

## 21.23.5 PA RCL Maungawera Valley: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Maungawera Valley PA is a rural valley about 6km north of urban Wānaka enclosed by Mount Brown to the south and Mount Maude to the north. The PA includes the northern flanks of Mount Brown and most of the valley floor extending towards Mount Maude/Mount Gold/Mount Burke ONL to the north, the hummocky moraine and Rods Creek catchment to the west, and the protruding moraine of Maungawera Hill to the east. The strip of land between Mount Brown and the Lake Hāwea - Albert Town Road (SH6) is also included.

There are two sub areas within the PA:

- The northern flanks of Mount Brown;
- The floor of the valley.

### Physical Attributes and Values

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

### Important landforms and land types:

1. Mount Brown: an elongated roche moutonnée landform that has been overridden by valley glaciers and smoothed by a veneer of glacial till deposits from successive glaciations. On the moderate to gently sloping northern flanks, the underlying schist bedrock has been overlain with till deposits from successive glaciations and eroded by subsequent fluvial action.
2. The valley floor: originally formed by a glacial tongue and overlain with glacial outwash gravels and more recent alluvial fan materials from the mountains to the north.
3. The relatively free-draining soils of the valley floor, making the area suitable for pastoral farming and cropping under irrigation.

### Important hydrological features:

4. Ephemeral water courses from the northern mountains that are artificially channelled across the valley floor and join to form Wai-utu-utu (Speargrass Creek) at the eastern end of the valley, flowing to the Hāwea River.

### Important ecological features and vegetation types:

5. Scattered regenerating kānuka forest on the northern flanks of Mount Brown, particularly on the steeper slopes, amongst rough and semi-improved pasture and pine woodlots.
6. Conifer and poplar shelter belts, generally oriented north-south across the valley to mitigate the wind tunnel effect created by Waiariki (Stevensons Arm) and the enclosing landforms.
7. A few small (1-4ha) forestry woodlots on the lower flanks of Mount Brown.

### Important land use patterns and features:

8. Distinctive and coherent pattern of cropping and pastoral farming on the valley floor, with large landholdings, regular but widely spaced shelterbelts, farm infrastructure such as tracks, irrigation systems

**Commented [JH1]:** Typographical correction to align with standard Schedule format.

and a few sporadic farm buildings, and dwellings/homestead clusters (some of which provide visitor accommodation and event facilities).

9. Low density rural living and hobby farming on the lower flanks or toe of Mount Brown and adjacent to Lake Hawea - Albert Town Road. Mt Maude vineyard is also located on the lower Mount Brown slopes. Rural living/hobby farming lots are generally between 2ha and 9ha in size, with a few larger lots greater than 50ha. Dwellings are set back to varying degrees from Maungawera Valley Road. Some dwellings are close to the road. However, all existing dwellings are generally well integrated by the hummocky topography of the mountain flanks or by existing vegetation and as such are not visually prominent from the road.

Commented [JH2]: OS 33.4 The Fork Farm Family Trust

Commented [JH3]: OS 33.4 The Fork Farm Family Trust

Commented [JH4]: OS 33.4 The Fork Farm Family Trust

10. The land use context of the PA includes:

- a. RCL open working farmland or kānuka-lined stream courses to the west as far as Waiariki (Stevensons Arm), including the distinctive Maungawera fan.
- b. RCL open pastoral farming on foothills and terraces/alluvial fans at the base of the Mount Maude/Mount Gold/Mount Burke ONL to the north.
- c. Pastoral farming, forestry and a small amount of rural living in the Maungawera Hill RCL to the north-east, and the PA RCL West of Hawea River to the east across SH6, where rural living development is largely set back from the highway and/or screened by vegetation.
- d. The Dublin Bay ONL extending to the ridge of Mount Brown, and RCL on the eastern part of Mount Brown to the south. These areas have open working farmland with a very low density of built development and contain sensitive ridgelines that are visible from Lake Wānaka, Mount Iron and public places on the Upper Clutha Basin floor.

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

11. Fork Farm Homestead at 100-152 Maungawera Valley Road constructed in 1910, with a surrounding garden designed by Alfred Buxton in 1937.
12. Māori occupation or use of the area (for example, archaeological sites F40/12 and F40/13).

#### Mana whenua features and their locations:

13. 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:

14. 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:

15. Associations of the area with early European settlement and farming, including Fork Farm (formerly part of Wanaka Station and later the Forks Run).

### Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

16. The low population density and infrequent through traffic mean that the valley is not a significant component of the shared and recognised landscape values of the Upper Clutha. However, it is valued by local residents as part of their sense of place.

### Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

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

### Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

18. The open flat expanse of the valley floor and the elongated and hummocky flanks of Mount Brown are expressive of the interaction of the glacial and fluvial processes that have shaped the valley.

### Particularly important views to and from the area

19. Highly scenic views from Maungawera Valley Road across open farmland to the northern mountainous ONL and to the southern flank of Mount Brown, which is somewhat foreshortened as a result of the proximity of the road to the mountain toe. Views have a strong ~~working farm~~ working farm rural character, with most rural living activity obscured by topography or vegetation.
20. The highly coherent pattern of large open paddocks alternating with north-south shelterbelts across the valley floor contributes strongly to the scenic values of the valley and allows unobstructed sequential views to the surrounding ONL and RCL landscapes.
21. Views from Lake Hāwea - Albert Town Road to the alluvially truncated escarpments at the eastern end of Mount Brown and to the eastern mouth of the Maungawera Valley at the road intersection. The farmed and managed flats contrast with the unmodified slopes of Mount Brown and more distant mountains in these views and the scattered patterns of regenerating kanuka on the escarpment contribute to perceptions of naturalness. Highly visible dwellings, domestication and earth mounding between the road and Mount Brown somewhat compromise the pleasantness, coherence and rural character of the views.

Commented [JH5]: OS 19.9 Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd

### Naturalness attributes and values

22. There is a moderate level of naturalness with a predominance of natural rather than built elements, but human intervention as managed farmland and rural living is evident. The variable but coherent patterns of rougher pasture and regenerating kākūka on the upper slopes of Mount Brown contribute to perceptions of naturalness.

### Memorability attributes and values

23. Memorable to residents and locals as an enclosed valley with a strong rural character.

### Transient attributes and values

24. Transient attributes of the landscape include seasonal foliage and pasture or crop colours, the changing shadow patterns from shelter belts and the presence of stock and wildlife such as hawks.

### Remoteness/wildness attributes and values

25. The lack of through traffic and easy access to the lake, together with a low population density, give the valley a very strong sense of rural tranquillity, quietness and remoteness.

## Aesthetic attributes and values

26. Strong aesthetic attributes as a result of:

- a. the highly attractive rural views across open pastoral/cropping land to the dramatic and sublime landforms of the Mount Maude/Mount Gold/Mount Burke range and to the elongated form of Mount Brown, with its regenerating kānuka cover;
- b. the coherent patterns of open farmland and shelterbelts;
- c. the spacious and tranquil ~~working farm~~ working farm rural character;
- d. the low density of domestication, particularly on the valley floor;
- e. the effective integration of dwellings by landform or vegetation.

**Commented [JH6]:** OS 19.8 Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd

### Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Perceptual (Sensory) • Associative

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

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

The physical, associative and perceptual attributes and values described above for Maungawera Valley PA can be summarised as follows:

- (a) **Moderate physical values** relating to the agricultural and horticultural land uses, the ~~glacially formed~~ roche moutonnée landform of Mount Brown, ~~the glacially formed and~~ outwash plain/alluvial fans of the valley floor, the strong patterns of rural land use, and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
- (b) **Low-moderate associative values** relating to the mana whenua associations of the area, the historic heritage of European pastoral farming, and the shared and recognised values of the area for residents and locals.
- (c) **Moderate-high perceptual values** relating to the expressiveness of the ~~underlying glacial landforms~~ terrace, escarpment and downlands, ~~landforms~~ the coherence of vegetation and land use patterns, the strong rural character, the scenic views across open pasture, the low-key rural tranquillity and quietness, and the moderate level of naturalness, with rural living remaining subordinate to pasture/cropping and vegetation.

**Commented [JH7]:** OS 67.35 Upper Clutha Environmental Society (although not submitted wording changes per se).

**Commented [JH8]:** OS 67.35 Upper Clutha Environmental Society (although not submitted wording changes per se).

**Commented [JH9]:** OS 67.35 Upper Clutha Environmental Society (although not submitted wording changes per se).

**Commented [JH10]:** OS 67.35 Upper Clutha Environmental Society (although not submitted wording changes per se).

### Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA RCL Maungawera Valley for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities based on the rural land resource that are visually recessive; of a modest scale and have a low key 'rural' character; and that maintain or enhance the PA's landscape character and visual amenity values.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities ~~and very limited to no landscape capacity for tourism related activities unless such activities that are co-located with existing development; located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic modest scale and have a low-key rural appearance, and~~ character; integrate landscape restoration and

enhancement and have a low key 'rural' character; and that maintain or enhance the PA's landscape character and visual amenity values. ~~No landscape capacity for tourism related activities (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).~~

**Commented [BG11]:** OS 33.9 The Fork Farm Family Trust.

- iii. **Urban expansions – no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – some** landscape capacity where ~~soils and available water allocation~~ supports the activity, and where expressiveness and aesthetic attributes and values are maintained or enhanced.
- v. **Earthworks – limited** landscape capacity to absorb earthworks associated with farming and rural living/visitor accommodation activities maintain naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and integrate with existing natural landform patterns. ~~Some landscape capacity for public walking and cycling trails that are sympathetically designed.~~
- vi. **Farm buildings – some** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that ~~are discreetly located and~~ reinforce the existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – very limited** landscape capacity for farm-scale quarries that maintain or enhance the PA's landscape character and visual amenity values.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity to absorb additional infrastructure that is of a modest scale and low-key rural character.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for additional district scale infrastructure that is co-located with roads and has an appearance consistent with the rural character of the PA. **Very limited** landscape capacity for larger scale regionally significant 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.~~
- x. **Renewable energy generation – some** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation. **Limited** landscape capacity for larger scale commercial renewable energy generation ~~that is discreetly located and screened from view.~~
- xi. ~~**Production Forestry – limited** landscape capacity for scattered small woodlots of up to 2 hectares in area.~~
- xii. **Rural living – very limited** landscape capacity to absorb additional rural living without cumulative adverse effects on naturalness, aesthetic, remoteness and rural character values. The rural character of the PA is vulnerable to fragmentation and domestication through rural living development. Any additional rural living should be set well back from roads; integrated by landform and/or existing vegetation; designed to be of a modest scale; have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); enhance public access (where appropriate); and should maintain public views across open land to surrounding landforms.

**Commented [JH12]:** OS 42.19 (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited

**Commented [JH13]:** OS 42.19 (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited

**Commented [JH14]:** OS 73.20 Bike Wanaka Inc  
OS 73.10 Bike Wanaka Inc  
OS 99.12 Upper Clutha Tracks Trust

**Commented [JH15]:** OS 67.32 Upper Clutha Environment Society

**Commented [JH16]:** OS 70.47 Transpower NZ Ltd

**Commented [JH17]:** OS 67.34 Upper Clutha Environmental Society

**Commented [JH18]:** Typographical correction.

# 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley RCL Schedule

11 AUGUST 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley RCL 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 specifically captured in the "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley RCL Schedule". This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. 15 examples identified.

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

## Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 19.2	Ian Percy (Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd)	Oppose	That landscape schedules 21.23 are amended to remove vague terms such as 'dramatic', 'sublime', and 'tranquil' as they are purely subjective.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Ms Gilbert's evidence in chief (EiC) addresses such wording where she notes that:</p> <p><i>"...the PA Schedules are intended to provide a guidance resource that incorporates technical landscape vocabulary to describe the landscape values and landscape capacity (at a PA level)... the terminology used within the PA Schedules is generally well understood by the landscape profession and is acknowledged and referenced in landscape related case law. So, while such terminology may not be evident in the District Plan or may be perceived as subjective, it has an established and accepted use within the lexicon of the landscape profession."</i></p> <p>In my opinion, while some terms are considered by the submitter to be subjective, they are used in the schedule to help describe the landscape in a way that most people understand.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 19.6	Ian Percy (Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be rejected as notified.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 19.7	Ian Percy (Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be amended to remove vague terms such as 'dramatic', 'sublime', and 'tranquil' as they are purely subjective.	Addressed in response to OS 19.2.	Reject submission.
OS 19.8	Ian Percy (Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be amended to provide explicit definitions for terms 'limited', 'very limited', 'some' in regard to landscape capacity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Section 3 of the PA Schedules Methodology Report explains the capacity rating scale (and noting that this explanatory detail is incorporated into the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to assist plan users).</p>	Reject submission.
OS 19.9	Ian Percy (Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is amended to remove quotation marks on the terms 'working farm', and 'rural'.	<p>Quotation marks are used twice around 'working farm' at [19] and [26c]. I recommend they be removed as follows:</p> <p>[19] Highly scenic views from Maungawera Valley Road across open farmland to the northern mountainous ONL and to the southern flank of Mount Brown, which is somewhat foreshortened as a result of the proximity of the road to the mountain toe. Views have a strong <del>working farm</del> working farm rural character, with most rural living activity obscured by topography or vegetation.</p> <p>However, the quotation marks around 'rural' is used twice - in the capacity section where 'rural' is used to help describe the desired</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				character of built activities that aren't strictly rural, and as such helps the reader understand what is expected.	
OS 19.10	Ian Percy (Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is amended to determine explain who arbitrates the definitions of the terms 'expressiveness', and aesthetics'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PA Schedules have been prepared in accordance with best practice landscape assessment as explained in the evidence of Ms Gilbert. The matters raised in this submission point are also addressed in response to OS 19.2.	Reject submission.
OS 24.2	Caroline Harker	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be rejected and not included in Chapter 21 of the Proposed District Plan.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 33.1	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is rejected as notified and dropped in favour of the current rural general rules.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 33.2	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is altered to reflect the capacity values outlined in this submission.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in response to OS 33.8 – 33.18. However, I note that I have not proposed any to the schedule capacities in response to those submission points.	Reject submission.
OS 33.3	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Support	That paragraph 4 of landscape schedule 21.23.5 is agreed with as notified in that the water courses are artificial throughout the valley.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 33.4	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be amended to address that paragraph 9 where it states ' <i>Dwellings are set back from Maungawera Valley Road, are generally well integrated by the hummocky topography of the mountain flanks or by existing vegetation and are not visually prominent from the road</i> ' to acknowledge that historically the houses are generally positioned beside the road and in full view of the road.	Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I observed that some dwellings are located close to the road. I consider that the following amendments to the wording are appropriate: [9] Low density rural living and hobby farming on the lower flanks or toe of Mount Brown and adjacent to Lake Hawea - Albert Town Road. Mt Maude vineyard is also located on the lower Mount Brown slopes. Rural living/hobby farming lots are generally between 2ha and 9ha in size, with a few larger lots greater than 50ha. Dwellings are set back to varying degrees from Maungawera Valley Road. <u>Some dwellings are close to the road. However, all existing dwellings</u> are generally well integrated by the hummocky topography of the mountain flanks or by existing vegetation and <u>as such</u> are not visually prominent from the road.	Accept submission in part.
OS 33.5	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be amended to confirm the significance of evidence of early Maori occupation by an appropriate cultural advisor/mana whenua authority.	The Priority Area Schedules have been reviewed by a cultural expert. The submission point is considered to be sufficiently met at [12 - 14] of the schedule.	Accept submission.
OS 33.6	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley paragraph 16 is retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 33.7	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be rejected and that no extra protection is placed on the landscape.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 33.8	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be amended to change the landscape capacity of commercial recreational activities from very limited to limited.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including through fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), it is of my opinion that increasing the capacity rating from very limited to limited would signal a level of development that is likely to be inappropriate in this PA. The PA currently has a very low-key, rural character. Commercial activities, if present, are not obvious, which helps maintain the 'quiet rural character'.</p> <p>While there may be specific locations within the PA where commercial recreational activities might be appropriate, I consider that would need to be determined through a site specific landscape assessment, as contemplated by the Preamble to Schedule 21.23.</p> <p>However, without further evidence I have no reason to support an increase in the capacity rating.</p> <p>The Preamble to Schedule 21.23 explains that the capacity identified in the schedule is assessed at the PA level (rather than a site level). I acknowledge that there may be specific locations within the PA where a carefully considered degree of development or activity might be successfully absorbed from a landscape perspective. I consider that the wording of the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 allows for such opportunities, activities and development to be evaluated as part of resource consent and plan change applications.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 33.9	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are co-located with existing development be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity; and be amended to some landscape capacity for tourism related activities, including farm related tourism.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Visitor accommodation has a 'limited' capacity rating at (ii) in the schedule and so part of the submission point is already met.</p> <p>Tourism-related activities are defined as 'resorts' in the PA schedules. Such development would be an inappropriate land use activity in this PA due to the potential nature and scale of the activity. However, there is the potential for low-key tourism related activities in my opinion. I recommend the following amendment to the capacity schedule at (ii):</p> <p><b>Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities and very limited to no landscape capacity for tourism related activities unless such activities that are co-located with existing development; located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic modest scale and have a low-key rural appearance, and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement and have a low key 'rural' character; and that maintain or enhance the PA's landscape character and visual amenity values. No landscape capacity for tourism related activities (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).</b></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS 33.10	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley landscape capacity for urban expansions be adopted as notified with no capacity.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 33.11	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley landscape capacity for intensive agriculture be adopted as notified with some capacity.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 33.12	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley landscape capacity for earthworks be adopted as notified with limited landscape capacity.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 33.13	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley landscape capacity for farm buildings be adopted as notified with some capacity.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 33.14	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley landscape capacity for mineral extraction be amended from very limited to limited capacity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including through fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), it is of my opinion that increasing the capacity rating from very limited to limited would signal a level of development that is likely to be inappropriate in this PA.</p> <p>While there may be specific locations within the PA where activities might be appropriate, I consider that would need to be determined through a site specific landscape assessment, as contemplated by the Preamble to Schedule 21.23.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 33.15	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley landscape capacity for transport infrastructure be amended from very limited to limited and that bus stops be included when public transport arrives in the Upper Clutha.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including through fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), it is of my opinion that increasing the capacity rating from very limited to limited would signal a level of development that is likely to be inappropriate in this PA.</p> <p>While there may be specific locations within the PA where activities might be appropriate, I consider that would need to be determined through a site specific landscape assessment, as contemplated by the Preamble to Schedule 21.23.</p> <p>I do not consider that provision of bus stops needs to be specifically captured within the Schedule, and they would likely fall within the "very limited" landscape capacity for transport infrastructure as set out in the Schedule.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 33.16	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley landscape capacity for utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended from limited to some capacity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including through fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), it is of my opinion that increasing the capacity rating from limited to some would signal a level of development that is likely to be inappropriate in this PA.</p> <p>While there may be specific locations within the PA where activities might be appropriate, I consider that would need to be determined through a site specific landscape assessment, as contemplated by the Preamble to Schedule 21.23.</p> <p>Also addressed in response to OS 70.47.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 33.17	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley landscape capacity for renewable energy generation be adopted as notified.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 33.18	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley landscape capacity for rural living be amended from very limited to some landscape capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including through fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), it is of my opinion that increasing the capacity rating from very limited to some would signal a level of development that is likely to be inappropriate in this PA. While there may be specific locations within the PA where activities might be appropriate, I consider that would need to be determined through a site specific landscape assessment, as contemplated by the Preamble to Schedule 21.23.	Reject submission.
OS 33.19	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be amended to remove reference to the historic importance of the submitters' family home and garden.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The notified version of Schedule 21.23.5 was reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the text in this regard. I understand that the homestead and garden are included in the schedule largely due to an article published in 'Stuff' (28 March 2010) which covered the centennial of Fork Farm (and homestead). It is not listed in the ODP / PDP as a heritage building/garden, but clearly has historic significance. <a href="https://www.stuff.co.nz/southland-times/news/3514598/100-years-old-and-still-good">https://www.stuff.co.nz/southland-times/news/3514598/100-years-old-and-still-good</a> It is of my opinion that it is appropriate to make mention of the submitter's family home and garden in the schedule due to its importance and public knowledge.	Reject submission.
OS 34.1	PHILL HUNT (Fork Farm) on behalf of The Fork Farm Family Trust	Oppose	That the Maungawera Valley does not become a Rural Character Landscape (RCL) Priority Area (PA).	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 42.2	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is removed or revised so that there is no additional constraints on the future use of the submitters properties (Lot 3 DP 27742, Lot 1 DP 426178, and Section 45 Block 5 Lower Wānaka SD).	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 42.9	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That the statement regarding soils and available water is amended to read as follows: some landscape capacity where expressiveness and aesthetic attributes and values are maintained or enhanced.	Addressed in response to OS 42.19	Accept submission in part.
OS 42.18	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.5.ii. visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended to remove the no landscape capacity for tourism related activities.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Tourism-related activities are defined as 'resorts' in the PA schedules. Such development would be an inappropriate land use activity in this PA due to the potential urban nature and scale of the activity. There is a 'no' capacity rating for tourism-related activities in this PA which is appropriate in my opinion.	Reject submission.
OS 42.19	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.5.iv. intensive agriculture be amended to remove reference to where soils and available water allocation support the activity, so that it reads: some landscape capacity where expressiveness and aesthetic attributes and values are maintained or enhanced.	Of note, the Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.23 Preamble outlines that Intensive agriculture has the same meaning as 'factory farming' in the PDP Chapter 2. Point (a) of that definition includes: <i>"the use of land and/or buildings for the production of commercial livestock where the regular feed source for such livestock is substantially provided other than from grazing the site concerned."</i> (emphasis added).	Partly accept submission. Please see S42A report regarding definitions.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				<p>Water allocation/consents is a Regional Council matter.</p> <p>As such, the submission point is valid in that soils (from the site, supporting the growth of stock feed) are not necessary to support the activity. In addition, the reference to water allocation is recommended be deleted, although water remains relevant.</p> <p>I recommend the following wording:</p> <p>(iv) <b>intensive agriculture</b> – some landscape capacity where soils are available water allocation supports the activity, and where expressiveness and aesthetic attributes and values are maintained or enhanced.</p> <p>I note that the submission states that soil and water availability are not landscape issues. While on the face of it this may be true, it is the effects of the changes to the rural landscape following the addition of water and nutrients to the soils that has the potential to change land use patterns and in terms character and amenity, which is a landscape issue.</p>	
OS 42.20	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.5.vi. farm buildings is amended to replace modestly scaled with reinforce, so that it reads: some landscape capacity for buildings that reinforce the existing rural character.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>'Modestly scaled' refers to building size and is a well-used and familiar term accepted by the Environment Court.</p> <p>As such the submitted wording is not supported.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 42.21	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.5.x. renewable energy generation is amended to use the defined term small and community scale renewable energy generation instead of small scale renewable energy.	<p>Renewable energy generation is defined in the PA RCL schedules as either 'small-scale' or 'larger scale commercial renewable energy'. Community scale renewable energy generation falls within 'larger scale commercial renewable energy' due to its potential size.</p> <p>As such the submitted wording is not supported.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 42.22	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That the 'no landscape capacity' category is removed and any areas or activities that are identified as having 'no' landscape capacity be reclassified as having 'very limited' landscape capacity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Activities with a 'no' capacity rating in the schedule include (iii) urban expansion and (ii) tourism-related activities. In my view, urban development is inappropriate within RCLs from a landscape perspective, as it will lead to a loss, or compromise, of the identified rural landscape character and visual amenity values.</p> <p>Tourism-related activities are defined as 'resorts' in the PA schedules. Such development would be an inappropriate land use activity in this PA due to the potential urban nature and scale of the activity.</p> <p>In my opinion it would be inappropriate to remove the 'no' capacity rating from the above two activity types.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 42.23	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That the schedules are made more concise.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 42.24	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That a definition is added to clarify what is meant by 'intensive agriculture'.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 42.25	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That 'tourism related activities' be considered in the landscape capacity assessment as part of Visitor Accommodation (the accommodation component and directly associated activities or services and facilities as defined in the Proposed District Plan) or Commercial Recreation (if the visitor attraction). Alternative Relief: That a definition for Tourism Related Activities be included within the Proposed District Plan.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 42.26	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That terms used in the Proposed District Plan are used wherever possible in the landscape schedules.	The PA Schedules have been prepared in accordance with best practice landscape assessment as explained in the evidence of Ms Gilbert. Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 50.1	Jo Fyfe (JEA) on behalf of Grant Ruddenklau	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be reassessed to acknowledge that rural living, farm buildings and other activities and uses can be appropriate throughout the priority area (including those existing), provided they are appropriately located and subject to comprehensive, site specific landscape assessment.	The landscape capacity assessment of the schedule states that rural living has a 'very limited capacity and farm buildings have 'some' capacity. It is unclear what 'other activities' means from the submission. As such the submission point appears to be largely met.	Accept submission.
OS 50.2	Jo Fyfe (JEA) on behalf of Grant Ruddenklau	Oppose	That the landscape schedules apply at a priority area level to guide future development but not preclude it.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 50.3	Jo Fyfe (JEA) on behalf of Grant Ruddenklau	Oppose	That the landscape schedules are clear that the capacity for development identified is not to be applied or interpreted at a site-specific scale.	In agreement. The Preamble to Schedule 21.23 explains that landscape capacity is evaluated at a PA level within the Schedule. Further, the Preamble signals that the capacity descriptions should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites and that varying landscape (values and) capacity may be identified as part of a site specific assessment for a plan change or resource consent application.	Accept submission.
OS 50.4	Jo Fyfe (JEA) on behalf of Grant Ruddenklau	Oppose	That in landscape schedule 21.23.5 the benefits of rural living and other appropriate activities are recognised and appropriately anticipated, subject to appropriate design and comprehensive landscape assessment.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 50.5	Jo Fyfe (JEA) on behalf of Grant Ruddenklau	Oppose	That any other consequential or alternative changes be made that are necessary to achieve the relief sought in the submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 65.1	Col Sutherland	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is rejected for inclusion in Chapter 21 of the Proposed District Plan.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 65.2	Col Sutherland	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is rejected or amended to address that the community has arisen in the Maungawera Valley under the current Rural General rules and that this is still an adequate level of protection.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 65.3	Col Sutherland	Oppose	That the Maungawera Valley has had rural subdivision for nearly 30 years and has done so in a manner that has allowed the rural character to be what it is today. This was achieved using the existing rules.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 66.1	Andrew Woods	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is rejected.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 66.2	Andrew Woods	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is rejected to acknowledge that the current rural general rules are still the most appropriate level of protection.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 66.3	Andrew Woods	Oppose	That the evidence provided in the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley document be rejected or amended to address that in some cases it is factually incorrect, contradicts itself, and is wholly subjective and should be not considered.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submission is unclear in the particular relief it is seeking. To respond to this submission point, further detail needs to be provided by the submitter setting out the changes sought.	Reject submission.
OS 66.4	Andrew Woods	Support	That features in the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley such as Mount Maude, Mount Gold, Mount Burk, and to the west of the peninsular do have significant landscape values.	Submission is in support.	Accept submission
OS 66.5	Andrew Woods	Oppose	That the valley floor in landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley and the slopes of Mount Brown are an already established and modified landscape with a rural residential community and should remain zoned that way.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submission point alludes to removing 21.23.5 PA RCL, although it is not clear whether that is the relief sought. The PA Schedules have been directed by the Environment Court's Topic 2 Decisions and overlay the Rural Zone (which remains in place). However, the schedule does acknowledge the farmed/modified landscape of the valley floor and slopes of Mount Brown at [8 -9], [10a - 10c], [11], [15], [19 - 24] and [26a - 26c]. Of note parts of the Mount Brown slopes are modified for pastoral farming while other areas include regenerating kanuka forest.	Reject submission.
OS 66.6	Andrew Woods	Oppose	That any future building, subdivision or business use application be determined on its individual merits and not by general restrictive zoning that precludes any sustainable low key development.	The schedules provide for what is being generally sought in the submission (sustainable, low key development). Any application for a resource consent or plan change would be determined on its individual merits as a matter of course. Comprehensive site specific landscape assessment is encouraged when applying for future plan changes or landuse consent applications.  Please see S42A report regarding how the PA schedules sit within the PDP.	Accept submission.
OS 67.32	Julian Haworth (Upper Clutha Environmental Society)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is generally supported however, the schedule should be amended so that farm buildings need to be discreetly located as well as modestly scaled.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. However, relying on my knowledge of the area (including through fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), it is of my opinion that farm buildings should be discreetly located in order to more fully reinforce the existing rural character and better maintain the: "...expressiveness of the terrace, escarpment and downland landforms, the coherence of vegetation and land use patterns, the strong rural character, the scenic views across open pasture, the low-key rural tranquillity and quietness, and the moderate level of naturalness, with rural living remaining	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				<p><i>subordinate to pasture/cropping and vegetation.</i>" As expressed in the Summary of Landscape Values (c) in the schedule.</p> <p>I recommend the following amendments to the schedule wording:</p> <p>(vi) <b>farm buildings – some</b> landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that <b>are discreetly located and</b> reinforce the existing rural character.</p>	
OS 67.33	Julian Haworth (Upper Clutha Environmental Society)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is amended to change the landscape capacity for rural living to being 'extremely limited'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>'Extremely limited' is not a capacity rating used.</p> <p>However, the 'qualifiers' under 'very limited' capacity set out in Schedule 21.23.5 capacity (xii) also play an important role in this regard, as they serve to 'curb' the inappropriate proliferation of rural living development within the PA.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 67.34	Julian Haworth (Upper Clutha Environmental Society)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is amended to change the capacity for any moderate or larger scale renewable energy generation to being 'very limited' and it would need to be very discreetly located and screened.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>However, relying on my knowledge of the area (including through fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), it is of my opinion that larger scale commercial renewable energy generation should be discreetly located and screened. I recommend the following amendment to the schedule wording.</p> <p>(x) <b>renewable energy generation – some</b> landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation. <b>Limited</b> landscape capacity for larger scale commercial renewable energy generation <b>that is discreetly located and screened from view.</b></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS 67.35	Julian Haworth (Upper Clutha Environmental Society)	Oppose	That the schedule lacks recognition of physical and perceptual relationships with the glaciated landforms above including the ONFL.	<p>The submission point is addressed at [1], [2], [10d], [18 - 21] and [26a]. However, in my opinion, the geomorphology could be better reflected in 'a' and 'c' under <b>Summary of Landscape Values</b>'. I recommend the below wording changes to the schedule:</p> <p>(a) <b>Moderate physical values</b> relating to the agricultural and horticultural land uses, the <b>glacially formed</b> roche moutonnée landform of Mount Brown <b>the glacially formed and</b> outwash plain/alluvial fans of the valley floor, the strong patterns of rural land use, and the mana whenua features associated with the area.</p> <p>(c) <b>Moderate-high perceptual values</b> relating to the expressiveness of the <b>underlying glacial landforms</b>, terrace, escarpment and downlands, <b>landforms</b> the coherence of vegetation and land use patterns, the strong rural character, the scenic views across open pasture, the low-key rural tranquillity and quietness, and the moderate level of naturalness, with rural living remaining subordinate to pasture / cropping and vegetation.</p>	Accept submission.
OS 70.47	Ainsley McLeod on behalf of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	<p>I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.23.5 Capacity are appropriate:</p> <p>ix. <b>Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited</b> landscape capacity for infrastructure that is co-located with existing facilities, buried or located such that it is 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. <b>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.</b></p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 73.10	Ian Greaves on behalf of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be amended to remove reference to limited or very limited capacity for new trails.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork), careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), and viewing the wider area from various locations, I do not consider it appropriate to remove the capacity reference for trails, as inappropriately located and/or designed trails have the potential to detract from RCL landscape values.	Reject submission.
OS 73.20	Ian Greaves on behalf of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be amended to include the following - Walking and cycling trails: some landscape capacity for additional trails that are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.	In the Landscape capacity section at (v), trails are not included within the broader earthworks category. It is of my opinion that walking and cycling trails include relatively low levels of earthworks and therefore would be appropriate to have a 'some' level of capacity. I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.23.5 Capacity are appropriate:  (v) <b>earthworks – limited</b> landscape capacity to absorb earthworks associated with farming and rural living activities that maintain naturalness, expressiveness and aesthetic attributes and values and integrate with existing natural landform patterns. <b>Some landscape capacity for walking and cycling trails that are sympathetically designed.</b>	Accept submission.
OS 73.21	Ian Greaves on behalf of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That any other further or consequential changes be made that are necessary to achieve the relief sought in the submission and to: (a) promote the sustainable management of resources and achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("Act"); (b) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; (c) enable social, economic and cultural wellbeing; (d) avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of the activities enabled by the Variation; and (e) represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of other means available in terms of section 32 and other provisions of the Act.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 99.12	John Wellington (Upper Clutha Tracks Trust)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.	Addressed in response to OS 73.20.	Accept submission.
OS 193.1	Mylrea Bell	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be rejected as notified with the current Rural General rules that are workable, practical, and sympathetic to the environment and heritage are retained.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 193.2	Mylrea Bell	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be rejected as notified or amended to address that the proposed schedule of landscape values is unworkable.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 196.1	Paul and Anne Cooper	Oppose	That the rural general zoning of the Maungawera Valley and status quo is retained.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 196.2	Paul and Anne Cooper	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is not implemented.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 198.1	Nancy Stout	Oppose	That any future development within the Maungawera Valley should be determined on the basis of the particular property rather than the restrictions imposed by Schedule 21.23.5.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Ms Gilbert's EiC addresses the question of the appropriate scale for landscape assessment in relation to the PA Schedules work. I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 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, attributes and capacities. This may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS 199.1	Finlay Woods	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is opposed and should be rejected as notified.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 199.2	Finlay Woods	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is rejected as notified or amended to address that it is factually incorrect, contradictory, and is wholly subjective and should therefore not be considered.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. However, the submitter is encouraged to provide evidence as to where any specific text changes might be appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS 199.3	Finlay Woods	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is amended to remove the valley floor from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The spatial extent of the RCL Priority Area mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions) and RCL mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS 199.4	Finlay Woods	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is rejected as notified and that the council focus on international buyers pushing out local families and individuals whose lives are intertwined with the area.	Outside scope of the Variation. Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 199.5	Finlay Woods	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley is rejected as notified with the current rule set protects the area. Any future building or business should be considered on a case by case basis.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A