

## 21.22.6 PA ONF Slope Hill: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Slope Hill PA ONF encompasses the elevated roche moutonnée landform of Slope Hill.

### Physical Attributes and Values

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

### Important landforms and land types:

1. The roche moutonnée glacial landform of Slope Hill, formed by the over-riding Wakatipu glacier, with a smooth 'up-glacier' slope to the southwest and a steeper rough 'plucked' (down-glacier) slope to the east adjacent to Lake Hayes. Rock outcrops throughout the elevated north-western flanks. Highest point: 625m.
2. The Slope Hill roche moutonnée is recognised in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory as one of the best examples of this type of landform in Otago and one of the most easily seen and accessible. It is identified as a site of national scientific, aesthetic and recreational values and is considered to be vulnerable to significant damage by human related activities.

### Important hydrological features:

3. Three steep (unnamed) stream gullies draining the southern faces of Slope Hill.
4. A gully draining the north-eastern side.
5. A small kettle lake on the elevated south-western flanks.
6. The irrigation race along the western flanks.

### Important ecological features and vegetation types:

7. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Remnant native vegetation comprising matagouri shrubland in the stream gullies and on some adjacent slopes on Slope Hill.
8. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. Grazed pasture with scattered shelterbelts and clusters of exotic shade trees throughout the elevated slopes.
  - b. Amenity and shelter plantings around the two dwellings and wetland on the north side.
  - c. Poplar plantings around the flanks.
9. Animal pest species include feral cats, hares, rabbits, ferrets, stoats, weasels, possums, rats and mice.

9a. Exotic plant pests such as willow, hawthorne and broom in gullies.

**Commented [BG1]:** OS 82.21 Milstead Trust.  
OS 140.18 Maryhill Ltd.

### Important land-use patterns and features:

10. Slope Hill **PA ONE** is predominantly in pastoral use with very limited rural living use. Modification is limited to a network of farm tracks across the landform, **other infrastructure (eg water tanks, fencing, utilities)**, a trig point and communication tower on the highpoint and two dwellings and associated farm buildings on the northern sides of Slope Hill. Built development is generally characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is well integrated by a mix of established and more recent vegetation features and reads as being subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns.

**Commented [BG2]:** OS 59.10 Anna Hutchinson Family Trust.  
OS 59.11 Anna Hutchinson Family Trust.

**Commented [BG3]:** OS 139.36 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

**Commented [BG4]:** OS 82.16 Milstead Trust.

**10a** Other neighbouring landuses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character and or proximity include: the rural living development throughout the western, southern and northern lower flanks of the roche moutonnée, outside the PA; and the existing or anticipated urban development associated with the Ladies Mile area.

**Commented [BG5]:** OS 82.14 Milstead Trust.  
OS 139.9 Grant Stalker Family Trust.  
OS 140.6 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

**Commented [BG6]:** OS 139.1 Grant Stalker Family Trust.  
OS 139.8 Grant Stalker Family Trust.  
OS 139.9 Grant Stalker Family Trust.  
OS 140.6 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

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

11. No historic heritage features, heritage protection orders, heritage overlays or archaeological sites have been identified/recorded to date within the ONF.

### Mana whenua features and their locations:

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

### Associative Attributes and Values

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

### Mana whenua associations and experience:

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

### Important historic attributes and values:

14. Slope Hill has contextual value for its association with Threeepwood Farm, one of the Wakatipu Basin's earliest farms.

### Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

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

### 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:

16. 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.

17. Indigenous gully plantings which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values within the gullies on Slope Hill.

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

18. Highly attractive framed mid-range views eastbound on SH6, west of the Shotover Bridge to the south-western smooth 'up ice' flanks of Slope Hill. The composition comprises an attractive patterning of the Shotover River terraces and their layered tree plantings (a mix of evergreen and exotic species including Lombardy poplars) below the highly legible and more 'natural' pastoral elevated slopes of the roche moutonnée and backdropped by (often) snow-capped mountain ranges of Cardrona and the Crown Range. The large-scale road cuttings that frame the highway add to the structure and distinctiveness of the vista. Overall, the outlook impresses as an engaging and memorable gateway to the Wakatipu Basin and seemingly more spacious 'rural' landscape beyond Queenstown/Frankton.
19. Appealing mid to long-range views westbound on SH6 on the elevated section of the highway east of the intersection with Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road to the south-eastern flanks of Slope Hill. The open pastoral character of the rough 'plucked' slopes of the landform in this view forms a bold contrast with the exotic vegetation and building-dominated low-lying terraces of Ladies Mile and Frankton to the left of view. From this orientation, the roche moutonnée blends seamlessly with the layered patterning of dramatic mountains and roche moutonnée that frame the western side of the Wakatipu Basin and Lake Wakatipu more generally. The depth of the outlook together with its 'classic' elements that include a structured layering of mountainous landforms and the gateway impression (enabling first glimpses of Queenstown) contribute to the memorability of the vista. It is possible that anticipated urban development throughout Ladies Mile may obscure views of the lower margins of the landform feature, adjacent Ladies Mile.
20. Highly attractive close to long-range views from the Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata, the necklace of reserves around the edge of Lake Hayes, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and the residential area properties around Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) (outside the ONF), across the lake (ONF) to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, the undeveloped ridgeline framing the western side of the lake and/or the more distant surrounding mountain backdrop.
21. Attractive mid to long-range views from the eastern western side of the Wakatipu Basin (including Tuckers Beach, Domain Road, Hawthorn Triangle, Dalefield, parts of the Shotover River corridor, the Hawthorn Triangle, the eastern end of Slope Hill Road and parts of the Queenstown Trail) to parts of the smooth pastoral elevated south-western flanks and the more rugged north-western flanks. From this these orientations, the open and generally undeveloped landform forms a marked contrast with the rural living development context in the foreground of view.
22. Attractive long-range views from the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts), the Queenstown Trail on Christine's Hill and from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road at McIntyre's Hill to Slope Hill beside the highly attractive glacial lake of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) and viewed within a broader ONL mountain context.
23. Attractive close, mid, and long-range views from Ladies Mile, Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country to the south side of Slope Hill. From this orientation the distinguishing roche moutonnée landform profile is clearly legible and there is an awareness of the transition from the smooth 'ice up' character to the rough 'plucked' character. It is possible that anticipated urban development throughout Ladies Mile may obscure views of the lower margins of the landform feature, adjacent Ladies Mile.
24. In all of the views, the dominance of 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONF, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the ONF and the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

**Commented [BG7]:** OS 139.28 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

**Commented [BG8]:** OS 140.25 Maryhill Ltd.  
OS 139.69 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

**Commented [BG9]:** OS 139.42 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

**Commented [BG10]:** OS 139.42 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

**Commented [BG11]:** OS 139.42 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

**Commented [BG12]:** OS 139.42 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

**Commented [BG13]:** OS 139.28 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

**Naturalness attributes and values:**

25. The seemingly 'undeveloped' character of Slope Hill which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to its pastoral use are visible, the very low number of buildings,

the relatively modest scale of tracks and limited visibility of infrastructure kerbs their influence on the character of the landform as a natural landscape element.

#### Memorability attributes and values:

26. The appealing and engaging views of the largely undeveloped and legible roche moutonnée landform of Slope Hill. The close proximity of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) ONF in the outlook, collectively seen within a relatively developed immediate context serves to enhance the memorability of the outlook.

#### Transient attributes and values:

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

#### Aesthetic qualities and values:

29. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
30. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. The highly attractive large-scale composition created by the generally undeveloped and distinctive roche moutonnée landform, juxtaposed beside a rural living and urban context.
  - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. the clearly legible roche moutonnée landform profile and character;
    - ii. the open and pastoral character of Slope Hill;
    - iii. the very limited level of built modification evident through the ONF; and
    - iv. the poplars around the flanks of Slope Hill, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

### 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
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

The combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA ONF Slope Hill and Lake Hayes Remarkables can be summarised:

31. **Very High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
32. **High associative values** relating to:
  - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
  - b. The historic associations of the area.
  - c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.

d. ~~The significant recreational attributes of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).~~

**Commented [BG14]:** OS 139.56 Grant Stalker Family Trust. OS 140.57 Maryhill Ltd.

33. **Very 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 very high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Lake Hayes Estate, Shotover Country, the Ladies Mile corridor, the eastern side of the Wakatipu Basin, the scenic route of SH6, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road, the Remarkables Ski Filed Access Road and the Queenstown Trail, along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
- c. The identity of the roche moutonnée as a natural landscape backdrop to Ladies Mile and the western and central portion of the Wakatipu Basin and as a gateway feature to Queenstown/ the Wakatipu Basin.
- d. A high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of natural landscape elements and patterns at Slope Hill.

## Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for ~~small scale and low key~~ activities that: integrate with, and complement/enhance, existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; ~~and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONF values.~~
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – ~~no landscape capacity; very limited~~** ~~landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms which: are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; are 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 or public access tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings – ~~in these 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.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protect the area's ONF values. **No** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.

**Commented [BG15]:** OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

**Commented [BG16]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

**Commented [BG17]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

**Commented [BG18]:** OS 139.62 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

**Commented [BG19]:** OS 139.66 Grant Stalker Family Trust. OS 140.67 Maryhill Ltd.

- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of the National Grid and utilities such as overhead lines, or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation, Very limited to no landscape capacity or discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Production forestry – no** landscape capacity.
- xii. **Rural living – very limited to no** landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; is designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).

**Commented [BG20]:** OS 70.18 Transpower New Zealand Limited.  
OS 86.9 Melissa Brook

**Commented [BG21]:** OS 140.7 Maryhill Limited.

**Commented [BG22]:** Typographical correction.

**Commented [BG23]:** OS 139.68 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

**Commented [BG24]:** OS 139.68 Grant Stalker Family Trust.

## 21.22.6 Slope Hill PA ONF Schedule

### August 2023 FINAL

**Blue highlighted** text: captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.6 Slope Hill PA ONF Schedule". New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

### Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS59.2	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected, or alternatively that amendments be made to address points raised in submission 59, with any other consequential changes made that are necessary to achieve the relief sought.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS59.10	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill paragraph 8 be amended for clarity.	Amend Schedule 21.22.6 [10] as follows:  <i>Slope Hill <b>PA ONF</b> is predominantly in pastoral use with very limited rural living use. Modification is limited to a network of farm tracks across the landform, a trig point and communication tower on the highpoint and two dwellings and associated farm building on the northern sides of Slope Hill. Built development is generally characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is well integrated by a mix of established and more recent vegetation features and reads as being subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns.</i>	Accept submission in part.
OS59.11	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill paragraph 10 be amended to make	Addressed in response to OS 59.10.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Hutchinson Family Trust		clear if referring to the entire roche moutonnée or only to the part of Slope Hill that has been recorded as an Outstanding Natural Feature within the schedule.		
OS59.18	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That paragraph 7 of landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended as it currently overstates the status of indigenous vegetation within or adjacent to the ONF as set out in the Ladies Mile Master Plan.	Addressed in response to OS 82.10.	Reject submission.
OS59.19	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be amended to recognise the extensive body of historic photographs that are available in the area, which depict high levels of human activity often celebrating European settlement.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the notified text in relation to such aspects.	Reject submission.
OS59.20	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to acknowledge and adequately address the tension that exists between the ONL, rural and urban land uses.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The developed context is acknowledged in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.6 appropriately.	Reject submission.
OS59.21	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedules be considered with regard to Part 2 of the RMA as there is a high possibility for unintended	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			consequences whereby the landscape schedules will be used to refer to adjoining areas and make inferences around the appropriateness of development that adjoins the ONF.		
OS59.22	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That the variation is rejected, refused or otherwise declined.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS59.23	Werner Murray On Behalf Of Anna Hutchinson Family Trust	Oppose	That if the variation is adopted, that it be amended, varied or otherwise modified (including schedules 21.22.3 and 21.22.6) to address the concerns, issues, and other matters raised in this submission including any necessary additional or consequential relief.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS70.18	Ainley McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual	Amend Schedule 21.22.6 Capacity (ix) as follows:  <b>Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited</b> landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of <u>the National Grid and utilities such as overhead lines, or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.</u>	<b>Accept submission subject to refinement.</b>

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			prominence, including associated earthworks'.	NB the response to OS 70.18 has been coordinated with the response to OS 86.9.	
OS82.7	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that it fails to recognise the Slope Hill outstanding natural feature is a highly modified landscape that has been extensively farmed and therefore has a very low naturalness, highly influenced by human activities.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.6 acknowledges the farming use of Slope Hill at [10]. It is noted that the submitter goes on to express the view that the area has 'very low' naturalness values. Case law supports the identification of areas that are dominated by pastoral uses (and other agriculture/horticulture related uses) as having naturalness values that allow the land to qualify for consideration as a RMA s6(b) landscape (e.g. <i>Man O'War Station</i> ). It is also noted that the question as to whether the PA qualifies as a RMA s6(b) landscape or feature is beyond the scope of the Variation and that the mapping of the District's ONF/Ls has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions).	Reject submission.
OS82.8	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that it fails to recognise the western end of Slope Hill is more modified than the eastern end and has a much greater capacity to absorb development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider there to be a discernible difference with respect to landscape modification between the western and eastern ends of Slope Hill PA ONF. In coming to my conclusions on this point, I have carefully reviewed the consented and unbuilt platforms and note that almost all of the recently consented platforms to the west of Slope Hill (excepting one), are located outside the PA.	Reject submission.
OS82.9	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that it	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			fails to recognise that Slope Hill outstanding natural feature is more extensively modified below the irrigation race than above it.	It is noted that, in the main, the irrigation race skirts around the edge of the Slope Hill PA ONF, with very little land below the water race located within the mapped extent of the PA.  Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider there to be a discernible difference with respect to landscape modification for the land within the Slope Hill PA ONF above and below the irrigation race.	
OS82.10	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified as it incorrectly states at [7] there is 'particularly noteworthy' indigenous vegetation features when this appears to be on the basis of the presence of matagouri which is not particularly noteworthy.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Schedule 21.22.6 [7] reference to matagouri shrubland is considered worthy of mention under the header "Important ecological features and vegetation types". It is also noted that Schedule 21.23.6 has been reviewed by an expert ecologist with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS82.11	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that it incorrectly states there is 'particularly noteworthy' indigenous vegetation when it fails to reflect the fact that Slope Hill outstanding natural feature has been extensively farmed for over 100 years, and it is misleading to suggest it has noteworthy indigenous vegetation.	The responses to OS 82.7 and OS 82.10, address this submission point.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS82.12	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [9] under the heading 'important ecological features and vegetation types' the schedule lists animal pest species which are not important ecological features and vegetation types.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the PA ONL (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <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>	Accept submission in part.
OS82.13	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [10] the description fails to acknowledge the irrigation race which has been an important land use pattern and feature.	The irrigation race is acknowledged at Schedule 21.22.6 [6] under "Important hydrological features".	Reject submission.
OS82.14	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [10] the description fails to acknowledge the significant rural living use on Slope Hill as a whole, outside of the	Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I consider that Schedule 21.22.6 should be amended after [10], to add a new schedule item (with consequential numbering change):	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			outstanding natural landscape boundary.	<a href="#">10a Other neighbouring landuses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character and or proximity include: the rural living development throughout the western, southern and northern lower flanks of the roche moutonnée, outside the PA.</a>	
OS82.15	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [10] the description fails to acknowledge the greater extent of activity and modification at the western end of Slope Hill.	Addressed in response to OS82.8.	Reject submission.
OS82.16	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [10] the description fails to acknowledge other farm buildings which exist but that have not been identified.	<p>Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [10] should be amended as follows:</p> <p>Slope Hill is predominantly in pastoral use with very limited rural living use. Modification is limited to a network of farm tracks across the landform, a trig point and communication tower on the highpoint, and two dwellings and associated farm building on the northern sides of Slope Hill. Built development is Slope Hill is predominantly in pastoral use with very limited rural living use. Modification is limited to a network of farm tracks across the landform, a trig point and communication tower on the highpoint and two dwellings and associated farm buildings on the northern sides of Slope Hill. Built development is generally characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is well integrated by a mix of established and more recent vegetation features and reads as being subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns.</p>	<a href="#">Accept submission.</a>

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS82.17	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [11] the description fails to recognise the historic Glenpanel Homestead which is outside of the outstanding natural landscape boundary.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PA Schedules aim to identify the landscape values within the spatial area that is mapped. The Glenpanel homestead is outside the priority area and is not an element that particularly influences the perceptual or associative values of the PA itself. Further, Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS82.18	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the relationship between mana whenua associations, Wāhi Tūpuna Chapter and consultation with mana whenua for applications be clarified in the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report. It should also be noted that Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by a cultural landscape / mana whenua expert (Aukaha) with that expert supporting the notified text.	Reject submission.
OS82.19	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [14] under the heading 'important historic attributes and values' the description fails to recognise the historic Glenpanel Homestead and associated farming activity, as well as the irrigation race.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Reference to the Glenpanel homestead is addressed in response to OS82.13 and OS 82.17. It should be noted that the review of the notified version of Schedule 21.22.6 by a heritage expert did not identify the irrigation race as a noteworthy heritage element.	Reject submission.
OS82.20	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [15] a generic statement is made that 'the descriptions and photographs of the area	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.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			in tourist publications' but provides no evidence provided as to what publications or photographs are referred to.	However, for example, Slope Hill is photographed in publicity material for the Countryside trail. See: <a href="https://queenstowntrails.org.nz/maps-and-trails/half-day-trails/countryside-trail/">https://queenstowntrails.org.nz/maps-and-trails/half-day-trails/countryside-trail/</a>	
OS82.21	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [17] the majority of the planting in the gullies are exotic weeds such as willow, hawthorne and broom, and not 'indigenous gully plantings' as stated.	<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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal and review of Schedule 21.22.6 by an expert ecologist, I consider the wording of Schedule 21.22.6 [17] to be technically correct.</p> <p>Further, best practice landscape assessment would not acknowledge weeds species in gullies as contributing to legibility and expressiveness values (i.e. the 'readability' of the landscape's formative processes). I also note that Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by an ecology expert with that expert supporting the notified wording in this regard.</p> <p>However, it is recommended that Schedule 21.22.6 is amended to acknowledge these exotic weed species in gullies. Amend Schedule 21.22.6 after [9], to add new schedule item (consequential numbering change):</p> <p><b><u>9a. Exotic plants pests such as willow, hawthorne and broom in gullies.</u></b></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS82.22	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [25] where the 'naturalness attributes and values are described' the schedule incorrectly states Slope Hill	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The farming activity and built modification (including airport radar) are acknowledged at Schedule 21.22.6 [10], [18], [19], [21], and [25].</p> <p>The evaluation of naturalness is guided by the interpretation of 'natural' in <i>Te Tangi a te Manu</i>, [9.44] to [9.46], drawing from</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			as 'natural' and 'undeveloped' when it has been completely modified for agriculture and farming and includes an airport radar system on its highest point.	<i>Harrison, WESI</i> and the <i>West Wind</i> Environment Court decisions.	
OS82.23	Blair Devlin On Behalf Of Milstead Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [31] the schedule refers to 'mana whenua features in the area' when no mana whenua features are identified in paragraph 12 which refers to the whole area, and also features vegetation features when, as noted earlier, the gullies on Slope Hill contain exotic weeds species.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The Priority Area Schedules have been reviewed by a cultural expert with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard. The response to OS 82.21 also addresses matters relevant to this submission point.	Reject submission.
OS86.9	Melissa Brook	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.6.ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended to: limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as an overhead lines or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments which cannot be screened, these should be co-located with existing infrastructure or	Amend Schedule 21.22.6 Capacity (ix) as follows: <b>Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited</b> landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of <b>the National Grid and</b> utilities such as overhead lines, <b>or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks, which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.</b> NB the response to OS 86.9 has been coordinated with the response to OS 70.18.	Accept submission subject to refinement.



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			designed and located to reduce their visual prominence to the extent practicable, recognising the operational and functional requirements of regionally significant infrastructure means this may not be practicable in all instances.		
OS139.1	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to recognise and provide for the development of the flats of Ladies Mile and amend the priority area boundaries in these locations.	Development within the flats of Ladies Mile is outside the spatial extent of Slope Hill PA ONF and to provide for such development within the Priority Area would be inappropriate. However, it is appropriate to acknowledge this development context in Schedule 21.22.6. Building on the amendment recommend in response to OS82.14, the following amendment is recommended Schedule 21.22.6 after [10], to add new schedule item (consequential numbering change):  <i>10a. Other neighbouring landuses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character and or proximity include: the rural living development throughout the western, southern and northern lower flanks of the roche moutonnée, outside the PA; and the existing or anticipated urban development associated with the Ladies Mile area.</i>	Accept submission in part.
OS139.2	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to reclassify the lower foothills as a rural lifestyle zone/section 7 amenity landscape.	ONF/L mapping amendments and rezoning to Rural Lifestyle (or other) Zone (or any other zone) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS139.3	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the southern boundary line of the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to be further up Slope Hill and particularly to	Addressed in response to OS139.2.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			exclude landform modifications on the lower flanks.		
OS139.4	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to provide for the desired outcomes of the submitter through an appropriate exception regime under the landscape schedules.	<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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal and 'other expert' review of the PA Schedules, along with my comments in response to OS 82.8, I consider that an exception regime is unwarranted on landscape grounds in this location.</p> <p>I also note that the introduction of an exception regime is beyond the scope of the Variation. This matter is also addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.</p>	Reject submission.
OS139.5	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to provide for the lower slopes of the outstanding natural feature as a separate character unit/lifestyle transition area under the 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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that the lower flanks of Slope Hill PA ONF demonstrate a different character or landscape capacity that merits distinction from the balance of the PA. Rather, I consider that the lower and upper slopes of the PA read as a contiguous and coherent landscape feature that has a consistent sensitivity to development change (when evaluated at a PA level, rather than a site level, as is required for the PA Schedules).</p>	Reject submission.
OS139.6	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is rejected as notified if the outcomes	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Stalker Family Trust		desired by the submitter are not incorporated into the landscape schedule.		
OS139.7	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remap the bottom flanks of the priority area further up the slope to both exclude modified landholdings not warranting section 6 classification and protection.	Addressed in response to OS 139.2.	Reject submission.
OS139.8	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to account for the dense urban and mixed use development under the Ladies Mile masterplan so that lawful development of this land is not affected or implicated in the future by the adjacent landscape schedule values.	Addressed in response to OS 139.1.	Accept submission.
OS139.9	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to account for the adjacent residential development anticipated and zoned to occur, including through either the Ladies Mile masterplan, Rural Lifestyle Zoning, or development under the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone.	Responses to OS 139.1 and OS 82.14 recommend amendments to Schedule 21.22.6 to better acknowledge the proximate urban and rural living context of the Priority Area.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS139.10	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to acknowledge that the zoning and development raised in point 139.9 should not be limited by the values contained within the adjacent Slope Hill outstanding natural feature.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Landscape Schedules are not required to address the potential implications of the identified values of the ONF/L on neighbouring landuses, rather that is a matter for the District Plan as guided by Chapters 3, 4 and 6.	Reject submission.
OS139.11	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to provide for the lower slopes of the outstanding natural feature to be effectively a lifestyle transition area between lower more intensive development and the more upper natural slopes.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.
OS139.12	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to use new definitions to provide for the intent of capacity in landscapes with a different ability to absorb development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submitter would appear to be suggesting that the capacity ratings used in the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study are applied to the PA ONF/Ls capacity rating work. Section 3 of the PA Methodology Report explains the distinction between the two, and why an alternate approach is required for the PA Schedules. A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to assist plan user's understanding of capacity ratings in the PA Schedules. It is expected that the explanatory text in the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble, which explains that the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications, may provide some comfort to the submitter.	
OS139.13	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to revise the capacity ratings as well a corresponding scale of development to guide the implementation of this.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Further, the meaning of this submission point is unclear. That said, the response to OS 139. 12 may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS139.14	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to recognise and provide for the benefits of change, enhancement, and remediation of land within the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The focus of the Schedules is to identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected. 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). It is 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.	Reject submission.
OS139.15	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That if the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill fails to respond to the imperative to remedy degraded landscapes and in both the landscape values and landscape capacity comments, the schedules	Addressed in response to OS 139.14.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			should identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation.		
OS139.16	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to more accurately recognise and provide for existing uses, their likely and anticipated upgrade, replacement, or development within the priority area.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Schedule 21.22.6 outlines the existing uses evident within Slope Hill PA ONF. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence of any uses that have been omitted so that they can be captured in Schedule 21.22.6.</p> <p>With respect to the suggestion that Schedule 21.22.6 should recognise and provide for the upgrading of existing uses, their replacement or development, this goes beyond the identification of the landscape values of the ONF and are planning matters that are addressed in other parts of the District Plan.</p>	Reject submission.
OS139.17	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to recognise particular attributes present within the priority area listed in this submission as part of the values and character of the outstanding natural feature within the schedule so as to identify these human elements of the landscape.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Many of the attributes and features requested for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.6 are already mentioned, albeit under more generic terms such as farm tracks, infrastructure, pastoral farming and the like, which is considered to be appropriate for a PA scale description, rather than a site-by-site description.</p> <p>The exceptions to this are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Walking trails.</li> <li>b) Historical farming uses.</li> <li>c) Pest control.</li> </ul> <p>I am unaware of any publicly accessible trails within Slope Hill PA ONF and the submitter is encouraged to provide evidence in this regard.</p> <p>With respect to reference to historic farming uses, Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				While the submitter may be managing pests at a site-specific level, this is not a particular characteristic of the PA as a whole that merits mention in Schedule 21.22.6.	
OS139.18	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That, without derogating from the generality of the points raised in this submission, the submitter seeks any additional amended, consequential, or further relief in respect of the schedules reflects the matters raised in this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS139.19	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That if the amendments raised in this submission are not included within the schedule, then the submitter seeks that the landscape schedule is deleted or otherwise removed from the proposed variation to Chapter 21.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS139.20	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so the starting point of the schedule is to only describe those values which contribute to a feature as being outstanding.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The PA Schedules identify the attributes and values that contribute to the 'outstanding-ness' of the PA, with the methodology applied, drawing from <i>Te Tangi a te Manu</i>.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that some aspects referenced in the Schedules are likely to be of greater or lesser importance in shaping the 'outstanding-ness' of the PA, however it is the collective relationship of the identified attributes and values that ultimately results in the RMA s6(b) classification.</p> <p>Put another way, the aim of the description of attributes and values in each PA Schedule is to signal, at a PA level (rather than a site-specific level), the key landscape matters to</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p>consider when evaluating the appropriateness of a resource consent or plan change application.</p> <p>As explained in response to OS 82.12, the PA Schedules include reference to negative landscape aspects such as existing plant and animal pests. These aspects have the potential to influence landscape values and have been deliberately included in the PA Schedules as a cue to what appropriate development within a PA might seek to manage.</p>	
OS139.21	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to only include vegetation types which are protected under the Proposed District Plan as those which contribute to outstanding-ness.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>It is widely accepted by the Environment Court and landscape profession that non-SNA, non-protected and exotic vegetation can make a noteworthy contribution to the values of an ONF/L (for example, the poplars at Glendhu Bay, referenced in <i>Parkins Bay</i>).</p> <p>The submitter goes on to request a number of changes to the description of "other vegetation types" that conflate physical and associative and perceptual values. This is not considered necessary as, where, for example, pastoral values are of importance to the perceptual values, they are typically discussed under the description of "important views" and "aesthetic qualities", thus providing the 'contextual reference' for the physical attribute.</p> <p>The submitter also requests that areas of identified ecological habitat should be mapped within the PA Schedule. This goes well beyond the usual scope of a Schedule of Landscape Values for an ONF/L, and is in my opinion, best addressed as part of a detailed landscape assessment for a site-specific resource consent application or plan change.</p>	Reject submission.
OS139.22	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove references of the requirement of the removal or eradication of pest flora	Addressed in response to OS 82.12.	Reject submission.



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			and fauna species from the landscape schedule.		
OS139.23	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so the land use patterns and features section of the schedule particularises a broader list of established activities occurring within the outstanding natural feature which are historically recognised as appropriate.	Addressed in response to OS 139.17.	Reject submission.
OS139.24	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so the rankings within the naturalness attributes and values section are 'low' to 'moderate' rather than 'high'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Addressed in response to OS 82.7 and OS 82.22.	Reject submission.
OS139.25	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That if the overall ranking within the naturalness attributes and values section of the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are not amended then the lower flanks should be specifically amended to include low to moderate values.	Addressed in response to O S139.5.	Reject submission.
OS139.26	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to be contextualised by further describing the future ability to consolidate and enhance	Addressed in response to OS 139.17.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			or develop existing uses over time.		
OS139.27	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to recognise that the property in question for this submission continues as a working farm today, and associated modification to landform and values are anticipated from the continuation of this permitted activity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.6 acknowledges pastoral farming as an important attribute and value associated with Slope Hill PA ONF. It does not however, follow that modification to the <b>landform and values</b> (emphasis added) associated with this permitted activity are anticipated. Rather it is my understanding that the PDP policy context for Rural Zoned land where a RMA s6(b) overlay applies, has been 'developed' to protect landscape values.	Reject submission.
OS139.28	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to additionally recognise that some views to lower flanks of Slope Hill will change and be affected by future development and zoning.	Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I consider it appropriate to amend Schedule 21.22.6 [19] and [23] as follows:  <i>19. Appealing mid to long-range views westbound on SH6 on the elevated section of the highway east of the intersection with Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road to the south-eastern flanks of Slope Hill. The open pastoral character of the rough 'plucked' slopes of the landform in this view forms a bold contrast with the exotic vegetation and building-dominated low-lying terraces of Ladies Mile and Frankton to the left of view. From this orientation, the roche moutonnée blends seamlessly with the layered patterning of dramatic mountains and roche moutonnée that frame the western side of the Wakatipu Basin and Lake Wakatipu more generally. The depth of the outlook together with its 'classic' elements that include a structured layering of mountainous landforms and the gateway impression (enabling first glimpses of Queenstown) contribute to the memorability of the vista. It is possible that anticipated urban development throughout</i>	Accept submission. Discuss with QLDC

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				<p><i>Ladies Mile may obscure views of the lower margins of the landform feature, adjacent Ladies Mile.</i></p> <p>23. Attractive close, mid, and long-range views from Ladies Mile, Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country to the south side of Slope Hill. From this orientation the distinguishing <i>roche moutonnée</i> landform profile is clearly legible and there is an awareness of the transition from the smooth 'ice up' character to the rough 'plucked' character. <i>It is possible that anticipated urban development throughout Ladies Mile may obscure views of the lower margins of the landform feature, adjacent Ladies Mile.</i></p>	
OS139.29	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the particular units of the outstanding natural feature are further particularised to describe more accurately differences in naturalness, such as the lower slopes adjacent to Ladies Mile.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.
OS139.30	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete the summary of landscape values section from the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5. Further, the requirement to include a rating of the landscape values draws from PDP 3.3.40(c).	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS139.31	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove the important hydrological features from the landscape schedule.	No technical evidence is provided by the submitter as to why this accepted aspect of landscape values should be deleted from Schedule 21.22.6.	Reject submission.
OS139.32	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to include a sentence under point 8 which states 'modified pasture, fencing, farming uses, rural living and amenity planting across the lower slopes.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. 'Fencing' and 'rural living dwellings' are not "other distinctive vegetation types" and therefore do not belong in this part of Schedule 21.22.6. Fencing is an accepted part of pastoral farming and rural living is acknowledged in Schedule 21.22.6 [10]. Amenity planting is acknowledged at Schedule 21.22.6 [8](b), and pastoral farming is acknowledged repeatedly throughout Schedule 21.22.6. It is also noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the schedules are intended to be read in full.	Reject submission.
OS139.33	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 8(b) to remove the words 'the two', and replace 'and wetland on the north side' with 'and their curtilage areas'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The identification of the two dwellings in Schedule 21.22.6 is a statement of fact. Reference to the curtilage is considered unnecessary as it is acknowledged that there are amenity plantings around the dwellings.	Reject submission.
OS139.34	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 8(c) to include the words 'resulting from lifestyle subdivision and development'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. It is understood that many of the poplar plantings in the District derive from historic farm shelter and shade planting strategies. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence in this regard so that the appropriateness of this amendment can be considered.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS139.35	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 9 to include the words 'Opportunities for their control are supported through future subdivision and development proposals'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. This submission point relates to a policy intention rather than landscape values and therefore is not relevant to a Schedule of Landscape Values. That said, the response to OS 82.12 may provide the submitter with some comfort in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS139.36	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 10 to change the capacity rating of important land-use features and to amend references within the paragraph. Also, that a sentence is included regarding the lower slopes being characterised as a transition or lifestyle area.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Many of the aspects sought for deletion in Schedule 21.22.6 [10] are matters of fact or addressed in other submissions (e.g. OS 82.14) and are therefore rejected. However, some minor amendment is recommended which may go some way to addressing the submitters concerns in this regard: <i>10 Slope Hill is predominantly in pastoral use with very limited rural living use. Modification is limited to a network of farm tracks across the landform, other infrastructure (eg water tanks, fencing, utilities), a trig point and communication tower on the highpoint and two dwellings and associated farm buildings on the northern sides of Slope Hill. Built development is generally characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is well integrated by a mix of established and more recent vegetation features and reads as being subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns.</i>	Accept submission in part.
OS139.37	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove the important shared and recognised attributes and values from the landscape schedule unless they are more accurately specified	Addressed in response to OS 82.20.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			within the landscape schedule.		
OS139.38	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to include a point under the title legibility and expressiveness attributes and values which states 'Remaining working farm and lifestyle practices including associated with irrigation races, infrastructure, access, modified pasture and landform, earthworks, and shelter/amenity planting.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The suggested text amendment is not relevant to "legibility and expressiveness attributes and values".	Reject submission.
OS139.39	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 18 to include the words 'resulting from rural lifestyle subdivision and development' and to replace the words 'and seemingly more spacious 'rural' landscape beyond Queenstown/Frankton' with 'framed within the urban context of the foreground flats'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.34.	Reject submission.
OS139.40	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 19 to include reference to lifestyle developments on the lower slopes of Slope Hill.	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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				Appeal and careful review of the Slope Hill PA ONF mapping, rural lifestyle development is not evident within the lower slopes of Slope Hill PA ONF (mapped area) in views westbound on SH6.	
OS139.41	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove point 20 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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that the viewing experience discussed in [20] should be deleted from Schedule 21.22.6.</p> <p>However, I do consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [20] would benefit from refinement as follows:</p> <p><i>Highly attractive <del>close to</del> long-range views from the Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata, the necklace of reserves around the edge of Lake Hayes, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and the residential properties around Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) (outside the ONF), across the lake (ONF) to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, the undeveloped ridgeline framing the western side of the lake and/or the more distant surrounding mountain backdrop.</i></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS139.42	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 21 to include the words 'of the upper slopes' in reference to attractive long-range views present, remove reference to the eastern end of Slope Hill Road and parts of the Queenstown Trail, remove reference to the undeveloped nature of the	<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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [21] should be amended as requested by the submitter.</p> <p>However, I do consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [21] would benefit from refinement as follows:</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			land, replace reference to the 'marked contrast' with 'transition of', and include reference to the steeper upper slopes of the priority area.	<i>Attractive mid to long-range views from the eastern western side of the Whakatipu Basin (including Tuckers Beach, Domain Road, Hawthorn Triangle, Dalefield, parts of the Shotover River corridor, the Hawthorn Triangle, the eastern end of Slope Hill Road and parts of the Queenstown Trail) to parts of the smooth pastoral elevated south-western flanks and the more rugged north-western flanks. From these this orientations the open and generally undeveloped landform forms a marked contrast with the rural living development context in the foreground of view.</i>	
OS139.43	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 22 to include reference to the attractive long-range views of the upper slopes from the Remarkables Ski Field Access 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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [22] should be amended as requested by the submitter as the lower slopes of the PA are also visible from the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road.	Reject submission.
OS139.44	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill 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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that the viewing experience discussed in [23] should be deleted from Schedule 21.22.6.	Reject submission.
OS139.45	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 24 to remove reference to the dominance of the natural	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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24	Reject submission.



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			landscape elements, include reference to the upper slopes of the outstanding natural feature, replace the words 'generally subservient nature of' with 'attractive', remove reference to the built environments contract with the surrounding land with reference to the land being a lifestyle transition with a flatter developed landscape in the 'foreground'.	appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [24] should be amended as requested by the submitter.  My response to OS 139.5 is also of relevance here.	
OS139.46	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 26 to reference the pastoral and farming character of the area, amending the high perception of naturalness of the area to a moderate perception and naturalness and domestication, remove reference to modifications related to pastoral use being in low numbers, and references to the 'naturalness' of the area.	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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [26] should be amended as requested by the submitter.  My response to OS 82.22 is also of relevance here.	Reject submission.
OS139.47	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 27 to reference the upper slopes of Slope Hill and to remove reference of the area being undeveloped.	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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [27] should be amended as requested by the submitter.	
OS139.48	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 28 to include the words 'resulting from rural lifestyle subdivision and development.	Addressed in response to OS 139.34.	Reject submission.
OS139.49	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 30 to include the word 'important'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. This aspect of the Schedule is talking about the "Aesthetic qualities and values" of the ONF. This is not the same as the "Particularly important viewpoints" section. The aesthetic qualities of the ONF will inevitably be experienced from some 'other' public viewpoints other than the specific viewpoints discussed in Schedule 21.22.6. (For example, the Old Shotover River Bridge, Remarkables Park.) Relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [30] should be amended as requested by the submitter.	Reject submission.
OS139.50	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 31(a) to remove reference to the undeveloped nature of the landscape, include reference to the upper slopes of the 'roche moutonnee' landform, include reference to the landscape being a transitions	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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [31](a) should be amended as requested by the submitter.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			of rural living on the lower slopes and the adjacent flats.	My response to OS 139.5 is also of relevance here.	
OS139.51	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 31(b)ii to include the words 'resulting from its use as a working farm'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The 'working farm character' of Slope Hill PA ONF is implicit in its description as having an open and pastoral character.	Reject submission.
OS139.52	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 31(b)iii to replace the words 'very limited level' with 'attractiveness of lifestyle', and to include the words 'lower flanks'.	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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, and having carefully reviewed the consented and unbuilt platforms within the Slope Hill PA ONF, I note that almost all of the recently consented platforms (excepting one) are located outside the mapped PA. It should also be noted that my response to OS 139.1, acknowledges the proximate rural living context to parts of Slope Hill PA ONF.	Reject submission.
OS139.53	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 31(b)iv to include the words 'and which have resulted from rural lifestyle subdivision and development'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.34.	Reject submission.
OS139.54	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the rating for physical landscape values from 'very high' to 'high' and to remove the	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by geomorphology, ecology and cultural experts. All of these experts have supported the wording of Schedule 21.22.6 [32] as notified.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			words 'habitats, species, hydrological values and mana whenua features in the area.		
OS139.55	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 33(b) to include reference to farming in relation to the historic associations of the area.	Addressed in response to OS 139.17.	Reject submission.
OS139.56	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove point 32(d) from the landscape schedule.	I agree with this submission point. Amend Schedule 21.22.6 [32] (d) as follows: <del>d. The significant recreational attributes of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).</del>	Accept submission.
OS139.57	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 35(a) to include reference to the physical values of the priority area being associated with the upper slopes of the priority area.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.
OS139.58	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 34(b) to remove reference to the visibility of the priority area from different locations within the District.	Addressed in response to OS 139.91, OS 139.42, OS 139.43 and OS 139.44.	Reject submission.
OS139.59	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 34(c) to include reference to the lowers slopes of the priority	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			area as being a lifestyle transition area between Ladies Mile and the upper slopes of the priority area, and remove reference to the natural landscape backdrop and the western and central portion of the Wakatipu Basin.		
OS139.60	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove point 34(d) 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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 [34](d) should be amended as requested by the submitter. My response to OS 139.5 is also of relevance here.	Reject submission.
OS139.61	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for commercial recreational activities from 'very limited' to 'limited', replace reference to the screening and/or camouflaging of natural landscape elements with 'integrate with', remove reference to developments being designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, character and to remove refence to integrating 'appreciable	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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 Capacity (i) should be amended as requested by the submitter.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			landscape restoration and enhancement and to enhance public access to the area.		
OS139.62	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities from 'no' capacity to 'limited', and to include the sentence 'landscape capacity for activities that: integrate with, and complement/enhance existing land uses; and are located to integrate with natural landscape elements and provide for the area's ONF values'.	<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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that Schedule 21.22.6 Capacity (ii) should be amended as requested by the submitter. In particular, the open, elevated, steep and exposed character of the majority of Slope Hill PA ONF makes it highly sensitive to built development change.</p> <p>However, it is acknowledged that there may be some <b>very limited</b> landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing rural living dwellings within the PA.</p> <p>It is recommended that Schedule 21.22.6 Landscape Capacity (ii) is amended as follows:</p> <p><b><u>ii. Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – no landscape capacity– very limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms which: are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements: are 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.</u></b></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS139.63	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Stalker Family Trust		landscape capacity of urban expansion from 'no' capacity to 'limited'.	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> ).	
OS139.64	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove the landscape capacity rating for intensive agriculture.	To delete consideration of 'intensive agriculture' in the landscape capacity section of the PA Schedules would not align with the directions of the Environment Court.  The proposed amendments to the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble include an explanation of this landuse term (along with other landuse terms that are not defined in PDP Chapter 2) which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns.	Reject submission.
OS139.65	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for earthworks from 'very limited' to 'limited', include reference to current lifestyle development and remove reference to protecting naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  ONFs typically have a particularly high sensitivity to earthworks changes due to their limited size/extent. In addition, in this instance, the largely unmodified roche moutonnée geomorphology of the ONF heightens this sensitivity to landform modification via earthworks (and which have the potential to detract from naturalness and expressiveness values).  As a consequence, Schedule 21.22.6 acknowledges the capacity for <b>very limited</b> earthworks for activities/elements within the ONF associated with farm tracks and public tracks.  Lifestyle development within the spatial extent of Slope Hill PA ONF is limited to two dwellings only and therefore does not merit reference in terms of the capacity for earthworks across the PA as a whole. Further, it is expected that a detailed landscape assessment as part of a resource consent or plan change application in the vicinity of the two lifestyle developments would identify localised areas where a varying capacity for earthworks may be apparent.  I also note that in reviewing the more recent consents associated with the existing lifestyle development, there would	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				appear to have been a very careful approach to managing earthworks within the Slope Hill PA.	
OS139.66	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the capacity for farm buildings from 'very limited' to 'limited', remove reference to this capacity rating to areas of the outstanding natural landscape with pastoral land uses and include the words 'or serve a purpose to support farming activities'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Slope Hill PA ONF has a high landscape sensitivity to built development change as a consequence of its open, elevated, steep and exposed nature. For this reason and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules work, the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that the landscape capacity for farm buildings in Slope Hill PA ONF should be changed from <b>very limited</b> to <b>limited</b>.</p> <p>However, I do consider that the text of Schedule 22.22.6 capacity c (v) would benefit from amendment as follows due to the fact that almost all of the PA is in pastoral landuse:</p> <p><b>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.</b></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS139.67	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure from 'very limited' to 'limited' and to remove the words 'and protect the area's ONF values. No landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>ONFs typically have a particularly high sensitivity to earthworks changes due to their limited size/extent. In addition, in this instance, the largely unmodified roche moutonnée geomorphology of the ONF heightens the sensitivity to landform modification typically associated with transport infrastructure.</p> <p>Within this context, it is appropriate that transport infrastructure beyond trails is carefully evaluated as part of a detailed resource consent or plan change process.</p> <p>For this reason and relying on my landscape evaluation of the broader area as part of the PA Schedules (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu</p>	Reject submission.



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I do not consider that the landscape capacity for transport infrastructure in Slope Hill PA ONF should be changed from <b>very limited</b> to <b>limited</b> .	
OS139.68	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant Stalker Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for rural living from 'no' capacity to 'moderate' and to include the words 'within the lower flanks/foothills of the ONF for activities that: integrate with, and complement/enhance existing land uses, provide for a transition between urban development of the adjacent flats; and are located to integrate with natural landscape elements'.	<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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, I consider that the following amendment to Schedule 21.22.6 Capacity is appropriate:</p> <p><b>(xi) Rural living – very limited to no landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; is designed to be small scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).</b></p> <p>It is also noted that the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 acknowledges that:</p> <p><i>the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites; landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there is likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through consent applications.</i></p> <p>This means that there is an acknowledgement that a finer grained assessment as part of a site-specific proposal may determine a higher capacity for a landuse which may give the submitter some comfort in this regard.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS139.69	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Grant	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove	Addressed in response to OS 140.25.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Stalker Family Trust		references to private views, such as from Lake Hayes houses from identification as particularly important views.		
OS140.1	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill, PA overlay and ONF boundary is amended to recognise and provide for future development and change within the foothills of the Slope Hill ONF.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.
OS140.2	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the proposed southern boundary line of the Slope Hill ONF is amended and moved further up Slope Hill to exclude the lower flanks where modified landholdings are located that do not warrant section 6 classification and protection.	Addressed in response to OS 139.2.	Reject submission.
OS140.3	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the northern and western boundary of the Slope Hill ONF is amended to exclude the significantly modified and developed land located on the lower flanks of Slope Hill and follow a clear topographical or geomorphological boundary that is consistent with the findings of the Environment Courts topic 2.1 decision (Hawthenden).	Addressed in response to OS 139.2.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.4	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That if the Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF) boundary line and priority area overlay contained within landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is not amended as sought by submission points #140.2 and #140.3 that: (a) an exception regime is provided to exclude the lower flanks of Slope Hill and/or; (b) The lower slopes of Slope Hill are identified as a separate character unit / lifestyle transition area; or (c) landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is deleted in its entirety from the landscape schedules.	Addressed in response to OS 139.4 and OS 139.5.	Reject submission.
OS140.5	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 is amended to provide for interface issues with the adjacent Ladies Mile or Rural Lifestyle / Wakatipu Basin Amenity Zoned land which is anticipated to become dense urban and mixed use development in accordance with the Ladies Mile Masterplan. The landscape schedule needs to be amended to account for this and ensure that anticipated future development of the Ladies Mile land will not be affected or implicated by the	Addressed in response to OS 139.1.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			scheduled values of landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill.		

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.6	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	<p>That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to acknowledge that upon development the Ladies Mile will significantly change in character. The schedule therefore needs to be amended to: (a) Account for the adjacent residential development anticipated and zoned to occur (either via the Ladies Mile Masterplan, Rural Lifestyle Zoning (southern boundary of ONF), or development under the Wakatipu Basin Rural Amenity Zone (western and northern boundaries of ONF); (b) Acknowledge that such zoning and future development of the Ladies Mile area should not be limited by the values contained within the adjacent Slope Hill ONF and will not impact on those values; and (c) Provide for the lower slopes of the ONF to effectively be a lifestyle transition area between lower more intensive development and the more upper natural slopes of the ONF.</p>	<p>Responses to OS 139.1 and OS 82.14 recommend amendments to Schedule 21.22.6 to better acknowledge the proximate urban and rural living context of the PA.</p> <p>With respect to the request to reference a lifestyle transition are across the slower slopes of the ONF, this is addressed in response OS 139.5.</p>	<p>Accept submission in part.</p>

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.7	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the capacity ratings, if retained within landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are amended to provide for the full spectrum of available land uses anticipated and to include a corresponding scale of development to guide implementation of these capacity ratings.	<p>Addressed in response to OS 139.12. Also see the response to OS 139.68, OS 139.66, OS 140.67and 139.63 which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p> <p>In considering this submission point, it is recommended that Schedule 21.22.6 Capacity (x) is amended as follows:</p> <p><b>Renewable energy generation – no landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. Very limited to no landscape capacity or discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.</b></p>	Accept submission in part.
OS140.8	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape values included within landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are amended to identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation.	Addressed in response to OS 139.15.	Reject submission.
OS140.9	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacities included within landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are amended to identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation.	Addressed in response to OS 139.14.	Reject submission.
OS140.10	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be amended to more accurately recognise and provide for the full range of historical,	Addressed in response to OS 139.16 and OS 139.17.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			established and existing activities and uses and their likely and anticipated future upgrade, replacement, or redevelopment.		
OS140.11	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to acknowledge that properties along the lower flanks of the Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF) have developed over time and that these contribute to the overall character, values, and history of the proposed ONF including its farming, lifestyle, and associative and historical attributes. Particular attributes and features that need to be recognised within the schedule include: (a) Existing accessways and stock tracks; (b) Walking trails; (c) Historical farming uses and structures including irrigation races; (d) Fences and retaining walls / earthworks; (e) Introduced and recently planted vegetation from subdivision and development; (f) Pest control; (g) Water storage and supply; (h) Supply of other utilities (power, wastewater, stormwater);	Addressed in response to OS 139.17.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			and (i) Residential dwellings and domestic curtilages.		
OS140.12	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That any additional, amended, consequential, or further relief in respect of the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill reflects the intent of the matters raised in this submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS140.13	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That if the relief sought and suggested amendments in this submission regarding landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are not included that the schedule is deleted or withdrawn from the variation to Chapter 21.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS140.14	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that only values that contribute to a feature as being outstanding are included (as per Environment Court Decision 2.2 and the Partially Operative Otago RPS 2019, chapter 3). Values and other descriptors within this landscape schedule that do not meet this purpose should be deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 139.20.	Reject submission.
OS140.15	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	Amend landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill so that only vegetation types which are protected under the	Addressed in response to OS 139.21.	Reject submission.



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Proposed District Plan (either through a Significant Natural Area (SNA) overlay or tree protection rules) are identified as those which contribute to the natural feature being considered "outstanding".		
OS140.16	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That if human elements are to be included as ecological features and vegetation types within the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill, that these are further particularized by the following: (a) Grazed pasture, shelter belts, amenity planting...[etc.] all contribute to character and context of the ONF. These practices exist historically within the landscape and contribute to its distinctive sense of place and historical association as a working farm; and (b) Perceived values include the ability to continue to operate, undertake, modernize, develop and consolidate such activities within the landscape.	Addressed in response to OS 139.16.	Reject submission.
OS140.17	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That if the 'Important ecological features and vegetation types' section is retained within landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill,	Addressed in response to OS 139.21.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			these attributes need to be specified more accurately with respect to areas of identified ecological and habitat value so that they can be inform future development applications.		
OS140.18	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to either delete the requirement to remove or eradicate pest flora and fauna species or that this section is reworded to align with the PDP assessment matters which recognise the opportunity and benefit of legal mechanisms to achieve such outcomes and reduce pest species secured through development proposals by way of offset/positive effect/compensation.	Addressed in response to OS 82.12.	Accept submission in part.
OS140.19	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to further particularise the broader list of established activities occurring within the Slope Hill ONF and which are historically recognised as appropriate and in keeping with the landform.	Addressed in response to OS 139.17.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.20	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	<p>That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is either amended to change the level of naturalness from 'high' to 'medium' or 'low' to recognise that the lower flanks of the ONF have been highly modified by established residential and farming activities or:</p> <p>If the level of naturalness is not changed as above that the values included for the Slope Hill landscape schedule are amended to acknowledge the modification of the landscape by farming activities and associated introduced pests, accessways, recreation, fencing, utilities and services.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Addressed in response to OS 82.7 and OS 82.22.</p> <p>The various modifications to the PA referenced by the submission point are addressed in Schedule 21.22.6, with the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explaining that it is intended that Schedules are read in full.</p>	Reject submission.
OS140.21	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	<p>That landscape schedule 21.22.6 is amended to contextualise the existing forms of modification and development within the Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF) by further describing the future ability of the landscape to consolidate and enhance or develop these uses over time. For example, farming practices established within the ONF has modified the land as well as provided a human</p>	Addressed in response to OS 139.17.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>association and intimate connection to the land.</p> <p>Other important land use patterns and features to be included within this landscape schedule include:</p> <p>(a) Amenity planting from subdivision and land use consent proposals; (b) Ancillary farming activities such as stock water, fences, and utilities; (c) Infrastructure and access connections; and (d) Pest control operations.</p>		
OS140.22	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 14 relating to 'Important historical attributes and values' to recognise that this property continues as a working farm today and associated modifications to landform and values are anticipated from the continuation of this permitted activity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Schedule 21.22.6 has been reviewed by a heritage expert with that expert supporting the notified text in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS140.23	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete paragraph 15 on 'Important shared and recognised values'.	Addressed in response to OS 82.20.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.24	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 18 to recognise that some views towards the lower flanks of Slope Hill will be affected by future development and zoning and in particular on Ladies Mile, and that such change will not undermine or detract from the recognized values of the landscape schedule / ONF.	Addressed in response to OS 139.28. Discuss with QLDC planner- how far has Ladies Mile gotten to in terms of process?	Accept submission.
OS140.25	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete all references to private views such as from Lake Hayes houses.	Amend Schedule 21.22.6 [20] as follows: Highly attractive close to long-range views from the Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata, the necklace of reserves around the edge of Lake Hayes, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and the residential area properties around Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) (outside the ONF), across the lake (ONF) to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, the undeveloped ridgeline framing the western side of the lake and/or the more distant surrounding mountain backdrop.	Accept submission in part.
OS140.26	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to identify the particular units of the ONF and describe more accurately the differences in the naturalness of values and attributes.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.

Commented [PE1]: Does not match changes in PA ONL schedule at point 20

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.27	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape values are consistent with and supported by the summary statements.	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 (including field work), along with the Wakatipu Basin Land Use Planning Study, PDP Chapter 24 appeals, PDP Stage 2 Wakatipu Equities Appeal, the PDP Stage 2 Strain Appeal and the PDP Stage 2 Cassidy Trust Appeal, along with the review of the PA Schedules by other expert input, I do not agree that Schedule 21.22.6 needs to be amended as suggested by the submitter. As the Methodology Report explains, the PA Schedules have been prepared in accordance with landscape assessment best practice.	Reject submission.
OS140.28	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete the 'Summary of Landscape Values' section, or:  If this section is to be retained within the landscape schedule, it is to be amended to reflect the modified character of different units within the ONF, such as the lower flanks.	Addressed in response to OS 139.30.	Reject submission.
OS140.29	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete the 'Landscape Capacity' section.	The Landscape Capacity section of the PA Schedules has been directed by the Environment Court's Topic 2 Decisions.	Reject submission.
OS140.30	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That if the landscape capacities identified within the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are retained, these are amended	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.6 outlines the existing uses evident within Slope Hill PA ONF. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence of any uses (consented or supported by other	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			to recognise existing and planned rural living opportunities and associated amenities and utilities within the lower flanks of the ONF (where the boundary has also been disputed by the submitter).	statutory or non-statutory documents) that have been omitted so that they can be captured in Schedule 21.22.6. With respect to the suggestion that Schedule 21.22.6 should recognise and provide for planned rural living opportunities and associated amenities and utilities, this would appear to embrace matters that go well beyond the identification of the landscape values of the PA ONF and its capacity for landuse change.	
OS140.31	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That if the landscape capacities identified within the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill are retained, then much of the lower flanks of Slope Hill need to be amended to moderate or high capacity for additional rural living, farming, earthworks and associated and ancillary activities.	Addressed in response to OS 139.68.	Reject submission.
OS140.32	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is further refined into character units and including the lower slopes being identified as a transition or lifestyle character unit.	Addressed in response to OS 139.5.	Reject submission.
OS140.33	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to either delete the 'Important hydrological features' section of the schedule, OR: More precisely describe what each of these specific values	Addressed in response to OS 139.31. Schedule 21.22.6 explains that the hydrological features contribute to the "Legibility and expressiveness values" [16] and the "Physical values" [31].	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			contribute to making the Slope Hill landscape outstanding.		
OS140.34	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 8 to add an additional subsection (b) to read: Modified pasture, fencing, farming uses, rural living and amenity plantings across the lower slopes.	Addressed in response to OS 139.32.	Reject submission.
OS140.35	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 8(b) to read: Amenity and shelter plantings around dwellings and their curtilage areas.	Addressed in response to OS 139.32.	Reject submission.
OS140.36	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 8(c) to read: Poplar plantings around the flanks resulting from lifestyle subdivision and development.	Addressed in response to OS 139.34.	Reject submission.
OS140.37	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to add the following sentence to the existing paragraph 9: 'Opportunities for their control are supported	Addressed in response to OS 139.35.	Reject submission.



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			through future subdivision and development proposals'.		
OS140.38	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	<p>That the landscape schedule 21.22.5 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 10 to read the following:</p> <p>'Slope Hill is predominately in pastoral use with rural living use peppered across the lower slopes. Modification includes a network of farm tracks across the landform, a trig point and communication tower on the highpoint, other infrastructure and utilities, dwellings and their associated curtilages and farm buildings on the northern sides of Slope Hill. Built development is generally characterised by carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is well integrated by a mix of established and more recent vegetation features and enhances the 'natural' landscape patterns'.</p>	Addressed in response to OS 139.36.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.39	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.5 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 10 to include the following additional sentence at the end of the 'Important land use and features' section:  'The lower slopes are characterised as a transition or lifestyle area between the foreground of more development on the flats (including anticipated and zoned future urban development) and lifestyle / Arcadian character of the lower slopes'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.36.	Reject submission.
OS140.40	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.5 Slope Hill is amended to include the following additional paragraph (new paragraph 17) at the end of the 'Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values' section:  'Remaining working farm and lifestyle practices including those associated with irrigation races, infrastructure, access, modified pasture and landform, earthworks, and shelter / amenity planting'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.38.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.41	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.5 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 18, second sentence to include the following after 'Lombardy poplars': 'resulting from rural lifestyle subdivision and development'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.34.	Reject submission.
OS140.42	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 18, final sentence to read the following: 'Overall, the outlook impresses as an engaging and memorable gateway to the Wakatipu Basin framed within the urban context of the foreground flats'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The suggested text amendment is not relevant to "legibility and expressiveness attributes and values" (which addresses how the landscape or feature demonstrates the formative processes of landscape).	Reject submission.
OS140.43	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 19, second sentence to read the following: 'The open pastoral character of the rough 'plucked' slopes of the landform in this view forms a bold contrast with the exotic vegetation and lifestyle development across lower slopes, and the building-dominated low-lying terraces of Ladies Mile and Frankton to the left of the view'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.40.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.44	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete paragraph 20.	Addressed in response to OS 139.41.	Reject submission.
OS140.45	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 21 to read the following: 'Attractive mid to long-range views of the upper slopes from the eastern side of the Wakatipu Basin (including Tuckers Beach, Domain Road, Hawthorn Triangle, Dalefield, parts of the Shotover River corridor, the Hawthorn Triangle, to the more rugged north-western flanks). From this orientation the landform forms a transition of rural living development between the context in the foreground view, and the steeper upper slopes'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.42.	Reject submission.
OS140.46	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 22 to read the following: 'Attractive long range view of the upper slopes from the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts), the Queenstown Trail on Christine's Hill and from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road at McIntyre's Hill to Slope Hill beside the highly attractive	Addressed in response to OS 139.43.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			glacial lake of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) and viewed within a broader ONL mountain context'.		
OS140.47	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to delete paragraph 23.	Addressed in response to OS 139.44.	Reject submission.
OS140.48	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 24 to read the following: 'In all of the views, the 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes are more evident within the upper slopes of the ONF, along with the attractive built development within the ONF as a lifestyle transition with the flatter 'developed' landscape in the foreground'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.45.	Reject submission.
OS140.49	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 26 to read the following: 'The pastoral and farming character of Slope Hill which conveys a moderate perception of naturalness and domestication, including a number of buildings across the lower flanks, and a series of tracks and infrastructure	Addressed in response to OS 139.46.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			influence on the character of the landform'.		
OS140.50	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 27, first sentence to read the following: 'The appealing and engaging views of the upper slopes to the legible roche moutonnée landform of Slope Hill'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.47.	Reject submission.
OS140.51	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 28 to read the following: 'Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation resulting from rural lifestyle subdivision and development'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.34.	Reject submission.
OS140.52	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 30 to read the following: 'The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of important public viewpoints'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.49.	Reject submission.
OS140.53	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 31, subsection 'a.' to read: 'The highly attractive large-scale composition created by the	Addressed in response to OS 139.50.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			distinctive upper slopes of the roche moutonnee landform, juxtaposed beside a transition of rural living on the lower slopes and urban context on the adjacent flats'.		
OS140.54	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 31, subsection 'b.' to read:  'At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:  i. the clearly legible roche moutonnée landform profile and character;  ii. the open and pastoral character of Slope Hill resulting from its use as a working farm;  iii. the attractiveness of lifestyle built modification evident through the ONF lower flanks; and  iv. the poplars around the flanks of Slope Hill, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native, and which have resulted from rural lifestyle subdivision and development'.	Addressed in response to OS139.51, OS 139.52 and OS 139.53.	Reject submission.
OS140.55	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 32 to	Addressed in response to OS 139.54.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			read: 'High physical values due to the high-value landforms, and vegetation features'.		
OS140.56	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 33, subsection 'b.' to read: 'The historic associations of the area, including farming'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.55.	Reject submission.
OS140.57	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 33 to delete subsection 'd.'	Addressed in response to OS 139.56.	Accept submission.
OS140.58	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 34, subsection 'a.' to read: 'The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes particularly associated with the upper slopes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.57.	Reject submission.
OS140.59	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 34, subsection 'b.' to read: 'The very high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its	Addressed in response to OS 139.58.	Reject submission.



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			distinctiveness and appealing composition of natural landscape elements.'		
OS140.60	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 34, subsection 'c.' to read: 'The identity of the lower slopes of the roche moutonee as a lifestyle transition area between Ladies Mile and the upper slopes, and as a gateway feature to Queenstown / the Wakatipu Basin'	Addressed in response to OS 139.59.	Reject submission.
OS140.61	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at paragraph 34, to delete subsection 'd.'	Addressed in response to OS 139.60.	Reject submission.
OS140.62	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Commercial recreational activities reads as follows:  i. Commercial recreational activities - limited landscape capacity for activities that: integrate with, and complement/enhance existing recreation features and area located to integrate with natural landscape	Addressed in response to OS 139.61.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			elements and provide for the area's ONF values'.		
OS140.63	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities reads as follows:  'ii. Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - Limited landscape capacity for activities that: integrate with, and complement/enhance existing land uses: and are located to integrate with natural landscape elements and provide for the area's ONF values'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.62.	Reject submission.
OS140.64	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Urban expansions is 'limited' and not 'no' landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 139.63.	Reject submission.
OS140.65	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the activity of Intensive agriculture (iii) is deleted from the landscape capacity list.	Addressed in response to OS 139.64.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS140.66	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Earthworks reads as follows:  'iv. Earthworks - limited landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm or public access tracks and current lifestyle development that is sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.65.	Reject submission.
OS140.67	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Farm buildings reads as follows:  'v. Farm buildings - limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character or serve a purpose to support farming activities'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.66.	Accept submission in part.
OS140.68	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Transport infrastructure reads as follows:  'vii. Transport infrastructure - limited landscape capacity for trails that are: located to	Addressed in response to OS 139.67.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement'.		
OS140.69	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Maryhill Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended so that the landscape capacity for Rural living reads as follows: xi. Rural living - Moderate landscape capacity within the lower flanks / foothills of the ONF for activities that integrate with, and complement/enhance existing land uses, provide for a transition between urban development of the adjacent flats; and are located to integrate with natural landscape elements'.	Addressed in response to OS 139.68.	Reject submission.