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.9	J Semple	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure such as bridges or crossings of the Shotover River in the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin should be amended to have no capacity for such activities.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Bridges as a landuse activity are likely to be 'captured' via other transport infrastructure or regionally significant infrastructure in Schedule 21.22.15. The former has a rating of very limited landscape capacity for trails, suggesting a very limited rating for bridges associated with trails. The latter has a rating of limited landscape capacity, which is considered appropriate given the wider public benefit that is associated with such infrastructure.	Reject submission.
OS122.12	J Semple	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is adopted in the Proposed District Plan to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.15	J Semple	Oppose	That the values of the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin are appropriately recorded so that those values can be considered in any future resource consent application or plan changes.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.18	J Semple	Oppose	That the land included within the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is ultimately protected from inappropriate	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			subdivision, use, and development.		
OS122.21	J Semple	Oppose	That any consequential amendments or refinements to the provisions of the Proposed District Plan and/or landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin to better achieve the purpose of sustainable management, and the protection of the Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape is adopted.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS131.3	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS131.6	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS131.9	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS136.3	Barbara Lusk	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Basin be retained as notified.		
OS136.6	Barbara Lusk	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS150.3	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS150.6	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS150.9	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS165.26	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.14 paragraph 20 be amended to include structures, infrastructure and associated earthworks as follows: ...south facing slopes of Coronet Peak where the ski area (inclusive of carparks, buildings, structures, infrastructure, roading (including Skippers Road, which provides access	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 [20] as follows: Human modification which is concentrated throughout the low-lying glacier carved terrace areas along the northern edge of the Whakatipu Basin; on the western flanks of Mount Dewar and across the south-facing slopes of the secondary mountain ridgeline on the south side of Bush Creek (to the north of Millbrook) that includes Pt 897, Pt 929, Pt 842, and Pt 876 where production forestry dominates; across Mount Dewar more generally, where development is anticipated; on the elevated south-facing slopes of Coronet Peak where the ski area field (including carparks, buildings, structures,	Accept submission (subject to minor refinement).

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			to the Skippers Bungy site, outside the PA) and associated earthworks are located;... .	infrastructure) and roading (including Skippers Road, which provides access to the Skippers Bungy site, outside the PA) is located; and throughout the western portion of the PA at Coronet Peak Road.	
OS165.27	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Important land-use patterns and features paragraph 23 be amended to add the bracketed words to read: Coronet Ski Area (inclusive of all associated activities and development).	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 [23] as follows: The location of the Coronet Peak Ski Field Area (inclusive of all associated activities and built development) across the elevated south-facing slopes, together with the exposed nature of the access road climbing up the steep slopes at the western end of the area, make this development prominent in views from much of the western and northern portion of the Whakatipu Basin. Night-time lighting of the ski field during the winter season adds to its prominence.	Accept submission (subject to minor refinement).
OS165.28	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Important land-use patterns and features at paragraph 26 be amended to read: Infrastructure is evident within the corridor and includes: electricity and communication systems traversing the steep slopes up to Coronet Ski Area and Coronet Peak; telecommunication masts at the top of Mount Dewar; other ski area infrastructure, forestry tracks; farm fencing; and farm tracks.	Amend Schedule 21.22.15[26] as follows: Infrastructure is evident within the corridor and includes: the power line (on poles) traversing the steep slopes up to Coronet Ski Area and Coronet Peak Field ; telecommunication masts at the top of Mount Dewar; forestry tracks; farm fencing; and farm tracks.	Accept submission.
OS165.29	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Important land-use patterns and features at paragraph 28 be amended to delete the description of ski field related activities and read: The Coronet Peak Ski	Amend Schedule 21.22.15[28] as follows: The Coronet Peak Ski Area Sub Zone which provides for the ongoing use and development of that area for ski field related activities .	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Area Sub Zone which provides for the ongoing use and development of that area.		
OS165.30	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Important historic attributes and values at paragraph 41 be amended from one of the earliest to the first commercial ski field in New Zealand, so that it reads: The historic significance of Coronet Peak (New Zealand's first commercial ski field).	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 [41] as follows: The historic significance of Coronet Peak (New Zealand's first commercial ski field) as one of New Zealand's earliest commercial ski fields.	Accept submission.
OS165.31	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 be amended to change references from ski field to ski area at paragraph 44, 56, 67, 71, 78.vi, and 81.b.	Amend Schedule 21.22.15 as follows: [44] The identity of Coronet Peak Ski Area Field as an integral part of the Whakatipu Basin. The very close proximity of this recreational feature to Queenstown urban area and its visibility from much of the Whakatipu Basin (and including from the airport, particularly at night when the ski field is lit for night skiing) play an important a role. [56] The postcard views from various lookouts on Coronet Peak Road and the ski area field-out over the Whakatipu Basin, Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes), Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), the Remarkables and the broader mountain context. [67] While the ski area field and its access road form a bold manmade element on the southern slopes of Mount Dewar and Coronet Peak, the connection this development establishes and enables between the mountain setting and the inhabited Whakatipu Valley adds a degree of interest to the view, meaning that it is not an overwhelmingly negative visual element. The scale of the seemingly 'undeveloped' mountain setting within which this development is viewed, together with its identity as a popular recreational feature,	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>also play a role in this regard. Because these landscape modifications also make an important contribution to Queenstown’s recreational values (see above), there is a degree of landscape ‘fit’ associated with them. During the ski season the patterning of lights throughout the groomed slopes forms an engaging element.</p> <p>[71] The panoramic alpine landscape views afforded from Mount Dewar, Coronet Peak Road, Coronet Peak Ski Area Field and Coronet Peak.</p> <p>[78](b)(vi) The confinement of appreciably visible built development to the Coronet Peak Ski Area Field and its access road.</p> <p>[81](b) The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area due to its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Arthurs Point, Arrowtown, the Whakatipu Basin, the scenic route of Malaghans Road, parts of the Queenstown Trail network, the Remarkables Ski Area Field Access Road, the Zig Zag lookout, and Tobins Track, along with the area’s transient values, play an important role.</p>	
OS165.32	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Important recreation attributes and values at paragraph 48 be amended to include general reference to outdoor recreation and read: Very popular year-round destination for outdoor recreation including skiing, walking, mountain biking, paragliding, hiking and enjoying the view from the various lookouts and café/restaurant facilities at Coronet Peak.	This text change is not considered necessary.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS165.33	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Particularly important view to and from the area at paragraph 61 be amended to add the word particularly so that it reads: The engaging and early evening views from Frankton and the airport to the Coronet Peak Ski Area particularly when the ski field is lit for night skiing.	Amend Schedule 21.22.15[61] as follows: The engaging early evening views from Frankton and the airport to the Coronet Peak Ski Area Field when the ski field is lit for night skiing.	Accept submission.
OS165.34	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Naturalness attributes and values at paragraph 67 be amended to remove the words 'During the ski season' from the last sentence so that it reads: The patterning of lights throughout the groomed slopes forms an engaging element.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point explaining why deletion of reference to the ski season is considered appropriate. This text change is not considered necessary, however the submitter is encouraged to provide evidence as to why this text change might be appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS165.35	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Transient attributes and values be amended to make clear it is referencing Coronet Peak Ski area and delete 'during winter months' so that it reads: Night lighting of the Coronet Peak ski area.	Addressed in response to OS 165.34.	Reject submission.
OS165.36	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Very high associative values at paragraph 80.d. include the	The descriptor 'strong' is not considered necessary, where the term 'significant' is used.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			words 'very strong' so that it reads: The very strong and significant recreational attributes of Coronet Peak Ski Area, Skippers Road and the network of walking and biking tracks in the area.		
OS165.37	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.15.i Commercial recreational activities be amended from limited to some capacity, delete the word existing, add the word activities, remove and delete the words 'and protects the area's ONL values' so that it reads: some landscape capacity for activities that integrate with and complement/enhance recreation features and activities; ...; and enhance public access.	<p>No expert evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>I acknowledge that recreation activities are an important feature of the area. For these reasons it is recommended that the rating for commercial recreation activities is amended from limited to some landscape capacity.</p> <p>Amend 21.22.15 Capacity (i) as follows:</p> <p>Commercial recreational activities – limited some landscape capacity for activities that integrate with, and complement/enhance, existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS165.38	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.15.ii Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended from no landscape capacity for tourism related activities to some, amend from very limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation to some and delete the words 'and	Addressed in response to OS 96.10 and OS 165.37 (protect ONL values).	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			protects the area's ONL values'.		
OS165.39	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.15.v. Earthworks be amended from very limited to some landscape capacity, include for association with Coronet Peak Ski Area, delete the word existing from recreational facilities, and delete the words protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values so that it reads: Earthworks - some landscape capacity for earthworks associated with the Coronet Peak Ski Area, farming, recreational facilities, or public access tracks that are sympathetically designed to integrate with natural landform patterns.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I consider the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.15 5 Capacity (v) are appropriate as follows:</p> <p>Earthworks – very limited landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farming, existing recreational facilities, or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with natural landform patterns. Some landscape capacity for earthworks associated with the Coronet Peak Ski Area that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS165.40	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.15.i Transport infrastructure be amended from very limited to some landscape capacity, include infrastructure transport associated with Coronet Peak Ski Area, delete the words 'and protect the area's ONF values', and delete no landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure, so that it reads: Transport	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I consider the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.15 5 Capacity Transport Infrastructure appropriate as follows:</p> <p>(viii) Transport infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing</p>	Accept submission in part. (NB consequential numbering correction to Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.15)

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>infrastructure - some landscape capacity for infrastructure associated with the Coronet Peak Ski Area; and trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement.</p>	<p>networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONF values. Limited landscape capacity for transport infrastructure associated with Coronet Peak Ski Area provided it is positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, is located and designed to be recessive in the landscape and protect the area's ONL values. No landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.</p>	
OS165.41	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	<p>That landscape capacity 21.22.15.viii Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended from limited to some landscape capacity, add reference to association with Coronet Peak Ski Area and add the words 'reasonably practicable' in reference to being designed and located, so that it reads: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure - some landscape capacity for infrastructure that is associated with Coronet Peak Ski area, or is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located as reasonably practicable so that they are not visually</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I consider that a rating of limited rather than some landscape capacity is appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure.		
OS165.42	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of NZSki Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.15.ix. Renewable energy generation be amended from no landscape capacity to some landscape capacity with the addition of small and community scale so that it reads: Renewable energy - some landscape capacity for small and community scale renewable energy generation.	Addressed in response to OS 96.12.	Accept submission in part.
OS167.1	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that the landscape schedules do not preclude future development. Site-specific landscape assessments should be given more weight than the schedules.	The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that site specific landscape assessments will be required for resource consent and plan change applications. The question of weighting is addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS167.2	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin landscape capacity section is amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority areas.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin appeals, Peer Review of resource consent applications in the wider area (including site visits to Arthurs Point), and review of the RM181638 Decision, I consider that the capacity ratings as shown in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.15 are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS167.3	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that it is clear that the capacity for development identified on the schedules is not to be applied or interpreted at a site-specific level.	The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that landscape capacity is evaluated at a PA level within the Schedule and that site specific landscape assessments will be required for resource consent and plan change applications.	Reject submission.
OS167.4	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to clarify that construction within existing building platforms, variations to building platforms and consented development is not restricted by the landscape schedule.	It is recommended that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 is amended to explain that the Schedules do not apply to permitted activities. This may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard. For completeness, it is not considered appropriate that variations to existing platforms or consented development should be exempted from the Schedules.	Accept submission in part.
OS167.5	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to clarify that variations to existing building platforms should not be precluded by the schedule and instead be assessed on their individual merits.	Addressed in response to OS 167.3 and OS 167.4.	Reject submission.
OS167.6	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to add text to ensure that rural living and farming-related activities are not precluded by the schedules.	The very limited capacity for farm buildings (along with the qualification in the Preamble that a site-specific assessment may identify different values and capacity) signals that this landuse type is not precluded. The response to OS 96.13 addresses amendments to the landscape capacity for rural living.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS167.7	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that the text of the landscape schedule does not preclude residential visitor accommodation in existing or any future residential dwellings.	<p>The very limited capacity for visitor accommodation (along with the qualification in the Preamble that a site-specific assessment may identify different values and capacity) signals that this landuse type is not precluded.</p> <p>However in consideration of this submission point, the following text amendments are recommended for Schedule 21.22.15 Capacity (ii), to better align with the text of other PA Schedules and PDP policy context:</p> <p>Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – no landscape capacity for tourism related activities. Very limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are: co-located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale small scale and have a 'low key' rural character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS167.8	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that earthworks associated with residential or farming related activities are not unreasonably restricted by the landscape schedules.	<p>The very limited capacity for earthworks associated with farming (along with the qualification in the Preamble that a site-specific assessment may identify different values and capacity) signals that this landuse type is not precluded.</p> <p>The response to OS 96.11 is also of relevance here where it is recommended to include reference to rural living related earthworks.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS167.9	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of Chilcotin Holdings Limited	Oppose	That any other consequential or alternative relief as may be necessary or appropriate to address the issues raised in this submission including changes that may arise from other submissions gives effect to the relief sought in this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS168.1	Lilly Manners Wood	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to provide for a smaller secondary dwelling to be placed on an existing site located at 101 Malaghans Road and within the Malaghans valley provided relevant bulk and location rules can be met, the dwelling fits into the natural landscape and isn't visible from the road.	<p>The acknowledgement of rural living as an established activity in the PA (see Response to Submissions version of Schedule 21.22.15), along with the rating of very limited to no landscape capacity for rural living, signals that extremely carefully located and designed rural living development is not precluded from the PA.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the landscape capacity ratings are at a PA level and that a detailed landscape assessment will be required as part of a resource consent (or plan change) application that may identify different landscape values and capacities which may also go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS172.4	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Arthurs Point Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for 21.22.15 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that the landscape capacity for development currently identified is not applied or interpreted at a site-specific scale.	Addressed in response to OS 167.2 and OS 167.3.	Reject submission.
OS172.6	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Arthurs Point Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for 21.22.15 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that construction within existing building platforms and consented development is not restricted by the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 167.4.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS172.8	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Arthurs Point Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for 21.22.15 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that clarity is provided that variations to existing building platforms should not be precluded by the landscape schedule and instead be assessed on their individual merits through associated site specific landscape assessments.	Addressed in response to OS 167.3 and OS 167.4.	Reject submission.
OS172.10	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Arthurs Point Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.15 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that text be added to landscape schedule to ensure that rural living is not precluded, with these assessed on their merits through site specific landscape assessments.	Addressed in response to OS 96.13.	Accept submission in part.
OS172.12	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Arthurs Point Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for 21.22.15 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that residential visitor accommodation and visitor accommodation be provided	Addressed in response to OS 167.7.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			for within existing and consented development.		
OS172.14	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Arthurs Point Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that earthworks associated with visitor accommodation or residential activity is not unreasonably restricted.	Addressed in response to OS 167.8.	Accept submission in part.
OS174.3	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is opposed and be rejected as notified.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS174.7	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as the Ski Area Sub Zone cannot be part of the Central Whakatipu Basin priority area and should be made clear in the mapping of the priority areas.	Addressed in response to OS 84.7.	Reject submission.
OS174.8	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as notified as it fails to account that the south-eastern reaches of the priority area is a highly modified landscape highly influenced by human activities.	Addressed in response to submissions on behalf of Treespace No 1 Limited Partnership. A number of amendments have been recommended to the text of Schedule 21.22.15 to better acknowledge the consented development in the south-eastern reaches of the PA.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS174.9	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as notified or amended to address that it incorrectly states at [18] that there are 'important ecological features and vegetation types' and lists features that do not have ecological importance.	Addressed in response to OS 84.9.	Accept submission in part.
OS174.10	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [19] under the heading important ecological features and vegetation types the schedule lists animal pest species.	Addressed in response to OS 84.9.	Accept submission in part.
OS174.11	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [36] under the heading important archaeological and heritage features and their locations the schedule incorrectly lists Coronet Peak Ski Area.	Addressed in response to OS 84.11.	Reject submission.
OS174.12	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is amended to clarify the relationship of mana whenua associations, Wahi Tupuna Chapter and	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			consultation with mana whenua for applications.		
OS174.13	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [65] under the heading naturalness attributes and values the schedule incorrectly states that the priority area conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness.	Addressed in response to OS 84.14.	Reject submission.
OS174.14	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Redemption Song LLC	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [xii] landscape capacity it is stated that rural living has no capacity. In this case there may be capacity on specific sites, relative to the scale of rural living activity Or the activity proposed.	Addressed in response to OS 96.13.	Accept submission in part.
OS187.3	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS187.6	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			no capacity for urban expansion.		
OS187.9	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS197.3	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS197.6	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS197.9	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS202.3	Michael John Boyd	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS202.6	Michael John Boyd	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			no capacity for urban expansion.		
OS202.9	Michael John Boyd	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS204.3	Anna-Louise & Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS204.6	Anna-Louise & Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS204.9	Anna-Louise & Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.3	Dennis Behan	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is adopted as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.6	Dennis Behan	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin should be protected in perpetuity from inappropriate development.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS205.9	Dennis Behan	Support	That the mapping, values identified and capacity assessment of landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.12	Dennis Behan	Support	That paragraphs 79-81 and the landscape capacity assessment of landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin are supported.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.15	Dennis Behan	Support	That recreational access where it will not erode the values identified in the submission and necessary infrastructure development where the values outlined can be adequately preserved or protected in landscape schedule 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin be supported.	Addressed in response to OS 45.3.	Accept submission in part.