

## 21.22.1 PA ONF Peninsula Hill: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Peninsula Hill ONF encompasses the elevated roche moutonnée landform of Peninsula Hill which frames the south side of Whakatipu Waimāori's (Lake Whakatipu's) Frankton Arm. Along its north and west boundaries, the PA ONF adjoins urban zoned land at Kelvin Peninsula. The southern part of the ONF coincides with the Jacks Point Zone (Exception Zone) and the Jacks Point Urban Growth Boundary. The south boundary adjoins the Jacks Point Zone Tablelands and Homesites area. The eastern boundary adjoins urban zoned land including Hanley Downs and the Coneburn SHA.

**Commented [BG1]:** OS 183.31 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

### 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. Largely unmodified roche moutonnée glacial landform of Peninsula Hill with a smoother and more coherent 'up ice' slope to the southwest/south, and a steeper rough 'plucked' slope extending from the northeast around to the northwest. Highest point: 834m. This form indicates the direction of travel of the glacier that formed the roche moutonnée clearly.
2. Exposed and irregular rock faces and outcrops, landslips and loose boulders throughout the north-western, northern and north-eastern flanks with thin soil cover.
3. Two elevated landform 'ribs' extending on a west to east alignment on the south side of the hill.
4. Further afield, the roche moutonnée of Peninsula Hill is linked to the roche moutonnée of Jacks Point Hill by the Tablelands - a hummocky elevated area formed by glacial processes.

### Important hydrological features:

5. A series of steep gullies draining from the western, northern, and eastern hill slopes to the Frankton Arm of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) or the Kawarau River.
6. Shallow gullies (including localised wetlands) draining the lower-lying landform ribs to the south of the hill in an easterly direction and which eventually discharge into the Kawarau River.
7. A series of small tarns, formed in topographic depressions in the bedrock left by glacial processes, around the crest of Peninsula Hill and the lower north-western hill slopes.

**Commented [BG2]:** OS 183.32 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

### Important ecological features and vegetation types:

8. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Swathes and scattered pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri, occur across the hillslopes with more extensive areas associated with the steeper bluffy terrain overlooking Frankton and Frankton Arm.

9. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. Grazed pasture covers the lower southeastern slopes facing the Remarkables, while rough pasture (exotic grassland) occurs on the southern and western side of the hill.
  - b. Mixed exotic tree plantings throughout the north-western lower slopes in the vicinity of the access from Kelvin Peninsula.
10. Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
11. Plant pest species include wilding pines, hawthorn, broom and sweet briar. Woody weeds cover much of the north facing slopes including the bluffy terrain overlooking Frankton and the Kawarau River.

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

12. Grazed pasture is the dominant land use across the PA. Associated with this activity is a network of farm tracks throughout the north-western and northern slopes that provide access between Kelvin Peninsula and the hilltop which is also used for paid scenic drive and animal encounter activities, and throughout the lower-lying rib/gully landforms to the south of the hill 'proper' (accessed from Hanley Downs and Jacks Point).
13. Other human modification is limited to: a cluster of communication towers on the hilltop; a dwelling on the north-eastern edge of the ONF (on Peninsula Road); and a dwelling on the south-western edge (accessed via Preserve Drive).
14. The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) at Jacks Point Zone includes the lower-lying ribs and gullies to the south of the hill. Much of this area is zoned Landscape Protection Area (LPA) under the Jacks Point zone and provides an important counterpoint or 'offset' for the urban and rural living development at Jacks Point and Hanley Downs. Within the LPA, policy focuses on enabling low-intensity pastoral farming and landscape restoration. A dwelling is anticipated in a localised hollow at the western end of the uppermost gully with a second dwelling anticipated adjacent the south boundary of the ONF. A range of location-specific assessment criteria and development controls are included in the zone provisions to guide an appropriate development outcome. Walking and cycling trails are also anticipated linking between Hanley Downs, Jacks Point and the existing track along the edge of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) (within PA ONL Homestead Bay).
15. State Highway 6 which runs along the outside of the north-eastern edge of the ONF.

**Commented [BG3]:** Typographical correction to align with standard Schedule format.

**Commented [BG4]:** OS 183.38 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

**Commented [BG5]:** OS 183.26 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd. OS 183.38 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

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

16. Rees or Boyes Cottage (archaeological site F41/761) at the base of Peninsula Hill.

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

17. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
18. The north-eastern extent of the ONF overlaps the mapped wāhi tūpuna Tititea. Tititea was a pā located on the south side of the Kawarau River near Whakatipu Waimāori.

## 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:

19. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
20. Kāi Tahu tradition tells of an incident where a 280 strong war party was repelled from this area and chased to the top of the Crown Range, which is now named Tititea in memory of this incident.
21. The mana whenua values associated with Peninsula Hill and Tititea include, but may not be limited to, kāika and tauraka waka.

### Important historic attributes and values:

22. The association of the hill with W. G. Rees' early sheep run.

### Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

23. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
24. The popularity of the views across the Frankton Arm to Peninsula Hill, (partially flanked and backdropped by the Remarkables) as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.
25. The identity of the area as an important gateway feature on the south side of Queenstown.
26. The landmark qualities of the landform as a reference point in views from Queenstown.
27. The popularity of the recreational 'features' listed below.

### Important recreation attributes and values:

28. The popularity of the area as a tourism destination: as a breeding and finishing farm with deer, sheep, cattle, goats, donkeys, pigs, and miniature horses, many of which can be fed by the public as paid visitors of Deer Park Heights. The area also has a number of film location attractions and picnic spots. Access by vehicle only.
29. Walking and cycling on the Jacks Point Trail (part of the Queenstown Trail) that runs along the western edge of the PA ONF Peninsula Hill (trail is located within PA ONL Homestead Bay).
30. SH6 as a key scenic route in very close proximity.

## Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

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

### Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

31. The area's natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above) which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial, slope and fluvial processes.

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

32. Engaging and attractive long-range views from the Frankton Arm, Queenstown, Frankton (including the airport), SH6, Queenstown Hill, the Queenstown Gondola, Queenstown Gardens, and the Frankton Track to the rugged and dramatic north-western, northern, and north-eastern hill slopes. From this orientation the open and distinctive roche moutonnée landform is highly legible and its generally undeveloped character forms a memorable contrast with the fringe of urban development along its base. The waters of the Frankton Arm seen in the foreground of view along with the Remarkables in the background of the outlook add to the scene, establishing it as one of the key vistas associated with Queenstown.
33. Intermittent closer-range views from Kelvin Peninsula that afford an appreciation of the rocky and 'plucked' landform character and dynamic nature of the northwest to northeast side of the hill. The contrast established by this natural landform backdrop seen within an urban context adds to the memorability and appeal of such views.
34. Highly attractive and memorable close to long-range views from the Jacks Point Trail to the south of Peninsula Hill across the undulating tablelands to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, flanked by Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and the distant peaks of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), ~~Mount Dewar~~ and Coronet Peak. The careful siting and design of rural living and urban development within the Jacks Point zone means that, where visible, built development is subservient to the natural landscape in these views.
35. Memorable 'gateway' views from SH6 to the southern and eastern sides of the hill and which screen views to Queenstown. The dominance of the landform feature by virtue of its proximity, scale, distinctive physical form, and undeveloped character, together with the limited awareness of urban development at Jacks Point, adds to the scene.
36. Attractive mid and long-range views from Jacks Point, Hanley Downs, and Coneburn SHA to the southern and/or eastern hill slopes. These orientations afford an appreciation of the rugged character of the eastern side of the feature and the smoother and more coherent landform character on the southern side. The mountainous backdrop against which the feature is seen together with its visual dominance (as a consequence of its scale, proximity, and appearance) and visual connection to the patterning of open and undeveloped hummocky terrain in the foreground of view (which is a fundamental development strategy of the Jacks Point zone) adds to the appeal of the outlook.
37. Appealing longer-range views westbound on the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road. In these views there is an awareness of the scale and form of the landscape feature rising out of the low-lying fans, deltas and hummocky terrain throughout the Coneburn valley. This theme of contrast is reinforced by the legible patterning of urban development (existing or anticipated) across the majority of the valley floor juxtaposed against the undeveloped roche moutonnée. At higher elevations along the road the broader mountain setting adds to the spectacle.
38. Highly attractive mid and long-range views from ~~Whakatipu-wai-Māori~~ Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) to the west and southwest to the smoother western and southern roche moutonnée slopes. From this orientation, ~~built development within the Jacks Point zone is largely screened from view, or, where visible, difficult to see.~~

**Commented [BG6]:** OS 183.47 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

**Commented [BG7]:** OS 77.36 Kai Tahu ki Otago. OS 188.36 Elisha Young-Ebert.

**Commented [BG8]:** Grammar correction BGLA.

39. Engaging and seemingly 'close-range' views from planes approaching or exiting Queenstown airport via the Frankton Arm. Such views offer an appreciation of the rugged nature of the northern hill slopes and the broader glacial landscape context within which the roche moutonnée is set.
40. In all of the views, the dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes is evident within the ONF along with the very limited extent and generally subservient nature of built development within the ONF and the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpinning the high quality of the outlook.

**Naturalness attributes and values:**

41. The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Peninsula Hill set within an urban context, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to its pastoral, tourism, and infrastructure use are visible, the very low number of buildings, the relatively modest scale of tracks and limited visibility of infrastructure on top limits their influence on the character of the landform as a natural landscape element.
42. The irregular patterning and proliferation of grey shrubland, exposed rock faces, and areas of visible erosion in places adds to the perception of naturalness.

**Memorability attributes and values:**

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

**Transient attributes and values:**

44. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the roche moutonnée slopes.

**Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

45. The juxtaposition of the generally undeveloped 'natural' landform in close proximity to Queenstown contributes to an impression of wildness, and the experience afforded from locations such as the Jacks Point Trail and ~~Whakatipu-wai-Maori~~ Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) to the west and southwest, where views of Peninsula Hill are generally unencumbered by visible built development contributes an impression of remoteness.

**Commented [BG9]:** OS 183.23 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

**Commented [BG10]:** OS 77.36 Kai Tahu ki Otago. OS 188.36 Elisha Young-Ebert.

**Commented [BG11]:** OS 183.23 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

**Aesthetic attributes and values:**

46. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
47. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the generally undeveloped roche moutonnée landform, juxtaposed beside an urban context or natural lake/mountain setting.
  - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. the clearly legible roche moutonnée landform profile and character;
    - ii. the open and pastoral character of Peninsula Hill;
    - iii. the distinctly rugged character of the northern side of the feature and the more coherent appearance of the southern side of the feature as a consequence of the landform and vegetation character; and,

iv. the very limited level of built modification evident through the ONF.

48. It is noted that control of plant pests species such as wilding pines can temporarily detract from aesthetic values.

Commented [BG12]: Typographical correction.

## Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

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

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

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

49. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.

50. **High associative values** relating to:

- a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
- b. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
- c. The recreational attributes of the ONF.

51. **Very High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Queenstown, Frankton, SH6, Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), the Jacks Point and Frankton Trails, Kelvin Peninsula, Hanley Downs, Coneburn SHA, Jacks Point, the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road, and the airport approach path, along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
- c. A high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of the more natural landscape across Peninsula Hill.
- d. A sense of remoteness and wildness primarily as a consequence of the landform's proximity to Queenstown and urban development within the Coneburn valley and the overt contrast established by its scale, naturalness and dramatic appearance within an urban context. From some orientations on the lake and local trail network, the very limited visibility of built development in the wider outlook establishes Peninsula Hill as part of the expansive natural landscape.

## Landscape Capacity

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

i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for **small scale and low key** activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise

Commented [BG13]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONF values.

**Commented [BG14]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – no** landscape capacity for tourism related activities. **Excepting in relation to the two homesites within the Jacks Point zone and consented dwellings within the PA at Hanleys Farm, no** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities.

**Commented [BG15]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

**Commented [BG16]:** OS 181.5 Henley Downs Ltd.

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

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

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

- vi. **Farm buildings – very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character in lower-lying flat land within the ONF.

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

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

**Commented [BG17]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

**Commented [BG18]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

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

**Commented [BG19]:** OS 70.9 Transpower. OS 86.7 Melissa Brook.

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

**Commented [BG20]:** OS 183.7 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd.

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

**Commented [BG21]:** Typographical correction.

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

**Commented [BG22]:** OS 183.7 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd. OS 183.70 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd. OS 183.76 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd. OS 21.4 Mee Holdings Ltd.

**Commented [BG23]:** OS 183.7 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd. OS 183.76 Coneburn Preserve Holdings Ltd and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Ltd. OS 21.4 Mee Holdings Ltd.

## 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill PA ONF Schedule

### August 2023 Final

**Blue highlighted text:** captured in “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill PA ONF Schedule”. New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

**Red text:** relates to a submission point that has not be captured in the “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill PA ONF Schedule”. This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **One example identified.**

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

### Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS21.4	Ben Gresson On Behalf Of Mee Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the capacity rating be amended in landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill to include some capacity for tourism related activities, rural living and urban expansion.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in response to OS 183.7.	Accept submission in part.
OS22.4	Ben Gresson On Behalf Of Scope Resources Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill be amended to include some capacity for cleanfill to be deposited in hidden gullies in this landscape.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. ONFs typically have a particularly high sensitivity to earthworks changes due to their limited size/extent. In addition, in this instance, the largely unmodified roche moutonnée geomorphology of the ONF heightens this sensitivity to landform modification via earthworks. As a consequence, Schedule 21.22.1 acknowledges the capacity for very limited earthworks for activities/elements that are established within the ONF (farm and public tracks).	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				While it may be possible to deposit clean fill in visually discreet locations (hidden gullies), the change to the landform would inevitably detract from the physical values of the ONF, more specifically: as a largely unmodified roche moutonnée; and its shallow gully patterning. For this reason, it is not considered appropriate to include specific reference to clean fill activities.	
OS22.5	Ben Gresson On Behalf Of Scope Resources Limited	Oppose	That reference to earthworks be included after reference to farm in the landscape capacity for landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill.	The submission is unspecific as to the types of farm earthworks that it seeks to include reference to.  Schedule 21.21.1 acknowledges that there is <b>very limited</b> capacity for earthworks in relation to farm access. Based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process and the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal, it is my assessment that the ONF is likely to be highly sensitive to other farm related earthworks such as farm quarries, irrigation ponds etc.	Reject submission.
OS70.9	Ainsley McLeod on behalf of Transpower	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.1 Capacity (ix) as follows:  <b>Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited</b> landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of <b>the National Grid and</b> utilities such as overhead lines, <b>cell phone towers, navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.</b>  NB the response to OS 70.9 has been coordinated with the response to OS 86.7.	Accept submission subject to refinement.
OS77.36	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill paragraphs 38 and 45 be amended to correct the	Agree with this submission point.  Amend Schedule 21.22.1 [38] as follows:  Highly attractive mid and long-range views from <b>Whakatipu wai-Māori Whakatipu Waimāori</b> (Lake Whakatipu) to the west	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	<p>and southwest to the smoother western and southern roche moutonnée slopes. From this orientation built development within the Jacks Point zone is largely screened from view, or, where visible, difficult to see.</p> <p>Amend Schedule 21.22.1 [45] as follows:</p> <p>The juxtaposition of the generally undeveloped 'natural' landform in close proximity to Queenstown and the experience afforded from locations such as the Jacks Point Trail and <del>Whakatipu wai Māori</del> <b>Whakatipu Waimāori</b> (Lake Whakatipu) to the west and southwest, where views of Peninsula Hill are generally unencumbered by visible built development.</p>	
OS86.7	Melissa Brook	Oppose	<p>That landscape capacity 21.22.1.ix. utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended to: limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as an overhead lines or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments which cannot be screened, these should be co-located with existing infrastructure or designed and located to reduce their visual prominence to the extent practicable, recognising the operational and functional requirements of regionally significant infrastructure means this may not be practicable in all instances.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.1 Capacity (ix) as follows:</p> <p><b>Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited</b> landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of <b>the National Grid and</b> utilities such as overhead lines, <b>or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.</b></p> <p>NB the response to OS 86.7 has been coordinated with the response to OS 70.9.</p>	<b>Accept submission subject to refinement.</b>

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS95.1	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Ben Sharpe, Brian Sharpe and William Sharpe	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove the site located at 48 Peninsula Road, Kelvin Heights from the outstanding natural landscape priority area.	The Ritchie Kerr Appeal Consent Order (and Landscape Report prepared by Rebecca Lucas) mapping reflects the scope of the Ritchie Kerr Appeal.  Mapping changes to PA mapping are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Accept submission.
OS95.2	Scott Freeman On Behalf Of Ben Sharpe, Brian Sharpe and William Sharpe	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove the site at 48 Peninsula Road, Kelvin heights and have the site rezoned to the Proposed District Plan's Lower Density Suburban Residential zone.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS120.1	Rosalind Devlin On Behalf Of Park Ridge Limited	Oppose	That the location of the Peninsula Hill outstanding natural feature eastern boundary as it applies to Lot 1 DP 553950 is amended to match the fine-scale line shown on the PDP Chapter 41 Jacks Point Structure Plan.	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS181.1	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of RCL Henley Downs Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill be amended so the outstanding natural feature overlay boundary aligns with the edges of the no-build areas approved within lot 8 DP 498179 under RM210606.	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS181.5	Hayley Mahon On Behalf Of	Oppose	That the landscape schedules 21.22 and 21.23 are amended to ensure that	In light of the mapping set out above, it is recommended that Schedule 21.22.1 Capacity (ii) Visitor Accommodation is amended as follows:	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	RCL Henley Downs Limited		the text of the schedules does not preclude residential visitor accommodation in existing or any future residential dwellings.	<b>Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – no landscape capacity for tourism related activities. Excepting in relation to the two homesites within the Jacks Point zone and consented dwellings within the PA at Hanleys Farm, no landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities.</b>	
OS183.1	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the boundary of the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to exclude parts of the submitters land zone Jacks Point Zone/within the Urban Growth Boundary.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS183.2	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the classification of the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended on the land zoned Jacks Point Zone/within the Urban Growth Boundary.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (including my understanding of the Jacks Point landscape Protection Area provisions and field work), I do not consider that this area merits a 'distinction' from the rest of the ONF. I also note that this 'landscape distinction' across Peninsula Hill was 'tested' in the Jacks Point appeal process and after landscape witness cross examination, the relief was withdrawn.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.3	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the relief sought regarding the boundary and classification of the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is provided for through an appropriate exception regime under the Outstanding Natural Feature schedule if it is to be adopted.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS183.4	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to provide for the Jacks Point Zoned land portion of the Outstanding Natural Feature as a separate character unit under the schedule if it is to be retained.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (including my understanding of the Jacks Point Landscape Protection Area provisions and field work), I do not consider that this area merits a 'distinction' from the rest of the ONF. Also see response to OS 183.2.	Reject submission.
OS183.5	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is rejected in its entirety to give effect to this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS183.6	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the boundaries of the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill, including the ONL and ONF boundaries, are amended.	The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.7	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to include new definitions to provide for the intent of capacity in landscapes with different abilities to absorb appropriate development. Revised capacity ratings are required if these are to be retained within the schedules.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The range of land uses to be addressed in the Priority Area Schedules was confirmed by the Environment Court in the Topic 2 Decisions.</p> <p>The PA capacity terminology is deliberately different to the Chapter 24 LCU capacity ratings as the latter related to one specific development typology: rural living (see PA Methodology Report, Section 3).</p> <p>On this basis, and relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal (including field work), I consider that the following changes to the Schedule 21.22.1 Capacity ratings are appropriate:</p> <p>x. <b>Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy developments. Very limited landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.</b></p> <p>xii. <b>Rural living – very limited to no landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a ‘low-key’ rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).</b></p> <p>I consider that a rating of <b>no landscape capacity</b> remains appropriate for tourism related activities (resorts), urban expansion, intensive agriculture, mineral extraction, other transport infrastructure (i.e. beyond trails), large scale renewable energy and production forestry due to the landscape sensitivity of the ONF.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.8	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to recognise and provide for the benefits of change, enhancement and remediation.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The focus of the PA Schedules is to identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected and/or play an important role in shaping the values of the PA, rather than to signal what changes might enhance the landscape values within the main body of the PA Schedule.</p> <p>That said, the identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>It is also expected that such matters would be traversed in detail as part of a detailed (and more site specific) landscape assessment in support of a plan change or resource consent process.</p>	Reject submission.
OS183.9	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation.	Addressed in response to OS 183.8.	Reject submission.
OS183.10	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to recognise the attributes and features listed in point 21 of this submission as part of the Outstanding Natural Feature within the landscape schedule.	<p>Schedule 21.21.1 acknowledges the proximity of the ONF to Jacks Point Zone and the Jacks Point Track.</p> <p>The suggested amendment to the General Description of the Area discussed under OS183.31 better clarifies the relationship of the Jacks Point Zone and UGB to the ONF.</p> <p>Schedule 21.21.1 [22] includes reference to the area as part of the W.G Rees early sheep run.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>With respect to recreational and access opportunities, the focus of the PA Schedule is on identifying existing values that need to be protected, rather than outlining opportunities.</p> <p>The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence with respect to planned development and utilities so that its reference in the Schedule 21.22.1 can be considered.</p>	
OS183.11	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to incorporate submitter feedback as to important values within the landscape schedule.	Schedule 21.22.1 has been amended to incorporate submitter feedback where considered appropriate from a landscape expert perspective.	Accept submission in part.
OS183.12	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That without derogating from the generality of the submission, the submitter seeks any additional, amended, consequential, or further relief in respect of the schedules reflect the matters raised in this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS183.13	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That if the amendments within this submission are not included then the submitter seeks it to be deleted or otherwise withdrawn from the variation.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.14	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended so the starting position of the schedule is to only describe those values which contribute to a feature as being outstanding. Values and other descriptors within the schedule that do not meet this purpose should be deleted.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>All of the attributes and values identified in Schedule 21.21.1 are considered to be of relevance to an understanding of the landscape values of the Peninsula Hill ONF.</p> <p>The submitter is also referred to the recommended amendments to the Schedule 21.22 Preamble which may go some way to clarifying matters in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS183.15	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title important hydrological features to be specified more accurately with respect to areas identified with ecological and habitat values if these are to be retained.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The request for hydrological (and ecological) features to be more fully described and mapped suggests a level of detail typically associated with a site-specific landscape assessment. Consistent with landscape assessment best practice and the Topic 2 Decisions, the PA Schedules of Values are intended to describe the landscape values associated with the PA, rather than form detailed landscape assessments of sites within the PA.</p> <p>Further, the Preamble to 21.22 explains that <i>a finer grained location-specific assessment of landscape attributes and values would be required for any plan change or resource consent. Other landscape values may be identified through these finer grained assessment processes.</i></p>	Reject submission.
OS183.16	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title important hydrological features to delete references to the removal or eradication of pest flora and fauna species.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The reference to existing pest flora and fauna species in Schedule 21.21.1 is considered relevant as a noteworthy landscape 'element' that plays a role in (negatively) shaping landscape values.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.17	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title important ecological features and vegetation types to delete references to the removal or eradication of pest flora and fauna species.	Addressed in response to OS 183.16.	Reject submission.
OS183.18	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title land use patterns and features to contextualize existing forms of modification and development within the priority area by describing the future ability to consolidate and enhance or develop those existing uses over time.	The meaning of this submission point is unclear. However, if the intention is for Schedule 21.21.1 to be amended to describe future landscape opportunities for the area in the 'Important Land use patterns and features' section: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) that is not in accordance with the purpose of the PA Schedule to describe the existing values of the landscape; and</li> <li>b) such an exercise would be unhelpfully open ended.</li> </ul>	Reject submission.
OS183.19	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title particularly important views to and from the area to acknowledge that the zoning extends higher than existing development on northern slopes.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  This amendment is not considered appropriate as the 'zoning' that extends higher than existing development corresponds to the Peninsula Hill Landscape Protection Area and/or ONF, where built development (other than two homesites) is generally not contemplated (unless it protects landscape values).	Reject submission.
OS183.20	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title particularly important views to and from the area to reference the built environment within the Jacks	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  21.21.1 [38] describes the visibility of built development within Jacks Point Zone as being largely screened from view, or difficult to see in mid and long-range views from the lake. The latter is the consequence of the diminishing influence of	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Downs Farm Holdings Limited		Point Zone to recognise that there are a tableland homesites that are quite visible from the lake and these frame an appropriate and attractive foreground to views.	distance coupled with the careful siting and design of built development along with mitigation mounding and plantings.  The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence that the tableland homesites are quite visible from the lake to allow careful consideration as to whether this text amendment should be incorporated into Schedule 21.21.1.	
OS183.21	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title summary of landscape values summary of physical values to reflect the reasonably modified nature of the vegetation and habitats making them no more than moderate.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  The notified version of Schedule 21.21.1 was reviewed by an ecologist with no such qualification recommended.  Further, the Preamble to Schedule 21.21 acknowledges: <i>The landscape attributes and values identified, relate to the priority area as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing the attributes and values of specific sites.</i>  It goes on to explain that a finer grained assessment will be required for plan changes or resource consents, and it is through these finer grained assessments that other values (including lower values) may be identified. 'Moderate' rated vegetation and habitats may be identified through such a process.	Reject submission.
OS183.22	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title summary of landscape values to amend the associative values to note that only a small part of the proposed Outstanding Natural Feature is accessible for recreation.	This submission point is factually incorrect. Refer Schedule 21.21 [28]. Also note that Schedule 21.21.1 [29] describes the extent of the trail.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.23	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title summary of landscape values to amend to perceptual values to remove reference to remoteness and wildness if in proximity to urban development.	<p>The Preamble to Schedule 21.21 acknowledges <i>that the landscape attributes and values identified, relate to the priority area as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing the attributes and values of specific sites.</i></p> <p>It goes on to explain that a finer grained assessment will be required for plan changes or resource consents, and it is through these finer grained assessments that other values (including lower values) may be identified. The relevance (or not) of remoteness and wildness values for parts of the ONF in proximity to urban development would be identified through such a process.</p> <p>However, some refinement of Schedule 21.22.1 [45] to better explain the relevant context of remoteness and wildness values is recommended as follows:</p> <p>The juxtaposition of the generally undeveloped 'natural' landform in close proximity to Queenstown <b>contributes to an impression of wildness</b> and the experience afforded from locations such as the Jacks Point Trail and Whakatipu-wai-Māori (Lake Whakatipu) to the west and southwest, where views of Peninsula Hill are generally unencumbered by visible built development <b>contributes an impression of remoteness.</b></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS183.24	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title summary of landscape values to generally recognise the distinction of the Exception zoned parts of the Outstanding Natural Feature.	<p>It is not appropriate to include this reference to the Exception Zone (EZ) in the Schedule as the basis of the EZs is that they are location specific zones that have been crafted to protect landscape values (so fundamentally align with ONF context). They also require that any new development not anticipated by the EZ will protect landscape values (PDP 3.2.5.4(b)). Further, the Chapter 41 zoning of the JP Zone within the ONF focuses on enabling pastoral farming, landscape restoration and trails/farm tracks and allows for a very limited number of homesites.</p> <p>In short, the landscape outcome for the Exception Zone part of Peninsula Hill is similar to the Rural zoned land within the ONF</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				and therefore does not merit distinction in the Summary of Landscape Values. The response to OS 183.2 is also relevant here. Also see s42A Report.	
OS183.25	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title landscape capacity to change the capacity rating for tourism related activities, urban expansions and transport infrastructure.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence with respect to planned development and utilities so that its reference in Schedule 21.21.1 can be considered. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal (including field work), I consider that tourism related activities (resorts) and urban development are not appropriate within Peninsula Hill PA ONF. Further, urban development is generally inappropriate within ONF/Ls as urban development inevitably means the ONF/L will fail to qualify as a RMA s6(b) landscape in terms of 'naturalness' (see <i>Long Bay</i> and <i>High Country Rosehip</i> ).	Reject submission.
OS183.26	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title landscape capacity to change the capacity for rural living to recognise at least the two homesites in the Jacks Point Zone. Amend to generally recognise distinction of the Exception zoned parts of the Outstanding Natural Feature.	See response to OS 183.38. The Capacity section of Schedule 21.21.1 addresses the potential for future development rather than a description of existing development.	Accept submission in part.
OS183.27	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title landscape capacity to	There does not appear to be a formed or unformed public road through Dead Horse Gully.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited		include reference to the road through Dead Horse Gully.	The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence on this aspect so that it can be appropriately addressed in Schedule 21.22.1.	
OS183.28	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title landscape capacity to indicate at what scale such potential activities have been considered, and accordingly, without more specific examples and analysis, the landscape capacity section should be deleted.	The methodology applied in relation to Capacity is described in the PA Schedules Methodology Report at Section 3.  It is recommended that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 is amended to explain the capacity ratings which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	Accept submission in part.
OS183.29	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title landscape capacity to include where there are existing and planned development opportunities and associated amenities and utilities in the capacity ratings.	The Capacity section of the PA Schedule addresses the potential for future development rather than a description of existing development.  The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence with respect to planned development and utilities so that its reference in Schedule 21.21.1 can be considered.	Reject submission.
OS183.30	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the title landscape capacity to change the capacity for additional subdivisions, industrial and service activities, lifestyle, earthworks and associated ancillary activities to having a moderate or high capacity.	Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (including my understanding of the Jacks Point Landscape Protection Area provisions and field work), I consider that the capacity ratings in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.1 are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.31	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at the general description of the area to replace the reference to the southern boundary adjoining the Jacks Point Zone to 'includes part of the Jacks Point Zone', include the words 'within the Urban Growth Boundary and which exhibits a more modified domestic landscape character in contrast with upper slopes of the ONF', and to include the sentence 'The Jacks Point Zone is an exception zone under the District Plan framework'.	<p>Aspects of this submission point relate to a level of detail that is not appropriate in a General Description of the Area.</p> <p>However, it is considered helpful to amend this section of Schedule 21.21.1 as set out below:</p> <p><i>The Peninsula Hill ONF encompasses the elevated roche moutonnée landform of Peninsula Hill which frames the south side of Whakatipu Waimāori's (Lake Whakatipu's) Frankton Arm. Along its north and west boundaries, the PA ONF adjoins urban zoned land at Kelvin Peninsula. <u>The southern part of the ONF coincides with the Jacks Point Zone (Exception Zone) and the Jacks Point Urban Growth Boundary.</u> The south boundary adjoins the Jacks Point Zone Tablelands and Homesites area. The eastern boundary adjoins urban zoned land including Hanley Downs and the Coneburn SHA.</i></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS183.32	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 5 to reference the eastern slopes draining into the Kawarau River.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.21.1 [5] as follows:</p> <p><i>A series of steep gullies draining from the western, northern, and eastern hill slopes to the Frankton Arm of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) <u>or the Kawarau River.</u></i></p>	Accept submission.
OS183.33	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 6 to remove the reference to including localised wetlands.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Schedule 21.21.1 has been reviewed by an ecologist with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.34	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to include a point under point 8 which states 'Recently planted and regenerating grey shrubland on the lower southern slopes within the Jacks Point Zone is associated with subdivision and development patterns.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  In accordance with landscape assessment best practice, it is not considered necessary to explain the provenance of plantings within each PA Schedule. Further, the development context of the Jacks Point Zone in close proximity to the ONF is repeatedly mentioned throughout Schedule 21.21.1.	Reject submission.
OS183.35	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 9(a) to include the words 'reading as part of the more modified landscape character associated with the Jacks Point Zone.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal (including my understanding of the Jacks Point Landscape Protection Area provisions and field work), the pastoral areas do not read as part of the modified landscape character of JPZ but rather provide an important counterpoint or foil to the (urban) developed area and read as a contiguous part of the generally undeveloped roche moutonnée landform feature (ie the ONF).	Reject submission.
OS183.36	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 11 to remove the reference to wilding pines unless there is further precision and mapping as to where these are located.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Wilding pines are evident in parts of the ONF.  The request for wilding pines to be more fully described and mapped suggests a level of detail typically associated with a site-specific landscape assessment. Consistent with landscape assessment best practice and the Topic 2 Environment Court Decisions, the PA Schedules of Values are intended to describe the landscape values of the PA rather than sites within the PA.  Further, the Preamble to 21.22 explains that <i>a finer grained location-specific assessment of landscape attributes and values would be required for any plan change or resource</i>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p><i>consent. Other landscape values may be identified through these finer grained assessment processes.</i></p> <p>It is considered that the detailed description and mapping of wilding pines would be addressed as part of such work.</p>	
OS183.37	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 11 to include the words 'cover are peppered over'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Schedule 21.21.1 has been reviewed by an ecologist with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS183.38	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 14 to replace the words 'provides an important counterpoint or 'offset' for the' with 'is contrasted with the', replace the sentence 'A dwelling is anticipated in a localised hollow at the western end of the uppermost gully', with 'At least two homesites and associated curtilage and access are anticipated, one at the western end of the uppermost gully and another on the southern boundary of the proposed ONF', make minor typographical changes, and include the words 'for the future of these lower slopes, including the potential for further discreet siting of homesites, associated curtilages, and	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.1 [14] as follows:</p> <p>The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) at Jacks Point Zone includes the lower-lying ribs and gullies to the south of the hill. <b>Much of t</b>his area is zoned Landscape Protection Area (LPA) under the Jacks Point zone and provides an important counterpoint or 'offset' for the urban and rural living development at Jacks Point and Hanley Downs. Within the LPA, policy focuses on enabling low-intensity pastoral farming and landscape restoration. A dwelling is anticipated in a localised hollow at the western end of the uppermost gully <b>with a second dwelling anticipated adjacent the south boundary of the ONF</b>. A range of location-specific assessment criteria and development controls are included in the zone provisions to guide an appropriate development outcome. Walking and cycling trails are also anticipated linking between Hanley Downs, Jacks Point and the existing track along the edge of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) (within PA ONL Homestead Bay).</p> <p>Based on my detailed review of additional homesites in the vicinity as part of the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process (including evidence preparation), I do not agree with the inclusion of 'at least' as it signals the potential for additional homesites to be appropriate. My detailed evaluation of the area revealed this not to be the case. For similar reasons, I do</p>	<b>Accept submission in part.</b>

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			additional access and development opportunities' regarding location-specific assessment criteria for appropriate development outcomes.	not agree with including reference to the potential for further homesites within the ONF in this part of Schedule 21.21.1.	
OS183.39	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 23 to delete or otherwise amend with more specificity as to where viewpoint included are from, and that those are limited to particularly important public viewpoints.	The meaning of this submission point is unclear. A wide range of views of Peninsula Hill are included in tourism publications which suggests that it is a part of the high value landscape around Queenstown that is valued by the broader community.	Reject submission.
OS183.40	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 25 to include the words 'within the urban contact and foreground of Jacks Point Zone development' regarding the identity of the area as an important gateway feature.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal (including field work), I do not consider that this change is necessary, as Peninsula Hill PA ONF is inevitably seen within the urban context of Queenstown as well as the Jacks Point Zone. Despite that urban context, it reads as a natural landscape gateway feature.	Reject submission.
OS183.41	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove point 26 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal (including field work), I do not consider that this change is necessary as the PA ONF does read as a landmark from many locations in Queenstown.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.42	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 27 to include the words 'and enhanced access opportunities created through subdivision and development proposals' regarding the popularity of the recreational features listed in the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  The potential benefits to recreational values accruing as part of a future subdivision proposal are not an existing landscape value.	Reject submission.
OS183.43	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove point 30 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal (including field work), I do not consider that this change is necessary as SH6 is a key scenic route in very close proximity to the ONF.	Reject submission.
OS183.44	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 31 to change the scope of the point from 'area' to 'northern upper hill slope' and to include further precision to describe the southern hill slopes as more characterised by urban development and modified farming and recreational uses associated with the Jacks Point Zone.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and (including field work), I do not consider that this change is necessary as the southern hillslopes of the ONF are relatively unmodified (in terms of earthworks), are largely pastoral with very little built development visible (i.e. buildings and tracks are difficult to see). As a consequence, the southern hill slopes are highly expressive of the landscape's formative processes.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.45	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 32 to replace the words 'and its generally undeveloped character forms a memorable contrast with the fringe of urban development along its base' with 'although residential development zoning extends higher than existing built development'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  The PA Schedule describes the existing visual composition rather than an undeveloped zone (and noting that the Jacks Point Zone context is acknowledged in several locations throughout Schedule 21.21.1).	Reject submission.
OS183.46	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 33 to include reference 'to the Northern slopes'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  This change is not considered necessary as 21.21.1 [33] refers to the northwest and northeast sides of the hill in relation to this view.	Reject submission.
OS183.47	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 34 to remove mention of the 'Highly attractive and memorable' long-range views, remove the words 'dramatic and generally undeveloped' roche moutonnée, remove reference to 'Mount Dewar and Coronet Peak', replace the words 'subserving to' with 'appropriately sited within' and to include the	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and (including field work), I disagree with the majority of this submission point. However I agree that reference to Mt Dewar in should be removed.  Amend Schedule 21.21.1 [34] as follows:  <i>Highly attractive and memorable close to long-range views from the Jacks Point Trail to the south of Peninsula Hill across the undulating tablelands to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, flanked by Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and the distant peaks of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) – Mount Dewar and Coronet Peak. The careful siting and design of</i>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			words 'and forms the foreground context of'.	<i>rural living and urban development within the Jacks Point zone means that, where visible, built development is subservient to the natural landscape in these views.</i>	
OS183.48	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 35 to change the word 'memorable' with 'limited' regarding the gateway views from State Highway 6, remove mention of the 'dominance' of the landform, and replace the words 'by virtue of its proximity, scale, distinctive physical form, and undeveloped character, together with the limited awareness of urban development at Jacks Point adds to the scene' with 'and its lower slopes of a more domesticated character within Jacks Point Zone contrast with urban development of the Jacks Point Zone in the foreground. Lower slopes of the feature provide for an effective transition between urban built form and more natural upper slopes of the feature'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.49	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove point 36 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.50	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 37 to include the words 'transition of domesticated lower slopes exhibiting rural living development to the more natural upper slopes of the roche moutonnée', remove the word 'undeveloped' and the sentence 'At higher elevations along the road the broader mountain setting adds to the spectacle.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.51	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 38 to include the words 'particularly of the Tablelands and golf course, frames an attractive foreground context for these views'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.52	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove point 39 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.53	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 40 to include reference to the 'upper slopes of the' Outstanding Natural Feature, replace the words 'very limited extent' with 'carefully sited', replace the words 'generally subservient' with 'appropriate', and include the words 'including those portions zoned Jacks Point Zone'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.54	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 41 to include reference to 'the upper slopes' of Peninsula Hill as opposed to the entire feature, remove the word 'which', change the perception of naturalness 'for the lower slopes within the Jacks Point Zone' from 'high' to 'low', make minor typographical amendments, include reference to the modifications related to its	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			pastoral, tourism, and infrastructure as being 'dominant', and replacing the section regarding the built form of the area with 'Careful siting of built form including homesites and associated curtilages, farm-buildings, access tracks and trails, infrastructure, fencing, and other forms of domestication are viable and influence the character of the landform'.		
OS183.55	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 42 to include reference to 'exotic shrubs' and to provide further context as to where the perception of naturalness is viewed from and to what parts of the Outstanding Natural Feature it applies to.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and (including field work), I do not consider that these changes are necessary.</p> <p>More specifically, with respect to reference to exotic shrubs, they are not a vegetation feature that is particularly dominant, meriting reference under Naturalness values.</p> <p>A discussion of naturalness within a Schedule of Values relates to the degree of modification associated with the area rather than views of the landscape. For this reason, it is not appropriate to describe specific views in this part of Schedule 21.21.1.</p>	Reject submission.
OS183.56	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 43 to reference the 'upper slopes' regarding the roche moutonnee landform of Peninsula Hill and replace the words 'along with its location on a key scenic	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			highway route and the airport approach path, and the magnificent mountain and lake context within which it is seen in many views' with 'including transition areas of the lower slopes within the Jacks Point Zone'.		
OS183.57	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove point 44 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.58	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 45 to include reference to the 'upper slopes' regarding the generally undeveloped landform.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.59	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove point 46 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.60	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 47(a) to include reference to the 'upper slopes of the' roche moutonnee landform and replace the word 'beside' with 'with a transition to' regarding the juxtaposition of the priority area and the urban landscape.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.61	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 47(b) ii to replace the words 'open and' with 'modified' and to include the words 'dominated by farming, recreational and lifestyle uses'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.62	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 47 (b) iii to replace the word 'more' with 'moderately'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.63	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 47(b) iv to replace the words 'very limited level of' with 'appropriate siting of'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.64	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 49 to change the rating of physical values from 'high' to 'moderate', include the words 'but reasonably modified' regarding vegetation features and to remove the words 'and mana whenua features'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.65	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 50(c) to include reference to 'access, farming, and lifestyle' attributes, include reference to the 'lower slopes of the' Outstanding Natural Feature, and to include the words 'including those parts of the zones Jacks Point Zone'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my landscape evaluation as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal and (including field work), I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point as the 'Recreational attributes and values' reference 'access'. 'Farming and lifestyle use' are not in my opinion aspects of the ONF that make a noteworthy contribution to the PA ONF's associative values.	Reject submission.
OS183.66	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 51(b) to remove mention of the visibility of the area from various surrounding locations.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.  The extensive visibility of the feature from several prominent locations in the wider area is an important part of why Peninsula Hill is valued.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.67	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 51(c) to change the perception of naturalness from 'high' to 'moderate', replace the word 'more' with 'less', to include the words 'character' and reference to the 'lower slopes' of Peninsula Hill.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.68	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended at point 51(d) to replace the words 'A sense of remoteness and wildness primarily' with 'A sense of dominant urban context', replace the words 'by its scale, naturalness and dramatic appearance within an urban context' with 'built urban form and development', include the words 'including within the Tablelands of Jacks Point Zone, frames an attractive foreground view of built form to', remove the word 'in' and 'establishes', include reference to the 'upper slopes' of Peninsula Hill and to remove reference to 'as part of the expansive natural landscape'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.69	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for commercial recreational activities from 'very limited' to 'limited', remove the words 'optimise the screening and/or camouflaging', make minor typographical amendments, replace the word 'protects' with 'provide for', and to include 'where appropriate' regarding the capacity rating'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.70	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities from 'no landscape capacity for tourism related activities' to 'moderate', replacing the word 'excepting' with 'particularly', removing reference to 'the two homesites' and replacing it with 'the lower slopes of the landform within the Jacks Point Zone', removing the capacity rating of 'no landscape capacity' for visitor accommodation activities, and including the words 'within which further siting of homesites,	Partly addressed in response to OS 183.7.  Other changes to text not supported, based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			associated curtilage, and access opportunities are available' regarding capacity.		
OS183.71	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for earthworks from 'very limited' to 'moderate', include reference regarding capacity to the 'golf course, mitigation landscape and formation of homesites within the lower slopes of the landform zoned Jacks Point Zone', and to remove the words 'that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.
OS183.72	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for farm buildings from 'very limited' to 'limited', remove the words 'modestly scaled' regarding buildings that reinforce existing rural character and remove the words 'in lower lying flat land' for such buildings within the Outstanding Natural Feature.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.73	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for transport infrastructure from 'very limited' to 'limited' and to include a capacity rating of 'moderate' for identified access through Dead Horse Gully and towards identified homesites within the lower slopes of the landform zoned Jacks Point Zone'.	Addressed in response to OS 183.27.	Reject submission.
OS183.74	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for utilities and regionally significant infrastructure from 'limited' to 'moderate'.	Addressed in response to OS 183.29.	Reject submission.
OS183.75	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to remove the capacity rating for renewable energy generation from 'no landscape capacity' and to change the capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation from 'very limited' to 'limited'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I disagree with the text changes requested in this submission point based on my detailed landscape review of the area as part of the PA Schedules work, the PDP Stage 1 Ritchie Kerr appeal and the PDP Stage 1 Jacks Point appeal process.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS183.76	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for rural living to no landscape capacity 'other than moderate landscape capacity for identified homesites within the Jacks Point Zone and their associated curtilage areas'.	Addressed in response to OS 183.7.	Accept submission in part.
OS183.77	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for urban expansion from 'no capacity' to 'limited'.	Addressed in response to OS 183.25.	Reject submission.
OS188.36	Elisha Young-Ebert	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill paragraphs 38 and 45 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Addressed in response to OS 77.36.	Accept submission.