

Queenstown Lakes Proposed District Plan, Landscape Schedules Variation

Kāi Tahu ki Otago (Kā Rūnaka) Summary of Submission, Response to s42A & JWS versions

Mana whenua features and their location; associations and experience

Through papatipu rūnaka, Kāi Tahu mana whenua provided input into these attributes and values. Apart from changes to correct omissions/errors as a result of the Kāi Tahu submission, or to revise Sticky Forest-related content in Schedule 21.22.22, kā rūnaka support the notified version of this content in the schedules and seek its retention.

Schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay (Sticky Forest block)

Kāi Tahu content relating to Sticky Forest at Schedule 21.22.22, para 21 has been modified in response to the Te Arawhiti and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu submissions and evidence. Kā rūnaka submitted to remove the third sentence in para 28 relating to Sticky Forest as a mountain biking destination. This sentence has been modified via QLDC rebuttal and expert conferencing. Kā rūnaka support the latest versions of paras 21 and 28 provided with QLDC opening legal submissions.

Landscape Capacity

Capacity Statements – The rūnaka submission raised concerns around clarity of the landscape capacity statements in each schedule and the meaning of terminology within them. The schedule preamble has been expanded considerably as a result of s42a, rebuttal and expert conferencing. It now includes context around the concept of landscape capacity, its application and meaning, along with interpretation of the terms used to describe capacity. Kā rūnaka generally support these changes, albeit retaining some concern around the ability of the schedules to manage cumulative landscape effects.

Commercial Recreational – The rūnaka submission that any capacity for this activity be qualified as relating to ‘small scale and low-key’ has been accepted, and this is supported.

Standard wording where capacity identified – Kā rūnaka sought additional text to help identify when capacity was available for the following activities - commercial recreational, tourism related, intensive agriculture, earthworks, mineral extraction, transport infrastructure/gondolas, utilities and regionally significant infrastructure. The section 42a author (para 8.42) considers the information repetitive and not adding clarity. Kā rūnaka still seek inclusion of this text, noting that similar expansion is undertaken in capacity statements for activities such as commercial recreation, visitor accommodation and earthworks.

Activity clarification - Kā rūnaka sought clarity on the meaning of several activities and raised issues of concern as follows.

- Tourism related activities, intensive agriculture and mineral extraction have been clarified in the preamble as meaning ‘resort’, ‘factory farming’ and ‘mining’ respectively. While it is understood that the nomenclature reflects Chapter 3 policies, it does not aid plan clarity to have different terminology for the same activity.
- Kā rūnaka sought no capacity for mining from the Kawarau and Ōrau (Cardrona) rivers, and supports the changes to Schedule 21.22.18 and 21.23.1 (Cardrona). The Kawarau has changed

from 'limited' to 'very limited' capacity, but an 'extremely limited or no' capacity rating would be preferred.

- Transport infrastructure/gondolas – gondolas have been changed to 'passenger lift systems' and limited capacity identified in three additional Priority Areas – Central and Western Whakatipu Basin and the Kawarau River, as well as the Northern Remarkables and Cardrona Valley ONLs. With the change to the meaning of 'limited capacity' ('very modest' changing to 'modest' in terms of capacity for the amount of sensitively located/designed development), kā rūnaka wonder whether 'very limited' capacity should be identified instead, as the description for this seems to align more with the initial capacity assessment.

Rural living - Kā rūnaka seek that rural living is contained within areas zoned for that purpose and consider capacity for this activity should not be identified outside these zones.

Lake Structures, Jetties, Moorings, Boathouses – The rūnaka submission sought clarity around the terminology used to describe activities on the surface of water and this has been improved. Further, a footnote has been added to the Preamble to the effect that identification of an attribute does not confirm that it is legally established. However, kā rūnaka retain concerns around the legality of these structures, particularly moorings, and how this has been factored into the landscape assessment and identification of capacity. As such, kā rūnaka retain the view that there should be no capacity identified until the legality of existing structures has been established.