

21.22.12 PA ONL Western Whakatipu Basin: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL encompasses the steep south-eastern mountain slopes of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), the steep south and eastern mountain slopes of Bowen Peak and the two elevated roche moutonnée landforms of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill and including Sugar Loaf) and Pt 781. The PA ONF also takes in Waipuna (Lake Johnson) sitting in the ice-eroded gully between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill (a separate PA ONF). Collectively, the mountain slopes form the northern backdrop to Sunshine Bay, Fernhill and Queenstown, and the ~~western/north-western backdrop~~ **mountain setting** to Gorge Road and Arthurs Point. The PA ONL adjoins the Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA ONF along its north-eastern boundary in the vicinity of Arthurs Point.

Commented [BG1]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 189.10 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 138.17 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

Physical Attributes and Values

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

Important landforms and land types:

1. The steeply sloping foliated schistose mountain landforms of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond 1,748m) and Bowen Peak (1,631m), which form part of the wall of mountains typical of the U-shaped glaciated valleys of which the Whakatipu Valley is an example.
2. The distinctive peaks of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) and Bowen Peak.
3. Exposed rock outcrops and bluffs in places.
4. The Ben Lomond saddle that extends on a west-east orientation between Ben Lomond and Bowen Peak and (in combination with the flanking peaks) separates the Whakatipu Valley from the Moke Creek Valley to the north.
5. The elevated ridgeline spurs extending southwards from the Ben Lomond saddle and taking in Pt 1121 and Cemetery Hill (812m, also known as 'Bobs Peak') immediately west of Queenstown (upon which the skyline Gondola and luge development is located).
6. The extensive ridgeline descending south-westwards from Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) to Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu (ONL)) and taking in Pt 1580, Pt 1395, Pt 1335, Pt 1138 and Pt 850.
7. The small roche moutonnée landform (480m) towards the western edge of the PA, Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu (ONL)).
8. Glacial till deposits at the toe of the steep mountain slopes forming shallow localised shelves and throughout the more gently sloping lower reaches of gullies within the PA.
9. A localised area of ribs of bedrock on the lower-lying slopes to the west of Sunshine Bay.
10. The steeply sloping roche moutonnée glacial landforms of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill, 907m), Sugar Loaf (911m), and Pt 781, with a smooth 'up-glacier' slope to the southwest and south of each landform and a steeper rough 'plucked' down-glacier slope generally to the west, northwest, north and northeast.
11. The elevated saddle-like landform between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill, within which Lake Johnson is located.

Commented [BG2]: Typographical correction.

12. Scarps and hummocky topography on the southeast slopes of Queenstown Hill and the eastern side of Sugar Loaf which are indicative of historic large-scale landslides.

Important hydrological features:

13. One Mile Creek and its numerous steeply incised tributaries draining the south-eastern flanks of Ben Lomond to Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu).
14. The series of unnamed streams on either side of the One Mile Creek network, draining directly to Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu).
15. The steeply incised Horn Creek (or Bush Creek), McChesney Creek, Domestic Creek, Shady Creek, and numerous unnamed streams draining the southern and eastern sides of Bowen Peak to Kimiākau (Shotover River PA ONF).
16. The shallow lowland, glacial lake of Waipuna (Lake Johnson, 399m). The lake is currently eutrophic (with poor water quality) due to elevated nutrient inputs from its catchment.
17. The numerous unnamed streams on the western, northern and south-eastern side of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill)/Sugar Loaf; the south side of Pt 781; between Sugar Loaf and Pt 781; and between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill.
18. Small kettle lakes and wetlands across the elevated slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
19. The wetland at Matakauri Park, on the east side of Gorge Road.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

20. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. Pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri and mingimangi occur throughout the low-lying rocky slopes of Bowen Peak adjacent to Gorge Road and Moonlight Track.
 - b. Kohuhu (*Pittosporum tenuifolium*) dominant (broadleaved) shrubland at the western end of the PA bordering the lake shore.
 - c. Pockets of mountain beech forest remnants in the gullies of One and Two Mile Creek and Bushy Creek.
 - d. Relic specimens of kowhai on the bluffs above McChesney Creek.
 - e. Subalpine shrubland and snow tussock grassland higher up above the bushline and areas of grey shrubland. The shrubs associated with the subalpine shrubland include species of the genera *Dracophyllum*, *Hebe*, *Leucopogon*, *Gaultheria*, *Pimelea* and *Ozothamnus*.
 - f. Parts of the beech forest in One Mile Creek and adjoining areas of subalpine shrubland and snow tussock grassland within the Ben Lomond Scenic Reserve.
 - g. Crack willows line much of the Waipuna (Lake Johnson) shoreline. Wetland vegetation comprising a mix of rushes and sedges at the southern and northern end of the lake where there is an absence of crack willows. Pockets of rushland and sedgeland also in isolated shoreline areas where gaps exist in the willow cover.
 - h. Swathes and scattered pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri and mingimangi occupy the bluffs, rocky slopes and gullies on each of the roche moutonnée landforms, as well as some hillslopes such as above the eastern shoreline of Waipuna (Lake Johnson). Some of these shrublands are interspersed with hawthorn, sweet briar and elderberry.

- i. Extensive patches of manuka (*Leptospermum scoparium*) and scattered specimens of bog pine (*Halocarpus bidwillii*) on the higher western slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
 - j. Short tussockland grassland covers large parts of the undulating crest terrain between Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and Sugar Loaf.
 - k. A large wetland (sedgeland) called the Matakauri wetland on the outskirts of Queenstown by Gorge Road which is classified as a Regionally Significant Wetland.
21. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
- a. The almost continuous patterning of plantation *Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Douglas fir) forest throughout the mid and lower flanks of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) and the southern flanks of Bowen Peak.
 - b. Areas of pasture adjacent to Gorge Road as far as Watties Track.
 - c. The almost continuous patterning of plantation larch and Douglas fir forest throughout the southern lower flanks of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
 - d. The more fragmented patterning of wilding conifers intermixed with grey shrubland, hawthorn, sycamore, broom, gorse and crack willow throughout the southern lower flanks of Pt 781, the western and northern lower slopes of Sugar Loaf and western lower slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
 - e. Open pasture and scattered scrub throughout the elevated steep slopes and crest of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill), Sugar Loaf and Pt 781.
 - f. Grazed pasture with scattered shelterbelts (including poplars) and clusters of pine and willow trees throughout the saddle between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill.
 - g. Amenity and shelter plantings around the few scattered rural and rural living dwellings at the southern end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) and on the north-western side of Sugar Loaf.
 - h. Amenity plantings around the two groupings of dwellings on the south side of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill), near the entrance to the Queenstown Hill Time Walk.
22. Waipuna (Lake Johnson) is a SNA in the District Plan. The riparian vegetation is of significance to aquatic values.
23. Scrub and exotic trees/weeds throughout the lower mountain slopes to the west of Sunshine Bay and adjacent Gorge Road, Arthurs Point and the Moonlight Track.
24. Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
25. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, hawthorn, buddleia, elderberry, sycamore, broom, cotoneaster and gorse.

Important land-use patterns and features:

- 26. Grazed pasture across the low-lying flatter land on the eastern side of the PA adjacent to Gorge Road, parts of the slopes to the west of Arthurs Point and the majority of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill), Sugar Loaf, Pt 781 and around Waipuna (Lake Johnson). Very low-intensity grazing across the elevated pastoral slopes. Associated with this activity are a network of farm tracks, fencing and farm buildings sheds.
- 27. The proliferation of plantation and wilding conifers around the edges of the PA that define the interface between much of the PA and urban Queenstown/Arthurs Point.

Commented [BG3]: OS 142.35 Hansen Family Partnership.

Commented [BG4]: OS 142.35 Hansen Family Partnership.

Commented [BG5]: OS 142.36 Hansen Family Partnership.

28. The gondola (towers, cableway and cabins in a cleared area of Douglas fir forest), luge tracks and chairlift and associated buildings (top and bottom stations, maintenance workshop), café/restaurant/terminal building, service buildings, lighting, signage, jumping-off point for paragliders, vehicular access track, star gazing platforms, bungee platform and associated buildings, zip lining and associated tree top huts and network of mountain bike trails (Queenstown Mountain Bike Park) on Cemetery Hill.
29. The swathe of Community Purpose and Informal Recreation zoned land across the slopes of Cemetery Hill facing towards Queenstown (where the Skyline gondola, luge, and mountain bike tracks are) and along either side of the lower reaches of One Mile Creek.
30. The Queenstown Hill Time Walk that leads from near the Queenstown city centre (Belfast Street) to the summit of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and coincides with Informal Recreation zoned land across the lower south-western slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
31. An area of Community Purposes zoned land adjacent the northern edge of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) on Gorge Road and coinciding with Matakauri Park wetland and boardwalk.
32. The Tiki Trail, Fernhill Loop and Ben Lomond tracks near Queenstown; the Arawata Track at the western end of Sunshine Bay; and the Moonlight Track on the north-western side of Arthurs Point. Associated with these tracks are signage, stiles, and seating.
33. The general absence of rural and rural living buildings within the PA, excepting a scattering at the north-western end of Arthurs Point, a scattering along the Gorge Road valley floor (including adventure tourism related facilities and activities), a very small pocket of urban dwellings at the toe of the Queenstown Time Walk, and the small cluster of rural living dwellings at the south end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
34. An unformed road leading from Gorge Road up the lower slopes on the east side of Bowen Peak; from Wynyard Crescent up the mountain slopes; and from Lomond Crescent up the mountain slopes (Ben Lomond Track).
35. Short stretches of unformed road: at the north end of Hansen Road (south) linking to Waipuna (Lake Johnson); at the southern end of Hansen Road (north) extending southwards along the western side of Ferry Hill; and from the western end of Tucker Beach Road extending southwards to the lower northern slopes of Pt 781.
36. Infrastructure is evident within the PA and includes: Aurora distribution lines around the lower slopes of Ben Lomond to the west of Sunshine Bay, along the Gorge Road corridor and on the south-eastern side of the area, and over the saddle near Waipuna (Lake Johnson); water reservoir designations near Greenstone Place and Scott Place in Fernhill; and a firefighting pond near the luge.
37. The UGB associated with Queenstown and the Fernhill/Sunshine Bay suburban area which adjoins the southern edges of the PA, and the Arthurs Point UGB which adjoins the north-western margins of the PA.
38. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include: the urban residential and commercial development adjoining the southern edges of the PA (taking in Sunshine Bay, Fernhill, Queenstown and Frankton); the urban residential and commercial development adjoining the north-western edges of the area (including Arthurs Point); the Queenstown Mountain Bike Club pump track area used for recreation and events on Kerry Drive near the south boundary; rural living development towards the western end of Tucker Beach; and Gorge Road, Glenorchy Queenstown Road and Frankton Road (SH6A).

Commented [BG6]: OS 186.2 Richard Kemp.

Commented [BG7]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 189.20 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited.
OS 138.7 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 138.8 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 138.25 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

Commented [BG8]: OS 186.2 Richard Kemp.

Commented [BG9]: OS 186.2 Richard Kemp.

Commented [BG10]: OS 75.6 Peter Clark.

Commented [BG11]: OS 189.22 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited.
OS 138.26 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

39. Queenstown Powerhouse, One Mile Creek (District Plan reference 96).
40. Old McChesney Bridge Abutment Remains, Arthurs Point (District Plan reference 104, archaeological site E41/236).

41. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, dams, and associated domestic sites in the area (for example, archaeological sites E41/204, E41/228, and E41/279).
42. A protected horse chestnut (*Aesculus hippocastanum*) on Gorge Road (western side of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill)) and a grouping of protected English oaks (*Quercus robur*) at the south-western end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
43. Various archaeological features associated with goldmining across the area (e.g., sluicings, tailings, water races, hut sites, dams, etc.), especially in the area around Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
44. Archaeological features relating to historic farming in the area around Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
45. Historic walking track from Queenstown to the top of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).

Mana whenua features and their locations:

46. 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.
47. Much of the ONL is mapped as the wāhi tūpuna Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) or Te Tapunui wāhi tūpuna. The very northern extent overlaps the Kimiākau (Shotover River) wāhi tūpuna.

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:

48. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
49. Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura is named after Hakitekura, a Kāti Māmoë woman who was the first person to swim across ~~Whakatipu wai-māori~~ Whakatipu Waimāori. ~~After watching other young women from the mountains attempting to outswim each other, she decided that she wanted to outdo them. She got a kauati (a stick used to start fire) from her father, and a bundle of dry raupō as kindling. The next morning, Hakitekura set out from Tāhuna (the flat land where Queenstown now stands). With the kauati and raupō bound tightly in harakeke (flax) to keep them dry, she swam across the lake in darkness, with the bundle strapped to her. When Hakitekura was discovered missing, her father remembered his daughter's request for a kauati, and a waka was sent across the lake to bring her back. The mountains where she would look across the lake were thereafter known as~~ ~~Te Taumata-a-Hakitekura~~ Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (The Resting Place of Hakitekura).
50. The name Te Tapunui signifies a place considered sacred to Kāi Tahu whānui both traditionally and in the present.
51. Kimiākau is part of the extensive network of mahika kai (food & resource gathering) and traditional travel routes in the area.
52. The mana whenua values associated with this ONF include, but may not be limited to, wāhi tapu, wāhi taoka, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

Commented [BG12]: OS 77.39 Kai Tahu Otago.
OS 188.39 Elisha Ebert-Young.

Commented [BG13]: OS 77.48 Kai Tahu Otago.
OS 188.48 Elisha Ebert-Young.

Important historic attributes and values:

53. The naming of the Ben Lomond, after Ben Lomond in Scotland by the early shepherd, Duncan McAusland.

54. Early European interactions with the creeks in the area as sources of water, power, and gold, as well as obstacles that needed to be bridged.
55. Gold mining in the area and the associated physical remnants.
56. Early farming around Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
57. The contextual value of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) as a landscape feature that historically defined communication routes around the Whakatipu Basin.
58. The importance of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) as an early tourist destination.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

59. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
60. The popularity of the postcard views from Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak) ~~out over Queenstown~~, Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill), Walter Peak, Cecil Peak, the Remarkables, ~~Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond)~~ and the broader mountain context, as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.
61. The very high popularity of the Skyline Gondola and luge facility and the Queenstown Time Walk (both described below). The very close proximity of these recreational features to Queenstown urban area also plays a role.
62. The identity of Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak), Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) and, further afield, Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) as part of the dramatic backdrop to Queenstown.
63. ~~The popularity of the postcard views from Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) out over Lake Whakatipu, Cecil Peak, Walter Peak, The Remarkables, Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), and the broader mountain context, as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.~~
64. The identity of Bowen Peak as part of the dramatic backdrop to Arthurs Point.

Commented [BG14]: Amended for consistency as the other outlooks are referred to in a general sense.
OS42.5 Sunnyheights Limited.

Commented [BG15]: Combined from [63] to reduce repetition.
OS42.5 Sunnyheights Limited.

Commented [BG16]: Combined with [60] to reduce repetition.
OS42.5 Sunnyheights Limited.

Important recreation attributes and values:

65. Walking, running, mountain biking, paragliding, luging, riding the gondola, bungee jumping and enjoying the view from the café/restaurant facilities on Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak).
66. Walking and running on the Tiki Trail, Ben Lomond Track, Arawata Track and the Moonlight Track.
67. Mountain biking within the Queenstown Mountain Bike Park and trails within and around the Wynyard Jump Park.
68. Walking, running, and picnicking on the Queenstown Time Walk which includes several heritage interpretation panels, lookout points and the 'Basket of Dreams' sculpture by Caroline Robinson.
69. Walking and running on the Matakauri Park boardwalk (near Gorge Road).
- 69a Adventure tourism tracks, facilities and activities in the Gorge Road valley.
70. Trout fishing at Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
71. Glenorchy-Queenstown Road and Gorge Road as key scenic routes in close proximity.

Commented [BG17]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 189.23 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 138.7 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 138.8 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

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:

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

Particularly important views to and from the area:

74. The postcard views from vantage points on Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak) ~~out over Queenstown~~, Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill), Walter Peak, Cecil Peak, the Remarkables, ~~Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond)~~, and the broader mountain context.
75. The spectacular panoramic views from the Ben Lomond saddle and Ben Lomond summit out over the Whakatipu Valley to the south (including the lake) and the rugged and dramatic expanse of Harris and Richardson mountains ranges to the north.
76. ~~The postcard views from Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) over Lake Wakatipu, the Remarkables, Ben Lomond and the broader mountain context of Queenstown.~~
77. The highly attractive short to long-range views from the Moonlight Track along the vegetation-clad gorge of the Shotover Corridor, across the rugged and largely undeveloped slopes of Mount Dewar and northwards to The Point.
78. The appealing short to long-range views from the Arawata Track across the mixed bush and scrub-clad lake margins to Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and Cecil Peak.
79. The engaging mid to long-range views from Queenstown, Fernhill, Sunshine Bay, Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights), Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), parts of the Queenstown Trail network, and the Glenorchy-Queenstown Road, in which the largely forested slopes of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) form the backdrop to Queenstown. The bold contrast between the urban development throughout the lower flanks of the hill and the elevated wooded slopes is memorable and of importance to the identity of Queenstown as a settlement tucked into the base of a mountain.
80. The appealing long-range views from more distant elevated vantage points such as the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts) in which the visibility of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) peak and the connection of Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak) and Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) to the broader glacial landscape confers a sense of grandeur to the outlook.
81. Dramatic close and mid-range views from Gorge Road to the rugged and vegetation-pocked slopes of Bowen Peak. The somewhat wild and unkempt character of the slopes where rocky outcrops and patches of scrub and grey shrubland dominate at relatively close range, combined with the broader mountain context (Sugar Loaf and Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill)), add to the spectacle.
82. Dramatic mid and long-range views from Arthurs Point, the Kimiākau (Shotover River) ONF, the western Whakatipu Basin / Littles Stream area and sections of the trail network coinciding with this part of the basin, to the rugged eastern and north-eastern slopes of Bowen Peak and Sugar Loaf. In views the mountainous context within which the largely undeveloped and open mountain-scape is seen, together with its visual dominance (as a consequence of its scale, proximity, and appearance), adds to the appeal of the outlook.

Commented [BG18]: Amended for consistency as the other outlooks are referred to in a general sense.
OS42.5 Sunnyheights Limited.

Commented [BG19]: Combined from [76] to reduce repetition.
OS42.5 Sunnyheights Limited.

Commented [BG20]: Combined with [74] to reduce repetition.
OS42.5 Sunnyheights Limited.

83. Engaging and attractive short to long-range views from the Frankton Arm, Frankton (including the airport), SH6, and Kelvin Peninsula to the smoother south-facing slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and the more irregular profile of Pt 781 (seen in combination with the cone like peak of Ferry Hill which is a separate PA ONF). In more distant views (e.g. Frankton Arm and Kelvin Peninsula), this part of the PA is perceived as a continuous, albeit varied, landform feature with Ferry Hill PA ONF. The almost unbroken patterning of vegetation plantation forest along the southern flanks of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and wilding conifers intermixed with grey shrubland and scrub throughout the southern lower flanks of Pt 781, together with its generally undeveloped character, forms a memorable contrast with the urban development below and the more open pastoral slopes sitting above, which reinforces the impression of coherence. In longer range views from many of the more distant locations to the south, there is a clear appreciation of the roche moutonnée landform profile and the waters of the Frankton Arm seen in the foreground of view, along with the often-snow-capped mountains of Ben Lomond and Coronet Peak in the background add to the appeal. In closer range views (e.g. Frankton and SH6), intervening landforms, vegetation and/or built development curbs the field of view in places. Despite the limited expanse of the feature visible, the contrast established by the natural landform seen within an urban context adds to the memorability and appeal of such views.
84. Attractive mid to long-range views from Queenstown, Lake Whakatipu, and the Glenorchy-Queenstown Road, in which the smoother 'up-glacier' largely forested south-western slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) form the backdrop to Queenstown. The bold contrast between the urban development throughout the lower flanks of the hill and the elevated wooded slopes is memorable and of importance to the identity of Queenstown as a settlement tucked into the base of a mountains. From more distant vantage points, the connection of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) to the broader glacial landscape is more legible and adds a sense of grandeur to the outlook.
85. Attractive mid and long-range views from the Fitzpatrick Basin, Dalefield, Hawthorn Triangle, the elevated flanks and foothills associated with Slope Hill and sections of Queenstown Trail coinciding with this part of the basin, to the more irregular steep profile of Pt 781 and the more rounded, albeit rugged, northern side of Sugar Loaf. In closer range views, the expanse of the PA is curtailed by intervening landform and vegetation; however, there is an increased appreciation of the localised rocky outcrops, scarps, and hummocky terrain of the landforms adding to their appeal. In some of these views, there is an appreciation of the band of rural living development (Tucker Beach) along the north side of the Waipuna (Lake Johnson) saddle along with the poplar shelterbelts, scattered shade trees. Nevertheless, from this orientation, the large-scale and distinctive sculptural form of the landforms and their generally undeveloped character make them memorable.
86. Highly attractive close and mid-range views across Waipuna (Lake Johnson), seen enclosed by the steeply rising roche moutonnée features of Pt 781 and Ferry Hill (ONF). Scattered largely exotic lake edge, shelterbelt, shade tree, and amenity plantings (around dwellings) add to the scenic appeal.
87. Engaging and seemingly 'close-range' views from planes approaching or exiting Queenstown airport via the Frankton Arm. Such views offer an appreciation of the roches moutonnées and the broader glacial landscape context within which the PA ONL is set.
88. In all of the views, the dominance of 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONL, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the ONL and, in the case of the southern and north-eastern sides of the area, the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

Commented [BG21]: Typographical correction.

Naturalness attributes and values:

89. The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL set within a largely urban context (Queenstown and Arthurs Point), which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to its forestry, pastoral, recreational, and infrastructure uses are visible, the very low number of buildings and the limited visibility (excepting the gondola etc described below), limits their influence on the character of the area as a natural landscape.

90. The irregular patterning and proliferation of grey shrubland, exposed rock faces, and scrub in places, adds to the perception of naturalness.
91. While the gondola forms a bold manmade 'cut' up the hillside, with a sizeable terminal building and luge development atop Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak), the movement of the gondola cabins together with the connection the gondola and associated development establishes between the mountain setting and Queenstown adds a degree of interest to the view, meaning that it is not an overwhelmingly negative visual element. Put another way, these landscape modifications make an important contribution to Queenstown's recreational values (see above), suggesting a degree of landscape 'fit'. The scale of the seemingly 'undeveloped' mountain setting within which this development is viewed together with its strong visual connection to Queenstown also play a role in this regard. At night, the patterning of lights up the mountain slopes forms a bold contrast to the darkness of the surrounding mountain slopes. Again, it is the very close proximity of the area to Queenstown that lends a visual fit.
92. The forestry plantings across the south and southeast flanks of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill), Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) and parts of Bowen Peak contribute a reduced perception of naturalness. However, the underlying natural (and largely unmodified) schistose mountain and roche moutonnée landform character remains legible and dominant, thus ensuring this part of the area displays at least a moderate-high level of naturalness. The visual appearance of these parts of the PA during and after harvesting cycles forms a prominent negative visual element within the broader landscape setting and serves to (temporarily) further reduce the perception of naturalness in this part of the PA.

Memorability attributes and values:

93. The appealing and engaging views of the largely undeveloped mountains and largely undeveloped and legible roche moutonnée landforms from a wide variety of public vantage points. The juxtaposition of the mountains and landforms within a largely urban context, along with the magnificent broader mountain and lake context within which they are seen in many views, are also factors that contribute to memorability.
94. The 'close up' experience of the alpine setting that the PA affords for many residents and visitors to Queenstown as a consequence of the relatively high accessibility of the area (via the tracks and gondola in very close proximity to the town centre).
95. The panoramic alpine landscape views afforded from: the Ben Lomond track, saddle and peak; and the top of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
96. The sense of Queenstown and Arthurs Point tucked in at the toe of a majestic mountain setting.
97. The sense of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) as a 'hidden gem' tucked away in the hillslopes by Frankton.

Transient attributes and values:

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

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

100. A strong sense of the sublime as a consequence of the sheer scale, dramatic character and undeveloped appearance of the mountain and roche moutonnée which is evident: on the Ben Lomond track above the Gondola and luge development; along Gorge Road away from existing built development and adventure tourism related activities; and across the northern part of the PA which contributes a sense of remoteness and wildness to the wider setting (including Arthurs Point, Kimiākau (Shotover River) ONF and the western part of the Whakatipu Basin), despite the more developed immediate context.

Commented [BG22]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

Aesthetic qualities and values:

101. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.

102. More specifically, this includes:

- a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the generally undeveloped, vegetation-dominated, mountain landforms and roche moutonnée juxtaposed beside an urban context and/or an (ONF/L) lake or river context.
- b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. The large-scale and dramatic character of the steep mountain landforms backdropping Queenstown and Arthurs Point.
 - ii. The sculptural peaks of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) and Bowen Peak.
 - iii. The ever-changing play of light and weather patterns across the mountain and roche moutonnée slopes.
 - iv. The more rugged and wild character of the eastern side of Bowen Peak.
 - v. The distinctly rugged character of the west, northwest, north and northeast sides of each of the roche moutonnée landforms and the more coherent appearance of the southwest and south of each as a consequence of the landform and vegetation character and patterns.
 - vi. The rounded tops of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and Sugar Loaf, and the more rugged and irregular profile of Pt 781.
 - vii. The open and pastoral character of Pt 781 and the top of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
 - viii. The contained and enclosed nature of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) set within a largely pastoral context interspersed with largely exotic plantings.
 - ix. The general confinement of visible built development to two three distinct locations: Cemetery Hill (gondola, luge, etc.); parts of the Gorge Road valley floor (rural living, rural buildings, and adventure tourism related buildings, facilities and tracks); and near Arthurs Point (limited scattering of rural living development).

Commented [BG23]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

Commented [BG24]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

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

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

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

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

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

- a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
- b. The historic features and associations of the area.
- c. The very strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.

- d. The significant recreational attributes of Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak), Ben Lomond and Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) and trout fishing in Lake Johnson.

Commented [BG25]: OS 115.3 Khaylm Marshall.

105. **High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area due to its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Queenstown, Arthurs Point, Sunshine Bay, Fernhill, Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights), the scenic routes of Glenorchy-Queenstown Road and Gorge Road, parts of the Queenstown Trail network, the Ladies Mile corridor, the western side of the Wakatipu Basin, the airport approach path and the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts), along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
- c. A moderate-high to high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of more natural landscape elements and patterns across the PA.
- d. The identity of the PA as a natural and dramatic landscape backdrop to Fernhill, Sunshine Bay, Queenstown, Arthurs Point, Frankton and the western side of the Whakatipu Basin.
- e. The sense of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) as a 'hidden gem' tucked away in the hillslopes by Frankton.
- f. A strong sense of remoteness and wildness throughout the elevated parts of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), along the western and north side of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill), the northern sides of Sugar Loaf and Pt 781 and on the slopes of Bowen Peak near Arthurs Point.

Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – **some** landscape capacity for small scale and low key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** – **no** landscape capacity; **very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms (including on the low lying southern margins of the PA adjacent Hansen Road) and which are 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; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). No landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA. No landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks** – **very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm, adventure tourism or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.

Commented [BG26]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG27]: OS 109.5 Vineyard Holdings Ltd.

Commented [BG28]: OS 91.3 Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited.
OS 75.11 Peter Clark.
OS 142.2 Hansen Family Partnership.
OS 142.41 Hansen Family Partnership
OS 186.7 Richard Kemp.
OS 186.10 Richard Kemp.
OS 189.2 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 189.3 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 189.32 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 109.5 Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Ltd.
OS 138.30 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Ltd.

Commented [BG29]: OS 71.5 Nathan Pringle.

OS 72.5 Charlotte Pringle.
OS 83.5 Michael McElroy.
OS 87.5 Karen Ramsay.
OS 92.5 Jana Brasch.
OS 107.5 Edward and Anne Halson.
OS 112.5 Claire Hazledine.
OS 13.8 J Semple.
OS 122.5 J Semple.
OS 14.8 M Semple.
OS 69.5 Andrew James Blackford.
OS 131.5 Justine Lee.
OS 150.5 Tracey van Hercul.
OS 187.5 Joshua Nicholas Jones.
OS 197.5 Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin.
OS 202.5 Michael John Boyd.
OS 204.5 Anna-Louise and Paul Hedley and Hollingsworth.

Commented [BG30]: OS 138.1 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 138.2 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited.
OS 189.2 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 189.35 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 138.8 Off Road Adventures Queenstown Ltd.

- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, **very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction** – no landscape capacity.
- i. **Transport infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protects the area's ONE values. **Very limited to no** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.

Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – **limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- viii. **Renewable energy generation** – no landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. Very limited to no landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- ix. **Production Forestry** – no landscape capacity.
- x. **Rural living** – **Very limited to no** landscape capacity. Where such development is appropriate, it is likely to be: co located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access (where appropriate).
- xi. **Passenger Lift Systems** – **limited** landscape capacity to improve public access to focal recreational areas higher in the mountains via non-vehicular transportation modes such as gondolas, provided they are positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, are co-located with existing gondola infrastructure and designed to be recessive in the landscape.

Commented [BG31]: Roman numeral numbering correction required form here on in the Schedule.

Commented [BG32]: NB Roman numeral numbering error to be corrected in the final version of the Schedule.

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

Commented [BG34]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
OS 91.3 Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited.

Commented [BG35]: OS 91.3 Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited.
OS 189.2 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 189.3 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 189.39 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 109.12 Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Ltd.

Commented [BG36]: OS 70.26 Transpower New Zealand Limited.
189.38

Commented [BG37]: OS 109.12 Vineyard Holdings Ltd..
OS 91.3 Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited.

Commented [BG38]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG39]: OS 75.19 Peter Clark.
OS 75.21 Peter Clark.
OS 90.3 Will Hodgson.
OS 142.2 Hansen Family Partnership.
OS 142.44 Hansen Family Partnership.
OS 186.7 Richard Kemp.
OS 189.2 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 189.3 Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Ltd.
OS 109.14 Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Ltd.
OS 91.3 Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited.

21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL Schedule”. New text underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text relates to a submission point that has not been specifically captured in the “Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL Schedule Draft (2)”. This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **Forty-nine examples identified.**

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS12.2	Ella Pedley	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required other than to note the relatively minor Schedule 21.22.12 text changes recommended in Response to Submissions version of Schedule 21.22.14 (July 2023).	Accept submission in part.
OS13.2	Jennie Semple	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS13.4	Jennie Semple	Support	That the values and attributes of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS13.6	Jennie Semple	Support	That the Western Whakatipu Basin Outstanding Natural Landscape is protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development in accordance with section 6 of	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			the Resource Management Act 1991.		
OS13.8	Jennie Semple	Support	That the identification of no capacity for urban expansion is retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS13.10	Jennie Semple	Oppose	That any other consequential changes be made to achieve the purpose of sustainable management and protection of the Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape within and around Arthurs Point.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS14.2	Matthew Semple	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS14.4	Matthew Semple	Support	That the values and attributes of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS14.6	Matthew Semple	Support	That the Western Whakatipu Basin Outstanding Natural Landscape is protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development in accordance with section 6 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS14.8	Matthew Semple	Support	That the identification of no capacity for urban expansion is retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS14.10	Matthew Semple	Oppose	That any other consequential changes be made to achieve the purpose of sustainable management and protection of the Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape within and around Arthurs Point.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS45.2	Natalie Reeves	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Western Whakatipu Basin is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS61.3	Michelle Rudd	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS69.2	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS69.5	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS69.8	Andrew James Blackford	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS70.26	Ainsey McLeod On Behalf Of	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 Capacity as follows:	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Transpower New Zealand Limited		Basin is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point viii utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. <u>In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.</u>	
OS71.2	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS71.5	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS71.8	Nathan Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS72.2	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS72.5	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS72.8	Charlotte Pringle	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS75.1	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be deleted, or that the landscape schedule be amended as otherwise set out in the submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS75.2	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu provide more refined identification of particular parts of the priority area to further distinguish various landscape components.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>This aspect of the submission relates to a request that the PA is 'dissected' to identify landscape character units within the Priority Area (which have shared landscape attributes), and that the attributes, values and landscape capacity in Schedule 21.22.12 are amended applying a more fine-grained landscape character unit approach. Part and parcel of this submission point is the submitter's criticism that the PA is not a landscape in itself and the assertion that due to the large size of the PA there are landscape nested within the PA.</p> <p>The Topic 2.2 Decision (December 2019) directs at [171], that the assessment of the ONF/L Priority Areas be undertaken for the feature or landscape <u>as a whole</u> (rather than at a landscape character unit scale).</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>Prior to the PA Schedules work being undertaken, landscape conferencing was undertaken (Joint Statement arising from Expert Planner and Landscape Conferencing in relation to Strategic Policies and Priority Area Expert Conferencing, TOPIC 2: RURAL LANDSCAPES, dated 29 October 2020) in which the experts agreed that there were likely to be a number of landscape character units within a single PA (see JWS [29]).</p> <p>The expert PA Schedule authors carefully considered the utility of identifying landscape character units within each PA in terms of identifying the important attributes and values that needed to be protected at a landscape scale, and landscape capacity. The PA Methodology Report [5.24] explains the authors did not consider it necessary to undertake landscape character unit delineation to inform an understanding of landscape values (and in turn, capacity). However, this is not to say that localised variances in values and landscape capacity occur across a PA. The PA Schedules have been drafted to acknowledge this variance in two ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) By acknowledging more localised nuances in the main body of the Schedule of Values and Landscape Capacity comments (where appropriate). b) By signalling upfront in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 and Schedule 21.23 that the landscape attributes, values and capacity relate to the PA as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing the attributes, values and capacity of specific sites; and a finer grained site-specific assessment of a plan change or resource consent process may identify different attributes, values and capacity to that identified in the PA Schedule. 	
OS75.3	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin values identification be revisited based on smaller units.	Addressed in response to OS 75.2.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS75.4	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu provide direction that recognises that there is landscape capacity to absorb development on the submitters property (Lot 1 DP 514017 and Lot 2 DP 397058 held in Record of Title 812220), and enable future rural-residential activities to the west of Sunshine Bay.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>For the reasons explained in response to OS 75.2, it is inappropriate to identify site specific capacity within a PA Schedule of Landscape Values.</p> <p>The response to OS 91.3 may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS75.5	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Important land-use patterns and features paragraph 27 be amended to include the sentence: Wilding conifers located to the west of Sunshine Bay.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Wilding conifers are evident around the edges of the PA generally, including at Sunshine Bay. It is considered that the wording of Schedule 21.22.12 [27] adequately acknowledges this (negative) landscape attribute.</p>	Reject submission.
OS75.6	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Important land-use patterns and features paragraph 37 be amended to include suburban residential development at Fernhill and Sunshine Bay, so that it reads: The UGB and suburban residential development at Fernhill and Sunshine Bay associated with Queenstown which	<p>Having carefully reviewed the UGB and zoning mapping for the area, the following amendment is recommended to Schedule 21.22.12 [37]:</p> <p>The UGB associated with Queenstown and the Fernhill/Sunshine Bay suburban area which adjoins the southern edges of the PA, and the Arthurs Point UGB which adjoins the north-western margins of the PA.</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			adjoins the southern edges of the PA... .		
OS75.7	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Important land-use patterns and features be amended by adding an addition paragraph: 38a. Some ONLs that are close to or adjoin urban areas are influenced by land use patterns (sic) arising from established urban development, and have a greater capacity to absorb development, including the area to the west of Sunshine Bay.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation for the PA Schedules work and involvement in several rezoning appeals and resource consent proposals within the District, while I agree that neighbouring urban development can (and does) influence the edges of an ONF/L, I do not consider that this amounts to an increased capacity to absorb development around such edges. Rather, it is my opinion that often the ONF/L land immediately adjacently an urban area has an increased landscape sensitivity to development change due to the role it plays in creating a legible 'edge' to the ONF/L sitting adjacent the urban zoned land. Put another way, such ONF/L - urban interfaces are highly vulnerable to development creep that can threaten the fundamental naturalness of the ONF/L and merit of the area as being part of a RMA s6(b) landscape.</p> <p>For these reasons, I consider that the text change requested by the submitter is inappropriate.</p>	Reject submission.
OS75.8	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Naturalness attributes and values be amended to add: 92a. Lower landscape values and naturalness to the west of Sunshine Bay, which contributes to the ONL being able to absorb some development.	Addressed in response to OS 75.7.	Reject submission.
OS75.9	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Remoteness and wildness attributes and values paragraph 100 be amended to add the words	Schedule 21.22.12 [100] explains that a strong sense of the sublime relates to specific parts of the PA. For this reason, the text change requested by the submitter is considered to be unnecessary.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>'In some places' in from of the first sentence 'A strong sense of sublime...'</p>		
OS75.10	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	<p>That landscape capacity 21.22.12.i Commercial recreational activities be amended to remove the rating of some capacity, and delete the words 'and protect the area's ONL values', so that it reads: Commercial recreational activities - would need to integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; be located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character; and integrate appropriate landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>In seeking that the word, 'some' is deleted from Schedule 21.22.12 Capacity (i), the amendment requested by the submitter provides no guidance with respect to the landscape capacity of the PA to accommodate commercial recreation. This means that it does not accord with the directions of the Environment Court for the PA Schedules.</p> <p>However, in considering this submission point, I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.12 Capacity (i) are appropriate:</p> <p>Commercial recreational activities – some landscape capacity for activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS75.11	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.ii Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended to delete no landscape capacity and replaced with: Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - activities would need to integrate with and complement existing recreation features; be located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS75.12	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.iii be amended from no landscape capacity to low landscape capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Urban development is 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.
OS75.13	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.iv intensive agriculture be amended from no landscape capacity to low landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 189.34.	Reject submission

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS75.14	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.v Earthworks be amended to delete the words 'very limited landscape capacity, and amend wording to read: Earthworks - associated with farm or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, will need to be sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. In seeking that the word, 'very limited' is deleted from Schedule 21.22.12 Capacity (v), the amendment requested by the submitter provides no guidance with respect to the landscape capacity of the PA to accommodate commercial recreation. This means that it does not accord with the directions of the Environment Court for the PA Schedules.	Reject submission.
OS75.15	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.vi. Farm buildings be amended to change from very limited to low landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character and add: Other area Very Low.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS75.16	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.vii. Mineral extraction be amended from no landscape capacity to low landscape capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Reject submission.
OS75.17	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.i Transport infrastructure be amended from limited to moderate landscape capacity for trails, and from no to low landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.	Addressed in response to OS 189.31.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS75.18	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.viii Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended to delete the words: 'limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of' and add 'Low for', so it reads: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure - low for utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened,...	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS75.19	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.ix. Renewable energy generation be amended from no to very limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS75.20	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.x. Production forestry be amended from no to very limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Reject submission.
OS75.21	Craig Barr On Behalf Of Peter Clark	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.xi. Rural living be amended from no to low landscape capacity and amended to read: Rural living - low landscape capacity within the elevated and remote areas of the PA. Moderate landscape capacity on the lower	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			elevated areas located west of Sunshine Bay. Any rural living development would need to integrate with and complement/enhance existing indigenous vegetation and be located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a very sympathetic scale, appearance, and character.		
OS77.39	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu paragraph 49 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 [49] as follows: Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura is named after Hakitekura, a Kāti Māmoe woman who was the first person to swim across Whakatipu wai māori Whakatipu Waimāori . After watching other young women from the mountains attempting to outswim each other, she decided that she wanted to outdo them. She got a kauati (a stick used to start fire) from her father, and a bundle of dry raupō as kindling. The next morning, Hakitekura set out from Tāhuna (the flat land where Queenstown now stands). With the kauati and raupō bound tightly in harakeke (flax) to keep them dry, she swam across the lake in darkness, with the bundle strapped to her. When Hakitekura was discovered missing, her father remembered his daughter's request for a kauati, and a waka was sent across the lake to bring her back. The mountains where she would look across the lake were thereafter known as Te Taumata-a-Hakitekura (The Resting Place of Hakitekura).	Accept submission.
OS77.48	Michael Bathgate On Behalf Of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 paragraph 49 be amended to correct the spelling of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura.	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 [49] as follows: Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura is named after Hakitekura, a Kāti Māmoe woman who was the first person to swim across Whakatipu wai māori Whakatipu Waimāori . After watching other young women from the mountains attempting to outswim each other, she decided that she wanted to outdo them. She	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				got a kauati (a stick used to start fire) from her father, and a bundle of dry raupō as kindling. The next morning, Hakitekura set out from Tāhuna (the flat land where Queenstown now stands). With the kauati and raupō bound tightly in harakeke (flax) to keep them dry, she swam across the lake in darkness, with the bundle strapped to her. When Hakitekura was discovered missing, her father remembered his daughter's request for a kauati, and a waka was sent across the lake to bring her back. The mountains where she would look across the lake were thereafter known as Te Taumata-a-Hakitekura Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (The Resting Place of Hakitekura).	
OS83.2	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS83.5	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS83.8	Michael McElroy	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS85.7	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sipka Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that it incorrectly states at [20] that there are 'important ecological features and	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			vegetation types' and lists features that do not have ecological importance such as crack willows which are invasive to native species.	<p>discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the PA ONL (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>However, it is agreed that as currently drafted the Schedules are potentially confusing in this regard as these aspects of the landscape are negative rather than positive.</p> <p>A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter.</p>	
OS85.8	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sipka Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [25] under the heading 'important ecological features and vegetation types' lists animal pest species and plant pest species which are not important ecological features or important vegetation types.	Addressed in response to OS 85.7.	Accept submission in part.
OS85.9	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sipka Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [33] the description of important land-use patterns and features fails to acknowledge other farm buildings which exist but that have not been identified.	<p>No specific location reference or technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 2 Steve Xin (Sunshine Bay ONL mapping) Appeal (which included a site visit to the submitter's land), the submitter is encouraged to provide evidence so that other farm buildings can be appropriately referenced in Schedule 21.22.12.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS85.10	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sipka Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That the relationship between mana whenua associations, Wāhi Tūpuna Chapter and consultation with mana whenua for applications be clarified in the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS85.11	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Sipka Holdings Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [59] a generic statement is made that the 'descriptions and photographs of the area in tourist publications' while providing no evidence as to what publications or photographs are referred to.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. It is not usual practice to identify which tourist publications make reference to an ONF/L in a Schedule of Landscape Values. However, for example, Queenstown Bike Park and the Skyline Gondola are featured on the Queenstown: Things to Do website https://www.queenstownnz.co.nz/	Reject submission.
OS87.2	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS87.5	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS87.8	Karen Ramsay	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS90.3	Will Hodgson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified, except for landscape capacity as set out in the submission.	The submitter seeks that Schedule 21.22.12 is amended to acknowledge the working rural landscape context of the PA and that reference to 'no landscape capacity' is changed to something like 'very low landscape capacity' to allow consideration of appropriate rural development. Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS90.5	Will Hodgson	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be amended so that; some landscape capacity is changed to high landscape capacity, limited landscape capacity is changed to moderate landscape capacity, very limited landscape capacity is change to low landscape capacity, and no landscape capacity is change to very low landscape capacity	Addressed in response to OS 189.31.	Reject submission.
OS91.2	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be amended to identify that the Gorge Road valley floor area does not contain any particularly outstanding landscape value(s).	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 (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS91.3	Ben Farrell On Behalf Of Columb Family and Off Road Adventures Limited	Oppose	That for landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin all landscape capacity rating be deleted, or alternatively identify that the submitter's property (229 Gorge Road, OT11B/747, OT18D/476, Middleton Farm/Queenstown Hill) or parts of the Outstanding Natural Landscape including the submitter's property, as having a high landscape capacity for a range of new development and activities including: commercial recreation, visitor accommodation and tourism related activities, intensive agriculture, earthworks, farm buildings, transport infrastructure, utilities and regionally significant infrastructure, renewable energy generation, production forestry, rural living.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>For the reasons explained in response to OS 75.2, it is inappropriate to identify site specific capacity within a PA Schedule of Landscape Values.</p> <p>However, in considering this submission and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Stage 2 Steve Xin (Sunshine Bay ONL mapping) Appeal (which included a site visit to the area in the vicinity of the submitter's land), I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.12 Capacity are appropriate:</p> <p>Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – very limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms (including on the low lying southern margins of the PA adjacent Hansen Road) and which are 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; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). No landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA. No landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA. No landscape capacity.</p> <p>Transport infrastructure – limited landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONF values. Very limited to no landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. Very limited to no landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>Rural living – Very limited to no landscape capacity. Where such development is appropriate, it is likely to be: <u>located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access (where appropriate).</u></p> <p>For completeness, I remain of the view that a rating of no landscape capacity is appropriate for tourism related activities (i.e. resorts), urban development, intensive agriculture, mineral extraction and production forestry.</p> <p>I also note a numbering error in the Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.12 which should be corrected in the final version of the Schedule</p>	
OS92.2	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS92.5	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS92.8	Jana Braasch	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS106.2	Tim Williams On Behalf Of RD & EM Anderson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to exclude the submitter's property at 91 Oxenbridge Tunnel Road, Arthurs Point (Section 121 Block XIX Shotover SD and Lot 2 DP 19294).	91 Oxenbridge Tunnel Road is entirely located within Shotover River PA ONF. Therefore, this submission is addressed in the Schedule 21.22. Shotover River Summary Table.	Reject submission (in relation to Schedule 21.22.12).
OS107.2	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS107.5	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS107.8	Edward and Anne Halson	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS109.3	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be amended to remove the Moonlight Block (OT16D/402) from the priority area.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in response to OS 91.2. The submitter queries, (amongst other matters addressed in response to Methodology submissions), the rating of no landscape capacity . The recommended amendments to the Schedule 21.22 Preamble and the Schedule 21.22.12 text in response to OS 75.2 and OS 91.3, may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS109.5	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.ii visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended from no landscape capacity to some landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS109.6	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.iii Urban expansion be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response OS 75.12.	Reject submission.
OS109.7	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.iv Intensive agriculture be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response OS 75.12.	Reject submission.
OS109.8	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.v Earthworks be amended from very limited landscape capacity to some landscape capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS109.9	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.vi Farm buildings be amended from very limited landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response OS 189.36.	Reject submission.
OS109.10	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.vii Mineral extraction be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response OS 91.3.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS109.11	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.i Transport infrastructure be amended from limited landscape capacity to some landscape capacity for trails and from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.	Addressed in response OS 189.37.	Reject submission.
OS109.12	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.ix Renewable energy generation be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS109.13	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.x Production forestry be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Reject submission.
OS109.14	Jenny Carter On Behalf Of Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.12.xi Rural living be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS112.2	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS112.5	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.		
OS112.8	Claire Hazledine	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS115.3	Khaylm Marshall	Oppose	That the list of associative attributes and values in landscape schedule 21.22.12 be amended to include the recreational attributes of Lake Johnson.	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 [104] (d) as follows: The significant recreational attributes of Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak), Ben Lomond and Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) and trout fishing in Lake Johnson .	Accept submission.
OS119.2	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is opposed and should be rejected as notified.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS119.4	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified as it fails to recognise that the outstanding natural landscape, outstanding natural feature, and rural character landscapes only apply to Rural Zoned landscapes. It is submitted that the Open Space and Recreation Zones cannot be part of the landscape schedule priority area and	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			should be made clear in the mapping of the priority areas.		
OS119.5	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified as at [ii] landscape capacity it is stated that tourism activities have no capacity. It is submitted that the landscape capacity schedules are at a landscape character unit level rather than a site specific level.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>With respect to the submitter's criticism in relation to the landscape capacity rating for tourism activities within the PA, the response to OS 91.3 is of relevance.</p> <p>Further the response to OS 75.2 may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in relation the scale or grain of the landscape assessed in the PA Schedules (including the attributes, values and capacity ratings).</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS119.6	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified and that tourism activities should be defined within Chapter 2 of the Proposed District Plan or clarified within the landscape schedule as it relates to resort development and not tourism activities as a whole.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The submitter is seeking a definition of 'tourism activities' either in Chapter 2 or the PA Schedules. The Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 addresses this matter.</p> <p>With respect to the submitter's criticism in relation to the landscape capacity rating for tourism activities within the PA, see the response to OS 91.3.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS119.7	Carey Vivian On Behalf Of Queenstown Mountain Bike Club	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be rejected as notified as the wording at [ii] landscape capacity for earthworks associated with public access tracks such as the mountain bike trails the submitter builds and maintains that protect the naturalness and	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>In my experience, public access tracks (and farm tracks) can protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values via the careful use of following 'design tools' such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Aligning the track to follow the landform. Configuring any mitigation and/or enhancement planting associated with the track to reinforce more natural landform patterns (such as steep slopes or gullies) so 	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing landform patterns is incorrect. It is uncertain how mountain bike tracks protect the naturalness and expressiveness of the attributes and values of the landscape. These words should be removed from this section.	<p>that it reinforces the formative processes of the landscape.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Locating the track to minimise (or avoid) retaining structures. • Where retaining structures are unavoidable, designing such structures to be of an appropriate materiality and integrated by locally appropriate plantings. • Avoiding urban style 'furniture' and infrastructure (such as lighting, stormwater management devices) associated with the track. <p>It is acknowledged that not all of the design tools will be relevant in every situation. However, the reference to naturalness and expressiveness values serves to cue careful consideration of these sorts of design tools, which is considered appropriate within a RMA s6(b) context.</p>	
OS122.2	J Semple	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is supported as notified and should be adopted as a matter of priority and importance.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.5	J Semple	Support	That the landscape capacity rating for urban expansions or urban development in landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin being no capacity is supported.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS122.8	J Semple	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure such as bridges or crossings of the Shotover River in the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	Shotover River bridges are not located within the spatial extent of the Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Basin should be amended to have no capacity for such activities.		
OS122.11	J Semple	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is adopted in the Proposed District Plan to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.14	J Semple	Oppose	That the values of the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are appropriately recorded so that those values can be considered in any future resource consent application or plan changes.	Schedule 21.22.12 as amended in the Response to Submissions Version appropriately records the landscape values of the PA.	Accept submission in part.
OS122.17	J Semple	Oppose	That the land included within the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is ultimately protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.	<p>To a large degree this submission is addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.</p> <p>The submitter requests a number of changes to the Schedule text, including the addition of a landscape description of the area derived from the QLDC Read Landscape Boundaries Report, April 2014.</p> <p>The submission is also critical that Schedule 21.22.12 forms a one size fits all approach to describing the landscape values and landscape capacity of the Shotover River ONF and wider ONL mountain context.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, I consider that all of the attributes and values signalled in the submission are captured in Schedule 21.22 (subject to the minor refinements, as shown in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.12, July 2023), albeit in a slightly different structure that accords with landscape assessment best practice and the mapped PAs (noting that the ONF/L context of Arthurs Point relates to three PAs). I also note that the particular 'sites' of</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				concern to the submitter are outside of the spatial extent of Western Whakatipu PA ONL. Further, the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the attributes and values, along with landscape capacity of a Priority Area are evaluated at a Priority Area level and that the PA Schedules are intended to be read in full.	
OS122.20	J Semple	Oppose	That any consequential amendments or refinements to the provisions of the Proposed District Plan and/or landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin to better achieve the purpose of sustainable management, and the protection of the Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape is adopted.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS131.2	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS131.5	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS131.8	Justine Lee	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.		
OS136.2	Barbara Lusk	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS136.5	Barbara Lusk	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS138.1	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to more accurately recognise that the submitters land and surrounding valley floor at Gorge Road exhibits a range of established and historical activities and is significantly more modified than the elevated hills and mountain peaks of the majority of the priority area. The schedule needs to amended to either exclude the site or to more accurately recognise and provide for these existing uses, their likely and anticipated future upgrade, replacement, or redevelopment.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and careful review of aerial photography of the submitter's land and the submission, I consider that Schedule 21.22.12 should be amended as follows to better reflect the development established in the Gorge Road valley and associated capacity:</p> <p>General Description of the Area</p> <p>The Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL encompasses the steep south-eastern mountain slopes of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), the steep south and eastern mountain slopes of Bowen Peak and the two elevated roche moutonnée landforms of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill and including Sugar Loaf) and Pt 781. The PA ONF also takes in Waipuna (Lake Johnson) sitting in the ice-eroded gully between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill (a separate PA ONF), Collectively, the mountain slopes form the northern backdrop to Sunshine Bay, Fernhill and Queenstown, and the western/north-western backdrop mountain setting to Gorge Road and Arthurs Point. The PA ONL adjoins the Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA ONF along its north-eastern boundary in the vicinity of Arthurs Point.</p> <p>33. The general absence of rural and rural living buildings within the PA, excepting a scattering at the north-western end</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>of Arthurs Point, a scattering along the Gorge Road valley floor (including adventure tourism related facilities and activities), a very small pocket of urban dwellings at the toe of the Queenstown Time Walk, and the small cluster of rural living dwellings at the south end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson).</p> <p>69a Adventure tourism tracks, facilities and activities in the Gorge Road valley.</p> <p>100. A strong sense of the sublime as a consequence of the sheer scale, dramatic character and undeveloped appearance of the mountain and roche moutonnée which is evident: on the Ben Lomond track above the Gondola and luge development; along Gorge Road (away from existing built development and adventure tourism related activities); and across the northern part of the PA which contributes a sense of remoteness and wildness to the wider setting (including Arthurs Point, Kimiākau (Shotover River) ONF and the western part of the Whakatipu Basin), despite the more developed immediate context.</p> <p>102 (b) (ix). The general confinement of visible built development to two three distinct locations: Cemetery Hill (gondola, luge, etc.); parts of the Gorge Road valley floor (rural living, rural buildings, and adventure tourism related buildings, facilities and tracks); and near Arthurs Point (limited scattering of rural living development).</p> <p>Landscape Capacity</p> <p>v. Earthworks – very limited landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm, adventure tourism or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.</p> <p>The response to OS 91.3 is also of relevance in this regard as it recommends a number of other amendments to the Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.12.</p>	
OS138.2	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that if the landscape capacity	<p>Addressed in response to OS 189.3 and:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> by the inclusion of additional explanatory text in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to 	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Adventures Queenstown Limited		ratings are retained within the schedules that they include a corresponding scale of development to guide the implementation of this. The term "no landscape capacity" should be deleted.	<p>Schedule 21.12 (July 2023) to better explain the capacity ratings; and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the introduction of a fifth rating scale: very limited to no landscape capacity (– refer to the table addressing the response to general landscape submission ‘themes’). 	
OS138.3	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to recognise and provide for the benefits of change, enhancement and remediation of land in the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The focus of the Schedules is to identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected.</p> <p>That said, the 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 ONL (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.
OS138.4	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended in order for landscape values and capacity components to identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The focus of the Schedules is to identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected.</p> <p>That said, the identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>It is expected that such matters would be traversed in detail as part of a detailed (and more site specific) landscape</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				assessment in support of a plan change or resource consent process.	
OS138.5	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include particular attributes and features existing at and around the submitters land. These are (a) Historical and existing farming uses, (b) Fences, (c) Roads, (d) Earthworks (e) Introduced and native vegetation, (f) Introduced species (particularly goats), (g) Pest control, (h) Rural-residential development, (i) Proximity to urban development, and (j) The realignment and modified nature of Horn Creek.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Almost all of the attributes and features requested for inclusion in the Schedule are already mentioned (directly or implicitly) or addressed in the response to OS 138.1. For example, fencing is an accepted part of farming landuse and earthworks are inevitable in relation to adventure tourism buildings, facilities and tracks.</p> <p>The possible exception is the reference to the realigned and modified nature of Horn Creek. Schedule 21.22.12 references the steeply incised section of Horn Creek as an important hydrological feature suggesting that this would likely exclude the realigned and modified section of the creek.</p> <p>The submitter is encouraged to produce evidence if any additional distinction is sought in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS138.6	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the priority area overlay included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is revised to exclude the submitters land and surrounding valley floor from the schedule, or that landscape schedule 21.22.12 and PA overlay be deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 91.2.	Reject submission.
OS138.7	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures	Oppose	That the 'Important landforms and land types' section of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended	Addressed in response to OS 138.1 and OS 189.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Queenstown Limited		to exclude the Gorge Road valley floor including the submitters land, or If the landscape schedule is to be retained as notified, that the low-lying and highly modified Gorge Road and valley floor is excluded from the landscape schedule.		
OS138.8	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the 'Land use patterns and features' section of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to further particularise the broader list of established activities occurring within the outstanding natural landscape which are historically recognised as appropriate and in keeping with the landform. These activities include but are not limited to farming activities, earthworks, rural-residential living and adventure tourism activities.	Addressed in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS138.9	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to delete reference to vegetation such as pasture, plant pest species and animal pest species from the schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 138.4 and OS 189.13.	Accept submission in part.
OS138.10	Maree Baker-Galloway On	Oppose	That paragraph 71 which specifies the Glenorchy-	Addressed in response to OS 189.24.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited		Queenstown Road and Gorge Road as key scenic routes is deleted from landscape schedule 21.22.12 Whakatipu Basin.		
OS138.11	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so that the landscape values for physical values (paragraph 103), associative values (paragraph 104) and perceptual values (paragraph 105) are moderate rather than high.	Addressed in response to OS 189.28, OS 189.29 and OS 189.30.	Reject submission.
OS138.12	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That if the overall landscape values for landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are not amended and the Gorge Road valley floor is not excluded from the Schedule (as per submission points #138.7 and #138.11), the values be amended to assign a low ranking to the lower-lying land, including the submitters land (Lot 1 DP 26780, Section 17 and 17 Block XX SD, and Sections 2-6 SO 24761).	Addressed in response to OS 91.2.	Reject submission.
OS138.13	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so the landscape capacity includes an indication of at what scale	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the Priority Area and	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Queenstown Limited		such potential activities have been considered and specific examples and analysis, or if the landscape capacities cannot be amended the landscape capacity section should be deleted from the schedule.	<p>should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites.</p> <p>Within the 12 landuses identified by the Court for consideration with respect to landscape capacity, there is a very large range of potential development scales and styles (for example, in the case of renewable energy, there are solar farms, wind farms and hydro schemes, each which can be of a widely varying scale). To provide a meaningful analysis for every landuse typology at a range of scales within each PA Schedule would be an enormous task. Rather, it is expected that this detailed analysis would occur as part of a resource consent or plan change application, as explained in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22.</p> <p>Further, to delete the Capacity section of the Schedules would not align with the directions from the Environment Court.</p>	
OS138.14	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that the landscape capacity classifications are consistent with the Wakatipu Basin Landscape Character Units. The term "no landscape capacity" should be deleted from the schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 189.31.	Reject submission.
OS138.15	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to ensure that if the landscape capacity sections are retained the submitters land should either be excluded from the schedule, or the schedule be amended to take into account the scale of existing	Addressed in response to OS 138.1. Also see response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			lawfully established activities occurring on the site (including existing and planned rural living opportunities, adventure tourism activities and associated utilities) and also likely future development associated with these existing land uses.		
OS138.17	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the 'General Description of the Area' included in landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove reference to "and the western/north-western backdrop to Gorge Road..." included in the third sentence of this section.	Addressed in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS138.18	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin should be amended at paragraph 15 to read: "The steeply incised and highly modified Horn Creek (or Bush Creek), McCheesney Creek, Domestic Creek.....".	No change required.	Reject submission.
OS138.19	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at subsection b of paragraph 21 to delete reference to areas	Addressed in response to OS 189.13.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Queenstown Limited		of pasture adjacent to Gorge Road / Watties track.		
OS138.20	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 23 to delete reference to "and adjacent Gorge Road...".	Addressed in response to 189.14.	Reject submission.
OS138.21	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to delete paragraph 24.	Addressed in response to OS 85.7.	Reject submission.
OS138.22	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to delete paragraph 25 from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 85.7.	Reject submission.
OS138.23	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to delete paragraph 26.	Addressed in response to OS 189.17.	Reject submission.
OS138.24	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to delete paragraph 27.	Addressed in response to OS 189.18.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Queenstown Limited				
OS138.25	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 33 to replace the words 'excepting a scattering at the north-western end of Arthurs Point, a very small pocket of urban dwellings at the toe of the Queenstown Time Walk, and the small cluster of rural living dwellings at the south end of the Waipuna (Lake Johnson)' with 'elevated mountainous part of the PA'.	Addressed in response to OS 189.20.	Accept submission in part.
OS138.26	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 40 to correct a typographical error and spelling of 'McChesney'.	Addressed in response to OS 189.22.	Accept submission.
OS138.27	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 89 (first sentence) to read: 'The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of the elevated parts of the Western Whakatipu Basin PA...'	Addressed in response to OS 189.25.	Reject submission.
OS138.28	Maree Baker-Galloway On	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	Addressed in response to OS 189.27.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited		Basin is amended at paragraph 100 to delete the words 'along Gorge Road' from the landscape schedule.		
OS138.29	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Whakatipu Basin is amended at paragraph 105 (subsection b) to delete reference to 'and Gorge Road' from the second sentence.	Addressed in response to OS 189.30.	Reject submission.
OS138.30	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities from 'no' capacity to 'some' capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS138.31	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so the landscape capacity for urban expansions is changed from "no landscape capacity" to "some landscape capacity in the lower-lying parts of the PA, including Gorge Road valley floor. No capacity in the elevated parts of the PA".	Addressed in response to OS 189.33.	Reject submission.
OS138.32	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so that the landscape capacity for	Addressed in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Adventures Queenstown Limited		earthworks is changed from 'very limited' capacity to "Some/high landscape capacity in the lower-lying parts of the PA, including Gorge Road valley floor", and to include the words "In the other parts of the PA".		
OS138.33	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for farm buildings from 'very limited' capacity to 'some' capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 189.36.	Reject submission.
OS138.34	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure from 'limited' capacity to 'some' capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 189.37.	Reject submission.
OS138.35	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Off Road Adventures Queenstown Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so the landscape capacity for urban expansions is changed from "no landscape capacity" to "some landscape capacity in the lower-lying parts of the PA, including Gorge Road valley floor. No capacity in the elevated parts of the PA".	Addressed in response to OS 189.33.	Reject submission.
OS142.2	Maree Baker-Galloway On	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	Addressed in response to OS 91.3. Also see response to OS 138.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership		Basin is amended to more accurately recognise that the submitters land exhibits a range of established and historical activities and is significantly more modified than the elevated parts of the Western Whakatipu outstanding natural landscape. The landscape schedule needs to provide for these existing uses, their likely and anticipated future upgrade, replacement, or redevelopment.		
OS142.13	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the 'Important landforms and land types' section of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to distinguish between the elevated part of Ben Lomond and Queenstown Hill and the lower, highly modified, flatter land which is characterised by farming and rural residential living, or if the landscape schedule is to be retained as notified, that the low-lying land including the submitters land is excluded from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I do not consider that proposed text amendments to the Important Landforms and land Types section of Schedule 21.22.12 are appropriate. The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions) and ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS142.14	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of	Oppose	That the 'Land use patterns and features' section of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	Addressed in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Hansen Family Partnership		Basin is amended to further particularise the broader list of established activities occurring within the outstanding natural landscape which are historically recognised as appropriate and in keeping with the landform.		
OS142.15	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so that the landscape values are low or moderate rather than high.	Addressed in response to OS 189.28, OS 189.29 and OS 189.30.	Reject submission.
OS142.16	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That if the overall landscape values for landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are not amended (as per submission point #142.15), the values need to be amended to assign a low naturalness ranking to the submitters site and other low-lying slopes.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate.</p> <p>The evaluation of naturalness in all of the PA Schedules is guided by the interpretation of 'natural' in <i>Te Tangi a te Manu</i>, [9.44] to [9.46] , drawing from <i>Harrison</i>, <i>WESI</i> and the <i>West Wind</i> Environment Court decisions.</p> <p>With respect to the suggestion that a low naturalness ranking should apply to the submitters site and other lower-lying slopes, it is also noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that attributes and values relate to a PA as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing values for specific sites.</p> <p>For these reasons, it is inappropriate to single out the rating of naturalness (or other landscape values) for individual sites in a PA Schedule of Values. However, it is acknowledged that varying values may emerge via the finer grained landscape assessment that is required as part of resource consent and plan change processes.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS142.17	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so the landscape capacity includes an indication of at what scale such potential activities have been considered and specific examples and analysis, or if the landscape capacities cannot be amended the landscape capacity section should be deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 138.13.	Reject submission.
OS142.18	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That if the landscape capacities for landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin section are retained as notified, then for the submitters land, this should be amended to recognise and provide for likely future development associated with existing land uses.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>This submission point suggests a site-specific grain of detail be included within the PA Schedule.</p> <p>As explained in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22, the landscape capacity is based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites. The preamble also explains that a varying level of capacity may be determined as part of a detailed landscape assessment supporting a resource consent or plan change process.</p> <p>There are a wide range of development scenarios that could be associated with the existing landuses (pastoral farming, rural living). It is expected that the appropriateness of future development associated with existing landuses would be assessed in detail as part of a resource consent application.</p>	Reject submission.
OS142.32	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That the 'General Description of the Area' included in landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove the second sentence that states: "The PA ONF also	<p>Addressed in response to OS 91.2.</p> <p>Waipuna (Lake Johnson) is correctly located within 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			takes in Waipuna (Lake Johnson) sitting in the ice eroded gully between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill (a separate PA ONF)".		
OS142.33	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraphs 11 and 12 are deleted from the 'Important ecological features and vegetation types' section included in landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin.	Referencing the response to OS 91.2, the landforms described in Schedule 21.22.12 [11] and [12] are located within the Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL and therefore appropriately referenced in this PA Schedule.	Reject submission.
OS142.34	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That subsections d - f of paragraph 21 on other distinctive vegetation types are deleted from landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin.	Referencing the response to OS 91.2, the other distinctive vegetation types described in Schedule 21.22.12 [21] (d) to (f) are appropriately included within the Western Whakatipu Basin PA ONL Schedule.	Reject submission.
OS142.35	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That subsection g of paragraph 21 on other distinctive vegetation types included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended as follows: 'Amenity and shelter plantings around the rural residential living environment at the southern end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) and on the north-western side of Sugar Loaf'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 [21] (g) as follows: Amenity and shelter plantings around the few scattered rural and rural living dwellings at the southern end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) and on the north-western side of Sugar Loaf.	Accept submission in part.
OS142.36	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of	Oppose	That paragraph 26 on 'Important land-use patterns and features' included within	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 [26] as follows: Grazed pasture across the low-lying flatter land on the eastern side of the PA adjacent to Gorge Road, parts of the slopes to	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Hansen Family Partnership		landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include reference to 'farm buildings' as follows: 'Grazed pasture across the low-lying flatter land on the eastern side of the PA adjacent to Gorge Road, parts of the slopes to the west of Arthurs Point and the majority of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill), Sugar Loaf, Pt 781 and around Waipuna (Lake Johnson). Very low-intensity grazing across the elevated pastoral slopes. Associated with this activity are a network of farm tracks, fencing, farm buildings and sheds'	the west of Arthurs Point and the majority of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill), Sugar Loaf, Pt 781 and around Waipuna (Lake Johnson). Very low-intensity grazing across the elevated pastoral slopes. Associated with this activity are a network of farm tracks, fencing and farm buildings sheds .	
OS142.37	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraphs 43 and 44 of 'Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations' are deleted from landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence as to why this accepted aspect of landscape values should be deleted from the PA Schedule. Further ,the notified text of Schedule 21.22.12 was reviewed by a heritage expert who considered the relevant text to be appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS142.38	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph 52 on 'Important historic attributes and values' included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to add the word 'ongoing' as	Schedule 21.22.12[52] relates to historic attributes and values (rather than current). The reference to current farming is repeatedly referenced in Schedule 21.22.12, for example see [21](d), [26], [83], [89]. For these reasons, I do not consider the text change requested by the submitter is necessary or appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			follows: 'Early and ongoing farming around Waipuna (Lake Johnson).		
OS142.39	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph 86 on 'Particularly important views to and from the area' is deleted from landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation for the PA Schedules work and involvement in the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal which included a site visit to Lake Johnson and environs, I consider the character and quality of the views of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) to merit inclusion in Schedule 21.22.12.	Reject submission.
OS142.40	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That subsection e of paragraph 105 is deleted from landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation for the PA Schedules work and involvement in the PDP Stage 2 Middleton Appeal which included a site visit to Lake Johnson and environs, I consider the description in Schedule 21.22.12 [105] (e) to be accurate.	Reject submission.
OS142.41	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph ii on the landscape capacity for 'Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities' included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended as follows: 'Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - no landscape capacity in the elevated parts of the ONL. High landscape capacity in the lower lying parts of the ONL, including the land around Lake Johnson'.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS142.42	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph iii on the landscape capacity for 'Urban expansions' included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended as follows: 'Urban expansions - no landscape capacity in the elevated parts of the ONL. High landscape capacity in the lower lying parts of the ONL, including the land around Lake Johnson'.	Addressed in response to OS 189.33.	Reject submission.
OS142.43	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph vi on the landscape capacity for 'Farm buildings' included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended from 'very limited' to 'some' as follows: 'Farm buildings - in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, some landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character'.	Addressed in response to OS 189.36.	Reject submission.
OS142.44	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Hansen Family Partnership	Oppose	That paragraph xi on the landscape capacity for 'Rural living' included within landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended as follows: 'Rural living - no landscape capacity in the elevated parts of the	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			ONL. High landscape capacity in the lower lying parts of the ONL, including the land around Lake Johnson'.		
OS150.2	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS150.5	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS150.8	Tracey van Herel	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS186.1	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is opposed and should be rejected as notified.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS186.2	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include the unformed road that extends up the hill from Wynyard Crescent as well as Designation 237 and 22 as important land use patterns	Having carefully reviewed the Cadastral and Designation mapping the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.12 are recommended. 34. An unformed road leading from Gorge Road up the lower slopes on the east side of Bowen Peak; from Wynyard Crescent up the mountain slopes; and from Lomond Crescent up the mountain slopes (Ben Lomond Track).	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			and features in the landscape schedule.	36. Infrastructure is evident within the PA and includes: Aurora distribution lines around the lower slopes of Ben Lomond to the west of Sunshine Bay, along the Gorge Road corridor and on the south-eastern side of the area, and over the saddle near Waipuna (Lake Johnson); water reservoir designations near Greenstone Place and Scott Place in Fernhill ; and a firefighting pond near the luge.	
OS186.3	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include the Informal Recreation zoned land on the bottom of Ben Lomond, Cemetery Hill and Queenstown Hill as important land use patterns and features in the landscape schedule.	Having carefully reviewed the zone mapping the following amendment to Schedule 21.22.12 is recommended. 29. The swathe of Community Purpose and Informal Recreation zoned land across the slopes of Cemetery Hill facing towards Queenstown (where the Skyline gondola, luge, and mountain bike tracks are) and along either side of the lower reaches of One Mile Creek.	Accept submission.
OS186.4	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin boundary is amended at the irregular shape along the bottom slopes (Fern Hill) of Ben Lomond and the top of Queenstown Hill that currently aligns with 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) and ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation. I also note that there are many locations in the District where urban zone directly abuts ONF/Ls.	Reject submission.
OS186.5	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include the urban context with residential development on the lower slopes of Ben Lomond and Queenstown Hill and its influence on the character of the area as a	This is already acknowledged at Schedule 21.22.12 [38]. No change required.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			natural landscape should be acknowledged.		
OS186.6	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include the lower slopes of Ben Lomond and Queenstown Hill where residential development has extended into the plantation forest of the priority area. There is a need to amend them outstanding natural landscape and urban growth boundary line so that it follows landscape features or patterns under paragraphs 101 and 102 of the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and review of aerial mapping with consented platforms and the PA mapping overlaid, I do not agree with the submitter that there is visible built development <u>within</u> the PA ONL across the lower slopes of Ben Lomond and Queenstown Hill that merits mention in Schedule 21.22.12.</p>	Reject submission.
OS186.7	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so that the summary of landscape values in paragraph 103 to 105 reflect the previously mentioned matters.	The amendments to the Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.12 addressed in response to OS 91.3, may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard. The response to OS 186.6 is also of relevance here.	Accept submission in part.
OS186.8	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so that it is clear from the rating scale of landscape capacity how these ratings interrelate with the wording used in the provisions of Chapter 3 of the Proposed District Plan.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Section 3 of the Methodology Report explains the capacity rating scale (and noting that it is recommended that this explanatory detail is incorporated into the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to assist plan users).</p> <p>The recommended amendments to the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				address this submission point to some degree. This matter is also addressed in the table addressing more general landscape related submission 'themes'.	
OS186.9	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin's commercial recreational activities landscape capacity assessment is amended to include the words 'or expand', 'eradicate wilding vegetation and replant native vegetation', and 'enhance visual amenity and landscape values' into the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I consider that the additional terminology requested by the submitter in this regard is unnecessary as the relevant 'principles' are already addressed in the text of Schedule 21.22.12 Capacity (i).	Reject submission.
OS186.10	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin's visitor accommodation and tourism related activities landscape capacity assessment is amended from 'no' capacity to 'limited' capacity, and to include the words 'for visitor accommodation on the lower slopes of the PA. The area can be serviced by Queenstown. Limited capacity for tourism related activities that expand or integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; eradicate wilding vegetation and replant native vegetation; enhance visual amenity and landscape values; enhance public access; and are consistent with the area's ONL values'.		
OS186.11	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the capacity of urban expansions from 'no landscape capacity' to 'limited capacity on the lower slopes of the PA, adjacent to or in-between the existing urban development' or to update the priority area mapping, associated boundaries and zoning to exclude areas where there is capacity to absorb urban expansion.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Urban development is 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.
OS186.12	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include a capacity assessment for Gondolas, towers and cableway with limited landscape capacity for such	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and review of consented gondola development within the PA, I recommend the following addition to the Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.12:	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			activities in the landscape schedule.	Passenger Lift Systems – limited landscape capacity to improve public access to focal recreational areas higher in the mountains via non-vehicular transportation modes such as gondolas, provided they are positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, are co-located with existing gondola infrastructure and designed to be recessive in the landscape.	
OS186.13	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to address the relief set out in the submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS186.14	Richard Kemp	Oppose	That in the alternative to the relief sought the submitter seeks additional or consequential relief necessary or appropriate to address the matters raised in this submission and/or the relief requested in this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS187.2	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS187.5	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS187.8	Joshua Nicholas Jones	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS188.39	Elisha Young-Ebert	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu paragraph 49 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Addressed in response to OS 77.39.	Accept submission.
OS188.48	Elisha Young-Ebert	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 paragraph 49 be amended to correct the spelling of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura.	Addressed in response to OS 77.48.	Accept submission.
OS189.1	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove the lower-lying slopes and valley floor from the outstanding natural landscape.	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) and ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS189.2	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to revise the capacity ratings if they are to be included within the schedules, as well as a corresponding scale of development to guide the implementation of the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. To the extent supportable and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and careful review of aerial photography of the submitter's land and the submission, amendments have been made to the Capacity section of Schedule 21.22.12 as explained in response to OS 91.3 and OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS189.3	Maree Baker-Galloway On	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited		Basin's capacity assessments are amended to remove 'no landscape capacity', or alternatively deleted from the landscape schedule.	A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter. The response to OS 91.3 is also of relevance here as re the reporting planner's comments in the S42A Report (with respect to deleting the capacity section of the PA Schedule).	
OS189.4	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to recognise and provide for the benefits of change, enhancement and remediation of land in the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 138.3.	Reject submission.
OS189.5	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include particular features and attributes existing in at the submitters land. These are a) Farming, b) Farm Tracks, c) Fences, d) Introduced pests, including goats, e) Introduced plant species, including wilding pines which are gradually being controlled/removed including through forestry, f) Commercial recreation activities including off road 4wd.	Addressed in response to OS 138.5.	Reject submission.
OS189.6	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to incorporate submitter	The Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.12 incorporates submitter feedback where appropriate from an expert landscape assessment perspective.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Adventure Park (1993) Limited		feedback as to important values.		
OS189.7	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include a clear link between existing character and the conclusions about capacity in the landscape schedule.	The meaning of this submission point is unclear as the PA Landscape Schedules have been prepared in accordance with landscape assessment best practice and it is the attributes and values collectively that inform the capacity comments. The submitter is encouraged to produce technical evidence in support of this aspect of their submission.	Reject submission.
OS189.8	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That any additional, amended, consequential, or further relief in respect of the schedules reflect the intent of the matters raised in this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS189.9	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That if the amendments raised in this submission are not undertaken that the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is deleted from the variation.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS189.10	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended under the general description of the area to remove the words 'and the western/north-western backdrop to Gorge Road'.	Addressed in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS189.11	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 15	Addressed in response to OS 138.5.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Adventure Park (1993) Limited		to include the words 'and highly modified'.		
OS189.12	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 20 to remove point (a.) from the list of important ecological features and vegetation types.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.12 has been reviewed by an ecology expert and no such deletion was deemed necessary.	Reject submission.
OS189.13	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove points (b, c, d, and e) from point 21 of the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that these changes are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.14	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 23 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.15	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 24 from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 85.7.	Reject submission.
OS189.16	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 25 from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 85.7.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS189.17	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin 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 of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Stage 2 Western Basin Appeals, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.18	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 27 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.19	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include a point under important land-use patterns and features which states 'The range of commercial recreation, farming and rural living activities and community gardens'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. To the extent supportable and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and careful review of aerial photography and the submission, amendments have been made to the Land Use section of Schedule 21.22.12 as explained in response to OS 138.1. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence of where the community gardens are in the PA.	Accept submission in part.
OS189.20	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 33 to replace the words 'excepting a scattering at the north-western end of Arthurs Point, a very small pocket of urban dwellings at the toe of the Queenstown Time Walk, and the small cluster of rural	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. To the extent supportable and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and careful review of aerial photography and the submission, amendments have been made to the Schedule 21.22.12 [33] as explained in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			living dwellings at the south end of the Waipuna (Lake Johnson) with 'elevated mountainous part of the PA'.		
OS189.21	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 34 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography with cadastral boundaries, I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.22	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 40 to correct the spelling of Old McChesney Bridge.	Amend Schedule 21.22.12 [40] as follows: Old McChesney Bridge Abutment Remains, Arthurs Point (District Plan reference 104, archaeological site E41/236).	Accept submission.
OS189.23	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to include a point under the title important recreation attributes and values which states 'commercial recreation including off road 4wd activities'.	Addressed in response to OS 138.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS189.24	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to remove point 71 from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that this change is appropriate. Both Glenorchy Queenstown Road and Gorge Road are popular scenic routes.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS189.25	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 89 to replace the words 'seemingly undeveloped character of' with 'modified character of the elevated', to replace 'high' with 'moderate', replace 'while' with 'due to visible', and to remove the words 'are visible, the very low number of buildings and the limited visibility (excepting the gondola etc described below), limits their influence on the character of the area as a natural landscape'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that this change is necessary nor appropriate.</p> <p>As explained in the Preamble to Schedule 21.22, the PA Schedules aim to describe the important attributes and values of the PA as a whole. It also acknowledges that different attributes and values may be evident as part of a finer grained assessment as part of a resource consent or plan change application. The Preamble goes on to explain that the Schedules are to be read in full. This approach to the use and interpretation of the PA Schedules, combined with the amendments to Schedule 21.22.12 outlined (particularly in relation to OS 138.1), appropriately signal the areas of modification within the PA. Regardless of this modification, I remain of the view that overall, the PA exhibits a seemingly undeveloped character.</p>	Reject submission.
OS189.26	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 90 to replace the word 'adds' with 'is relevant'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, careful review of aerial photography and field work, I do not consider that this change is necessary nor appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.
OS189.27	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 100 to remove the words 'along Gorge Road' from the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I do not consider that this change is necessary nor appropriate due to the sheer scale and close proximity of the mountain landforms framing the Gorge Valley corridor.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS189.28	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 103 to change the landscape physical values are changed from 'high' to 'moderate or low'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I do not consider that this change is necessary nor appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.29	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 104 to change the landscape associative values from 'high' to 'moderate or low'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I do not consider that this change is necessary or appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS189.30	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended at point 105 to change the landscape perceptual values from 'high' to 'moderate or low', and to remove the words 'and Gorge Road'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I do not consider that this change is necessary or appropriate. I also note that, were the submitter correct in relation to OS 189.28, OS 189.29 and OS 189.30, it is difficult to see how the PA would qualify as an ONL (as endorsed by the Environment Court in the Topic 2 Decisions). Also see OS 189.27 in relation to this submission point.	Reject submission.
OS189.31	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for Commercial recreational activities to 'some/high' in the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The rating of capacity is explained (and defined) in the Section 3 of the PA Methodology Report. This is deliberately distinguished from the rating of landscape values (i.e. the seven point 'very high' to 'very low' scale) for the reasons explained in the report. Further, a number of changes are recommended to the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.23 Preamble (July 2023) to better explain the intended use and	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				meaning of the capacity ratings. This may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	
OS189.32	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities from 'no' capacity to 'some/high' capacity in the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3 and OS 189.31.	Accept submission in part.
OS189.33	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so the landscape capacity for urban expansions is changed from 'no' capacity to 'some/high' landscape capacity in the lower-lying parts of the PA, including Gorge Road valley floor. No capacity in the elevated parts of the PA'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Urban development is 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.
OS189.34	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so the landscape capacity for intensive agriculture is changed from 'no' capacity to 'some' capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. A definition of intensive agriculture (and tourism activities) is included in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 July 2023) which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns. In light of this definition and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS189.35	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended so that the landscape capacity for earthworks is changed from 'very limited' capacity to 'Some/high landscape capacity in the lower-lying parts of the PA, including Gorge Road valley floor', and to include the words 'In the other parts of the PA'.	Addressed in response to OS 138.1. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I do not consider it appropriate to reference the low-lying Gorge Road valley floor as having a rating of some (rather than very limited) landscape capacity for earthworks change in that part of the PA due to its visibility from an important scenic route.	Reject submission.
OS189.36	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for farm buildings from 'very limited' capacity to 'some/high' capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work and field work, I consider that farm buildings are relatively scarce within the PA, reflecting the relatively limited extent of rural production activities across the PA as a whole. I also note that much of the pastoral area is exposed to views from a popular scenic route (Gorge Road). For these reasons, I consider that a rating of very limited capacity for farm buildings of the PA where there are pastoral uses is appropriate, as it signals the careful consideration of the location and design of such buildings is necessary for them to be appropriate from a landscape perspective.	Reject submission.
OS189.37	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure from 'limited' capacity to 'some/high' capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PDP Chapter 2 definition for Transport Infrastructure takes in a wide range of elements including: retaining walls, road carriageway widening, engineering measures, shelters, traffic control devices, parking and any other structures. Many of these sorts of elements have the potential to materially compromise the landscape values of the PA if poorly located or designed.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				In light of this definition and relying on my relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate.	
OS189.38	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for utilities and regionally significant infrastructure from 'limited' capacity to 'some' capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work (including field work), I do not consider that this change is appropriate. Also refer response to OS 70.26.	Reject submission.
OS189.39	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for renewable energy generation from 'no' capacity to 'some' capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.
OS189.40	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for production forestry from 'no' capacity to 'some capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Reject submission.
OS189.41	Maree Baker-Galloway On Behalf Of Queenstown Adventure Park (1993) Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is amended to change the landscape capacity for rural living from 'no landscape capacity' to 'some/high landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 91.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS197.2	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS197.5	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS197.8	Sonja and John Kooy and Gavin	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS202.2	Michael John Boyd	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS202.5	Michael John Boyd	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS202.8	Michael John Boyd	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS204.2	Anna-Louise & Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS204.5	Anna-Louise & Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu be retained as notified in terms of the Shotover Loop Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape having no capacity for urban expansion.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS204.8	Anna-Louise & Paul Hedley & Hollingsworth	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin be retained as notified to implement Policy 3.3.42.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.2	Dennis Behan	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is adopted as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.5	Dennis Behan	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin should be protected in perpetuity from inappropriate development.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS205.8	Dennis Behan	Support	That the mapping, values identified and capacity assessment of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin is strongly supported.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS205.11	Dennis Behan	Support	That paragraphs 103-105 and the landscape capacity assessment of landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are supported.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.
OS205.14	Dennis Behan	Support	That recreational access where it will not erode the values identified in the submission and necessary infrastructure development where the values outlined can be adequately preserved or protected in landscape schedule 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin are retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 12.2.	Accept submission in part.