

21.22.21 PA ONL West Wānaka: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The West Wānaka PA extends from the Mātakitaki (Matukituki River) mouth to Damper Bay on Wānaka (Lake Wānaka). This includes Roys Peninsula, the Motatapu River valley, the roche moutonnée down its eastern side, and much of the Alpha Range. It also encompasses parts of Wānaka (Lake Wānaka), including Paddock Bay, Bishops Bay, Parkins Bay, and Glendhu Bay. The Fern Burn Valley also falls within this area.

Physical Attributes and Values

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

Important landforms and land types:

1. The Harris Mountains: these form the western boundary of the Fern Burn and Motatapu Valleys. These contain extremely steep and visually rugged landforms, including deeply incised gorges and canyons, extensive rock outcrops, and bluffs. Treble Cone and End Peak are prominent features along the eastern ridge of the range.
2. The Alpha Range: which defines the eastern side of the Fern Burn valley, capped by the distinctive peaks of Mt Alpha and Roys Peak.
3. A series of roche moutonnées to the north-west include:
 - a. Pt 782m between Hospital Flat and Parkins Bay and the Glendhu and Emerald Bluffs;
 - b. Rocky Mountain north of Hospital Flat; and
 - c. Roys Peninsula north of Glendhu/Parkins Bay.
4. A number of moraine outwash areas: which are located below these features, including along the western side of Fern Burn Valley. These contain material deposited by retreating ice and now have the form of long moraine ridges that are characterised by their undulating profiles, together with extensive ablation and terminal moraine material.
5. The fan of the braided Mātakitaki (Matukituki River): comprising fluvial gravels with sand and loess deposits around Paddock Bay and the base of Roys Peninsula. The river flats, delta, and fluvial terraces of the Mātakitaki (Matukituki River) include that system's valley floors and floodplains.
6. The western Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) shoreline: comprising the indented bays of Parkins, Paddock and Glendhu Bays, which are separated from the main lake by Roys Peninsula. A gravel foreshore and low-lying lake and river terraces, resulting from both lake shore deposits and post-glacial river alluvium, are apparent towards the south, interspersed with distinctive steep banks and escarpments. The outwash material of the Fern Burn Fan separates Glendhu Bay from Parkins Bay.

Important hydrological features:

7. The western arm of Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) notable for its scale, largely undeveloped mountain context, intricate patterning, unmanaged lake level, high water quality and clarity, clear visibility, and attractive water colour.

Commented [BG1]: OS 176.38 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

8. The Mātakitaki (Matukituki River). Corresponds to the lower reaches of a largely glacier-fed braided river system draining broadly south eastwards from the Main Divide in Mt Aspiring National Park to Wānaka (Lake Wānaka). Subject to periodic flooding and inundation of the adjacent floodplain.
9. The Motatapu River is part of the lower reaches of a larger river system draining north eastwards from Roses Saddle to Wānaka (Lake Wānaka). Consists of comparatively narrow riverbeds, with extensive fluvial terraces. Subject to periodic flooding and inundation of the adjacent floodplain.
10. The Fern Burn and Alpha Burn rivers which comprise comparatively narrow riverbeds, with extensive fluvial terraces. Subject to periodic flooding and inundation of the adjacent floodplain.
11. Wetland to the west of Damper Bay.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

12. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
 - a. The stands of beech forest through the steeply incised gullies on the western side of the Alpha Range.
 - b. The subalpine and alpine vegetation across the Alpha Range, including snow tussocklands, cushionfields and herbfields.
 - c. The diverse broadleaved shrublands throughout the roche moutonnée west of Fern Burn, the steep north-eastern slopes of the Glendhu Bluff Conservation Area, the bluffs and slopes of Roys Peninsula, in gullies around Rocky Mountain and across the Emerald Bluff. The shrublands occur in association with large areas of bracken fernland and to a lesser extent matagouri-mingimingi dominant shrublands.
13. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
 - a. Grazed pasture with shelterbelts and clusters of shade trees typical of the Fern Burn valley floor, the Fern Burn fan, the Alpha Burn, Motatapu River, Fern Burn and the flats either side of Buchanan Road leading out to Roys Peninsula. Willows line much of the Alpha Burn and Fern Burn and parts of the Motatapu River.
 - b. The grazed and gently flat river terraces behind Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay.
 - c. The willows and poplars that dominate the majority of the lake shore between Damper Bay and Roys Peninsula.
14. High value wetlands (sedgelands) are located in natural depressions bordering roche moutonnée west of Damper Bay.
15. The PA possesses a diverse range of valued habitats from the lake to the mountain tops for New Zealand falcon, Australasian harrier, kea, tui, bellbird, New Zealand pipit, grey warbler, fantail, tomtit, NZ New Zealand shoveler, paradise shelduck, grey teal, crested grebe, Black shag, Little shag and New Zealand scaup. Kea are nationally threatened with a threat status of nationally endangered.
16. The lower braided reach of the Mātakitaki (Matukituki River) north of Roys Peninsula is likely to provide favoured feeding and nesting habitat for the nationally threatened black-fronted tern (nationally endangered) and banded dotterel (nationally vulnerable).
17. Valued habitats for koaro, brown trout, rainbow trout, Chinook salmon, common bully, brook char, banded kokopu and long-finned eels.
18. Valued habitat for sports fishing spawning in Fern Burn and Motatapu River.
19. Valued habitat for game birds at Paddock Bay.

Commented [BG2]: OS 176.40 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG3]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG4]: OS 176.42 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG5]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG6]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG7]: OS 115.8 Khaylm Marshall

20. High indigenous invertebrate values associated with high alpine and tussock areas, including a potentially new species of weevil. Aquatic invertebrate communities throughout the high alpine areas are healthy and consistent with a pristine environment.
21. Valued habitat for skink and gecko, particularly in the rock outcrops, boulderfields and rock strewn tussock and exotic grasslands. This includes the nationally threatened Roys Peak (*Haplodactylus* sp. "Roys Peak") and Cromwell geckos (*Hoplodactylis* aff.*maculatus* "Cromwell") have been recorded in the PA. Both species are classified as At-Risk Declining.
22. Animal pest species include red deer, chamois, feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
23. Plant pest species include sweet briar, broom, gorse and wilding pines.

Commented [BG8]: OS 176.43 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG9]: OS 176.43 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Important land-use patterns and features:

24. Human modification which is currently concentrated around Glendhu Bay, with its existing campground, woolshed wedding events venue, Bike Glendhu bike trails and facility development (including bike trails, pump park, bike hub facility), farmhouses (and associated curtilages), driveways/tracks, airstrip and farm buildings, as well as Parkins Bay with its consented golf resort/ homesite development and associated restoration planting strategy.
25. Throughout the remainder of the area, development is largely restricted to isolated farm buildings and a scattering of rural residential dwellings around Emerald Bluff (associated with the pocket of Rural Lifestyle zoned land) and Roys Peninsula. Generally, such development is characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Typically this sees buildings well integrated by existing landform features and a mix of established and more recent vegetation features. In addition, new development is typically accompanied by appreciable landscape enhancement in the form of native restoration plantings and / or improvements to public access.
26. Several moorings at Glendhu Bay and along the western side of Paddock Bay. Marked water ski lanes to the northwest of Parkins Bay. Consented jetty at Parkins Bay.

Commented [BG10]: OS 137.3 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 137.5 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 137.8 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 176.12 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.
OS 176.20 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG11]: OS 116.1 Bike Glendhu.

Commented [BG12]: OS 137.3 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 137.5 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 137.8 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 176.12 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.
OS 176.20 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG13]: OS 137.3 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 137.5 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 137.8 Robert and Pamela McRae.
OS 176.12 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.
OS 176.20 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG14]: OS 48.2 Second Star

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

27. Sites associated with historic farming in the area. For example, the remains of the Motatapu homestead site (including archaeological sites F40/121-123).
28. Māori archaeological sites (e.g. F40/3 and F40/5).

Mana whenua features and their locations:

29. 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.
30. Much of the ONL is mapped within the wāhi tūpuna: Wānaka (Lake Wānaka), Mātakitaki (Matukituki River), or Area surrounding Te Poutu Te Raki.
31. Lake Wānaka is highly significant to Kāi Tahu and is a Statutory Acknowledgement under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.

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:

32. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
33. Wānaka is one of the lakes referred to in the tradition of “Ngā Puna Wai Karikari o Rākaihautū” which tells how the principal lakes of Te Wai Pounamu were dug by the rangatira (chief) Rākaihautū. Through these pūrakau (stories), this area holds a deep spiritual significance both traditionally and for Kāi Tahu today.
34. The mapped area covers a vast area with kaika mahika kai which were once part of the extensive mahika kai network in the area. Tuna (eels), kāuru (cabbage tree root), weka, kākāpō and aruhe (fern root) were gathered throughout the area.
35. The mana whenua values associated with this area include, but may not be limited to, wāhi taoka, mahika kai, ara tawhito, urupā, kāika and nohoaka.

Important historic attributes and values:

36. Early Māori occupation associated with the lakeshore and local rivers.
37. Historic farming patterns, especially early pastoralism.
38. Historic recreational use of the lake and lakeshore.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

39. The photographic references and descriptions of the area in tourism publications. Commented [BG15]: OS 176.47 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.
40. The very high popularity of Roys Peak Track (noting that most of the track is in Mount Alpha PA ONL) but parts of it afford views out over the eastern portion of West Wanaka PA ONL). Commented [BG16]: OS 176.47 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.
41. The very high popularity of the Roys Peak Track Lookout as a vantage point for social media photographs.
42. The high popularity of the biking routes, walking trails and camping grounds/spots in the area.
43. The importance of the natural heritage area to the local community as evidenced by the efforts of Wai Wanaka in the area.
- 43(a) The impression of the Fern Burn valley as the entrance to the Motatapu Valley that displays a more structured appearance as a consequence of the pastoral landuse and patterning of shelterbelts, hedges and small conifer plantations. Commented [BG17]: OS 176.39 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Important recreation attributes and values:

44. Aotearoa’s National Walkway, the Te Araroa Trail runs along the lakeshore between Damper Bay and Glendhu Bay, Motatapu Road, and the Motatapu Track (adjacent Fern Burn).
45. The highly popular walking trail of Roys Peak Track.
46. Wānaka Mt Aspiring Road as a key scenic route providing access to Treble Cone ski field and Mt Aspiring National Park.

47. Popular walking trails including: Spotts Creek Track; Roys Peak Track; the Motatapu River track; the northern flanks of Pt 782 (Main Wall Track and Little Big Wall Track); the trail to the crest of Pt 442 (to the east of Paddock Bay); and the trail to the crest of Roys Peninsula.
48. Boating, water skiing, kayaking, fishing, and swimming at Wānaka (Lake Wānaka).
- 48(a) Trails, open space, jetty and (consented but largely unbuilt) golf course amenities at Parkins Bay.
49. Nationally significant fishery at Wānaka (Lake Wānaka), sports fishing spawning habitat in the Fern Burn, recreational angling in the Motatapu River and game bird habitat at Paddock Bay.
50. Picnicking around the lake shoreline.
51. Highly popular mountain and road biking routes throughout the area, including at Bike Glendhu, along the Glendhu Bay Track, and along Wānaka Mt Aspiring Road.
52. Highly popular public campground at Glendhu Bay.
53. Fishing and duck shooting on the Mātakitaki (Matukituki River).
54. Canoeing, tubing, rock climbing, and informal camping on the Motatapu River.
55. Extensive rock climbing at Hospital Flat and Diamond Lake Conservation Area.

Commented [BG18]: OS 176.52 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Commented [BG19]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG20]: OS 115.9 Khaylm Marshall.

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:

56. The area's natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above) which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative processes.
57. Indigenous gully and stream plantings reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values in places.
58. More generally the vegetation cover and land uses found within the area reinforce the landform differences throughout the ONL, with more cultural vegetation patterns and human modification evident on the lower-lying areas and natural vegetation cover apparent across more elevated areas.

Commented [BG21]: OS 176.56 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

59. The sequence of highly attractive, frequently dramatic, and varied views from Wanaka-Mt Aspiring Road between Damper Bay and Emerald Bluff of the lake and mountain context.
60. The striking mid and long-range views from Glendhu Bluff lookout (layby on Wanaka-Mt Aspiring Road) out over the lake, Roys Peninsula, Paddock Bay, Parkins Bay, Glendhu Bay, Roys Peak, and the Alpha Range.
61. A series of highly attractive close to long-range views from the Glendhu Bay Track along the largely undeveloped lake margins and across Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) to the surrounding mountain context.
62. The series of appealing views from the 'inland' sections of the Te Araroa Trail across the open pastoral river terraces backdropped by the Alpha Range and the Harris Mountains.
63. Views from Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) within Glendhu / Parkins/ Paddock Bays.

64. The expansive long-range views from the Roys Peak lookout and track over almost the entire area.

65. In many of the views there is an awareness of the Glendhu Bay campground, and to a far lesser degree, development associated with the Parkins Bay development and Bike Glendhu. However, the visual dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes along with the generally subservient nature of built development underpins the high quality of the outlook.

Commented [BG22]: OS 176.24 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.
OS 176.25 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Naturalness attributes and values:

66. Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) as a central feature of the ONL.

67. The mountains framing the ONL are an important feature in their own right and as a counterpart to the lake.

68. The Fern Burn valley floor is the least natural part of the ONL because of the presence of the campground and pastoral farming activities. The campground, with its high level of development, contrasts with the rural character of the farmland on the southern side of the road, notwithstanding the presence of scattered farm buildings and dwellings.

69. Parkins Bay which conveys a sense of transition, away from the rural environs of Glendhu Bay and the lake margins into a more natural landscape: in particular, the managed pasture across the Fern Burn fan and lower terraces transitions into the more vegetated and hummocky terrain around the base of the roche moutonnée. This culminates in the natural shrubland and roche moutonnée landforms of Pt 782m, Glendhu Bluff and Emerald Bluff. The vegetation within this area of change includes the shrubland revegetation that has occurred as part of the Parkins Bay development and the Bike Glendhu development. It also encompasses the development consented by the Environment Court, including:

Commented [BG23]: OS 116.6 Bike Glendhu Ltd.

a. the golf course;

b. a jetty;

c. a clubhouse and visitor accommodation, which is carefully sited amongst existing mature vegetation, set back from the lakefront, and constrained with respect to its height and extent so that it is visually recessive in views from the lakeshore, lake, and road; and

d. residential homesites that are subject to specific controls in relation to their location, integration with natural landforms, and related mounding, building height, roof materials, building extent, curtilage, and native restoration planting, to ensure built development is 'difficult to see' from external locations.

70. Overall, the area displays naturalness values that rate towards the moderate to higher end of the spectrum as a consequence of the dominance of the more natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes. The relatively confined extent of built development and its predominantly visually recessive, modest, and/or relatively low-key character plays an important role in this regard.

Memorability attributes and values:

71. The highly memorable views of the lake and its surrounding mountain frame.

Transient attributes and values:

72. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain slopes and surface of the lake.

73. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation (lake edge poplars and willows in particular).

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

- 74. The parts of the PA that are set apart from the more developed lake shore and immediate hinterland at Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay (which includes the lower reaches of the Fern Burn, and the Bike Glendhu area) display an impression of wildness, and with a distinctly increasing impression of remoteness as one travels westwards along Wānaka – Mount Aspiring Road.
- 75. A localised sense of remoteness along the Parkins Bay lakeshore, where the landform and/or vegetation serves to obscure views of (land based) built development.
- 76. The dark night sky (i.e. lack of light pollution), contributes to the impression of wildness and remoteness.

Commented [BG24]: OS 176.69 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Aesthetic attributes and values:

- 77. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
- 78. More specifically, this includes:
 - a. The highly attractive and striking composition created by the arrangement of the natural waters of the lake framed by the complex and dramatic mountain setting.
 - b. The continuous and large-scale patterning of the alpine ridges and peaks together with the expanse of the lake which form a bold contrast to the more modified and 'tamed' low-lying land at Paddock Bay, Parkins Bay, the Fern Burn Valley and Glendhu Bay that is engaging and appealing.
 - c. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. the bold bluffs and rock outcrops set within a native vegetation context;
 - ii. the indigenous vegetation covered hummocky moraine;
 - iii. the relatively low-key and 'rural vernacular' or visually discreet style of the majority of built development;
 - iv. the contrasting columnar forms of Lombardy poplars at Parkins Bay; and
 - v. the willows and poplars along the lake shore and the Fern Burn, including its delta, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

Commented [BG25]: OS 176.72 Glendhu Bay Trustees Ltd.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

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

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

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

- 79. **High physical values** due to the proliferation of high-value and large-scale landforms, landforms reflecting the interaction of a range of geomorphic processes, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features throughout the area .

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

- a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
- b. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
- c. The popularity of the area for a wide range of recreational activities.

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

- a. The legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of biophysical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its often dramatic and highly appealing visual character. The attractive composition of both natural and rural/farmed landscapes, with a strong focus on the mountains and lake, are critical features of the area. The public accessibility of much of the area which allows the experience of these values along with the area's transient values also play a role in this regard.
- c. A moderate to high impression of naturalness arising from the dominance of the natural landscape and the generally relatively modest or visually recessive nature of built development.
- d. A sense of remoteness and wildness in places, particularly away from the lake shore and hinterland at Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay, and where the landform and/or vegetation obscures views of built development.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONL West Wānaka 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 filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale and have a 'low key' rural character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; **and enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values.**
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** (including campgrounds) – **very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities that: are co-located with existing consented facilities; are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale and have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks** – **limited** landscape capacity for earthworks that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, **limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.

Commented [BG26]: OS 67.14 Julian Haworth.

Commented [BG27]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [BG28]: Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2.

Commented [BG29]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [BG30]: OS 67.14 Julian Haworth.

Commented [BG31]: Typographical correction.

Commented [BG32]: OS 67.15 Julian Haworth.

Commented [BG33]: OS 67.15 Julian Haworth.

- vii. **Mineral extraction** – no landscape capacity for extraction larger than farm-scale quarries. **Limited** capacity for farm-scale quarries and gravel extraction in riverbeds that protects the naturalness and aesthetic attributes and values of the ONL. **Commented [BG34]:** Typographical correction.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure** – very limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low-key 'rural' roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns. **Limited** **Some landscape** capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and protects the area's ONL values. **Commented [BG35]:** OS 73.11 Bike Wanaka Inc. OS 99.4 John Wellington. **Commented [BG36]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2. **Commented [BG37]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks. **Commented [BG38]:** OS 70.39 Transpower New Zealand Limited.
- x. **Renewable energy generation** – no landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation. Limited landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation. **Commented [BG39]:** OS 67.15 Julian Haworth.
- xi. **Production forestry** – no landscape capacity. **Commented [BG40]:** Typographical correction. **Commented [BG41]:** OS 67.15 Julian Haworth. **Commented [BG42]:** OS 67.14 Julian Haworth.
- xii. **Rural living** – very limited landscape capacity for rural living development located on lower-lying terrain and sited so that it is contained by landforms and vegetation – with the location, scale, and design of any proposal ensuring that it is barely discernible from external viewpoints. The exception to this is views from Roys Peak, where rural living development should be extremely visually recessive. Developments should be of a modest scale; have a low key 'rural' character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access; and protects the area's ONL values. **Commented [BG43]:** Consequential amendment arising from OS 74.2. **Commented [BG44]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust. **Commented [BG45]:** OS 77.28 Kai Tahu ki Otago. **Commented [BG46]:** OS 67.15 Julian Haworth.
- xiii. **Jetties, Boatsheds, Lake Structures and Moorings** - no landscape capacity.

21.22.21 West Wanaka PA ONL Schedule

August 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.21 West Wanaka PA ONL Schedule". New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text relates to a submission point that has not been captured in the "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.21 West Wanaka PA ONL Schedule". This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **Forty-nine examples identified.**

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

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS28.1	Peter Oliver	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka be retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required other than to note the relatively minor amendments in the Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.12 (July 2023).	Accept submission in part.
OS48.1	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedules be reassessed to include a further layer of capacity mapping that identifies areas within specific ONLs that have the capability to absorb some development, with specific reference to schedules 21.22.19 and 21.22.21	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>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 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.</p> <p>My EiC also discusses the appropriate grain of landscape assessment for the PA Schedules work in more detail.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS48.2	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedules be reassessed to include a further layer of capacity mapping that identifies areas within specific ONLs that have the capability to absorb some development, with specific reference to schedules 21.22.19 and 21.22.21	Addressed in response to OS 48.1.	Reject submission.
OS48.2	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka be reassessed to acknowledge that rural living, farm buildings and other activities and uses can be appropriate throughout the priority area (including those existing), provided they are appropriate located and subject to comprehensive, site specific landscape assessment.	Addressed in response to OS 46.4. However, in considering this submission point, I recommend the description of the PA under the 'Important land-use patterns and features' is expanded to address the pocket of Rural Lifestyle in the vicinity of Emerald Bluffs. Throughout the remainder of the area, development is largely restricted to isolated farm buildings and a scattering of rural residential dwellings around Emerald Bluff (associated with the pocket of Rural Lifestyle zoned land) and Roys Peninsula. Generally, such development is characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Typically this sees buildings well integrated by existing landform features and a mix of established and more recent vegetation features. In addition, new development is typically accompanied by appreciable landscape enhancement in the form of native restoration plantings and / or improvements to public access.	Accept submission in part..
OS48.6	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That with regard to landscape schedule 21.22.21, that the benefits of visitor accommodation are recognised and appropriately	The potential landscape related benefits of rural living development are appropriately signalled in the factors listed in Schedule 21.22.21 Capacity (ii) that are likely to frame appropriate rural living development.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			anticipated, subject to appropriate design and comprehensive landscape assessment,		
OS48.6	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That the benefits of rural living and other appropriate activities are recognised and appropriately anticipated, subject to appropriate design and comprehensive landscape assessment.	Addressed in response to OS 46.4.	Reject submission.
OS48.8	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 apply a priority area level to guide to guide future development but not preclude it.	The Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the capacity ratings apply to the PA as a whole (rather than at a site specific level) and that the more detailed assessments of the landscape (including capacity) that would be required as part of resource consent and plan change applications may identify a varying landscape capacity rating.	Reject submission.
OS48.9	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That it is clear that the capacity for landscape schedule 21.22.21 is not to be applied or interpreted at a site-specific scale.	The Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the capacity ratings apply to the PA as a whole (rather than at a site specific level) and that the more detailed assessments of the landscape (including capacity) that would be required as part of resource consent and plan change applications may identify a varying landscape capacity rating.	Reject submission.
OS48.10	Jo Fyfe On Behalf Of Second Star Limited	Oppose	That with regard to landscape schedule 21.22.21, any other consequential or alternative changes be made that are necessary to achieve the relief sought in the submission.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report.	Reject submission.
OS67.14	Julian Haworth	Support	That the landscape capacity rating for commercial	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			recreation, visitor accommodation, tourism and rural living capacity being 'very 'limited' in landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wanaka is supported.		
OS67.15	Julian Haworth	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wanaka is amended so there is 'no landscape capacity' for lake structures or moorings, urban expansion, intensive agriculture, renewable energy generation or production forestry nor any permanent exotic evergreen forests.	In agreement with the capacity ratings for lake structures or moorings, urban expansion, intensive agriculture, renewable energy generation or production forestry, so no comment required. Permanent exotic evergreen forests are not a landuse type directed for consideration by the policy framework. The submitter is encouraged to provide evidence that this is a landuse type that is likely to proliferate in the PA, so that consideration can be given as to whether it merits reference in the Capacity section of the PA Schedule.	Accept submission in part.
OS70.39	Ainley McLeod On Behalf Of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wanaka is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 Capacity (ix) as follows: Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.	Accept submission.
OS73.1	Ian Greaves On Behalf Of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.21 West Wānaka be amended to remove	Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider it appropriate to remove the capacity	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			reference to limited or very limited capacity for new trails.	reference for new trails, as inappropriately located and/or designed trails have the potential to detract from landscape values. Also addressed in response to OS 73.11.	
OS73.11	Ian Greaves On Behalf Of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.21 West Wānaka be amended to include the following - Walking and cycling trails: some landscape capacity for additional trails that are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.	In recognition of the important role that trails play in shaping recreation and shared and recognised values in the PA, amend Schedule 21.22.21 Capacity (viii) as follows: Transport infrastructure – very limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low-key 'rural' roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns. Limited Some 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 ONL values.	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS74.4	Ian Greaves On Behalf Of John May and Longview Environmental Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka be amended to remove reference to the Parkins Bay golf resort consent.	The Parkins Bay development forms part of the existing environment that shapes landscape values, and for this reason merits reference in Schedule 21.22.21.	Reject submission.
OS99.4	John Wellington On Behalf of Upper Clutha Tracks Trust.	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.	Addressed in response to OS 73.11.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS115.7	Khaylm Marshall	Oppose	That both the physical values (para 79) and associative values (para 80) of the West Wanaka Outstanding Natural Landscape are increased from 'high' to 'very high'.	<p>The submitter requests that the rating of the (summary of) Physical and Associative values is changed from High to Very High, particularly on the basis of the importance of the Lake Wanaka fishery.</p> <p>While the importance of the fishery is not disputed, it is difficult to see how the fishery itself elevates landscape values of the PA (as a whole) to 'very high' given that much of the PA relates to land (rather than waterbodies or streams).</p> <p>However, in considering this submission point it is noted that Schedule 21.22.21 [49] acknowledges the nationally significant fishery of Lake Wanaka which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns.</p> <p>As a consequence of reviewing this submission point, it is however recommended that the typographical error in Schedule 21.22.21 [49] is corrected as follows:</p> <p>Nationally significant fishery at Wānaka (Lake Wānaka), sports fishing spawning habitat in the Fern Burn Brun and game bird habitat at Paddock Bay.</p>	Reject submission.
OS115.8	Khaylm Marshall	Oppose	That the list of physical attributes and values for landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka is amended to acknowledge that the Motatapu River is a valued habitat for fish spawning.	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [18] as follows:</p> <p>Valued habitat for sports fishing spawning in Fern Burn and <u>Motatapu River</u>.</p>	Accept submission.
OS115.9	Khaylm Marshall	Oppose	That the list of associative attributes and values section (important recreational attributes and values subsection) for landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka is amended to include the recreational angling	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [49] as follows:</p> <p>Nationally significant fishery at Wānaka (Lake Wānaka), sports fishing spawning habitat in the Fern Burn, <u>recreational angling in the Motatapu River</u> and game bird habitat at Paddock Bay.</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			opportunities of the Motatapu River.		
OS116.1	Simon Pierce On Behalf Of Bike Glendhu Limited	Oppose	That paragraph 24 of landscape schedule 21.22.1 West Wanaka be amended to read: Human modification which is currently concentrated around Glendhu Bay, with its existing campground, woolshed wedding venue, Bike Glendhu consented development, including bike trails, pump park, and bike hub facility and farm buildings, as well as Perkins Bay with its consented golf resort / homesite development.	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [24] as follows: Human modification which is currently concentrated around Glendhu Bay, with its existing campground, woolshed wedding venue, Bike Glendhu bike trails and facility development (including bike trails, pump park, bike hub facility) and farm buildings, as well as Perkins Bay with its consented golf resort/ homesite development.	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS116.2	Simon Pierce On Behalf Of Bike Glendhu Limited	Support	That paragraph 42 of landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wanaka is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 28.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS116.3	Simon Pierce On Behalf Of Bike Glendhu Limited	Support	That paragraph 51 of landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wanaka is retained as notified.	Addressed in response to OS 28.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS116.4	Simon Pierce On Behalf Of Bike Glendhu Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity assessments for West Wanaka contained in landscape schedule 21.22.21 are reframed away from identifying specific activities (such as commercial recreation and	The requirement to include a capacity rating for specific landuse activities has been directed by the Environment Court's Topic 2 Decisions and consequently, PDP Chapter 3 policy.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			tourism) that the landscape is able (or unable) to absorb. Instead it is suggested that an assessment of activities should be based on the guidance on capacity descriptions included in landscape schedule 21.22 (paragraph 6) for outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscape priority areas.		
OS116.6	Simon Pierce On Behalf Of Bike Glendhu Limited	Oppose	That references to Fern Bern Valley within paragraph 68 of landscape schedule 21.22.21 for West Wanaka be amended to recognise the potential for consented activities at Bike Glendhu to contribute to the protection and enhancement of landscape values.	It is considered that this reference is most appropriately included in Schedule 21.22.21 [69] as follows: Parkins Bay which conveys a sense of transition, away from the rural environs of Glendhu Bay and the lake margins into a more natural landscape: in particular, the managed pasture across the Fern Burn fan and lower terraces transitions into the more vegetated and hummocky terrain around the base of the roche moutonnée. This culminates in the natural shrubland and roche moutonnée landforms of Pt 782m, Glendhu Bluff and Emerald Bluff. The vegetation within this area of change includes the shrubland revegetation that has occurred as part of the Parkins Bay development and the Bike Glendhu development. It also encompasses the development consented by the Environment Court, including:	Accept submission (subject to refinement).
OS137.1	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That the West Wānaka Priority Area and boundary of the Outstanding Natural Landscape be amended to exclude more modified parts of the Submitter Land.	ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS137.2	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That an appropriate exception regime under the Outstanding Natural Landscape schedule be provided for.	Adopting this approach would not accord with the directions of the Environment Court addressed in the Topic 2 decisions.	Reject submission.
OS137.3	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That the more developed parts of the Submitter Land (Lot 2-3 DP 53917 - ROT 878794, Lot 1 DP 533917 - ROT 878793, Lot 7 DP 564796, Lot 6, 8 DP 457489, Section 2, 18-19, 22-23 SO 347712 - ROT 1007146, and Lot 5 DP 457489, Lot 4 543116 - ROT 917004) are provided for as a separate character unit in landscape schedule 21.22.21.	<p>The existing development within the submitter's land is generally acknowledged in Schedule 21.22.21 at [24], although the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.21 [24] are recommended:</p> <p>Human modification which is currently concentrated around Glendhu Bay, with its existing campground, woolshed wedding/events venue, Bike Glendhu bike trails and facility, farmhouses (and associated curtilages), driveways/tracks, airstrip and farm buildings, as well as Parkins Bay with its consented golf resort/ homesite development and associated restoration planting strategy.</p> <p>The merits of identifying landscape character units within the PA are addressed in response to general landscape submission 'themes'.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS137.4	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 be deleted in its entirety.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS137.5	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended to give appropriate recognition for existing commercial, recreational, farming, and living opportunities within the land such that their future consolidation, enhancement, upkeep and extension can be adequately provided for.	Addressed in response to OS 137.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS137.6	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That in 21.22.21 the term 'no landscape capacity' should be deleted.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>For completeness, relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I remain of the view that a rating of no landscape capacity (at a PA level), is appropriate for the following landuses with in the West Wanaka PA ONL: urban expansion, intensive agriculture, mineral extraction, commercial scale renewable energy, production forestry and lakes structures and moorings.</p> <p>I note that these ratings accord with the West Wanaka PA ONL JWS.</p> <p>The application of a no landscape capacity rating is also discussed in response to general landscape submission 'themes'.</p>	Reject submission.
OS137.7	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended so that farmers and landowners are incentivised to promote the biodiversity of their land and transition towards more sustainable land use activities and/or practices without excessive regulations and expenses.	I agree that development can assist with biodiversity enhancement and it is for this reason that reference to landscape restoration (and other environmental benefits such as public access) is repeatedly mentioned in the Capacity section of the Schedule, as a 'likely' characteristic of appropriate development within the PA.	Reject submission.
OS137.8	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That the following features of the Submitter Land (Lot 2-3 DP 53917 - ROT 878794, Lot 1 DP 533917 - ROT 878793, Lot 7 DP 564796, Lot 6, 8 DP 457489, Section 2, 18-19, 22-23 SO 347712 - ROT 1007146, and Lot 5 DP 457489, Lot 4 543116 - ROT 917004) and wider Priority Area be included in	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>All of the attributes and features requested for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.21 are already mentioned or addressed in response to OS 137.3.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			landscape schedule 21.22.21: Historical farming uses, fences, farm buildings, existing accessways and stock tracks, roads, the Airstrip on Lot 7 DP 564796, walking and biking trails and associated commercial activities, campground facilities, access to Lake Wānaka, introduced and recently planted vegetation, residential development and domestic curtilages, and residential activities associated with the existing dwellings.		
OS137.9	Vanessa Robb On Behalf Of Robert and Pamela McRae	Oppose	That the landscape capacity rating for visitor accommodation and tourism earthworks, farm buildings, transport infrastructure, rural living and lake structures and moorings be amended to 'some' or 'moderate' to provide for the existing uses.	The capacity section of the schedule relates to future development rather than existing development. (NB The latter is addressed in the main body of the Schedule.)	Reject submission.
OS173.3	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Motuihe Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.21 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that the landscape capacity for development currently identified is not applied or interpreted at a site-specific scale.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The Capacity section of Schedule frames the sorts of characteristics that are likely to make future development appropriate. This includes referencing typical locations where relevant or practical (e.g. rural living on the lower lying terrain in the PA). The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 acknowledges the point raised in this submission by explaining that the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the priority area and	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				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.	
OS173.4	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Motuihe Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.21 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that the benefits of rural living, farm buildings, structures and moorings in the lake are recognised and appropriately anticipated, subject to good design and comprehensive landscape assessment.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The environmental benefits of development are acknowledged in the Capacity section of the schedule (where appropriate), as characteristics that are likely to frame appropriate development (e.g. landscape restoration and public access).	Reject submission.
OS173.5	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Motuihe Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity 21.22.21 be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that text be added to ensure that rural living, farm buildings, lake structures and moorings are not precluded by the landscape schedule, with these assessed on their merits through site specific landscape assessments.	Addressed in response to OS 173.3.	Reject submission.
OS173.6	Emma Ryder On Behalf Of Motuihe Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section be amended to acknowledge that there is capacity for development	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Schedule 21.22.21 acknowledges a limited landscape capacity for earthworks. Relying on my landscape evaluation	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			within parts of the priority area, or alternatively that earthworks associated with rural living, farm buildings or access are not unreasonably restricted.	(including field work) as part of the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal and the PA Schedules work, I consider this to be appropriate.	
OS176.1	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended to reflect the distinct landscape quality, character and visual amenity provided by existing development and the consented resort and golf course by either separating this area from the PA overlay, or otherwise providing for that within the schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The landscape quality, character and visual amenity of the existing development and the consented resort and golf course is described in Schedule 21.22.21 [69] with that description corresponding to the description in the ENV 2018-CHC-141 Joint Witness Statement Topic 23 – Rezoning Appeals (Group 2), PA ONL West Wanaka Schedule of Landscape Values dated 24 June 2021 (referred to hereafter as the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS) - see Naturalness (d). The suggestion that the area be separated from the PA ONL is addressed in response OS 137.1.	Reject submission.
OS176.2	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the West Wanaka Schedule 21.22.21 be amended to more accurately recognise and provide for existing uses and their likely and anticipated future upgrade, replacement or development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I consider that the existing uses are accurately described in the Schedule. I also note that the wording of Schedule 21.22.21 with respect to existing uses closely aligns with that use in the West Wanaka PA ONL JWS. With respect to the suggestion that the Schedule 21.22.21 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 PA and capacity of the PA as a whole. It does not always follow that the replacement or upgrade of an existing structure or use will protect landscape values. For this reason, it is fitting that the appropriateness or otherwise of such development change is	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				addressed via a detailed assessment, as signalled in the Preamble to the Schedule 21.22.	
OS176.3	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended by changing the Priority Area boundary of the Outstanding Natural Landscape to exclude part of the landform associated within the Parkins Bay Development, in the alternative the schedule should be amended to reflect it.	Addressed in response to OS 137.1. I also note that my involvement in the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal suggests that there is appreciable development pressure in this part of the PA ONL. I understand this to mean that it is exactly the sort of location and context which the Court intended that Schedules of Landscape Values be prepared for.	Reject submission.
OS176.4	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended include an exception regime in the Outstanding Natural Landscape schedule for the landform associated with the Parkins Bay Development.	Addressed in response to OS 137.2.	Reject submission.
OS176.5	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the Parkins Bay development portion of the Outstanding Natural Landscape be provided for as a separate character unit in the schedule, in the alternative the schedule should be amended to reflect it.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I consider that the Parkins Bay development area does not merit a 'distinction' from the rest of the PA ONL.	Reject submission.
OS176.6	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be deleted.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS176.9	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 be amended to address inconsistencies between the schedule and	The West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS was prepared prior to the PA Schedules work. This latter workstream included the preparation of the PA Methodology Statement which addresses in full, the approach to recording and	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited		the landscape expert Joint Witness Statement prepared for this schedule.	<p>evaluating the PAs across the district, in response to the directions of the Environment Court. This means that there are inevitably differences in the way the landscape characteristics and values are described between the two documents and how capacity is described and rated (noting there is no specified landscape capacity rating scale applied in the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS).</p> <p>It is of interest to note that while there are aspects of Schedule 21.22.21 that differ to the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS, the description of the submitter's land (Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay are) in the two documents align reasonably well, as does the analysis of land use typologies with a no landscape capacity rating.</p>	
OS176.12	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended to recognise and provide for human influence on the landscape of recreational, residential, lifestyle and associated activities including: 1. existing accessways and stock tracks, 2. walking and biking trails, 3. campground facilities, 4. access to Lake Wanaka, 5. historical farming uses, 6. introduced and recently planted vegetation, 7. residential dwellings and domestic curtilages, 8. The consented golf course and associated facilities such as the clubhouse, shearers quarters and visitor accommodation	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>I consider that the notified text of Schedule 21.22.21 along with the amendments recommended in response to OS 137.3 address all of the attributes referenced in this submission point.</p>	Accept submission part.
OS176.20	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of	Oppose	That 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in 21.22.21 be	Addressed in response to OS137.3.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited		amended to add the following: Recognise that some of the area to the west of the Fern Burn has been retired from grazing and on its hummocky moraine landforms. Large areas of regenerating matagouri and bracken fernland are now found, together with some weeds. Some of the moraine area to the south of the Parkins Bay development continues to be extensively grazed, while within the homesite development area, native restoration planting has been established.		
OS176.21	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 'important land-use patterns and features' be amended to recognise that most human modification is currently concentrated around Glendhu Bay, with its existing campground, woolshed wedding venue, Bike Glendhu facility and farm buildings, as well as Parkins Bays with its consented golf resort/visitor accommodation residences.	These characteristics are acknowledged throughout Schedule 21.22.21, and particularly in [24] and [69]. No change is required.	Reject submission.
OS176.22	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That in 21.22.21 the existing forms of modification and development with the Outstanding Natural Landscape be contextualised	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			by describing the future ability to consolidate and enhance or develop existing uses over time.	This submission point relates to a policy intention rather than landscape values and therefore is not relevant to a description of landscape values per se. It is noted however that such matters are alluded to under the reference to landscape restoration being a typical characteristic of future development in the Capacity section of the Schedule.	
OS176.24	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the section 'particularly important views to and from the area' in 21.22.21 be amended to recognise the Glendhu Bay Campground and Parkins Bay resort, in particular the term "largely undeveloped lake margins".	Amend Schedule 21,22,21 [65] as follows: <u>In many of the views there is an awareness of the Glendhu Bay campground, and to a far lesser degree, development associated with the Parkins Bay development and Bike Glendhu. However, the visual dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes along with the generally subservient nature of built development underpins the high quality of the outlook.</u>	Accept submission in part.
OS176.25	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the section 'particularly important views to and from the area' in 21.22.21 be amended to promote consistency with the Joint Witness Statement agreed to by the landscape experts and recognise that the built from approved is an attractive visible characteristic of the area.	Addressed in response to OS176.24.	Accept submission in part.
OS176.26	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the 'summary of landscape values' section of 21.22.21 be amended to remove reference to sense of remoteness and wildness which are primarily experienced outside Glenhu and Parkins Bay.	Addressed in response to OS 176.69.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.27	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the 'summary of landscape values' section of 21.22.21 be amended to reflect the reasonably modified nature of the vegetation and habitats.	Addressed in response to OS 176.75.	Reject submission.
OS176.28	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the 'landscape capacity' section of 21.22.21 be amended to recognise all activities generally anticipated by or associated with the Parkins Bay Resort development.	Reference to the consented development at Glendhu Bay and Parkins Bay is most appropriately referenced in the description of existing landscape values, rather than in the Capacity section of the schedule, which focuses on the ability of the PA to absorb future development.	Reject submission.
OS176.30	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the 'landscape capacity' section of 21.22.21 be amended to specify the types of activities against which the capacity for the Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) to absorb or ranked or listed and at what scale.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The range of land uses to be addressed in the Priority Area Schedules was confirmed by the Environment Court in the Topic 2 Decisions. The PA capacity terminology is deliberately different to the Chapter 24 LCU capacity ratings as the latter related to one specific development typology: rural living (see PA Methodology Report, Section 3). The submitter is also referred to the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble which may go some way to addressing the concerns raised in this submission point.	Reject submission.
OS176.31	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the 'landscape capacity' section of 21.22.21 be amended to include existing and planned development opportunities and associated amenities and utilities in capacity.	Reference to the existing consented development is most appropriately referenced in the description of existing landscape values. The Capacity section of the schedule focuses on the ability of the PA to absorb future development and identifies the PA to have a very limited landscape capacity for rural living. I consider that this rating broadly accords with the thinking of the Environment Court, noting that the Court's focus was on a	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				specific part of the PA only (i.e. the hinterland of Glendhu Bay) where they signalled that rural living development was acceptable, largely as a consequence of its extremely limited visibility (i.e. described by the Court as being 'difficult to see'), extensive landscape restoration and public access strategy.	
OS176.32	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That if the 'landscape capacity' is retained as notified, that much of the Outstanding Natural Landscape lower lying areas be amended to moderate or high capacity for additional subdivision, industrial and service activities, lifestyle, earthworks and associated and ancillary activities.	Addressed in response to OS 176.81 to 176.87.	Reject submission.
OS176.33	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule provides opportunities for industrial and other land development and associated enhancements through landscaping pest management and planting to improve biodiversity and conservation values.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I am not aware of industrial landuses being particularly sought in the PA which is no surprise to me given its ONL classification. I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS176.34	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the division of the Priority Area into further units would assist in defining where features are being discussed and better inform future land use and subdivision proposals.	The merits of identifying landscape character units within the PA are addressed in response to general landscape submission 'themes'.	Reject submission.
OS176.35	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of	Oppose	That the general description of the area section in 21.22.21 have the following	Aspects of this submission point relate to a level of detail that is not appropriate in a General Description of the Area, which	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited		added at the end: Parkins Bay includes the comprehensive consented golf course resort and associated development approved by the Environment Court.	focuses on broadly defining the spatial extent of the PA, to orient the plan user.	
OS176.36	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 paragraph 6. be amended with additional text at the end of the statement to read as follows: The western Wanaka (Lake Wanaka) shoreline: comprising the indented bays of Parkins, Paddock and Glendhu Bays, which are separated from the main lake by Roys Peninsula. A gravel foreshore and low-lying lake and river terraces, resulting from both lake shore deposits and post-glacial river alluvium, are apparent towards the south, interspersed with distinctive steep banks and escarpments. The outwash material of the Fern Burn Fan separates Glendhu Bay from Parkins Bay with the water/land interface defined by exotic tree plantings such as poplars.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The inclusion of vegetation characteristics under the "Important Landform and land types" section of the PA Schedule is methodologically confusing. I also note that this vegetation is referenced at Schedule 21.22.21 [13](c).	Reject submission.
OS176.37	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That the 'important landforms and land types' section of 21.22.22 be amended by a new limb (below), and if not,	No technical evidence is provided in support this submission point. The ONL status of the area in question has been confirmed by the Environment Court in the Topic 2 Decisions. Further, the	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			that the area of consented development is excluded from the PA entirely. New limb 7) The Fern Burn valley flats and Glendhu/Parkings Bay lake shore display characteristics of a visual amenity landscape with a level of modification that is not generally expected in an ONL, however sits within the broader ONL expanse.	Topic 2.5 [164] states: <i>We disagree with Mr Ferguson that the Values' Identification Frameworks should extend to giving direction to QLDC to undertake a District-wide landscape assessment or to progress ONF/L values scheduling beyond specified Priority Areas or to re-visit the ONF/L or RCL overlays on the planning maps. Rather, on all these matters, we find in favour of leaving these matters to QLDC's discretionary judgment as the planning authority.</i> Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I consider that the area in question qualifies as an ONL.	
OS176.38	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 paragraph 7 under 'important hydrological features' be amended by removing clear visibility and adding clarity to read as follows: The western arm of Wanaka (Lake Wanaka) notable for its scale, largely undeveloped mountain context, intricate patterning, unmanaged lake level, high water quality, clarity and attractive water colour.	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [7] as follows: The western arm of Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) notable for its scale, largely undeveloped mountain context, intricate patterning, unmanaged lake level, high water quality and clarity, clear visibility , and attractive water colour.	Accept submission.
OS176.39	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 paragraph 10 'important hydrological features' be amended to read as follows: The Fern Burn and Alpha Burn rivers which comprise comparatively narrow riverbeds, with extensive fluvial terraces. Subject to periodic flooding and inundation of the adjacent	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The requested amendments to Schedule 21.22.21 [10] do not relate to hydrological features and it would be confusing to include this detail in this part of the PA Schedule. However, the following amendments are recommended to other parts of Schedule 21.22.21 to address some of the matters raised in this submission point. (For completeness, I consider that the other requested text changes are adequately referenced in the notified version of Schedule 21.22.21.)	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			floodplain. The Fern Burn flats form the entrance to the Motatapu Valley with the largely willow-lined Fern Burn riverbed. The terraces on the true right of the Fern Burn and on the Parkins Bay flats are used for more intensive farming than the steeper surrounding slopes. Within this valley landscape shelterbelts, hedges and small exotic conifer plantations are distinctive features, give it a more structured and modified appearance. The willows along the riverbed of lower Alpha Burn are a distinct part of the developed farmland in this area. Visually the moraine landform along the true left of Fern Burn above Parkins Bay separates the upper Fern Burn flats from the lake.	[43] (a) The impression of the Fern Burn valley as the entrance to the Motatapu Valley that displays a more structured appearance as a consequence of the pastoral landuse and patterning of shelterbelts, hedges and small conifer plantations.	
OS176.40	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That section 13 a under the 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in 21.22.21 be amended to read as follows: Grazed pasture with shelterbelts, willows line the waterways along the Alpha Burn, Motatapu River and Fern Burn, and clusters of shade trees typical of the	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [13] (a) as follows: Grazed pasture with shelterbelts and clusters of shade trees typical of the Fern Burn valley floor, the Fern Burn fan, the Alpha Burn, Motatapu River, Fern Burn and the flats either side of Buchanan Road leading out to Roys Peninsula. Willows line much of the Alpha Burn and Fern Burn and parts of the Motatapu River.	Accept submission (subject to minor refinement).

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			Fern Burn valley floor, the Fern Burn fan, the Alpha Burn, Mototapu River, Fern Burn and the flats either side of the Buchanan Road leading out to Roys Peninsula.		
OS176.41	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That section 13b in the 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in 21.22.21 be amended to the following:</p> <p>The grazed and gently flat river terraces behind Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay. Some of the area to the west of the Fern Burn has been retired from grazing and on its hummocky moraine landforms, large areas of regenerating matagouri and bracken fernland are now found, together with some weeds. Some of the morained area to the south of the Perkins Bay development continues to be extensively grazed, while within the homesite development area, native restoration planting has been established.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I consider that the matters raised in this submission point are adequately addressed in the notified version of Schedule 21.22.21.</p>	Reject submission.
OS176.42	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That section 15 under 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [15] as follows (including correcting other grammatical errors in this schedule item text):</p> <p>The PA possesses a diverse range of valued habitats from the lake to the mountain tops for New Zealand falcon,</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			21.22.21 be amended to include the crested Grebe.	Australasian harrier, kea, tui, bellbird, New Zealand pipit, grey warbler, fantail, tomtit, NZ New Zealand shoveler, paradise shelduck, grey teal, crested grebe , Black shag , Little shag and New Zealand scaup. Kea are nationally threatened with a threat status of nationally endangered.	
OS176.43	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21 under 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in 21.22.21 be amended to read as follows: Valued habitat for skink and gecko, particularly at the rock outcrops, boulderfields and rock strewn tussock and exotic grasslands. The nationally threatened Roys Peak (<i>Haplodactylus</i> sp. "Roys Peak") and Cromwell geckos (<i>Hoplodactylis</i> aff. <i>maculatus</i> "Cromwell") Both species are classified as At-Risk Declining.	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [21] as follows: Valued habitat for skink and gecko, particularly in the rock outcrops, boulderfields and rock strewn tussock and exotic grasslands. This includes the nationally threatened Roys Peak (<i>Haplodactylus</i> sp. "Roys Peak") and Cromwell geckos (<i>Hoplodactylis</i> aff. <i>maculatus</i> "Cromwell") have been recorded in the PA . Both species are classified as At-Risk Declining.	Accept submission (subject to minor refinement) .
OS176.44	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That section 22 in 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in 21.22.21 be amended to read as follows with new text beginning from the second sentence: Animal pest species include red deer, chamois, feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums and mice. Opportunities for their removal and eradication are encouraged through future	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 description of landscape values per se. It is noted however that such matters are alluded to under the reference to landscape restoration being a typical characteristic of future development in the Capacity section of the Schedule.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			subdivision and development.		
OS176.45	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That section 23 in 'important ecological features and vegetation types' in 21.22.21 be amended to read as follows with new text beginning from opportunities: Plant pest species include sweet briar, broom, gorse and wilding pines opportunities for their removal and eradication are encouraged through future subdivision and development.	The same comments in response to OS 176.44 apply to this submission point.	Reject submission.
OS176.46	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended to add under 'important land-use patterns and features as follows: Human modification which is currently concentrated around Glendhu Bay, with its existing campground, woolshed wedding venue, Bike Glendhu bike trails and facility and farm building, as well as Parkins Bay with its consented golf resort/homesite development.	No comment required as this text is already included in Schedule 21.22.21 [24].	Reject submission.
OS176.47	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 39, 40 and 41 in the 'important shared and recognised attributes and	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 as follows: [39] The photographic references and description of the area in tourism publications.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			values section of 21.22.21 be deleted.	[40] The very high popularity of Roys Peak Track (noting that most of the track is in Mount Alpha PA ONL but parts of it afford views out over the eastern portion of West Wanaka PA ONL).	
OS176.48	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 paragraph 42 'important shared and recognised attributes and values' be amended to read as follows, with new text starting with PA: The high popularity of the biking routes, walking trails and camping grounds/spots in the PA and resulting from development and subdivision opportunities.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. In my experience it is unnecessary to include the provenance of landscape elements in the shared and recognised values part of a Landscape Schedule unless they are particularly unique. While I acknowledge that the trails and bike routes referenced in this schedule item are typically the consequence of subdivision, in my experience, this is not an usual outcome in the District (or development within ONLs elsewhere in New Zealand). I also note that the campground is the consequence of Council policy, but for similar reasons the provenance of that item does not merit specific mention here.	Reject submission.
OS176.49	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended be adding a new limb under the important shared and recognized attributes and values section as follows: Recreation and visitor industry opportunities through the future construction of anticipated development such as the Parkins Bay Golf Course, Clubhouse, jetty and visitor accommodation.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The text change requested amounts to a potential future outcome rather than an existing landscape value and is therefore not appropriate for inclusion in Schedule 21.22.21 under Important shared and recognised attributes and values.	Reject submission.
OS176.50	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 43 in important shared and recognised attributes and values in 21.22.21 be deleted.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I consider that the notified text is appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.51	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 45 in the important recreation attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be deleted.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Having carefully reviewed the track mapping overlaid with the PA mapping, I confirm that parts of the Roys Peak track are located within the West Wanaka PA ONL and therefore this feature merits reference under the Important recreation attributes and values associated with the PA.	Reject submission.
OS176.52	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 be amended by a new limb being inserted under the important recreation attributes and values section as follows: Recreation opportunities associated with the Parkins Bay development including easement walking and access trails, open space, foreshore access, jetty and golf course amenities.	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 as follows: <u>[48](a) Trails, open space, jetty and (consented but largely unbuilt) golf course amenities at Parkins Bay.</u>	Accept submission in part.
OS176.52	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That's a new line item is added: Recreation opportunities associated with the Parkins Bay development including easement walking and access trails, open space, foreshore access, jetty and golf course amenities	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 as follows: <u>[48](a) Trails, open space, jetty and (consented but largely unbuilt) golf course amenities at Parkins Bay.</u>	Accept submission in part.
OS176.53	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 50 under important recreation attributes and values in 21.22.21 be deleted.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I consider that the notified text is appropriate.	Reject submission.

Commented [DD1]: Duplicate submission number but different summary etc., see previous row

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
				Schedule 21.22.21 has been reviewed by a recreation and tourism expert with that expert supporting the notified text.	
OS176.54	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That 56 in the legibility and expressiveness attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended, with new text beginning with the second sentence:</p> <p>The area's natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above) which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative processes. Except for the more modified flats of Parkins Bay/Glendhu Lakeshore and including the Parkins Bay resort development.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the requested text changes are appropriate. Although there has been modification in the lower lying areas, I consider that the fundamental formative processes of the landscape are still legible (i.e. glacial, alluvial and fluvial processes).</p>	Reject submission.
OS176.55	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That 57 in the legibility and expressiveness attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended with the addition of and vegetation in the first sentence, and additional new text in the second sentence</p> <p>Indigenous gully and stream plantings and vegetation reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values in place. Opportunities to further enhance this through future subdivision and</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the requested text changes are appropriate. The response to OS 176.44 is also of relevance here.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			development are recognised.		
OS176.56	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That 58 in the legibility and expressiveness attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended with the addition of human modified, as well as the text beginning with including at the end of the statement as shown below.</p> <p>More generally the vegetation cover and land uses found within the area reinforce the landform differences throughout the ONL, with more cultural/human modified vegetation patterns evident on those lower-lying areas and natural vegetation cover apparent across more elevated areas, including those recently planted in association with the Parkins Bay resort development.</p>	<p>Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [58] as follows:</p> <p>More generally the vegetation cover and land uses found within the area reinforce the landform differences throughout the ONL, with more cultural vegetation patterns and human modification evident on the lower-lying areas and natural vegetation cover apparent across more elevated areas.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS176.57	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That any views which are not important public views should be deleted.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that any of the views referenced in Schedule 21.22.21 should be deleted.</p>	Reject submission.
OS176.58	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of	Oppose	That 59 in the Particularly important views to and from the area section in 21.22.21	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
	Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited		<p>be amended by adding elevated parts of as shown below.</p> <p>The sequence of highly attractive, frequently dramatic, and varied views from Wanaka-Mt Aspiring Road between Damper Bay and Emerald Bluff of the lake and elevated parts of mountain context.</p>	<p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate as the views from the road take in far more than the lake and elevated mountains and include the flats, terrace risers, stream gullies and moraine areas.</p>	
OS176.59	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That 60 in the Particularly important views to and from the area section in 21.22.21 be amended by removing striking and lookout, and adding text at the end starting with which, as shown below.</p> <p>The mid and long-range views from the Glendhu Bluff (layby on Wanaka-Mt Aspiring Road) out over the lake, Roys Peninsula, Paddock Bay, Parkins Bay, Glendhu Bay, Roys Peak and the Alpha Range, which includes the context of the Parkins Bay resort development.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. In my opinion, the outlook from the lookout is striking. Further, I understand that the development consented at Parkins Bay anticipates a sympathetic outcome in which built development is difficult to see, earthworks are naturalised and much of the area is restored to native vegetation cover. As such, I understand that the design intention underpinning the consented development is that it is not prominent in views and is sympathetically integrated into the natural landscape setting. For these reasons I do not consider it merits reference in the description of this outlook.</p>	Reject submission.
OS176.60	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That 61 in the Particularly important views to and from the area section in 21.22.21 be amended by deleting largely undeveloped and</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined in response to OS 176.59 and relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal and the PA Schedules work, I</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			adding new text starting with which as shown below. A series of highly attractive close to long-range views from the Glendhu Bay Track along the lake margins and across Wanaka (Lake Wanaka) to the surrounding mountain context which includes the context of the Parkins Bay resort development.	do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	
OS176.61	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 63 and 64 in the Particularly important views to and from the area section in 21.22.21 be deleted.	Addressed in response to OS 176.57.	Reject submission.
OS176.62	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 65 in the Particularly important views to and from the area section in 21.22.21 be deleted and replaced with the following Overall, the ONL displays a high level of aesthetic appeal from a range of public viewpoints due to the values identified below, and including the high quality master planned design of the Parkins Bay resort development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS176.63	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 68 in the naturalness attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended by adding 'and more akin to a visual amenity section 7	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>landscape' in the first sentence, and 'access tracks and recreation'. Also replacing notwithstanding with including as well as other minor grammatical edits to read as follows:</p> <p>The Fern Burn valley floor is the least natural part of the ONL, and more akin to a visual amenity (section 7) landscape, because of the presence of the campground, pastoral farming activities, access tracks and recreation. The campground, with its high level of development, contrasts with the rural character of the farmland on the southern side of the road, including the presence of scattered farm buildings and dwellings.</p>	<p>appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.</p> <p>The response to OS 176.37 explains the reasons why I consider it inappropriate to describe the area as a visual amenity landscape.</p> <p>Access tracks and recreation are evident in other parts of the PA ONL (and referenced in other parts of Schedule 21.22.21) and therefore are not in my opinion, a noteworthy characteristic of the Fern Burn floor that merits reference here.</p> <p>The use of the term 'notwithstanding;' is deliberate, as the important point here is that the area displays a contrasting character to the campground, despite the existing level of modification and built form.</p>	
OS176.64	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 69 in the Naturalness attributes and values section of 21.22.2 is amended to add 'shearers quarters' as a limb.	It is understood that the shearers quarters relate to Visitor Accommodation which is referenced under Schedule 21.22.21 [69] (c), so no change is required here. However, if this is incorrect (noting that the same description of this part of the PA is in the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS), the submitter is encouraged to provide evidence so that this can be corrected.	Reject submission.
OS176.65	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 69c in the Naturalness attributes and values section of 21.22.2 is amended by deleting all the text after accommodation and	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			replaced with the buildings as shown below. A clubhouse and visitor accommodation buildings,	appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. I also note that the majority of the text that is requested by the submitter to be deleted from Schedule 21.22.21 [69] matches the relevant description in the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS.	
OS176.66	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 69d in the Naturalness attributes and values section of 21.22.2 is amended to: residential homesites, and a new limb added below as follows: x. Mounding, planting, mitigation works, landscaping tracks, trails, and fencing associated with the above	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. I also note that the majority of the text that is requested by the submitter to be deleted from Schedule 21.22.21 [69] matches the relevant description in the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS.	Reject submission.
OS176.67	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 69 in the Naturalness attributes and values section of 21.22.2 is amended by adding a new limb as follows: Overall, the area displays naturalness values that rate towards the moderate end of the spectrum as a consequence of the dominance of the more natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes. The relatively confined extent of built development and its predominantly low-key character plays an important role in this regard.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.68	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 72 in the Transient attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be deleted.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The notified wording matches the relevant description in the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS.</p> <p>It is also unclear why the submitter requests that an accepted aspect of landscape values (i.e. Transient Values) be deleted from the Schedule.</p>	Reject submission.
OS176.69	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 74 in the Remoteness and wildness attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended to delete 'and with a distinctly increasing impression of remoteness as one travels westwards along Wanaka' and replace it with 'are within the context of comprehensive consented development'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.</p> <p>I also consider that the notified text reflects the 'thinking' of the relevant description in the West Wanaka PA ONL Landscape JWS.</p> <p>However, I consider that the meaning of Schedule 21.22.21 [74] would be improved by the following amendments:</p> <p>The parts of the PA that are set apart from the more developed lake shore and immediate hinterland at Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay (which includes the lower reaches of the Fern Burn, and the Bike Glendhu area) display an impression of wildness, and with a distinctly increasing impression of remoteness as one travels westwards along Wānaka – Mount Aspiring Road.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS176.70	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 75 in the Remoteness and wildness attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended by deleting 'a localised sense of remoteness along the' and replacing it with 'including along' and deleting obscure and replacing it with soften to	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			read as follows Including along Parkins Bay lakeshore, where the landform an/or vegetation serves to soften views of (land based) built development.		
OS176.71	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 77 in the aesthetic attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended by adding 'important' and 'excluding tracks and trails' to read as follows: The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of important public viewpoints, excluding tracks and trails.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. I understand that under the PDP, the reference to public viewpoints would exclude consideration of views from trails on private land.	Reject submission.
OS176.72	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 78b in the aesthetic attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended by adding consenting and development and Fern Burn Valley as follows; The continuous and large-scale patterning of the alpine ridges and peaks together with the expanse of the lake which form a bold contrast to the more modified, consented development and 'tamed' low-lying land at Fern Burn Valley, Paddock Bay, Parkins Bay, and Glendhu Bay that is engaging and appealing.	Amend Schedule 21.22.21 [78] (b) as follows: The continuous and large-scale patterning of the alpine ridges and peaks together with the expanse of the lake which form a bold contrast to the more modified and 'tamed' low-lying land at Paddock Bay, the Fern Burn Valley , Parkins Bay, and Glendhu Bay that is engaging and appealing.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.73	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 78c ii in the aesthetic attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be amended by replacing 'the' with 'limited' and 'covered' with 'partially peppering' so that it reads as: Limited indigenous vegetation partially peppering hummocky moraine	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. For completeness, having carefully reviewed the consent documents, it is my understanding that the native restoration planting across the moraine as part of the Parkins Bay development is intended to be extensive and comprehensive (rather than a 'peppering').	Reject submission.
OS176.74	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 78c iii in the aesthetic attributes and values section of 21.22.21 be deleted and replaced with the following High quality master planned development associated with the Parkins Bay resort development	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. Having carefully reviewed the consent documents, I remain of the view that the description of the consented development as 'relatively low-key', being of a 'rural vernacular' or 'visually discreet' is accurate.	Reject submission.
OS176.75	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 21.22.21 paragraph 79 summary of landscape values be deleted and replaced with the following: High physical values due to the structure created by the lake, Matukituki River delta, and mountain/rouche moutonee landforms including Roys Peninsula, together with areas of natural vegetation cover.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.76	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 80.c of the summary of landscape values for 21.22.21 be amended to include 'and public access opportunities' as follows: The popularity of the area for a wide range of recreational activities and public access opportunities.	Addressed in response to OS 176.44, noting that the reference to public access enhancement is repeatedly mentioned in the Capacity section of the Schedule where appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS176.77	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 81a in the summary of landscape values of 21.22.21 be refined relative to where within the PA it relates.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. For completeness, I consider that high legibility and expressiveness values are evident across all of the PA despite the level of modification evident or anticipated at Glendhu Bay, the Fern Burn Valley, Parkins Bay or around Roys Peninsula.	Reject submission.
OS176.78	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 81b of 21.22.21 be amended to remove 'both natural and' and add an additional sentence to the end so it reads as follows: The aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its often dramatic and highly appealing visual character. The attractive composition of rural/farmed landscapes, with a strong focus on the mountains and lake, that are critical features of the area. The public accessibility of much of the area which	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			allows the experience of these values along with the area's transient values also play a role in this regard and have been created through subdivision and development opportunities.		
OS176.79	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 81c of 21.22.21 be amended with 'low' replacing 'moderate to high' and additional amendments related to Parkins Bay development, to read as shown below: A low impression of naturalness arising from the dominance of the natural landscape within the lower lying land through consented and built development, in particular the extent of the Parkins Bay resort development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS176.80	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That 81d of 21.22.21 be deleted and replaced with: The area is associated with rural land uses, recreational activities and use of the Glendhu Bay Campground. As a result, its remoteness and wildness is limited. Feelings of remoteness and wildness are primarily experiences outside of Glendhu and Parkins Bay,	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.81	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That i in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be deleted and replaced with:</p> <p>Commercial recreational activities- moderate landscape capacity for activities that are co-located with existing consented facilities, designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale, have a low key 'rural' character and be consistent with the area's ONL values.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.</p> <p>More specifically, I particularly disagree with the removal of reference to landscape restoration as being a typical characteristic of appropriate development and consider this change conflicts with the submitter's suggested changes elsewhere in the Schedule, which reference the environmental benefits associated with development.</p>	Reject submission.
OS176.82	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That ii in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be amended by replacing very limited with moderate, and with new text beginning from 'designed' as shown below:</p> <p>Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities (including campgrounds) - Moderate landscape capacity for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities that: are co-located with existing consented facilities; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale, have a low key 'rural' character and be consistent with the area's ONL values.</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.</p> <p>More specifically, I particularly disagree with the removal of reference to landscape restoration as being a typical characteristic of appropriate development and consider this change conflicts with the submitter's suggested changes elsewhere in the Schedule which reference the environmental benefits associated with development.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
OS176.83	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That v in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be deleted and replaced with the following: Earthworks - Moderate landscape capacity for earthworks that provide for naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values. High landscape capacity for earthworks associated with the golf course construction.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. I do not consider it is necessary to reference earthworks associated with the golf course here, as I understand that change to the landform to be allowed for by the existing resource consent. This part of the PA Schedule relates to the capacity for new development.	Reject submission.
OS176.84	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That vi in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be amended by replacing 'limited' with 'moderate' and 'modestly scaled' with 'appropriately sited', to read as follows Farm buildings - in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, moderate landscape capacity for appropriately sited buildings that reinforce existing rural character.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.
OS176.85	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That viii in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be amended by replacing 'limited' with 'moderate' and 'protect' with 'provide for' as well as insert 'enhance recreation or access	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate. I consider the inclusion of text guiding that new trails should enhance recreation or access opportunities is unnecessary, as	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			<p>opportunities so it reads as follows</p> <p>Transport infrastructure - very limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low-key 'rural' roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns. Moderate capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; enhance recreation or access opportunities, integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and provide for the area's ONL values.</p>	<p>such benefits are implicit with trail networks. It should be noted that via OS 74.2 it is proposed to delete the reference to 'protect the areas ONF values.</p>	
OS176.86	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	<p>That xii in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be amended by deleting 'very limited' and replacing it with 'moderate' as well a series of other amendments so that it reads as follows:</p> <p>Rural living - Moderate landscape capacity for rural living development located on lower-lying terrain and generally within the vicinity of consented homesites through the Parkins Bay resort development and sites so that it is constrained by landforms and vegetation -</p>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	BG Comments	BG Recommendation
			with the location, scale, and design of any proposal ensuring that it is reasonably difficult to see from public roads and visually recessive from other viewpoints beyond the site.		
OS176.87	Rosie Hill On Behalf Of Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	Oppose	That xiv of the landscape capacity section of 21.22.21 be amended by replacing 'no' with 'moderate' as well as additional explanatory text to read: Lake Structures and Moorings - moderate landscape capacity. For a club house, visitor accommodation buildings, and jetty as anticipated by the Parkins Bay resort development.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my landscape evaluation and field work as part of the PA Schedules work and the PDP Topic 23 Glendhu Bay appeal, I do not consider that the text changes requested are appropriate.	Reject submission.