

Before the Hearings Panel

For the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan

**Under the** Resource Management Act 1991

**In the matter** of a variation to Chapter 21 Rural Zone of the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan, to introduce Priority Area Landscape Schedules 21.22 and 21.23

**Outcome of Expert Landscape Architects and Planning Conference Held 3 October 2023**

**Facilitator:** Ken Fletcher

**Landscape Experts:** In person: Bridget Gilbert, Jeremy Head, Nikki Smetham, James Bentley, Ben Espie, Steve Skelton, Paul Smith. Diane Lucas (via Teams, left about 10:00am).

**Planning Experts:** In person: Blair Devlin, Rachael Pull, Duncan White, Ruth Evans, Carey Vivian, Morgan Shepherd, Richard Kemp, Scott Edgar. Ben Farrell (via Teams).

1. We are familiar with the Environment Court Code of Practice 2023 as it relates to expert witnesses and conferencing, having read the relevant parts within the last twelve months, have complied with it in all aspects of participating in this conference and preparing this statement.
2. Due to personal issues, Diane Lucas had to leave the meeting after about an hour, so the agreements below cannot be taken as representing her views.
3. All references to the Landscape Schedules below are to the version as included in rebuttal evidence of Bridget Gilbert dated 29 September 2023.
4. All references to the Preambles are to the versions as included in the rebuttal evidence of Ruth Evans dated 29 September 2023.
5. All references to the plan are to the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) as proposed or decided at this time and as referenced in paragraph 2.4(b) of the s42A report.
6. The following agreements and disagreements are about the structure of the schedules in general, and should not be taken as comments on the detailed content of any particular schedule.
7. Our conferencing built upon the work of the landscape experts of the previous day. While the Landscape Joint Witness Statement from that day was not yet available, where they had got to was summarised by Ken and supplemented by comments by other landscape architects.
8. During our discussions, the following points were made by the landscape experts from their work of the previous day, which we accept:

- a. each Priority Area (PA) Schedule should be read in conjunction with the Preamble and not in isolation;
- b. the schedules are written at the broad scale PA level, they are a high level description and assessment, and any proposal will be set at a smaller scale within the PA;
- c. each proposal will require a specific landscape assessment that identifies how the project sits within the PA, which attributes and values of the PA are relevant to the proposal, and an assessment against those values and related landscape capacity;
- d. The schedules are themselves a summary of a large amount of technical detail;
- e. The schedules are constrained by what the PDP Chapter 3 Strategic Objectives and Policies require.

### **Landscape Capacity Rating (Agenda point 3)**

9. Building on the work of the landscape experts from the previous day, we have agreed on the landscape capacity rating schema below. In doing so we acknowledge:
  - a. that in the PAs the starting position is that in general, the landscape capacity will be limited and that the rating scales represent small downward increments from **some** towards **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity; and
  - b. that the schema will be tested as the landscape experts work through the PA schedules on Wednesday 4<sup>th</sup> October 2023, particularly the qualifiers highlighted in **yellow** below. Following the detailed review of PA schedules by the landscape experts, it was concluded that the highlighted terms in the landscape capacity scale were acceptable.
10. The agreed schema is a modification of the rebuttal version, with the **No Landscape Capacity** rating replaced by an **Extremely Limited or No Landscape Capacity** and utilising the descriptors from the James Bentley schema. There are two versions of this rating category required, reflecting the different policy direction for the ONF/L and RCL PAs.
11. The agreed Landscape Capacity Rating schema is:

For the purposes of the PA Schedules, landscape capacity is described using the following five terms:

**Some landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which a careful or measured amount of sensitively located and designed development of this type is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is near its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values and where only a **modest** amount of sensitively located and designed development is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Very limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is very close to its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only a **very small** amount of sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

**Extremely limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is extremely close to its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only an **extremely small** amount of very sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

**Extremely limited or no landscape capacity (ONF/Ls):** there are extremely limited or no opportunities for development of this type. Typically this corresponds to a situation where development of this type is likely to materially compromise the identified landscape values. However, there may be exceptions where occasional, unique or discrete development protects identified landscape values.

**Extremely limited or no landscape capacity (RCLs):** there are extremely limited or no opportunities for development of this type. Typically this corresponds to a situation where development of this type is likely to materially compromise the identified landscape values. However, there may be exceptions where occasional, unique or discrete development maintains and/or enhances identified landscape values.

### **Placement of PA Schedule – in the PDP or outside the PDP (Agenda points 6 & 7)**

12. We agree that the PA Schedules should sit inside the PDP. While not disagreeing that they should be inside the PDP, Ben Farrell was more nuanced in his view, considering that guidance material should be outside the PDP, but that strong value identification and capacity ratings should be inside the PDP. As noted above, the PA Schedules are a summary of the technical reports, and it is agreed that these technical reports should remain readily available to users of the PA Schedules.
13. We agree that the landscape capacity assessments should remain part of the PA Schedules.

### **Preambles (Agenda points 4 & 5, 8 & 9)**

14. While acknowledging that there is question of scope, we discussed whether the mapping of the PAs should exclude those parts that are not subject to the PA Schedules (the Exception Zones of 3.1B.5 - Ski Area Sub-Zones, Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle zones, Gibbston Character Zone and the Jacks Point Zone and any zone other than the Rural Zone). This would enable the removal of references to these zones in the Preambles. We did not reach agreement on this point.
15. If there is scope to remove the Exception Zones (and any zone other than the Rural Zone) from the mapping of the PAs, Ben E, Carey, Ben F, Blair, Morgan, Nikki, Duncan, Scott and Richard want them excluded. Rachael has no opinion on the matter. Steve, Paul, Ruth, Bridget, Jeremy and James do not want them removed.
16. With one small exception we are agreed on the wording of the Preambles. The agreed versions, including the text highlighted in **yellow**, are included at the end of this Statement, and tracked changes versions, showing the changes from the rebuttal versions, are included as appendices.

17. The wording not agreed is the inclusion of the phrase stating that landscape capacity **estimates an unknown future** in the description of landscape capacity (3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph under the Landscape Capacity heading, highlighted in yellow). All except Ruth, Bridget and Jeremy support its inclusion. Those not supporting the inclusion consider it to be superfluous, but the inclusion does not detract from their overall agreement with the Preambles below.
18. We discussed the definitions of the activities listed in the Preambles, particularly those with only an indirect definition elsewhere in the plan. Of concern are the interpretation of Intensive Agriculture as Factory Farming, Tourism Related Activities as Resorts, and the very broad definition of Forestry, with no distinction between exotic and indigenous forestry. We accept that, while not ideal, these are the best available, given the activities prescribed in Policy 3.3.38 and Policy 3.3.41. We do not support defining jetties, moorings, lake structures and boat sheds and acknowledge that these terms are interchangeable.
19. We acknowledge that the list of activities included in the Preambles is as specified in Policy 3.3.38 and Policy 3.3.41, that this list is not exclusive, and that there may be other activities proposed within the PAs that fall outside the listed activities. We understand that such proposals will be assessed within the context of the relevant PA, and that a landscape capacity assessment will need to be undertaken against the site-specific landscape that the proposal may sit in.
20. We agree that the Preambles would benefit from paragraph numbering.
21. We acknowledge that some of the wording in the Preambles remains clunky.

Appendix 1 ONF/L Preamble with tracked changes from rebuttal version

Appendix 2 RCL Preamble with tracked changes from rebuttal version

Signatures and dates

 BLAIR DEVLIN 6/10/23

 CAREY VIVIAN 6/10/23

 BEN ESPIE.

 NIKKI Smetnam 9/10/23

PAUL SMITH ~~PSmith~~ 6/10/23.  
Jeremy Head J. E. Head. 6.10.23.  
Bridget O'Brien ~~Berwick~~ 6/10/23  
James Beuney ~~Bunley~~ 6/10/23.

DkWhite  
Duncan White  
6 October 2023.



6 October 2023

Rachael Pull

RCAm

Ruth Evans  
6 October 2023



Richard Kemp  
6/10/2023



06/10/23

Scott Edgar



Steve Skelton 10/10/23

I agree with the exception of paragraph 18 in relation to the definition on Tourism Related Activities which I still remain uncomfortable with, however I understand Bridget and Jeremy were advised to correlate this with the PDP definition of 'Resort' and therefore that is what they have assessed.

Morgan Shepherd  
9/10/2023



22. Ben Farrell participated via AVL on 3 October, and was provided an opportunity to review the JWS signed by other planners on 5 October. Ben Farrell notes the following points in disagreement or clarification in respect of the above matters:
- a. [par 8c] That landscape assessments for some proposals may need to assess landscape values beyond those identified in the PA Schedule (e.g. where an identified PA forms only part of a larger ONF/L). This is because ONF/L policy directives tend to apply across the full extent of a ONF/L, not just the extent of a PA.
  - b. [par 8e] The content of the schedules is not entirely constrained by the SOs and SPs. Rather, the content of the schedules has been directed by the SOs and SPs.
  - c. [par 9] In respect of plan drafting / architecture, it would be better to have consistency throughout the PDP by ensuring the Landscape Capacity Ratings in the PAs are the same or consistent with the language applied in Schedule 24.8 Wakatipu Basin Landscape Character Units, noting that "Capability to absorb additional development" effectively has the same meaning as "Landscape Capacity".
  - d. [par 9a] In general the landscape capacity rating schema should acknowledge that many parts of PAs have higher landscape capacity for certain activities/development, as reflected in respective PDP provisions that enable and support some activities/development within ONF/Ls.
  - e. [par 9b] Ben cannot agree because he did not participate fully in this discussion.
  - f. [par 11] There will be practicable difficulties and associated implementation issues trying to interpret and apply terms such as 'modest', 'very' small, 'extremely' small. These terms need to be better understood and tested, including from a statutory interpretation point of view.
  - g. [par 18] 'Tourism Related Activities' is not the 'best available' term or definition. Assuming 'Tourism Related Activities' (as specified in SP 3.3.38 and 3.3.41) is intended to mean 'resort' (as defined in the PDP), then the best available term to adopt is 'resort'. The terms used in the schedule do not need to strictly quote SP 3.3.38 and 3.3.41. For example, an interpretation statement (or amendment to the preamble) can be introduced to clarify that within the PA Schedules 'resort' is used instead of 'tourism related activities'.
  - h. [par 19] A Landscape Assessment / Landscape Capacity Assessment for a proposal on a site should not be limited to a 'site-specific landscape'. Rather proposals occur on specific sites with landscapes typically being broader in extent than the subject site (exceptions tend to occur with very large sites, e.g. valleys contained in high country stations or national parks).
  - i. [par 16] Noting the preamble would benefit from plan drafting improvements, inclusive of the capacity rating descriptions.



9/10/23

# Clean ONL/F Preamble

## 21.22 Schedule of Landscape Values: Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape Priority Areas

### Preamble

#### Purpose

Schedule 21.22 identifies and describes 24 Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) or Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) priority areas (PA), as set out in Strategic Policy 3.3.36.

The Landscape Schedules are a tool to assist with the identification of the landscape values that are to be protected within each PA and related landscape capacity. They contain both factual information and evaluative content and are to inform plan development and plan implementation processes.

The description of each priority area must be read in full. Each description, as a whole, expresses at a PA scale, the landscape values, and the attributes from which those values derive.

#### Application

The PA schedules have been prepared to reflect that the PA mapping extends beyond the Rural Zone. The application of the PA schedules is as follows:

- The PA schedules apply (as relevant) to any proposal requiring resource consent in the Rural Zone, including the Rural Industrial Sub Zone.
- The PA schedules do not apply to proposals requiring resource consent in any other zone, including Exception Zones (see 3.1B.5). They may inform landscape assessments for proposals involving any land within a PA but are not required to be considered.

#### Landscape Attributes and Values

The landscape attributes and values identified, relate to the PA as a whole and are not intended to describe the relevant attributes and values of specific sites within the PA.

Given the PA scale of the landscape assessment underpinning the schedules, a finer grain location-specific assessment of landscape attributes and values will typically be required for plan development or plan implementation purposes (including plan changes or resource consent applications) (refer SP 3.3.43 and SP 3.3.45). The PA Schedules represent a point in time and are not intended to provide a complete record. Other location specific landscape values may be identified through these finer grained assessment processes.

The PA Schedules include attributes<sup>1</sup> that contribute positively to landscape values, attributes that detract from landscape values, and attributes that are neutral with respect to informing landscape values.

Within the PAs plant and animal pests detract from landscape value. Few, if any of the District's ONF/Ls are pristine, there are varying levels of modification evident (including plant and animal pests). This means that landscape restoration and enhancement (which can include the management of pests) is a highly desirable outcome. Pest information is intended to guide appropriate future landscape management within the PA. (For example, where a resource consent or plan change is proposed within the PA, the proposal or provisions may seek to specifically address the management of pests).

#### Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity ratings used in the PA Schedules, which are described below, are intended to reflect

---

<sup>1</sup> The identification of an attribute in the PA schedule is not confirmation or otherwise as to whether the attribute has been legally established.

the capacity of the landscape or feature to accommodate various types or forms of development, without compromising the identified landscape values. The definition of landscape capacity applied in the PA Schedules is set out in 3.1B.5(b). The capacity ratings, and associated descriptions, are based on an assessment of each PA as a whole, and are not intended to describe the relevant capacity of specific sites within a PA.

The descriptions in the PA Schedules are relatively 'high level' and focus on describing potential outcomes that would likely be appropriate within each PA. These descriptions are not a replacement for any relevant policies, rules or standards in the District Plan, and are intended to provide guidance only.

Landscape capacity is not a fixed concept, it estimates an unknown future, and it may change over time as development occurs or landscape characteristics change. In addition, across each PA there is likely to be variation in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through future plan changes or resource consent applications.

For the purposes of the PA Schedules, landscape capacity is described using the following five terms:

**Some landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which a careful or measured amount of sensitively located and designed development of this type is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is near its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values and where only a modest amount of sensitively located and designed development is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Very limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is very close to its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only a very small amount of sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

**Extremely limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is extremely close to its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only an extremely small amount of very sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

**Extremely limited or no landscape capacity:** there are extremely limited or no opportunities for development of this type. Typically this corresponds to a situation where development of this type is likely to materially compromise the identified landscape values. However, there may be exceptions where occasional, unique or discrete development protects identified landscape values.

It is intended that the use of this five-tier landscape capacity terminology, along with a description of the characteristics that are likely to frame development that is appropriate (from a landscape perspective), and the description of the landscape attributes and values of the PA will assist in providing high level guidance with respect to the scale, location and characteristics of each land use type that will protect landscape values in each PA ONF/L.

### Meaning of activities for the purpose of the PA Schedules

For the purpose of the PA schedules, activities listed have the following meanings:

- Commercial recreational activities: has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- Visitor accommodation: has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- Tourism related activities: has the same meaning as 'Resort' in Chapter 2.
- Urban expansions means:
  - a change from a rural activity to urban development; or
  - a change (including any proposed change) in zoning to an urban zone, including any change to the urban growth boundary or any other zone changes (or proposed changes) that would provide for urban development.
- Intensive agriculture: has the same meaning as 'Factory Farming' in Chapter 2.
- Earthworks: has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- Farm buildings: has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- Mineral extraction: has the same meaning as 'Mining' Activity in Chapter 2.
- Transport infrastructure: has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- Utilities: has the same meaning as Chapter 2

- Regionally significant infrastructure: has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- Farm scale quarries: means mining of aggregate for farming activities on the same site.
- Renewable energy generation: has the same meaning as Renewable Electricity Generation and Renewable Electricity Generation Activities in Chapter 2.
- Forestry: has the same meaning as Forestry Activity in Chapter 2.
- Rural living: has the same meaning as rural living in Chapter 3 section 3.1B.5.
- Rural industrial activities: has the same meaning as Chapter 2.
- Passenger lift systems: has the same meaning as Chapter 2 except that for the purposes of the PA schedules it includes base and terminal buildings and stations.
- Jetties, lake structures, moorings, boat sheds: have their plain meaning (and may be used interchangeably).

The range of land use activities addressed in the capacity section of the PA Schedules includes the activities prescribed by SP 3.3.38. It is acknowledged that this does not span the full array of land use activities that may be contemplated in the PAs over time. In the case of a future application for a land use activity that is not addressed in a PA Schedule, an assessment applying the principles set out in 3.3.43, 3.3.45 and 3.3.46 is required.

# Clean RCL Preamble

## 21.23 Schedule of Landscape Values: Upper Clutha Rural Character Landscape Priority Areas

### Preamble

#### Purpose

Schedule 21.22 identifies and describes 5 Rural Character Landscape (RCL) priority areas (PA), as set out in Strategic Policy 3.3.39.

The PA Schedules are a tool to assist with the identification of the landscape values that are to be protected within each PA and related landscape capacity. They contain both factual information and evaluative content and are to inform plan development and plan implementation processes.

The description of each priority area must be read in full. Each description, as a whole, expresses PA scale, the landscape values and the attributes from which those values derive.

#### Application

The PA schedules have been prepared to reflect that the PA mapping extends beyond the Rural Zone. The application of the PA schedules is as follows:

- The PA schedules apply (as relevant) to any proposal requiring resource consent in the Rural Zone, including the Rural Industrial Sub Zone.
- The PA schedules do not apply to proposals requiring resource consent in any other zone, including Exception Zones (see 3.1B.5). They may inform landscape assessments for proposals involving any land within a PA but are not required to be considered.

#### Landscape Attributes and Values

The landscape attributes and values identified, relate to the PA as a whole and are not intended to describe the relevant attributes and values of specific sites within the PA.

Given the PA scale of the landscape assessment underpinning the schedules, a finer grain location-specific assessment of landscape attributes and values will typically be required for plan development or plan implementation purposes (including plan changes or resource consent applications) (refer SP 3.3.43 and SP3.3.45). The PA Schedules represent a point in time and are not intended to provide a complete record. Other location specific landscape values may be identified through these finer grained assessment processes.

The PA Schedules include attributes<sup>2</sup> that contribute positively to landscape values, attributes that detract from landscape values, and attributes that are neutral with respect to informing landscape values.

Within the PAs plant and animal pests detract from landscape value. Few, if any of the District's RCLs are pristine, there are varying levels of modification evident (including plant and animal pests). This means that landscape restoration and enhancement (which can include the management of pests) is a highly desirable outcome. Pest information is intended to guide appropriate future landscape management within the PA. (For example, where a resource consent or plan change is proposed within the PA, the proposal or provisions may seek to specifically address the management of pests).

With respect to the link between the PA RCL Schedules and Strategic Policies 3.2.5.5, 3.2.5.7, and 3.3.41, landscape character and visual amenity values are expressed through the 'three dimensioned' construct of landscape values set out in the PA RCL Schedules (i.e. physical, associative and perceptual / sensory). The

---

<sup>2</sup> The identification of an attribute in the PA schedule is not confirmation or otherwise as to whether the attribute has been legally established.

concept of 'landscape character' encompasses all three dimensions of landscape values. 'Visual amenity values' typically draw from the perceptual dimension, however there is inevitably an overlap with the physical dimension.

The key public routes and viewpoints are typically identified in the description of the 'Important land use patterns and features', with key scenic routes identified under 'Important recreation attributes and values' and/or 'Particularly important views to and from the area'.

The relationship between the PA RCL and the wider Rural Character Landscape context, the Outstanding Natural Features within the Upper Clutha Basin and the Outstanding Natural Landscapes that frame the Upper Clutha Basin are typically addressed in the description of 'Important land use patterns and features', 'Important shared and recognised attributes and values', 'Particularly important views to and from the area', and 'Aesthetic qualities and values'.

### **Landscape Capacity**

The landscape capacity ratings used in the PA Schedules, which are described below, are intended to reflect the capacity of the landscape or feature to accommodate various types or forms of development, without compromising the identified landscape values. The definition of landscape capacity applied in the PA Schedules is set out in 3.1B.5(b).

The capacity ratings, and associated descriptions, are based on an assessment of each PA as a whole and are not intended to describe the relevant capacity of specific sites within a PA.

The descriptions in the PA Schedules are relatively 'high level' and focus on describing potential outcomes that would likely be appropriate within each PA. These descriptions are not a replacement for any relevant policies, rules or standards in the District Plan, and are intended to provide guidance only.

Landscape capacity is not a fixed concept, **it estimates an unknown future**, and it may change over time as development occurs or landscape characteristics change. In addition, across each PA there is likely to be variation in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through future plan changes or resource consent applications.

For the purposes of the PA Schedules, landscape capacity is described using the following five terms:

**Some landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which a careful or measured amount of sensitively located and designed development of this type is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is near its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values and where only a **modest** amount of sensitively located and designed development is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Very limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is very close to its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only a **very small** amount of sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

**Extremely limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is extremely close to its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only an **extremely small** amount of very sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

**Extremely limited or no landscape capacity:** there are extremely limited or no opportunities for development of this type. Typically this corresponds to a situation where development of this type is likely to materially compromise the identified landscape values. However, there may be exceptions where occasional, unique or discrete development maintains and/or enhances identified landscape values.

It is intended that the use of this five-tier landscape capacity terminology, along with a description of the characteristics that are likely to frame development that is appropriate (from a landscape perspective), and the description of the landscape attributes and values of the PA will assist in providing high level guidance with respect to the scale, location and characteristics of each land use type that will maintain and/or enhance landscape values in each PA ONF/L.

### **Meaning of activities for the purpose of the PA Schedules**

For the purpose of the PA schedules, activities listed have the following meanings:

- Commercial recreational activities: has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- Visitor accommodation: has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- Tourism related activities: has the same meaning as 'Resort' in Chapter 2.
- Urban expansions means:
  - a change from a rural activity to urban development; or
  - a change (including any proposed change) in zoning to an urban zone, including any change to the urban growth boundary or any other zone changes (or proposed changes) that would provide for urban development.
- Intensive agriculture: has the same meaning as 'Factory Farming' in Chapter 2.
- Earthworks: has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- Farm buildings: has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- Mineral extraction: has the same meaning as 'Mining' Activity in Chapter 2.
- Transport infrastructure: has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- Utilities: has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- Regionally significant infrastructure: has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- Farm scale quarries: means mining of aggregate for farming activities on the same site.
- Renewable energy generation: has the same meaning as Renewable Electricity Generation and Renewable Electricity Generation Activities in Chapter 2.
- Forestry: has the same meaning as Forestry Activity in Chapter 2.
- Rural living: has the same meaning as rural living in Chapter 3 section 3.1B.5.
- Rural industrial activities: has the same meaning as Chapter 2.
- Passenger lift systems: has the same meaning as Chapter 2 except that for the purposes of the PA schedules it includes base and terminal buildings and stations.
- Jetties, lake structures, moorings, boat sheds: have their plain meaning (and may be used interchangeably).

The range of land use activities addressed in the capacity section of the PA Schedules includes the activities prescribed by SP 3.3.41. It is acknowledged that this does not span the full array of land use activities that may be contemplated in the PAs over time. In the case of a future application for a land use activity that is not addressed in a PA Schedule, an assessment applying the principles set out in 3.3.43, 3.3.45 and 3.3.46 is required.

