

Queenstown Lakes District Proposed District Plan – Stage 1

Section 42A Hearing Report For Hearing commencing: 7 March 2016

Report dated: 19 February 2016

Report on submissions and further submissions
Chapter 6 Landscapes

File Reference: Chp. 6 S42A

Contents:

1. Executive summary
2. Introduction
3. Code of conduct
4. Scope
5. Background – Statutory
6. Background – Overview of the issues
7. Section 32
8. Submissions
9. Analysis
10. Conclusion

Appendix 1. Recommended Revised Chapter.

Appendix 2. List of Submission points with recommended decision.

Appendix 3. Section 32 Report.

Appendix 4. Statement of Evidence of Dr Marion Read, Landscape Architect.

Appendix 5. Aerial photographs of the Wakatipu Basin and Wanaka area showing Rural Building Platforms.

1. Executive Summary

- 1.1. The framework, structure and majority of the provisions in the Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) Landscape Chapter (6) should be retained as outlined and supported in the section 32 (**s32**) assessment. I consider that the provisions, with my recommended changes, are more effective and efficient than the Operative District Plan (**ODP**) and better meet the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 (**RMA**). Key reasons include:
- The objectives and policies, and limited rules in this chapter, provide a more appropriate platform than the ODP to manage land use, subdivision and development and the protection of the District's landscapes from inappropriate development, through providing better specificity of the activities that could be contemplated within specified areas and landscape classifications.
 - The policies have been drafted to be distinct from the assessment matters located within the Rural Zone Chapter (21), so that they offer a higher order framework to assess development proposals, and provide added value to the analysis and decision making process.
 - The policy framework recognises that traditional pastoral farming and the retention of large landholdings is an important element of rural character, and that this attribute is a value of its own and is distinct from amenity values.
 - The identification of a new landscape category 'Rural Landscape' to replace the ODP Visual Amenity Landscape and Other Rural Landscape categories recognises the value of rural character and the openness and lack of domestic elements where these are present within the landscape.
 - The framework and style is more concise, accessible and engaging.
 - The issue of contemplating cumulative effects is brought to the fore. This is an important issue that is difficult to quantify because the Rural Zone does not require a minimum allotment size or separation space for residential development. A qualitative assessment is required on a case-by-case basis, rather than identifying a minimum allotment size or separation of buildings as a benchmark to contemplate whether cumulative effects are at issue.
 - The removal of the Visual Amenity Landscape classification better equips the PDP with the ability to manage cumulative effects of subdivision and development.
- 1.2. Several changes are considered appropriate, and these are shown in the Revised Chapter attached as **Appendix 1** (Revised Chapter).

2. Introduction

- 2.1. My name is Craig Alan Barr. I am employed by the Council as a senior planner and I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I hold the qualifications of Bachelor of Science and Master of Planning from the University of Otago. I have been employed in planning and development roles in local authorities and private practice since 2006. I have been employed by the Queenstown Lakes District Council (including former regulatory provider Lakes Environmental Limited) since 2012, in both district plan administration and policy roles.
- 2.2. In addition to my experience administering the ODP, my experience relevant to the Landscape Chapter includes working at other local authorities in New Zealand with rural and landscape issues. These include employment at the Christchurch City Council administering the Banks Peninsula District Plan and Christchurch City Plan, and at the Auckland Council based on Waiheke Island administering the Hauraki Gulf Islands District Plans.

- 2.3. I am the principal author of the notified PDP Landscape (6) Chapter and s32 report Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone.

3. Code of Conduct

- 3.1. Although this is a Council hearing, I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witness contained in the Environment Court Practice Note and that I agree to comply with it. I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person. I am authorised to give this evidence on the Council's behalf.

4. Scope

- 4.1. My evidence addresses the submissions and further submissions received on the proposed Landscape (6) Chapter (**Landscape Chapter**). I discuss issues raised under broad topics, and where I recommend substantive changes to provisions I assess those changes in terms of s32AA of the RMA. The Table in **Appendix 2** outlines whether individual submissions are accepted, accepted in part, rejected, out of scope or deferred to another hearing stream.
- 4.2. Although this evidence is intended to be a stand-alone document and also meet the requirements of s42A of the RMA, a more in-depth understanding can be obtained from reading the Landscape, Rural and Gibbston Character zones, Surface of Water Lakes and Rivers, Indigenous Vegetation and Wilding Exotic Trees s32 reports. The principal s32 is the Landscape, Rural and Gibbston Character Zones report, which is attached at **Appendix 3**, although the relevant extract for this hearing is the section on Landscape. The Rural, Landscape and Gibbston Character Zone s32 report contains several landscape reports attached as Appendices and these, along with Monitoring reports can be found of the Council's website at www.QLDC.govt.nz.
- 4.3. Due to the breadth of the PDP and submissions, the hearing of submissions is separated into the respective chapters or grouped into themes as much as practical. Submissions associated with the rules for residential activity, buildings and non-farming buildings will be addressed in the hearing on the rural areas. Submissions associated with rezoning, urban growth boundaries and the location of outstanding natural features and landscapes will be heard in those respective hearings at a later date. **Appendix 2** indicates whether a submission or further submission has been deferred to another hearing stream.
- 4.4. Some submissions that are fundamentally on landscape but have been summarised as being more relevant to a rule in the Rural Zone (Chapter 21) will be considered in the evidence in the Rural Stream hearing. An example is Submitter 145 (Upper Clutha Environmental Society (**UCES**)), the majority of their submission is considered in this evidence, however where the UCES seek relief to change the activity status of rules¹ the submission has been summarised and will be considered in the Rural Hearing Stream.
- 4.5. This evidence analyses submissions for the benefit of the Hearings Panel to make recommendations on the Landscape Chapter. The Landscape Chapter's objectives, policies and rules are related to and implemented through rules in other chapters. Specifically, the rules and landscape assessment matters in the Rural Zone (21) and Gibbston Character Zone (23) chapters. These provisions are not within the scope of this evidence and hearing, however they will be identified and discussed in broad terms where necessary to illustrate the relationship and connection with the higher order provisions in the Landscape Chapter.
- 4.6. I have read and considered the evidence of Dr Marion Read, attached as **Appendix 4**.

¹ Refer to Submission items summarised as 145.10 and FS1034 that seek relief associated with the UCES commentary on the RMA Reform Bill, currently being consulted on.

5. Background - Statutory

- 5.1. The Landscape, Rural and Gibbston Zones s32 is attached as Appendix 3 and provides a detailed overview of the higher order planning documents applicable to the Landscape Chapter. In summary, the following documents have been considered.
- 5.2. The RMA, in particular Part 2, Purpose and Principles.

The District's landscapes and natural environment are highly recognised and valued. The Council's Economic Development Strategy 2015 states:

'The outstanding scenery makes the District a highly sought after location as a place to live and visit.' And, 'The environment is revered nationally and internationally and is considered by residents as the area's single biggest asset.'

The Queenstown Lakes District is one of the fastest growing areas in New Zealand and a strategic policy approach is essential to manage future growth pressures in a logical and coordinated manner to promote the sustainable management of the valued landscape resource.

5.3. Iwi Management Plans

When preparing or changing a district plan, Section 74(2A)(a) of the RMA states that Council's must take into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority, to the extent that its content has a bearing on the resource management issues of the district.

Two iwi management plans are relevant:

- The Cry of the People, Te Tangi a Tauria: Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan 2008 (MNRMP 2008).
- Kāi Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan 2005 (KTKO NRMP 2005).

5.4. Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 1998 (RPS)

Section 75(3) of the RMA requires that a district plan prepared by a territorial authority must "give effect to" any operative Regional Policy Statement. The operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 1998 is the relevant regional policy statement to be given effect to within the District Plan.

The operative RPS contains a number of objectives and policies of relevance to plan review, specifically Objectives 5.4.1 to 5.4.4 (Land) and related policies which, in broad terms promote the sustainable management of Otago's land resource by:

- Maintaining and enhancing the primary productive capacity and life supporting capacity of land resources.
- Avoiding, remedying or mitigating degradation of Otago's natural and physical resources resulting from activities utilising the land resource.
- Protect outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

These objectives and policies highlight the importance of the rural resource both in terms of the productive resources of the rural area and the protection of the District's outstanding natural features and landscapes. I consider that the PDP Landscape Chapter gives effect to the RPS.

5.5. Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2015 (PRPS)

Section 74(2) of the RMA requires that a district plan prepared by a territorial authority must “have regard to” any proposed Regional Policy Statement. The evaluation and provisions in the PDP have regard to the PRPS. In particular, there are consistencies in the application of the PRPS Schedule 4 ‘Criteria for the identification of outstanding natural features and landscapes’ and the Landscape assessment matters in outstanding natural landscapes and features, for guiding decision makers when considering proposals for activities within identified outstanding natural landscapes and features.

The PRPS was notified on 23 May 2015, the hearing of submissions was held in November 2015 and at the time of preparing this evidence the Hearing Panel were deliberating the submissions. A decision on the submissions has not been issued.

- 5.6. Local Government Act 2002, in particular s14, Principles relating to local authorities.

The LGA provisions emphasise a strong intergenerational approach, considering not only current environments, communities and residents but also those of the future. They demand a future focussed policy approach, balanced with considering current needs and interests. Like the RMA, the LGA provisions also emphasise the need to take into account social, economic and cultural matters in addition to environmental ones.

6. Background – Overview of the issues

- 6.1. The District’s landscapes are of significant conservation, economic and intrinsic value to the District. The Landscape Chapter is the framework to manage this important resource.
- 6.2. The ODP framework for managing subdivision and development in the Rural Zone is different to many other parts of rural New Zealand in that there is no minimum allotment size. What this does is prevent any ‘development right’ for residential subdivision and development, associated with a minimum landholding area, but requires proposals for subdivision and development to prove that the development would be appropriate in terms of effects on the landscape and, other factors including hazards, rural production and reverse sensitivity issues.
- 6.3. When a discretionary or non-complying activity status subdivision and/or development is proposed, the ODP provisions require an appraisal to determine whether the landscape values are one of an ‘outstanding natural feature’, ‘outstanding natural landscape’, ‘visual amenity landscape’, or ‘other rural landscape’. On this basis an assessment of the proposal is undertaken against a prescribed suite of ‘assessment criteria’.²
- 6.4. The s32 report identified that the most appropriate method to manage the landscape resource was to retain the fundamental structure of the ODP. That is, a discretionary activity status has been retained in conjunction with not having any minimum allotment size. By having a discretionary class of activity status the proposed approach provides the ability to assess the variable nature of issues that present alongside development in the Rural Zone, and encourages innovative and design-led approaches to ensure activities are appropriate in terms of the landscape resource.
- 6.5. It is recognised that not having a minimum allotment size associated with residential activity and subdivision presents issues in terms of quantifying the potential for cumulative degradation of landscape values, especially from residential subdivision and development. While cognisant of this issue, overall it is preferred to retain this regime because it maintains and reinforces a landscape-based management regime that demands a site specific design response.

² Noting that some subdivision and development could qualify as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity and not be subject to requiring the application of the landscape classification. Refer to Parts 5.3.3.2 (Controlled Activities) and 5.3.5.1 (Site Standards) Rural General Zone (ODP) where the matters of control or discretion for these activities are specified, and Part 15.2.3.2(i) (ODP) for controlled activity subdivision.

6.6. While retaining the fundamental components of the ODP framework, substantial changes have been made to the structure, objectives and provisions to address the following identified issues (within the operative framework):

- A lack of certainty and inefficient plan administration from the requirement to identify the landscape classification with every proposal for resource consent, notice of requirement or plan change. The PDP has established a framework to identify outstanding natural features, landscapes and rural landscapes on the planning maps.
- The removal of the 'visual amenity landscape' and 'other rural landscape' classifications. A deficiency with the ODP 'visual amenity landscape' landscape provisions is that they anticipate the maintenance, if not the creation of, a specific type of landscape, with the ODP rules using the words being 'arcadian' or 'pastoral in the poetic sense'³. However, much of the rural land that falls within this classification has varying types of landscape character. A consideration of the different characters of the Wakatipu Basin⁴ and the Upper Clutha Basin illustrates this point. Parts of the District's rural areas within the existing 'visual amenity landscape' are actual working landscapes, characterised by relatively large paddocks and an absence of domestic buildings and associated activities and curtilage that can disrupt the rural character characterised by pastoral farming. In many areas, the predominant (introduced) vegetation patterns are for sheltering stock and paddocks, rather than creating amenity and shelter associated with housing. The landscape character of these areas and the management of them with regard to subdivision and development do not benefit from the existing visual amenity landscape provisions. To rectify this deficiency, a new, 'Rural Landscape' category has been included in the PDP.
- Notwithstanding the development pressure for rural living opportunities, this matter may be a reason why there have been a relatively high number of residential building platforms approved in the Wakatipu and Wanaka Basins. It is difficult to suggest, or for the Council to quantify that the amount of consented development has reached a cumulative adverse effect, when the provisions in the ODP anticipate the creation of an 'arcadian' or 'pastoral in the poetic sense' landscape. Aerial photographs of the Wakatipu Basin and Wanaka area, updated in February 2016 are attached to this evidence as **Appendix 5**. The images provide an indication of the amount and location of established and consented development.
- A case in point here is the difference in character between parts of the Wakatipu Basin compared to the Wanaka and Hawea Basins, Luggate and parts of the Crown Terrace. These areas are for the most part typically categorised as being a visual amenity landscape but do not exhibit the characteristics of an 'arcadian' or 'pastoral in the poetic sense' visual amenity landscape. Instead they have a rural working character and are characterised by productive farming, linear shelterbelts and an absence of residential housing.
- The ODP has one principal landscape objective and 43 policies grouped into 17 themes.⁵ These are phrased in a similar 'effects based' manner to the landscape assessment criteria⁶ and do not offer effective specificity and value over and above the assessment criteria, many of which are structured and phrased as policies in themselves.

6.7. With regard to the PDP, the objective and policy framework has been restructured and written to establish a clearer regulatory framework and address activities within identified areas and themes.

³ Refer to Appendix 1 of the Landscape, Rural and Gibbston Valley section 32: Read Landscapes Limited 'Report to Queenstown Lakes District Council on appropriate landscape classification boundaries within the District, with particular reference to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features' 2014.

⁴ Refer to Appendix 2 of the Landscape, Rural and Gibbston Section 32 titled: Read Landscapes Limited 'Wakatipu Basin Residential Subdivision and Development: Landscape Character Assessment' June 2014.

⁵ Part 4.2 - Landscape and Visual Amenity – District Wide Issues

⁶ Part 5.4.2 Assessment Matters – Rural Areas – Rules, Part 5.8.2 Assessment Matters – Gibbston Character Zone

- Objective 6.3.1 sets the framework for rules and provides general policies to apply when considering development proposals.
- Objective 6.3.2 establishes a policy framework to manage cumulative effects.
- Objectives 6.3.3 to 6.3.5 establishes a policy framework for the three identified landscape classifications.
- Objective 6.3.6 establishes a policy framework for activities on the surface of water.
- Objective 6.3.7 provides a policy framework that recognises indigenous vegetation and nature conservation values as part of the District's landscapes.
- Objective 6.3.8 recognises the dependence of tourism on the District's landscapes and relationship with activities locating within a range of visually sensitive and important locations.
- A 'rules' section (6.4.1) has been introduced into this Landscape Chapter to clarify the application of the landscape classifications, assessment matters and higher order objectives and policies.

6.8. Non-Statutory Consultation

- 6.9. Between 9 January and 10 February 2015 draft landscape and rural chapters and s32 reports were made available for informal consultation. The information was placed on the Council's website and circulated to persons on the Council's District Plan Review distribution list, persons with an interest in the changes and statutory consultation parties required by the RMA. Written feedback was received from, in the order of 40 persons/groups.

7. Section 32

- 7.1. A s32 report was also prepared during the preparation of this chapter to assist in and provide a record of the analysis and decision making undertaken during the preparation of the proposed zone/chapter provisions. The s32 is attached at **Appendix 3**.

8. Submissions

- 8.1. The submissions received relating to the Landscape Chapter and whether the submission is recommended to be rejected, accepted, or accepted in part is attached at **Appendix 2**. I have read and considered all submissions.
- 8.2. Submissions are considered by issue. Where applicable they are considered by provision. **Appendix 2** contains a summary of the submission points and recommendation.
- 8.3. The PDP was notified on 26 August 2015. The submission period closed on 23 October 2015. A summary of submissions was notified on 3 December. The further submission period closed on 16 December 2015.
- 8.4. A further summary of submissions was notified on 28 January 2016 following the identification of several submissions that were not summarised in the initial period.
- 8.5. 211 submissions or further submissions were received with 1202 points of submission itemised on the Landscape Chapter (noting that some of the submission points are on rezoning or the location of landscape lines and not on a specific part of the Landscape Chapter).

9. Analysis

- 9.1. The RMA, as amended in December 2013 no longer requires a report prepared under 42A or the Council decision to address each submission point but, instead, requires a summary of the issues raised in the submissions.
- 9.2. Some submissions contain more than one issue, and will be addressed where they are most relevant within this evidence.
- 9.3. The following key issues have been raised in the submissions and are addressed in broad terms:
- Issue 1 – Retention of the ODP.
 - Issue 2 – The PDP provisions are too restrictive.
 - Issue 3 – Providing for infrastructure and electricity generation.
 - Issue 4 – Consistency with RMA phrasing.
 - Issue 5 – Whether the PDP provides for the management of rural character.
 - Issue 6 – Hydro Generation Zone and Hydro Generation Activity.
- 9.4. Following the above, an analysis of the key issues identified by submitters is provided for each objective and related policy. Where a policy has not been submitted on or where the submission is without any coherent basis the submission point is not likely to have been discussed (although a recommendation for the latter is set out in **Appendix 2**). I have set out my analysis of the provisions by issue (as above) and then by objective as follows:
- Objective 6.3.1 - The framework for rules and general policies.
 - Objective 6.3.2 - Cumulative effects.
 - Objective 6.3.3 - Outstanding Natural Features.
 - Objective 6.3.4 - Outstanding Natural Landscapes.
 - Objective 6.3.5 - Rural Landscapes.
 - Objective 6.3.6 - Lakes and Rivers.
 - Objective 6.3.7 - Indigenous vegetation and nature conservation values.
 - Objective 6.3.8 - The relationship with tourism and landscapes.
 - Rules 6.4 – Rules - Application of the landscape provisions.

9.5. Issue 1 – Retention of the Operative District Plan

- 9.6. A relatively small number of submissions including submitters 145 (Upper Clutha Environmental Society (**UCES**)) and 643, 688, 693 and 702⁷ request that the Landscape Chapter is deleted and the ODP provisions are reinstated. The reasons include that the PDP weakens environmental protection (145), and the landscape provisions were heavily scrutinised over several years before the ODP was settled, they have been applied for many

⁷ Submitters 643 (Crown Range Enterprises), 688 (Justin Crane and Kirsty Mactaggart), 693 (Private Property Limited), 702 (Lake Wakatipu Station Limited) (represented by John Edmonds & Associates Limited).

years and practitioners are familiar with how they are applied and considered against the RMA, and retaining the ODP provisions aids consistent interpretation.

9.7. The submitters (643, 688, 693, 702) analysis of the PDP states:

By comparison the proposed landscape chapter objectives and policies suffer from the following issues:

- Long winded and excessive numbers of objectives and policies
- Ambiguous wording (e.g. reference to “rural zones”)
- Repetition of matters covered in objectives and policies in other chapters
- Wording that inappropriately restricts development
- Excessively elevating landscape matters in areas where they are but one of many valid considerations (for example by not properly distinguishing the distinct tests appropriate for different landscape categories).

Overall, it would be significantly more efficient and effective in achieving the purpose of the Act to continue to apply Section 4.2 of the Operative District Plan in Section 6 with no more than minor and inconsequential amendments.

9.8. For the reasons set out in the s32, in sections 4 and 5 of this evidence and generally in the analysis of submissions, I consider that these criticisms better reflect the framework and provisions of the ODP. This submission point is rejected.

9.9. Submitter 643 (Crown Range Enterprises) requests that all the objectives and policies in Chapter 6 are deleted and replaced with those that already exist in s4.2 of the ODP, while making minor wording amendments such as replacing Visual Amenity Landscapes with Rural Landscape. For the reasons set out in the Background discussion in section 3 of this evidence, the s32 and further within this evidence, it is considered that this would not be the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA. The replacement of the Visual Amenity Landscapes (**VAL**) and Other Rural Landscapes (**ORL**) categories with the Rural Landscape classification are more than just the consolidation of two classifications into one. It has been identified that the VAL and ORL planning frameworks are not the most appropriate way to manage the landscape resource and the entire policy framework and assessment matters in part 21.7 have been modified to reflect that the landscape quality should not be based on the terms of an ‘arcadian or pastoral in the poetic sense’ landscape. I also refer to Dr Read’s evidence (see Section 5.6) where her view is that that the qualities that characterise the VAL were developed with reference to the Wakatipu Basin, and fail to value the characteristics of other locations such as the Upper Clutha landscape. This submission is rejected.

9.10. Submission 145 (UCES) requests that the retention of the ODP, subject to minor modifications is necessary because the PDP Landscape Chapter would weaken the protection of landscapes such that rural subdivision and development and farming are more likely to gain consent in inappropriate locations in a manner that will degrade landscape values. In my opinion, I do not accept this submission point and that the objectives and provisions in the PDP Landscape Chapter provide sufficient protection of the landscape resource while contemplating development. I also consider that they are better framed and structured, which is an improvement on the ODP provisions by being more concise, direct and providing specificity of the types of development activities that are likely to be appropriate in the Rural Zone.

9.11. In my view, the PDP Landscape objectives and provisions are more effective at recognising and managing the values derived from rural character, in that they are different from ‘amenity values’. The matter of recognising the finite capacity of rural areas to absorb development and to sustain the quality and character, and amenity of the District’s landscapes is also better acknowledged in the PDP provisions.

9.12. I consider that the PDP Landscape Chapter, utilised in conjunction with the provisions in the Rural Zone (21) Chapter are considered to provide a more efficient and effective framework to

assess activities and manage the use, development and protection of the District's landscape resource.

- 9.13. For the reasons set out above, in the s32 report, and in parts 4 and 5 of this evidence, these submissions are rejected. In my view, the PDP Landscape Chapter, subject to recommended modifications set out in **Appendix 1** is the most appropriate way to meet the Purpose of the RMA.
- 9.14. Issue 2 – The provisions are too restrictive
- 9.15. By contrast to submission 145 (UCES), several submitters (including but not limited to 456, 375, 433, 635, 531-537, 570, 610 and 806⁸) submit that the PDP Landscape Chapter does not weaken landscape protection but is too restrictive for development proposals contemplating activities in the Rural Zone.
- 9.16. Examples include submission 537 (Slopehill Joint Venture) and others that consider Policy 6.3.2.1 is not appropriate because '*no development could be achievable if amenity values are to be sustained*' and Policy 6.3.2.2 does not go far enough to recognise that there are rural areas that can absorb development, whether they be new or infill. Submitter 430 (Ayrburn Farm Estate) considers that the PDP as notified does not strike an appropriate balance between accepting the inevitability of growth and how landscape values should be managed in the face of this growth. The submission goes on to state that the PDP is weighted too far in the direction of protection of all landscapes, and that this will frustrate appropriate development proposals.
- 9.17. Submitters including 456 (Hogans Gully Farming Limited) and 635 (Aurora Energy Limited (**Aurora**)) have also submitted that the use of the phrase 'inappropriate', for example, in Objective 6.3.1 has been incorrectly applied to the Rural Landscape Classification, and that this phrase is a test/matter reserved only for outstanding natural landscapes because s6(b) of the RMA uses this word. In my view, the word 'inappropriate' does not need to be placed in a vacuum because it is used in s6(b) of the RMA, and therefore, only for the reserve of outstanding natural features and landscapes. If this argument was accepted in the context of Objective 6.3.1, then inappropriate subdivision and development would be acceptable in the Rural Landscape areas.
- 9.18. Related to this point, are the submissions of 513, 515, 522, 531, 537 and 608⁹ who request that the word 'inappropriate' is inserted into policy 6.3.5.1, which is a policy for the Rural Landscapes classification, and clearly not a policy for ONL/ONF areas. The reasons given for the requested change are to better reflect RMA purpose and terminology, and that the policy (as notified) sets a higher threshold of protection than provided for in s6 of the RMA¹⁰. This point illustrates the divergence of views from submitters as to what constitutes 'RMA terminology' and where and to what extent it should be applied.
- 9.19. If objectives and policies were compelled to be written in strict accordance with all words or phrases contained within the RMA then, an objective for the Rural Landscape areas would, in accordance with s7(c) need to have 'particular regard' to the amenity values of this resource. Objectives and policies phrased in this manner could, in my view, be meaningless.
- 9.20. Objective 6.3.2 relating to cumulative impacts of subdivision, land use and development has also been criticised for being too strong in terms of restricting future development and may foreclose the opportunity for proposals for which adverse effects can be appropriately remedied or mitigated. My response to that point is that the objective and related policies are intended to set a high bar, especially in the context of the development pressures faced in the Rural Zone, the value of the landscape resource and that no minimum allotment size is

⁸ Submitters 456 (Hogans Gully Farming Limited), 375 (Jeremy Carey-Smith), 433 (Queenstown Airport Corporation), 635 (Aurora Energy Limited), 531 (Crosshill Farms), 532 (Walker Family Trust et. al.) 534 and 535 (G W Stalker Family Trust et. al.), 537 Slopehill Joint Venture), 608 (Darby Planning LP Limited), 610 (Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek No. 1 LP).

⁹ Refer to footnote above and 513 (Jenny Barb), 515 (Wakatipu Equities), 522 (Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch).

¹⁰ Refer to Submission 515, page 6, Wakatipu Equities Limited.

identified for the Rural Zone. The matter at the heart of cumulative adverse effects is that it is the sum of a number of effects from developments that on their own, have been determined to be appropriate. For this reason the submissions of 537 (Slopehill Joint Venture) and 581 that seek to have the phrase 'caused by *inappropriate* development' replaced with '*incremental*' are also rejected.

- 9.21. Submitter 456 (Hogans Gully Farming Ltd) seeks that subdivision and development should be allowed in the Rural Landscapes on the basis that it does not '*significantly adversely affect*' the landscape quality or character, as opposed to '*degrade*' as proposed in Policy 6.3.5.1. I consider that accepting these changes would weaken the provisions to protect the landscape resource and are not supported.
- 9.22. Further, the repetition of 'RMA phrases' is not considered to offer added value to persons contemplating development or decision makers assessing the merits of the development on the landscape resource. The merits of a development proposal could include 'remediation or mitigation measures' that would ultimately contribute toward avoidance of the impact identified in the objective or policy. These aspects are inherently part of decision making and the contemplation of activities under the framework of the RMA and are not considered necessary to be repeated in every circumstance through a district plan objective or provision.
- 9.23. Overall, I consider that the landscape objectives and policies are appropriately balanced and are adequately phrased. Some changes requested by submitters are accepted and these are identified in **Appendix 1**. These changes are considered to improve the provisions and ensure their application is clear and efficient.
- 9.24. Issue 3 – Providing for infrastructure and electricity generation
- 9.25. Submitters including 635 (Aurora), 805 (Transpower) and 433 (Queenstown Airport Corporation (QAC)) have submitted that the landscape objectives and policies are too restrictive, particularly where infrastructure must locate within the District's ONFs and ONLs or that the Rural Landscape areas have too high a level of protection afforded to them. The relief sought includes the addition of bespoke references or policies that provide recognition of infrastructure to facilitate development.
- 9.26. The importance of regionally significant infrastructure and energy generation is acknowledged, and is recognised in the Strategic Direction (3) Chapter policy framework, and the Energy and Utilities Chapter (30). Providing exemptions and add-ons to policies as requested, particularly within the higher-order Landscape Chapter policies is not considered necessary or appropriate. For example, the changes sought to Policies 6.3.1.3 and 6.3.1.4 by Aurora and Transpower, if appropriate at all, would be better suited to lower order provisions.
- 9.27. Submitter 805 (Transpower) has also requested amendments to recognise and provide for its regionally significant infrastructure and the national grid, noting the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission 2008. It is considered that both the PDP Strategic Direction Chapter¹¹ (3) and Energy and Utilities Chapter (30) recognise and provide for regionally significant infrastructure and the National Grid, in particular its ongoing operation, maintenance and upgrading within the District. I have reviewed and agree with Mr Paetz's recommended definition of 'regionally significant infrastructure', as attached to his evidence in Appendix 1. The Landscape objectives and provisions as recommended in my **Appendix 1** are appropriate and in my view meet the purpose of the RMA in the context of the importance of the landscape resource to not only the District and region, but nationally.
- 9.28. Notwithstanding the above, I consider that it is appropriate to acknowledge the matter of the importance of the contribution that regionally significant infrastructure (the recommended definition includes the National Grid) makes to social and economic wellbeing and health and safety, with location constraints in the District.

¹¹ With recommended changes as presented to the Hearings Panel and described in the S42A report.

9.29. Because of the often steep topography, and lakes and rivers that characterise this District, regionally significant and national grid infrastructure is likely to be affected by location constraints and there may not be any legitimate alternatives to locate. In this context these submissions are recommended to be accepted in part. A new policy is recommended under Objective 6.3.1 that addresses this resource issue.

9.30. An assessment of the recommended changes pursuant to s32AA of the RMA follows:

Recommended Policy (6.3.1.12 in Revised Landscape Chapter)
<u>Regionally significant infrastructure shall be located to avoid degradation of the landscape, while acknowledging location constraints.</u>

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy is weighted toward protection of landscape over infrastructure (relative cost to infrastructure). • Introducing a policy that contemplates the location of infrastructure in ONL/ONF areas could be construed as providing for infrastructure that would degrade landscape values (cost to landscape values). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy acknowledges that notwithstanding the District has high landscape values, there are likely to be circumstances where it is necessary for infrastructure to locate within landscapes that are vulnerable to degradation. • The policy acknowledges the necessity of regionally significant and national grid infrastructure (noting that national grid is included in the definition) and location constraints (benefit to infrastructure). • The policy acknowledges higher order planning instruments such as the NPSET 2008 (benefit to infrastructure). • The policy offers decision makers the ability to consider the location constraints and potential for limited or no viable alternatives. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding the policy complements the Landscape Chapter policy framework by acknowledging that regionally significant and national grid infrastructure is located within landscapes that are vulnerable to degradation. • The policy would need to be contemplated with other provisions and does not provide for regionally significant and national grid infrastructure upgrades and development to be contemplated without consideration of the landscape resource and potential for impacts leading to degradation. • The policy is effective in that it provides decision makers with the ability to directly reconcile the tension between landscape and necessity for regionally significant infrastructure and national grid upgrades and development. Particularly in the terms of s5 of the RMA.

9.31. Issue 4 – Consistency with RMA phrasing

9.32. A number of submissions recommend the adoption of using ‘RMA phrases’. Requested amendments include adding ‘remedying or mitigating adverse effects’ after the use of the word avoid, or replacing a verb such as ‘degrade’ with ‘adverse effects’. The divergence of views from submitters as to what constitutes ‘RMA terminology’ and where it and to what extent it should be applied, is also discussed in Issue 2 above.

9.33. While acknowledging that s5(2)(c) of the RMA includes the phrase ‘avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment’, as part of promoting the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. I do not consider it necessary to repeat these phrases throughout the objectives or provisions in the Landscape Chapter.

Furthermore, while the word 'inappropriate' is specified in s6(b) of the RMA with regard to outstanding natural features and landscapes, it does not require that this word is only for the exclusive domain of matters specified in s6 of the RMA.

- 9.34. The use of these phrases in the Landscape Chapter has been purposefully used sparingly. The RMA and its 'tests' are the legislative framework that need to be given local expression in a way that is appropriate to local issues. There is no compulsion to paraphrase parts of the RMA and this habit has been reduced in the Landscape Chapter and PDP overall, in an attempt to make the objectives and policies relevant to the local context and have specificity to the types of activities that could be contemplated. Refraining from the repetition of RMA phrases and similar jargon is also intentional to encourage readers to engage with the PDP. The repetitive use of long drawn out phrases could in my view alienate the wider community from the PDP.
- 9.35. In addition, the phrases 'adverse effects' and whether they are of a 'minor' scale or not have been purposefully avoided, despite a number of submitters requesting the inclusion of these phrases. These phrases have an association with s95 and s104D of the RMA and are primarily the domain of the administration of resource consents. The objectives, policies and landscape assessment matters are intended to be considered against a broader range of development proposals including plan change requests, notice of requirements and outline plans, and resource consent applications that require consideration under s104 of the RMA broadly, not just s104D, which requires a determination of whether the adverse effects will be minor.
- 9.36. By comparison s104(a), utilised for assessing discretionary activities requires, 'to have regard to any actual and potential effects on the environment of allowing the activity'. Yet, it is common practice in resource consent decisions for discretionary activities to use the phrase 'minor' as a pass mark of whether an activity is appropriate.
- 9.37. In this regard, the use of the word 'degrade' within the landscape policies is preferred over the use of the phrase 'avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects'. The Oxford English Dictionary¹² describes the meaning of degrade as '*lower the character or quality of*'. This is the matter at issue which the Landscape Chapter addresses.
- 9.38. Issue 5 – The management of character
- 9.39. That the District's landscapes have been influenced by productive farming and rural character is a prevalent landscape character element throughout the District I refer to Section 4.1 of Dr Read's evidence where she notes that while a large portion of the District's high quality landscapes are within the Conservation Estate, much of the landscapes within the ambit of the Council is utilised for farming. As set out in the background discussion (Part 6) to this evidence, and the Landscape s32, recognition and management of rural character has been identified as a resource issue that is not being appropriately managed by the ODP, particularly in the case of (ODP) VAL and ORL landscapes.
- 9.40. Submitter 145 (UCES) considers that the PDP as notified would weaken landscape protection such that the ODP should be reinstated, while submitter 248 (Shotover Trust) opposes policy 6.3.5.6 where it seeks to manage openness within the Rural Landscapes and a further submission by Arcadian Triangle Ltd (FS1255)¹³ states that '*Open character is a recognised attribute of Outstanding Natural Landscapes but not of other rural landscapes. The proposed amendments inappropriately attribute this value to all rural landscapes.*
- 9.41. Related to this matter is a decision on a recent resource consent application for residential development in the Rural Zone (RM150550). The decision maker came to the view that '*in its present form, the PDP contains no provisions which distinguish rural character from visual amenity or landscape values*'¹⁴.

¹² <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/degrade> Accessed 19 February 2016.

¹³ Further submission on 238 (NZIA and Architecture + Women Southern).

¹⁴ RM150550 Decision of the Commission. Para 57.

- 9.42. In coming to this view the decision maker reviewed the PDP Strategic Direction and Rural Zone Chapters. It appears that the PDP Landscape Chapter has been purposefully overlooked because the decision maker emphasises the distinction between 'landscape' being something that constitutes visual amenity or aesthetic values, and 'rural character' as a separate element that is not wholly reliant on landscape alone, perhaps more suited to the provisions in the respective zone.
- 9.43. In comparison, I consider that rural character is one of many elements, or subsets of the landscape, and for the reasons that follow, the PDP Landscape Chapter and provisions in the PDP Rural Chapter in my view sufficiently address the matter of rural character.
- 9.44. It is acknowledged that rural character could comprise multiple sensory attributes such as smell, sounds, how the land is actually used irrespective of how it appears, and a sense of open space or lack of domestic elements. These elements all contribute to the quality and character of the landscape, and therefore rural character is considered to be an element of the landscape and wider landscape values of the District.
- 9.45. To emphasise this further, the resource consent application was declined due to effects on rural character, with precedent issues and plan integrity being contributing factors. To my understanding the application was not declined because the proposed land use would have impacts on the productive capacity of the rural land or soil resource, or reverse sensitivity effects on a rural or other legally established activity.
- 9.46. To this end, the issue comes back to landscape, albeit not so much a visual amenity issue but a rural character issue. In drafting the PDP Landscape Chapter and related provisions in the Rural Zones (Chapters 21-23), I have made a concerted effort to identify landscape character as distinct from visual amenity. This allows the Council to manage effects on scenery (visual amenity) but also recognises that there are differences in landscape character within the District and that these different character areas are valued. The removal of references to 'arcadian' and 'pastoral in the poetic sense' as used within the VAL classification in the ODP is a case in point. The reasons for this include that a landscape does not need to have significant or outstanding visual amenity values to be valued as a landscape in its own right, particularly if the landscape is characterised by openness or productive pastoral farming.
- 9.47. The PDP Landscape Chapter identifies rural character as a distinct landscape attribute which requires consideration separate from other landscape identified attributes such as 'landscape quality' or 'amenity'.
- 9.48. I consider the following statements that recognise rural character, and that conclude that it could comprise openness in Part 6.2 of the PDP Landscape Chapter, to be relevant in light of the relief sought by the submitters identified above and the comments made in RM150550:

The open character of productive farmland is a key element of the landscape character which can be vulnerable to degradation from subdivision, development and non-farming activities. The prevalence of large farms and landholdings contributes to the open space and rural working character of the landscape. The predominance of open space over housing and related domestic elements is a strong determinant of the character of the District's rural landscapes'.

Some rural areas, particularly those closer to Queenstown and Wanaka town centres and within parts of the Wakatipu Basin, have an established pattern of housing on smaller landholdings. The landscape character of these areas has been modified by vehicle accesses, earthworks and vegetation planting for amenity, screening and shelter, which have reduced the open character exhibited by larger scale farming activities.

- 9.49. In terms of provisions, 'character' is specified in many of the Landscape Chapter's Objectives and policies and include the following components:
- Policy - 6.3.1.10 Recognise that low-intensity pastoral farming on large landholdings contributes to the District's landscape character.

- Policy - 6.3.1.11 Recognise the importance of protecting the landscape character and visual amenity values, particularly as viewed from public places.
- Objective - 6.3.2 Avoid adverse cumulative effects on landscape character and amenity values caused by incremental subdivision and development.
- Policy 6.3.2.1 Acknowledge that subdivision and development in the rural zones, specifically residential development, has a finite capacity if the District's landscape quality, character and amenity values are to be sustained.
- Policy 6.3.2.2 Allow residential subdivision and development only in locations where the District's landscape character and visual amenity would not be degraded.
- Policy 6.3.2.4 Have particular regard to the potential adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values from infill within areas with existing rural lifestyle development or where further subdivision and development would constitute sprawl along roads.
- Policy 6.3.2.5 Ensure incremental changes from subdivision and development do not degrade landscape quality, character or openness as a result of activities associated with mitigation of the visual effects of proposed development such as screening planting, mounding and earthworks.
- Policy 6.3.5 Objective - Ensure subdivision and development does not degrade landscape character and diminish visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes (RLC).

9.50. The provisions in the PDP Rural (21) Zone chapter identify landscape character as part of the rural resource in the following:

- Policy 21.2.1.3 relating to rural activities.
- Policy 21.2.5.4 relating to mineral extraction activities.
- Policies 21.2.9.2 – 3 relating to commercial and forestry activities.
- Policy 21.2.10 relating to non-farming activities.
- Policies 21.2.12.2, 4 and 5 relating to the surface of lakes and rivers and their margins.
- Objective 21.2.13 relating to the Rural Industrial Sub Zone.
- Rule 21.4.14 relating to retail sales of garden produce.
- Rules 21.5.1, 2, 4, 5, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 32, 34 and 35 - relating to the matters of discretion for performance standards associated with buildings and retail activities.

9.51. In addition, the landscape assessment matters in Chapter 21.7 (which are not within the scope of this hearing) identify 'character' as a distinct attribute for consideration in 22 places. It is however acknowledged that because the PDP is in its infancy, only the objectives and policies were applied¹⁵ and provisions such as the landscape assessment matters were not able to be assessed (in decision making on RM150550).

9.52. While the decision on resource consent RM150550 is not within scope, the commentary in the decision is relevant in the context of the submissions received on the Landscape Chapter. In particular, whether the provisions that manage rural character should be located in the Landscape Chapter. In my opinion, which is supported by Dr Read's landscape evidence attached as **Appendix 4**, where the elements of rural character primarily relate to visual aspects, they are a subset of landscape and are appropriately placed within the Landscape

¹⁵ Refer to s104(b)(vi) of the RMA 'have regard to any relevant provisions of a plan or proposed plan'. In addition, noting that an appraisal of the rules (assessment matters) was constrained by s86B of the RMA.

Chapter. Where the matter affecting Rural Character was more to do with other elements such as the type and intensity of traffic generation, noise, odour, and lighting or whether the proposed activity would be sensitive to permitted or legally established rural activities, the provisions are provided for within the respective zone chapter¹⁶.

- 9.53. On this basis it is considered that the PDP sufficiently identifies character as a resource issue that is managed appropriately.
- 9.54. Issue 6 – Hydro Generation Zone and Hydro Generation Activity
- 9.55. Submitter 580 (Contact Energy) questions whether the landscape classifications apply to the Hydro Generation Zone, which include Lake Hawea and the area zoned for a potential future dam of the Clutha River at Luggate.
- 9.56. The Hydro Generation Zoned areas and the Hydro Generation Zone Chapter have not been notified in Stage 1 and are programmed for Stage 2 of the District Plan Review. The PDP planning maps have included the Hydro Generation Zone as presented in the ODP planning maps for information purposes only – no chapters have been notified. The PDP Landscape Chapter and s32 report has purposefully been silent on Hydro Generation Activities within the Hydro Generation Zone.
- 9.57. Landscape lines have however been notified over or within the geographic area of the Hydro Generation Zone (the latter identified on the Planning Maps for information purposes only). The Hydro Generation Zone and provisions only apply to Hydro Generation Activity, other activities are subject to the rules of the Rural General Zone, as confirmed in Part 12.13.3 of the ODP. Therefore, in the context of the PDP planning maps and Rural Zone activities, the identification of landscape lines is appropriate (although the location of those lines is not within the scope of this hearing). In addition, the management of activities under the Rural Zone rules, other than Hydro Generation Activity is considered especially important because Contact Energy has been disposing of land in the Luggate area.
- 9.58. Policy 6.3.4.4 sets out that large scale renewable electricity generation or mineral extraction activities are not likely to be compatible with the maintenance of the district's outstanding natural landscapes. For clarification, Policy 6.3.4.4 is not intended to be applicable to Hydro Generation Activity within the Hydro Generation Zone. Hydro Generation Activity is contemplated within this zone and a planning framework is established under the ODP (to be notified for the PDP in Stage 2). It is understood that the development of the Luggate power project is not imminent and the Hydro Generation Zone, and any provisions required in the Landscape Chapter to provide clarification are appropriate to be deferred until Stage 2 of the district plan review (although the landscape lines will be considered in the Rural hearing).
- 9.59. Contact Energy has also requested the addition of a policy that *recognises that electricity generation facilities and structures may cause significant changes in landscape quality, character and visual amenity on a day to day or seasonal basis*. The effects of fluctuating lake levels and structures are established, and the limitations are governed by Otago Regional Council consents, or are contemplated by the relevant ODP Hydro Generation Zone. The requested policy is not considered necessary or appropriate because the impacts that the submitter seeks are established or could be contemplated through the Hydro Generation Zone. I recommend that the requested policy is rejected.
- 9.60. Objective 6.3.1: The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development.
- 9.61. Objective 6.3.1 establishes the framework for managing landscapes, setting the rules and general policies.

¹⁶ Refer to Objectives 21.2.1, 21.2.2 and 21.2.3 and related policies in the Rural Zone Chapter of the PDP.

- 9.62. Further to the points raised in Issue 2 above, submitters 375, 430 and 456¹⁷ consider that the phrase ‘inappropriate’ should not apply to the Rural Landscape areas and request the following amendments:

6.3.1 Objective *The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development and Rural Landscapes where the adverse effects of subdivision and development are appropriately managed.*

- 9.63. The requested amendments are not considered to offer any added value, be better suited for the landscapes not afforded ONF or ONL status, nor do they in my view better fulfil a planning framework, or expectations for subdivision and development in the Rural Landscapes.
- 9.64. I do not see any tangible difference between the amendment requested which aspires to ‘the appropriate management of Rural Landscapes’ and protecting them from ‘inappropriate development’ as stated in the objective as notified. These statements have the same objective. The more specific policy provided for the ONF, ONL and RL areas within the respective objective in the Landscape Chapter and the assessment matters in Part 21.7 (Rural Zone) respectively provide more detailed thresholds for whether a development is appropriate. These submissions are rejected and it is recommended the objective is retained as notified.
- 9.65. Policies 6.3.1.1 and 6.3.1.2 set the framework for the identification of landscapes. Submitter 456 (Hogans Gully Farming Ltd) suggests that the phrase ‘classification’ is removed as it may cause confusion with the abbreviation ‘RLC’. This is accepted, and it is also considered that these two policies can be merged into one as they are closely related and of a mechanical nature. This change is a mechanical/drafting one, not one of merits.
- 9.66. Policies 6.3.1.3 and 6.3.1.4 set out that proposals shall be assessed against the assessment matters in parts 21.7 depending on the landscape classification. The policies formally establish a procedural requirement, and they also set out that development in the ONF/ONL is inappropriate in almost all locations but there will be exceptional cases. In the RL, development is inappropriate in many locations, and successful applications will be, on balance, consistent with the assessment matters.
- 9.67. These statements relating to the appropriateness of development have been taken from Part 1.5.3 of the ODP, where explanatory text describes why a discretionary activity status has been afforded to development in the Rural General Zone. The statements have been taken and used as a policy in the PDP to reinforce the vulnerability of landscapes to development and that applications must be carefully scrutinised against the provisions. It is acknowledged that they are conservative statements, and have attracted a number of submissions¹⁸ requesting that these phrases are deleted from the policy
- 9.68. Submitter 437 requests that the policies are amended so that the reference to directing an assessment against the assessment matters in part 21.7 are removed. This request is rejected, the policies as notified are in my view effective in that they provide administrative direction and set a basis for the quality of any development granted in the Rural General Zone.
- 9.69. Similar amendments such as those requested by submitters 513, 456, 581 and 598¹⁹ attempt to make the policies more generic by employing RMA terminology such ‘avoid, remedy or mitigate’ phrasing and disable the administrative component that specifies the use of the

¹⁷ Submitters 375 (Jeremy Carey-Smith), 430 (Ayrburn Farm Estate Ltd), 456 (Hogans Gully Farming Ltd).

¹⁸ Submitters 249 (Willowridge Developments Ltd), 251 (Power Net Ltd), 355 (Matukituki Trust), 375 (Jeremy Carey-Smith), 378 (Peninsula Bay Joint Venture), 502 (Allenby Farms Ltd).

¹⁹ Submitters 456 (Hogans Gully Farming Ltd), 513 (Jenny Barb), 581 (Lesley and Jerry Burdon), 598 (Straterra).

Assessment Matters in part 21.7. In my view there is no benefit from accepting these changes and it is recommended they are rejected.

- 9.70. Policy 6.3.1.5 is 'Avoid urban subdivision and development in the Rural Zones'. The policy was drafted with the intention to be absolute in that resource consent applications for urban subdivision and urban development are to be discouraged. The intention was that successful private or Council initiated plan changes for urban development would circumvent this policy through rezoning the land from Rural, to an urban zone. The assessment of the plan change and justification through a strategic evaluation is preferred in terms of identifying new urban land.
- 9.71. The policy is supported by 719 (NZTA), while submitters 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd) and 806 (Queenstown Park Ltd) request changes that contemplate development based on the scale and intensity of activity and the management of effects. Submitter 356 (X-Ray Trust Ltd) requests that the policy is deleted for reasons including that urban subdivision is not defined in the PDP. Submitter 806 (Queenstown Park Ltd) seek that the word 'avoid' is replaced with phrasing that manages the extent and location of urban subdivision and development.
- 9.72. Because of the vulnerability of the District's landscapes to degradation from urban development, I am reluctant to accept these changes. The policy was also intended to avoid the establishment of urban development in these zones to maintain integrity and confidence in the administration of the PDP.
- 9.73. Having considered the policy against the submissions and upon further consideration I accept that the policy as notified in the PDP is problematic for the following reasons:
- It is not clear that the policy is intended to apply principally to resource consent applications.
 - The policy is intended to directly provide for plan integrity and instil confidence in administration. These matters are not policy statements and are determined through the administration of the policies against development proposals. The quality and articulation of the policy will help consistent decision making that upholds the integrity of the District Plan.
 - The wording of the policy is prohibitive in that there are not any qualifying parameters to 'avoid', it sought to avoid a certain type of activity, rather than the impacts/effects on the landscape resource. As notified it therefore had the potential to unintentionally include all development. This would discord with other PDP objectives and provisions, particularly those that contemplate urban growth in appropriate locations.
- 9.74. The ODP has a similar suite of policies relating to urban development²⁰, however they differentiate between the ONF, ONL and VAL landscape categories, and are generally more contemplative of urban development in the VAL, focussing on avoiding adverse effects of sprawl along roads. The ODP policies also recognise openness in the ONL, however as identified throughout this evidence, openness is an element of character that is also prevalent throughout the rural areas and not just the ONL.
- 9.75. For these reasons I still consider that it is important to provide a policy for the protection of landscape from inappropriate urban subdivision and urban development in the Rural Zones. However, I remain of the view that the ODP policies are not appropriate. In the context of the above, an amended policy is recommended and I further evaluate it below in terms of s32aa of the RMA.

Recommended Amendment to Policy 6.3.1.5 (6.3.1.4 in Revised Landscape Chapter)

²⁰ Part 4.2.5.6 (a) – (d) Landscape and Visual Amenity. QLDC ODP.

Avoid Urban subdivision and urban development in the Rural Zones shall:

- Avoid degradation of the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes;
- Be located only in those parts of the Rural Landscape that have capacity to absorb change.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From a landscape protection perspective the amended policy contemplates urban subdivision and urban development, including through resource consents. • The granting of resource consents for urban subdivision has the potential to impact on District Plan integrity and confidence in its administration. This could affect the ability for the Council to refuse resource consents based on precedent and plan integrity matters. • The amended policy is not as strong at discouraging proponents from applying for resource consents. Resource consents are often preferred by proponents over plan change requests as they are seen as being a faster process. It is preferred that proponents seek zone changes for urban subdivision and development in the Rural Zones because it creates an administrative burden for the Council by apply bulk and location standards through interests on the computer freehold register of the lots and can frustrate the end-resident/home builder. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy contemplates the impacts of urban development proposals and provides added value to decision making. • The policy is more open at contemplating development, subject to conservative parameters, as opposed to being prohibitive toward contemplating urban subdivision and urban development. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The policy is effective in so far it now specifies that it applies to urban development, and removes the potential for unintentionally including all 'development', such as rural living development. There are other policies and assessments matters that help evaluate the merits of rural living development. The policy focuses on urban development. • The policy provides parameters to gauge the appropriateness of development by seeking to avoid 'degradation' in the ONF/ONL and to locate within the RL areas where there is capacity to absorb change. The policy therefore provides added value to decision making by encouraging urban development to locate within locations that accord with these parameters. • The policy is more useful to use in conjunction with the Strategic Direction objectives and the objective and policies of the Urban Development Chapter. • The policy also supports the Strategic Direction and Urban Development objectives associated with managing the sprawl of development and uncoordinated and inefficient demand for infrastructure. These matters are addressed in Mr Paetz's evidence supporting the urban development s42A.

9.76. The amended Policy 6.3.1.5 is considered to go at least some way to meeting the relief sought by the submitters identified above. I recommend that these submissions are accepted in part and the amended policy is approved.

- 9.77. Policy 6.3.1.6 is 'Enable rural lifestyle living through applying Rural Lifestyle Zone and Rural Residential Zone plan changes in areas where the landscape can accommodate change'.
- 9.78. Submitters 513 (Jenny Barb), 522 (Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch) and 515 (Wakatipu Equities) request the following amendments:
- 'Enable rural living through rural living zones in areas where landscape can accommodate change and through carefully considered development applications'*
- 9.79. Submitter 456 (Hogans Gully Farming Ltd) has a similar request, although has retained the identification of the Rural Lifestyle and Rural Residential Zones.
- 9.80. The intent of the policy is to encourage plan change proponents seeking rural living opportunities to utilise the PDP Rural Lifestyle and Rural Living Zones in areas that can accommodate change. The further proliferation of special zones is not encouraged, particularly where the development sought is for rural living. Therefore, it is preferred that the Rural Lifestyle Zone and Rural Residential Zone is identified in the policy, instead of 'rural living zones' as requested. In addition, it is inherent that any development worthy of acceptance in the District's Rural Zone would be carefully considered. The requested phrase reads literally as though development applications would be acceptable if they are 'carefully considered'. If the intent of the request is to be able to contemplate the merits of a development proposal through the resource consent then it should be explicit on that matter.
- 9.81. The majority of policies in the Landscape Chapter that contemplate development are tailored to be applicable to plan changes, resource consents and notice of requirements. However, Policy 6.3.1.6 provides specific guidance associated with contemplating plan changes. I prefer that it remains this way.
- 9.82. One item identified by Submitter 456 (Hogans Gully Farming Ltd) was the use of the reference to rural lifestyle living. This may be misconstrued with the name of the zone 'Rural Lifestyle'. For this reason it is recommended that the policy is amended slightly to reduce the potential for uncertainty. This matter is associated with grammar and clarity.
- 9.83. Submission 696 (Millbrook Country Club Ltd) seeks the inclusion of 'resort development' on the basis that the Millbrook Resort Zone is also a zone where lifestyle development is enabled within a rural environment, and that the PDP should recognise and provide for resort zones for activities such as golf tourism. This is a valid point, noting that the framework for the Rural Lifestyle and Rural Residential Zones does not readily contemplate commercial activities, in particular commercial recreation and tourism based commercial land uses.
- 9.84. On this basis an amended policy is identified below that evaluates the inclusion of resort zones and the potential for associated commercial activities.

Recommended Amendment to Policy 6.3.1.6 (6.3.1.5 in Revised Landscape Chapter)
Enable rural lifestyle living through applying Rural Lifestyle, Zone and Rural Residential and <u>Resort Zone</u> plan changes in areas where the landscape can accommodate change.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Contemplating resort zone plan changes has the potential to compromise rural character and amenity values derived from rural productive landscapes. Noting that plan changes would need to accord with the limb of the policy where it contemplates development in areas only with capacity to absorb 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amendments contemplate the opportunity for resort and tourism based enterprises to establish by zone changes. Recognising that resort and tourism based commercial activities such as golf courses, accommodation and services are an important part of the District's economy. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amending the policy is effective in so far that it recognises for resort activities and the importance of tourism and commercial recreation based activities to the District.

<p>change, and other policies in the Rural Zone that manage the soil resource and seek to protect rural productive land uses and established activities from the effects sensitive activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The nature and intensity of development in the Rural Lifestyle and Rural Residential Zones can be contemplated with certainty because the provisions are established and typically, are generic across the entire zone. Whereas, the inclusion of 'resort zones' could encourage more bespoke zones, and lead to unnecessary complexities in the District Plan. The ODP Part 12 – Special Zones are a case in point. Many of these zones cater predominantly for residential activity only. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adding resort activities to the policy would be likely to encourage these types of activities to establish through plan changes, rather than resource consent applications. 	
--	---	--

- 9.85. Policy 6.3.1.7 requires consideration of the impacts associated with extending urban growth boundaries within ONFs and ONLs, and to minimise the impacts on the values of open rural landscapes. Submitter 806 (Queenstown Park Limited) requests this policy is deleted because it is repetitive, although provides no further explanation, while submitter 378 (Peninsula Bay Joint Venture) requests the phrase 'remedy or mitigate the effects of' is added after avoid. These submissions are rejected. However it is recommended the word 'disruption' is replaced with 'degradation', being considered a more appropriate word in terms of its meaning, 'to lower the rank or quality of', and consistent with other policies in the Landscape Chapter.
- 9.86. Policy 6.3.1.8 is '*Ensure that the location and direction of lights does not cause glare to other properties, roads, and public places or the night sky*'. Submitter 621 (Real Journeys Ltd) requests that exemptions are provided for lighting required for navigational and other safety requirements. In my view, the necessity of navigational safety lights and any dispensations or approvals can be determined on a case by case basis through resource consents, if one was required. The submitter has not provided any evidence to support the relief requested and it is recommended the submission is rejected.
- 9.87. Submitter 806 (Queenstown Park Ltd) requests the policy is deleted and located in other chapters/zones, while submitter 761 (ORFEL Ltd) requests the policy be deleted because '*Whilst the policy is appropriate to manage the effects of glare, the policy is not intended to manage effects on landscape values, and therefore would more appropriately sit elsewhere in the plan*'.
- 9.88. The impacts of lighting on the night sky associated with development are an important component of the landscape. Lighting associated with development should have regard to the potential impact on the appreciation of landscape by night. The Council have a strategy to manage the impact of street and public space lighting on the night sky.²¹
- 9.89. In my view, it is appropriate to have a policy that considers the impact of lighting on the night sky, and this matter is particularly important in the context of the location of development

²¹ Southern Light: A lighting strategy for the Queenstown. QLDC. Adopted 15 December 2006.

within sensitive landscapes and that any efforts to ‘mitigate’ the effects of buildings through design and recessive colours could be undone if they are lit up at night.

- 9.90. The point made by submitters ORFEL Ltd and Queenstown Park Ltd has merit in so far that the reference to impacts of glare on other properties, roads and public places is not so much the matter at issue, as the impacts of lighting on the night sky, landscape character and the sense of remoteness that is part of the District’s rural character. An amended policy is recommended as evaluated in accordance with s32AA of the RMA.

Recommended Amendment to Policy 6.3.1.8 (6.3.1.7 in Revised Landscape Chapter)
Ensure that the location and direction of lights does not cause glare to other properties, roads, and public places or avoids degradation of the night sky, landscape character and sense of remoteness where it is an important part of that character.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The removal of the reference to glare and effects on properties and roads means the policy would not be able to be utilised for smaller scale situations. E.g. property to property impacts. However the respective zones have provisions controlling glare. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The policy is more focused on the impacts of development on the night sky landscape. It is more relevant to the objective and its placement within the Landscape Chapter. Amending the policy provides a more appropriate focus of the potential impacts of lighting on the night sky, rather than the impacts at a smaller scale or property to property level associated with glare. The amended policy strengthens the protection of the landscape resource because it recognises the night sky and that it is an important element of landscape character and remoteness, where these elements are present. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amending the policy is effective because it would better manage the potential impact of development on the night sky and the appreciation of the night sky landscape.

- 9.91. I therefore accept in part submissions of ORFEL Ltd and Queenstown Park Ltd in so far that the revised policy is more relevant to the impacts of lighting from development on the night sky.
- 9.92. Policy 6.3.1.9 is ‘*Ensure the District’s distinctive landscapes are not degraded by forestry and timber harvesting activities*’. No submissions of substance have been made on this policy and I recommend that it is retained as notified.
- 9.93. Policy 6.3.1.10 is ‘*Recognise that low-intensity pastoral farming on large landholdings contributes to the District’s landscape character*’. This policy acknowledges that traditional low intensity pastoral farming is long established and has influenced the rural character of the District, including the openness of the landscape in many locations.
- 9.94. In recognising this influential factor on the District’s landscapes, the policy also requires consideration of the impacts that subdivision and development could have on rural character. Submitter 238 (NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern (**NZIA**)) requests that ‘*both large and small*’ landholdings are recognised. However this is not what the policy is

seeking to recognise and manage. A prevalence of small landholdings would change the rural character. While this is not necessarily detrimental, because there are and will be locations where small landholdings will be appropriate, the intent of the policy is to recognise rural character created, and currently maintained, by large landholdings based on pastoral farming.

- 9.95. Submitter 325 (Solobio Ltd) supports the policy without modification, while submitters 590 (Sam Kane) and 600 (Federated Farmers of New Zealand) support the policy but seek the reference to large landholdings is removed. For the reasons set out above I consider that the reference to large landholdings is retained. While the points made by submitter 590 that 'large landholding' is not defined in terms of size, and that the size of farms are based economic viability, have validity, removing the reference to large landholdings, or coming up with an arbitrary figure would not be of any assistance to decision makers because the policy would become meaningless. It is considered that the policy is appropriate in its current form and no amendments are recommended.
- 9.96. Policy 6.3.1.11 is '*Recognise the importance of protecting the landscape character and visual amenity values, particularly as viewed from public places*'. The policy emphasises the importance of the District's landscapes as viewed from public locations.
- 9.97. Submitters Solobio Ltd and 356 (X-Ray Trust Ltd) support the policy. Submitters 581 (Lesley and Jerry Burdon) and 608 (Queenstown Park Ltd), and several submitters represented by Anderson Lloyd (502, 513, 515, 519, 522, 531, 532, 534, 535 and 537)²² request that the phrase '*avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects*' replaces the word 'protecting'. This change would not provide any added value in my view. In a situation where a development proposal proved that it could either avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects, then the proposal would accord with the policy because these values would be protected. These submissions are rejected and I recommend the policy is retained as notified.
- 9.98. Policy 6.3.1.12 is *Recognise and provide for the protection of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes with particular regard to values relating to cultural and historic elements, geological features and matters of cultural and spiritual value to Tangata Whenua, including Tōpuni*. Submitter 810²³ (KTKO) request 'Manawhenua' replaces Tangata Whenua, and wahi tupuna replaces Topuni. For the reasons set out in the S42A report on Chapter 5 Tangata Whenua, this submission is rejected.
- 9.99. Submitter 355 (Matukituki Trust) requests amendments including adding the phrase '*from inappropriate subdivision, use and development*' and that particular regard given to values '*identified by a method in this plan*'. These additions are not considered necessary and in addition it is sometimes not known if a development proposal has potential impacts on cultural, geologic or historic elements or values because it is not possible or necessary to identify every resource in the district in the District Plan. A case in point is the discretionary activity status for subdivision and development in the Rural Zone, the discretionary activity status for subdivision in the PDP, and, the extensive range of the matters of control for controlled activity subdivision in the ODP²⁴.
- 9.100. I reject the submission and it is recommended the policy is retained as notified.
- 9.101. Objective 6.3.2 – Avoid adverse cumulative effects on landscape character and amenity values caused by incremental subdivision and development.
- 9.102. The matter of cumulative effects in the PDP has been highlighted through a dedicated objective and five supporting policies. The consideration of cumulative effects is particularly important because of development pressure in the District for rural living and resort activity

²² Submitters 502 (Allenby Farms Ltd), 513 (Jenny Barb), 515 (Wakatipu Equities), 519 (New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited), 522 (Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch), 531 (Crosshill Farms Limited), 532 (Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust), 535 (G W Stalker Family Trust), 537 (Slopehill Joint Venture).

²³ Submitters 810 (Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou and Hokonui Runanga collectively Manawhenua) represented by Kai Tahu ki Otago Ltd (KTKO).

²⁴ Refer to Section 15. Subdivision, development and financial contributions. QLDC ODP.

opportunities, and that the ODP and PDP provisions are focused on a design-based response, and do not have a minimum allotment size requirement associated with subdivision and development.

- 9.103. With regard to areas not located within the ONF/ONL, an additional matter identified above, is that the ODP policies and assessment matters for the visual amenity landscape anticipate the maintenance of an 'arcadian' or 'pastoral in the poetic sense' landscape, without appropriate regard to the existing character of the landscape in its own right. It is considered that the ODP anticipates that the following type of landscape is advanced over other landscape character types:

They (Visual amenity landscapes) are landscapes which wear a cloak of human activity much more obviously - pastoral (in the poetic and picturesque sense rather than the functional sense) or Arcadian landscapes with more houses and trees, greener (introduced) grasses and tend to be on the District's downlands, flats and terraces.²⁵

- 9.104. By default, the majority of the District's rural areas that are not ONF/ONL are classified as visual amenity landscapes. I consider that this contributes to the difficulty under the ODP to identify whether a threshold has been reached with regard to cumulative effects. While there are policies and assessment matters that require consideration of the cumulative adverse effects, it is considered that the stated issues for visual amenity landscapes contribute to the problem of addressing cumulative effects. The maps contained in **Appendix 5** illustrate the relatively high levels of consented development in the Wakatipu Basin and Wanaka area.
- 9.105. To reiterate, this is another reason why the VAL and ORL classifications have been removed and why there is an emphasis on landscape character. The PDP policies do not predetermine the maintenance of a type of landscape, but aim to recognise the value of all landscapes including pastoral, rural working landscapes in the functional sense.
- 9.106. No quantifiable sum such as a minimum density or allotment size has been identified in the policies to help guide whether a cumulative effects threshold has been reached. Nor, is it in my view efficient to identify the character of every rural zoned landscape unit and apply policy with identified density parameters. As discussed in issue 2 above, Objective 6.3.2 recognises that cumulative effects are the sum of more than one development proposal that, when considered in isolation could be considered appropriate. However, at some point the culmination of further development, irrespective of its quality or redeeming features would degrade the identified values of the landscape it is located within. For this reason the submissions requesting that the word 'incremental' is replaced with 'inappropriate' or similar are not supported. Objective 6.3.2 is recommended to be retained as notified.
- 9.107. The policies direct consideration of the finite capacity of rural areas to absorb development (Policies 6.3.2.1 and 6.3.2.2), that proposals seeking support from existing and consented development have potential for cumulative adverse effects (Policy 6.3.2.3), the impacts of infill and sprawl along roads (Policy 6.3.2.4) and, that efforts to mitigate the visual effects of development such as screening, earthworks or planting do not cumulatively contribute to degradation of the landscape.
- 9.108. Submitters 430, 513 and 535²⁶ and others request that the policies identify significant adverse effects only, recognise that there will be parts of the rural area that have capacity for development, and that these only apply where important views are at stake. It is inherent that development proposals which accord with the policy would fit within the description of the requested changes. Therefore, these amendments would not in my view offer added value from either a conservation, development or administration perspective and are rejected.
- 9.109. Submitter 513 (Jenny Barb) and others request that Policy 6.3.2.1 is deleted because sustaining landscape quality, character and amenity values is not an appropriate RMA policy.

²⁵ Part 4.2.4(3) Operative District Plan.

²⁶ Submitters 430 (Ayrburn Farm Estate Ltd), 513 (Jenny Barb), 535 (G W Stalker Family Trust).

The submitter does not state why it is inappropriate and without any further explanation or evidential basis the submission is not supported.

- 9.110. Submitter 761 (ORFEL Ltd) considers that Policies 6.3.2.3, 6.3.2.4 and 6.3.2.5 should be combined into one policy to avoid duplication and improve clarity and provide certainty. The suggested policy is:

Ensure incremental subdivision and development in the rural zones and sprawl along roads does not degrade landscape character or visual amenity values, including as a result of activities associated with mitigation of the visual effects of proposed development such as screening planting, mounding and earthworks.

- 9.111. It is considered that the requested change is not appropriate because it reduces the effectiveness of identifying and considering the different circumstances that could contribute to cumulative effects. The requested amendment is trying to do too many different things in one statement. It is recommended that the policies are retained as notified.

- 9.112. Submitter 624 (D & M Columb) requests that Policy 6.3.2.5 requests the following amendments:

Ensure incremental changes from subdivision and development do not degrade the overall quality of the district's significant landscape values, ~~character or openness as a result of activities associated with mitigation of the visual effects of proposed development such as screening planting, mounding and earthworks~~

- 9.113. The requested changes are not considered more appropriate because the phrase 'overall quality' and 'significant' introduces vagueness and weakens the ability for cumulative effects to be recognised. The requested changes also remove the focus of the policy which is to consider the cumulative impacts of screening and mitigation could have. The submission is rejected.

- 9.114. In summary, it is considered important that the issue of cumulative effects are recognised and given priority for decision makers. I don't consider that the submissions have provided a better case or applied any evidential basis that cumulative effects should be managed in another way, particularly in the context of the planning regime for the Rural Zone of the District. In addition, the submission points received on the cumulative effects objective and policy do not convince me that they are not appropriate or that there is a more suitable alternative. It is therefore recommended the objective and policies are retained as notified.

- 9.115. A grammatical change has been made to Policy 6.3.2.3.

- 9.116. Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4 - Protect, maintain or enhance Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes

- 9.117. These two objectives and related policies seek to avoid subdivision and development that would not protect, maintain or enhance the ONF and qualities and character of the ONL. Policy 6.3.3.2 requires consideration of development located adjacent to ONFs to ensure it does not degrade the qualities of the ONF.

- 9.118. Submitter 285 (Debbie MacColl) requests that the ONL line is moved where it affects their property and requests that the features that are protected are defined. Further submission FS1221 (Robins Farm Ltd) supports this submission, stating that the identification ONL/ONF significantly compromises the ability to manage pastoral land. The matter relating to the location of ONF/ONL areas will be considered at the hearing of submissions on the landscape lines and are deferred to that time.

- 9.119. Submitter 355 (G W Stalker Family Trust) requests that Objective 6.3.3 and Objective 6.3.4 are deleted because they are ambiguous. The submission states that '*the objectives are ambiguous as to what components of the feature or landscape in question are to be*

maintained or enhanced. It is also unclear what level of protection is to be afforded to ONF's from subdivision, use and development'.

- 9.120. The components of a particular ONF or ONL would need to be identified on a case-by-case basis against the nature, scale and intensity of the development proposal. It is noted that the ODP policy for outstanding natural features²⁷ does not identify the components of ONFs, except to describe the desirability of development to not compromise landscape values and natural character in a generic sense. The justification for the identification of ONF and ONL on the planning maps would identify the components that are valued and worthy of ONF/ONL status. The submission is rejected. It is noted that further submission FS1320 (Just One Life Limited) opposes submission 355 (G W Stalker Family Trust).
- 9.121. In addition, the PDP landscape assessment matters in part 21.7 (Rural Zone) utilise the criteria for determining ONF/ONL and through the use of these assessment matters the qualities of the landscape can be identified and their vulnerability to development can also be assessed. It is considered that the outcome sought by Submitter 355 is met through the PDP landscape assessment matters (Part 21.7 Rural Zone). Submission 355 (G W Stalker Family Trust) is rejected.
- 9.122. Submitter 433 (QAC) has requested that infrastructure, location constraints and the necessity to locate within the ONF/ONL is recognised in the policy. This submission is supported by further submissions FS1106 (Chorus New Zealand), FS1208 (Vodafone New Zealand Ltd), FS1253 (Spark New Zealand Trading Limited), FS1077 (BARNZ) and FS1092 (NZTA). This issue has been addressed above in Issue 3 and a new policy is recommended that addresses this matter. These submissions are accepted in part.
- 9.123. Submitters 325, 380, 600, FS1209²⁸ support the two objectives as notified.
- 9.124. Submitter 355 (Matukituki Trust) requests that Policy 6.3.3.2 is deleted because it contains the word 'degrade' and is unnecessarily subjective. For the reasons set out under Issue 4 above, I consider the word degrade is appropriate and this submission is rejected.
- 9.125. Submitter 519 (New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited) supports Objective 6.3.4, however seeks that Policy 6.3.4.4 is deleted because it does not take into consideration the merits of a mining project, the likely effects on the environment and proposals for avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects. An example cited is an underground mine.
- 9.126. Policy 6.3.4.4 is:
- The landscape character and amenity values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape are a significant intrinsic, economic and recreational resource, such that large scale renewable electricity generation or new large scale mineral extraction development proposals including windfarm or hydro energy generation are not likely to be compatible with the Outstanding Natural Landscapes of the District.*
- 9.127. As discussed in Issue 6 above, it is accepted that the policy is directive and does not readily contemplate the opportunity for regional or national scale electricity generation or extraction activities to accord with the policy. The policy is intended to protect the District's landscape resources from the impacts of these activities, however there will be circumstances where these types of activities could accord, as the phrase, 'not likely to be compatible' within the policy provides the opportunity for these activities to be contemplated. The policy is considered appropriate and the submission is rejected.
- 9.128. Submitter 608 (Darby Planning LP) has requested a policy is added under Objective 6.3.4 to provide for offsetting for wilding tree control within ONF/ONLs. It seems that the submitter wishes to trade the removal of a pest for accepting degradation of the landscape resource. This is not supported, In addition, Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4 are to 'protect, maintain or

²⁷ Part 4.2.5 ODP.

²⁸ Submitters 325 (Solobio Ltd), 380 (Villa del Lago), 600 (Federated Farmers) FS1209 (Richard Burdon).

enhance', and these sorts of activities could be contemplated though the enhancement component of the objective. The submission is rejected.

- 9.129. In summary, it is considered that the Objectives for ONF and ONL are the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA. I do not consider that the submissions have offered a more appropriate method to manage the District's landscapes.
- 9.130. Objective 6.3.5: Ensure subdivision and development does not degrade landscape character and diminish visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes.
- 9.131. This objective sets the policy framework for managing the impacts of subdivision and development on the rural areas of the District not identified as an ONF/ONL. These areas contain rural land with varying character and amenity that will have differing capacity to either absorb development, or be vulnerable to subdivision and development, depending on the nature and scale of the development proposed.
- 9.132. The objective and related policies 6.3.5.1 – 6.3.5.5 do more than just replace the ODP visual amenity and other rural landscape categories. The objectives and policies remove any assumption that a certain type of landscape is contemplated, and require that the important qualities of that particular landscape are recognised in their own right, particularly in the context of the landscape to absorb change (Policy 6.3.5.1).
- 9.133. The majority of submissions seek that the objective is amended to replicate language that in the opinion of the submitters better reflects the intent of the RMA. Two examples often submitted those submissions filed by Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd and Anderson Lloyd, who seek the following amendments respectively:
- Submitter 456 (Hogans Gully Farming Ltd): *Ensure that subdivision and development does not degrade avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects* landscape character and *diminish* visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes.
- Submitter 513, 515, 528, 532, 535, 537²⁹: *Ensure Enable subdivision and development which will avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects on does not degrade* landscape character and *diminish* visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes.
- 9.134. This matter is addressed in Issue 4 above. In addition, and related to this matter, submitters also seek changes to be able to more readily contemplate development by adding 'Enable' and 'avoid, remedy or mitigate' phrasing. I consider that the objective as notified is appropriately worded and fit for purpose to appropriately manage the District's landscapes by requiring decision makers to 'ensure' that subdivision and development does not degrade landscape values. I also consider that the objective is balanced in that it contemplates change within rural areas, subject to the merits of the development proposals and the ability of the landscape to absorb development. It is recommended that the objective is retained as notified.
- 9.135. Policy 6.3.5.1 is 'Allow subdivision and development only where it will not degrade landscape quality or character, or diminish the visual amenity values identified for any Rural Landscape'.
- 9.136. Submitter 456 (Hogans Gully Farming Ltd) requests amendments to allow development where it would not *significantly adversely affect* landscape, in favour of the word degrade. These changes would allow subdivision and development up to a 'significant' threshold. The use of the word 'significant' is not considered to be more appropriate than the word 'degrade'. I consider using the word significant in this context introduces vague parameters and would weaken the ability of the PDP to appropriately manage the landscape resource and would also be likely to not accord with the other objectives and policies in the Landscape and

²⁹ Submitters 513 (Jenny Barb), 515 (Wakatipu Equities), 532 (Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust), 535 (G W Stalker Family Trust), 537 (Slopehill Joint Venture).

Strategic Direction Chapters. It is recommended that the requested changes by Hogans Gully Farming are not accepted.

- 9.137. Submitters 513,515, 522, 531, 537 and 608³⁰ who request that the policy is amended so that it '*avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects from inappropriate development*'. The requested changes do not offer any added value in terms of managing the resource or guidance for decision makers. It is recommended that the policy is retained as notified.
- 9.138. Policy 6.3.5.2 is intended to protect the Rural Landscape classified areas from adverse effects associated with development that would be highly visible from roads and public places. The policy excludes any trail as defined in the PDP (same definition as the ODP), having regard to the outcomes of Plan Change 28,³¹ which was a response to concerns that walking trails were not being created due to landowners reluctance to allow public access across their land. This was because of a view that, due to the wording of the ODP, creating public access could compromise the future (non-farming) development potential of land.
- 9.139. Policy 6.3.5.2 is:
- Avoid adverse effects from subdivision and development that are:*
- *Highly visible from public places and other places which are frequented by members of the public generally (except any trail as defined in this Plan); and*
 - *Visible from public roads.*
- 9.140. Submitters including 456 (Hogans Gully Farming Ltd) request that the words 'remedy or mitigate' are included after avoid, and that the second limb of the policy 'visible from public roads' is deleted.
- 9.141. The policy is considered an important mechanism to recognise the inherent value of the landscape resource and its importance to the District as appreciated from public places. It is from roads that most tourists and many residents experience the landscape, and that the landscape as a scenic resource for tourism and intrinsically for residents is important. It is considered that the preamble that requires 'avoiding adverse effects' is an appropriate statement given the importance of landscape views from public places, and in particular roads. The policy is not considered to be too absolute, or stringent because in an overall sense, avoiding an adverse effect also includes the consideration of mitigation or other redeeming elements.
- 9.142. I recommend that the policy is retained as notified.
- 9.143. Policy 6.3.5.3 is '*Avoid planting and screening, particularly along roads and boundaries, which would degrade openness where such openness is an important part of the landscape quality or character*'.
- 9.144. The policy will require consideration of the impacts created from efforts to screen the development itself, and that mitigation measures such as planting, screening or earthworks do not degrade openness where this is an important part of landscape quality or character. The policy takes care to distinguish between quality and character and visual amenity, recognising that character and visual amenity are two different elements. In this case the policy is not requiring a response in terms of effects on amenity, but how the planting or screening could impact the character. The policy does not discourage planting or screening in situations that would not affect openness, or where it is a part of the local character.
- 9.145. Submitters³² request that the word 'views' replace 'openness'. This is not supported because it is not just a view that could be at issue, but openness in terms of the landscape character.

³⁰ Submitters 513 (Jenny Barb), 515 (Wakatipu Equities), 522 (Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch), 531 (Crosshill Farms Limited), 537 (Slopehill Joint Venture) and 608 (Darby Planning LP).

³¹ Plan Change 28. Made Operative 10 June 2010. <http://www.qldc.govt.nz/council-online/council-documents/agendas-and-minutes/full-council-agendas/2010-full-council-agendas/25-may-2010/>.

³² Submitters 513 (Jenny Barb), 515 (Wakatipu Equities), 532 (Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust), 535 (G W Stalker Family Trust), 537 (Slopehill Joint Venture).

- 9.146. Submitter 356 (X-Ray Trust Ltd) requests that the policy is amended so that it only seeks to avoid this situation where the adverse effects would be significant. Again, the use of the word significant is not favoured because it is vague and could weaken landscape protection. This is not considered appropriate.
- 9.147. I recommend that the policy is retained as notified.
- 9.148. Policy 6.3.5.4 is *'Encourage any landscaping to be sustainable and consistent with the established character of the area'*.
- 9.149. This policy encourages landscaping to be sustainable in terms of maintenance, selecting species that are not reliant on heavy water use (particularly once established) and can adapt to local climate conditions. The reference to the 'established character of the area' requires consideration of the context in which a proposal is locating. The policy does not automatically predetermine what type or design of planting is appropriate. There could be instances where traditional linear planting is appropriate if this replicates the character of the area. In other areas a more clustered planting design could be appropriate.
- 9.150. The policy has the phrase 'encourage', because there could be instances where linear planting along a road boundary could be at odds with Policies 6.3.5.1 – 6.3.5.3. In this context the policy would need to be balanced against the overall impacts of the proposal and it does not encourage planting at the expense of other landscape policies.
- 9.151. I recommend that the policy is retained as notified.
- 9.152. Policy 6.3.5.5 is *'Encourage development to utilise shared accesses and infrastructure, to locate within the parts of the site where they will be least visible, and have the least disruption to the landform and rural character'*.
- 9.153. Submitter 719 (NZTA) and 806 (Queenstown Park Limited) supports the policy, while Submitter 635 (Aurora Energy limited) requests that the phrase *'where operationally and technically feasible'* is added to recognise location constraints and practicalities associated with infrastructure.
- 9.154. Submitter 836 (Arcadian Triangle Limited) submits that the policy:
- 'seems to assume that visibility of development is automatically adverse, whereas the surrounding rural character of a particular proposed development may be such that visibility is either not an issue, or is not such as issue that the development must necessarily be located where it is least visible. There is no automatic need to force development to locate in the biggest hole in the ground on the relevant site'*.
- 9.155. This is a valid point, and while noting that the policy states 'encourage' and is not as directive or compelling as another word, such as 'require', therefore does not compel development to locate within the parts of the site where it will be least visible. I do not consider the policy compels development to locate in the most recessive part of the site.
- 9.156. The amended policy suggested by Submitter 836 is:
- Encourage development to utilise shared accesses and infrastructure, and to locate within the parts of the site where ~~they~~ it will be least visible, ~~and have the least~~ minimise or mitigate disruption to the landform and rural character'*.
- 9.157. The point made by Arcadian Triangle Ltd has merit in so far that it is more balanced and merits based than the policy as notified. It certainly removes any doubt as to whether the policy automatically requires development to locate in the least visible part of the site. The merits or nature and scale of the proposal, or unique circumstances should be able to be considered without being penalised by this policy. I recommend that the change sought be added to the policy, except that the word mitigate is not necessary and should be excluded

because any proposal that satisfactorily minimises development will be more than likely to have mitigating elements.

Recommended Amendment to Policy 6.3.5.5

Encourage development to utilise shared accesses and infrastructure, and to locate within the parts of the site where ~~they it will be least visible, and have the least~~ minimise disruption to the landform and rural character.

Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Removing the references to 'least visible or least disruption' is less forthright in terms of expectations where development will locate within a site. The amendments will reduce the protection of landscapes to a small degree, noting that any proposal would need to accord with other provisions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amendments would enable a wider consideration of the circumstances associated with the location of development and infrastructure within a site, including the replacement of an existing house or the location of development near or within an existing node of development. The amendments recognise that while not located in the 'least visible location' development could be more appropriate if it is located in a location that offers the least disruption. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The amended policy is more effective than the notified version that could have discorded with a large number of proposals and situations where the design and merits are adequate but the development was not located within the least visible part of the site. The policy is more balanced at contemplating design-led responses.

9.158. Any proposal that accords with the intent of the policy to 'minimise' would be likely to have mitigating circumstances or elements that are encapsulated within the context of minimise. I therefore accept the submissions of Arcadian Triangle Ltd and Aurora in part. It is considered that the changes would not affect the NZTA's concerns. These are understood to be associated with reducing crossing places onto the State highways, as the fundamental element that encourages access and infrastructure to share is retained.

9.159. I consider that the request of Arcadian Triangle Ltd is incorporated into the amended policy through my recommended changes, noting that the policy is to encourage development to utilise shared accesses and infrastructure, and does not compel in every case. The merits of a particular location and the co-location or sharing of infrastructure can be assessed on a case by case basis.

9.160. Policy 6.3.5.6 is *'Have regard to the adverse effects from subdivision and development on the open landscape character where it is open at present.'*

9.161. Submitter 248 (Shotover Trust) takes issue with this policy and states: *'This policy in effect is seeking to maintain open space in the rural zone, irrespective of the landscape classification.'* This is the intent of the policy, and a fundamental change between the 'VAL' and 'Rural Landscapes' classification in the ODP in that where the landscape is open, that this open character should be recognised. The policy does not automatically assume that all land within the Rural Landscape classification is open or that openness needs to be preserved.

9.162. Similarly, Submitter 456 (Hogans Gully Farming Ltd) seeks that policy 6.3.5.6 is deleted and relocated to the policy for ONL (6.3.4). Arcadian Triangle Limited in their further submission FS1255.23 state that *'Open character is a recognised attribute of Outstanding Natural Landscapes but not of other rural landscapes'*.

- 9.163. I consider that recognising open landscape character where it is open at present is an important component of managing the Rural Landscape resource. This is reinforced by Dr Read in Section 5 of her evidence and I rely on it in terms of supporting the policy approach of the PDP. Having regard to openness only within the ONL would be disregarding an important element of the Rural Landscape Resource. To reiterate, this is a fundamental reason for the removal of the policy framework of the ODP and replacing it with the PDP Rural Landscape classification and policy framework.
- 9.164. Submitters³³ seek that the policy is amended to focus on views, and whether or not they are uninterrupted at present. The emphasis here is not only on views, these are covered by policy 6.3.5.2 and the assessment matters in Part 21.7 (Rural Zone), but also on the openness of the landscape character which includes many parts of the District. For example, the areas classified Rural Landscape in the PDP Planning Maps³⁴ that have an open, rural character include Luggate, Hawea (including the area around Maungawera Valley Road), the Wanaka Basin area (in particular around Ballantyne and Mt Barker Roads), and in the Wakatipu area, Morven Ferry Road area and the northern side of Malaghans Road.
- 9.165. These submissions are recommended to be rejected because it is not just a view that could be at issue, but openness in terms of the Landscape character. I recommend that the policy is retained as notified.
- 9.166. Objective 6.3.6 is 'Protect, maintain or enhance the landscape quality, character and visual amenity provided by the lakes and rivers and their margins from the adverse effects of structures and activities'.
- 9.167. The related policies seek to control the location, scale and intensity of structures (policy 6.3.6.1), and identify specific locations that have an urban character and intensity with corresponding rules in the respective zone chapters, being Frankton (Chapter 21) and Queenstown Bay (Chapter 12).
- 9.168. Submitters 766 (Queenstown Wharves GP Limited) and 806 (Queenstown Park Limited) request that a greater level of guidance is provided. This is not considered necessary, it is clear in the respective chapters that these areas contain a different suite of rules than the rules for activities on the surface of lakes and rivers³⁵, structures and moorings generally in the Rural Zone. The submission is rejected.
- 9.169. Queenstown Wharves GP Limited also seeks that the objective is deleted or amended, submitting that the objective is worded too strongly and does not reflect the fact that in some cases adverse effects can occur³⁶. The following relief is sought:

~~6.3.6 Objective - Protect, maintain or enhance the~~ Recognise and provide for the landscape quality, character and visual amenity, recreational and tourist values provided by the lakes and rivers and their margins and avoid, remedy or mitigate from the adverse effects of inappropriate structures and activities.

- 9.170. I do not support the requested amendments, especially where the submitters seeks to '*recognise and provide for ... recreational and tourist values provided by the lakes and rivers*'. By identifying certain activities, such as recreation or tourism, it excludes the values or elements that are also applicable. These could include more passive appreciation, or simply the intrinsic values and appreciation derived from this resource. I also maintain that the objective is not too strongly worded in that it contemplates development activities and is balanced appropriately with the first policy (6.3.6.1):

³³ Submitters 513 (Jenny Barb), 515 (Wakatipu Equities), 522 (Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch), 531 (Crosshill Farms Limited), 537 (Slopehill Joint Venture) and 608 (Darby Planning LP).

³⁴ Noting that the location of the ONF/ONL and RL landscape classifications are subject to the hearing of submissions.

³⁵ Refer to Rules 12.4.3, 12.4.7, 12.4.7, 12.4.8 (Queenstown Town Centre Chapter 12 PDP) and Rule 21.5.40 relating to the Frankton Arm (Rural Zone 21 PDP).

³⁶ Refer to Part 1.7.1 of Submission 766 Queenstown Wharves GP.

Policy 6.3.6.1: Control the location, intensity and scale of buildings, jetties, moorings and utility structures on the surface and margins of water bodies and ensure these structures maintain or enhance the landscape quality, character and amenity values.

- 9.171. The submission is rejected and I recommended that the objective is retained as notified.
- 9.172. Submitter 580 (Contact Energy) requests as additional policy to recognise that existing electricity generation facilities and structures may cause significant changes to landscape quality on a day to day or seasonal basis. It is also noted that submitter FS1040 (Forest and Bird) opposes this submission. An additional policy is not considered appropriate or necessary for the reasons set out under Issue 5 above. In summary where Contact Energy's submission relates to the effects of existing development and activities within the Hydro Generation Zone, these are established and are undertaken irrespective of the objective. In the situation where Contact Energy wished to pursue other electricity development outside the Hydro Generation Zone or the ambit of any development rights, the objective and policies would be applicable.
- 9.173. Policy 6.3.6.1 contains reference to controlling utility structures. It is considered that a more consistent phrase, in light of the amendments under Objective 6.3.1 through use of the word 'infrastructure' is more appropriate. The preference of 'infrastructure' over 'utility structure' does not affect the scope or nature of activities subject to the policy, nor are any costs and benefits identified. The policy will however, be more effective and efficient in terms of consistency and administration.
- 9.174. Submitter 810 (KTKO Ltd) requests that Manawhenua values are provided for in policy 6.3.6.1. Any changes in this regard would prefer the reference to Tangata Whenua for the reasons described in Mr Pickard's planning evidence for Chapter 5 'Tangata Whenua'. It is considered that this reference is not necessary, as Tangata Whenua values and statutory obligations are appropriately recognised in more specific provisions including Policy 21.2.12.1 and assessment matters in Part 21.7 (Rural Zone).
- 9.175. With the exception of the identified wording change, it is recommended the objective and policies are retained as notified.
- 9.176. Objective 6.3.7 is: '*Recognise and protect indigenous biodiversity where it contributes to the visual quality and distinctiveness of the District's landscapes*'. Indigenous biodiversity is an important element of the landscapes of the Queenstown Lakes District.
- 9.177. Policy 6.3.7.1 is '*Encourage subdivision and development proposals to promote indigenous biodiversity protection and regeneration where the landscape and nature conservation values would be maintained or enhanced, particularly where the subdivision or development constitutes a change in the intensity in the land use or the retirement of productive farm land*'.
- 9.178. The policy is intended to encourage the consideration of compensatory measures associated with subdivision and development proposals. The policy also encourages a wider consideration of the use of land and future land use associated with subdivision and development, and requires consideration of the potential to recognise, protect or regenerate indigenous biodiversity where the land use is likely change from a focus on rural production to rural living or a commercial tourism basis. The policy is supported by Submitters 373 (Department of Conservation), 519 (New Zealand Tungsten Mining), 598 (Straterra) with further submissions supporting the policy. The policy is recommended to be retained as notified.
- 9.179. Submitter 806 (Queenstown Park Limited) requests that the policy is amended to recognise that landscape values should be able to change over time. It is considered that without further qualification or evidence, the policy directly considers landscape change through contemplating subdivision and development and opportunities to protect indigenous biodiversity values.

- 9.180. Submitter 608 (Darby Planning) request that biodiversity offsetting principles and mechanisms are added under Objective 6.3.7. I do not consider these amendments necessary or appropriate. The PDP contemplates opportunities for indigenous biodiversity through Policy 6.3.7.1 and the Landscape assessment matters in Part 21.7 (Rural Zone) provide finer grained provisions on offsetting or compensation. Chapter 33; indigenous Vegetation also addresses biodiversity offsetting and indigenous vegetation clearance and is reserved for the Rural hearing Stream. This submission is rejected.
- 9.181. Policy 6.3.7.2 is '*Avoid indigenous vegetation clearance where it would significantly degrade the visual character and qualities of the District's distinctive landscapes*'.
- 9.182. The policy is supported by Submitter 600 (Federated Farmers). Submitter 519 (New Zealand Tungsten Mining Ltd) and 598 (Straterra) requests that '*remedy and mitigate*' is added after the word avoid, while Submitter 806 (Queenstown Park Limited) seeks that the policy is deleted because it applies to indigenous vegetation while using the term significant, and it may be open to interpretation what is meant by significant.
- 9.183. The policy is a stand-alone statement that recognises the contribution and distinctiveness that indigenous biodiversity makes to the District's landscape. The policy is separate in the context of the provisions in PDP Chapter 33 Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity in so far that the latter primarily relate to the intrinsic value of indigenous biodiversity from a preservation perspective. The values identified in this instance are more from a conservation, human centric basis.
- 9.184. For the reasons set out in issues 2 and 4 of this evidence I do not recommend accepting the addition of the phrase 'remedy or mitigate'. With regard to the submission of Queenstown Park Limited, I accept that the word 'significant' would be open to a degree of interpretation, just like any decision maker needs to apply their interpretation and judgement of the various statutory tests. In my opinion, clearance of indigenous vegetation that could constitute 'significant degradation of the landscape' as acknowledged in the policy would need to be over a relatively large area within landscapes that are visually vulnerable to degradation. An example could be where the landscape represents particularly high natural values and would not be likely to have been previously modified, or modified for a long time.
- 9.185. Overall, it is recommended the policy is retained as notified.
- 9.186. Objective 6.3.8 'Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District's landscapes'.
- 9.187. The intent of the objective and related policies is to acknowledge the importance of tourism to the District, that tourism is dependent on the quality of the landscape, the dependence of tourism on landscapes and that some tourism and commercial recreation activities, by necessity, will require locating within environments that are valued as matters of national importance in terms of s6(a), (b), and (e) of the RMA, and can be vulnerable to degradation.
- 9.188. Policies 6.3.8.1 and 6.3.8.2 are intended to assist with decision making by acknowledging the location dependency of some commercial recreation activities, and that these can be contemplated within these environments, subject to the nature, scale and design response of the proposal. Policies 6.3.8.3 and 6.3.8.4 are more administrative and provide a framework to facilitate commercial ski activities within identified Ski Area Sub Zones, and within the Gibbston Character Zone, for wine making and producing activities.
- 9.189. Objective 6.3.8 is supported by Submitters 285, FS1097, 380, 608, 610, 613, 768³⁷ without any requested modification. Submitter 806 (Queenstown Park Limited) requests that the objective is amended to acknowledge that landscapes will change over time and to recognise the importance of ski area activities.

³⁷ Submitters 285 (Debbie MacColl), FS1097 (Queenstown Park Ltd), 380 (Villa Del Lago), 608 (Darby Planning LP), 610 (Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek No. 1 LP), 613 (Treble Cone Investments Ltd), 768 (Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd).

- 9.190. It is considered that the objective inherently fulfils the requests sought by Submitter 608 (Darby Planning LP) and does not require more text. It is noted that the ODP landscape related objective and policies in Part 4.2³⁸ focus on the potential adverse effects on activities, and do not contemplate the location requirements of certain commercial recreation activities. Therefore, the objective as proposed, and the related policies are a significant advancement in terms of providing a framework to reconcile tourism based activities with the protection of the landscape resource in terms of s6(b) of the RMA, having regard to other matters in s7, with Part 2 of the RMA.
- 9.191. The submission is rejected and it is recommended the objective is retained as notified.
- 9.192. Policy 6.3.8.1 is '*Acknowledge the contribution tourism infrastructure makes to the economic and recreational values of the District*'. Submitter 806 requests that the policy is more direct and to '*recognise and provide for the important contribution tourism infrastructure and activities make*'. Similarly, Submitter 677 (Amrta Land Ltd) and 696 (Millbrook Country Club Ltd) requests the addition of tourism activities and development to the policy.
- 9.193. Amending the policy to 'recognise and provide for' is not in my view appropriate as it would lean too heavily in favour of any tourism related development without the opportunity to contemplate the effects, merits or location requirements of the proposal. The policy is not intended to enable tourism activities within valued landscape areas just because it is a tourism activity. In addition, the requested amendments to include 'activities and development' are not considered necessary because infrastructure encapsulates development, and the lasting effects on the landscape are not so much the activity itself, but the infrastructure, both temporary and permanent that make the activity possible. It follows that these submissions are rejected.
- 9.194. Submitters 610 (Soho Ski Area and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP), 613 (Treble Cone Investments Ltd) seek the policy is retained without modification.
- 9.195. It is recommended that the policy is retained as notified.
- 9.196. Policy 6.3.8.2 is '*Recognise that commercial recreation and tourism related activities locating within the rural zones may be appropriate where these activities enhance the appreciation of landscapes, and on the basis they would protect, maintain or enhance landscape quality, character and visual amenity values*'.
- 9.197. Submitters 610 (Soho Ski Area and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP), 613 (Treble Cone Investments Ltd) request the policy is phrased so that adverse effects of tourism related activities are managed in terms of effects on landscape quality, character and visual amenity values. A number of further submissions also support this request. I do not consider the request is appropriate, as the requested changes would lose meaning in the context of the overall intent of the policy that recognises the location requirements and desirability of tourism activities to locate within the valued landscape resource. In addition, the policy as notified seeks to enhance appreciation on the basis the landscape resource is protected. Reducing the policy to managing adverse effects is not in my view a desirable outcome, would be at odds with the overall thrust of the Landscape and Strategic Direction Chapters and would not accord with Part 2 of the RMA. The submission is rejected and it is recommended the policy is retained as notified, with regard to these submissions.
- 9.198. Submitter 810 (KTKO Ltd) requests 'Manawhenua' values are included in the policy. Any changes in this regard would prefer the reference to 'Tangata Whenua' for the reasons described in Mr Pickard's planning evidence for Chapter 5 'Tangata Whenua'. It is considered that this reference is not necessary, as Tangata Whenua values and statutory obligations are appropriately recognised in more specific provisions including the Tangata Whenua Chapter, policies and assessment matters in the Rural Zone, which these applications would be subject to. The submission is rejected and it is recommended the policy is retained as notified.

³⁸ ODP. Part 4.2 District Wide. Landscape and Visual Amenity.

- 9.199. Policy 6.3.8.3 is 'Exclude identified Ski Area Sub Zones from the landscape categories and full assessment of the landscape provisions while controlling the impact of the ski field structures and activities on the wider environment'. The policy sets the framework for enabling activities within identified ski area sub zones. The policy is supported by Darby Planning LP, Soho Ski Area and Blackmans Creek No.1 LP, and Treble Cone Investments Ltd.
- 9.200. Darby Planning LP Ltd requests the policy is amended to identify access corridors, presumably irrespective of these being located within a ski area sub zone. Further submitter FS1229 (NZ Ski Limited) support this request, and also support the opportunity for a gondola access to the Remarkables Ski Area.
- 9.201. I do not consider the requested amendments to be appropriate. Although it is important to manage the visual impact of access to these areas, proponents can apply to have areas intended for access as part of the Ski Area Sub Zone, which would cater for their request. I recommend that the policy is retained as notified.
- 9.202. No submissions were received for Policy 6.3.8.4.
- 9.203. 6.4 Rules – Application of the landscape provisions
- 9.204. This section of the Landscape Chapter provides clarification and confirmation of where the landscape provisions apply at a high level. The ODP does not have a corresponding framework. The application of provisions and exemptions are peppered throughout the ODP or left to deciphering the provisions.
- 9.205. Some submitters have used this section as a dumping ground and wish list for activities that they would like to see more control over, or be exempted. For example Submitter 110 (Alan Cutler) seeks that a clause is added to address modern large irrigators, while Submitter 671 (Queenstown Trails Trust) seeks that a controlled activity rule is added guarantying a development right for the construction of walking tracks. In my view these requests are not appropriate for this chapter, as its purpose is to provide a management framework and set the direction for administration at a high level³⁹. Submitter 806 (Darby Planning LP) requests that the 'Remarkables Alpine Recreation Area' and gondola access routes are exempt. My strong preference is that these matters are deferred to the respective hearing stream on rezoning.
- 9.206. Provision 6.4.4.1 is:
- "The term 'subdivision and development' includes subdivision, identification of building platforms, any buildings and associated activities such as roading, earthworks, lighting, landscaping, planting and boundary fencing and access / gateway structures".*
- 9.207. The phrase is taken from Part 5.4.2 of the ODP where it sets out the application of the assessment criteria. The provision is important because it confirms what is meant by the term 'subdivision and development' and that activities such as landscaping, driveway construction and earthworks are considered as part of the overall proposal. The phrase is used repeatedly in the Landscape Chapter and the Rural Zone Chapters (21-23). The phrase is directly related to the impacts on Rural Zoned landscape and is not as important or even applicable in urban zones. It is my preference that this provision is located in the Landscape Chapter, rather than, for example, the Definitions Chapter. Locating the phrase in the Landscape Chapter also provides confirmation to people not familiar with the planning regime that 'subdivision and development' in the Rural Zones that it includes these types of activities⁴⁰.
- 9.208. Submitter 254 (PowerNet Limited) request that infrastructure is not included as part of subdivision and development. This is not appropriate and I consider, for the reasons that follow, that it is important that infrastructure is included. It is also noted that many

³⁹ Also refer to the QLDC Practice note 1/2014 Centre pivot and linear irrigators under the QLDC District Plan. <http://www.qldc.govt.nz/planning/resource-consents/practice-notes/>

⁴⁰ In this context, the term 'development' in this phrase is not related to the definition of 'development in the PDP (and ODP). The definition in the PDP and ODP of development is related to financial contributions.

infrastructure providers have requiring authority status, and there are designations, and policies and rules in the PDP and recommended provisions in the Landscape Chapter that recognise infrastructure. A case can be made for the advancement of infrastructure through these provisions. Also, it is important that the impacts of infrastructure are considered as part of subdivision and development, not just in the context of utility or regionally significant infrastructure, but also smaller scale infrastructure associated with subdivision and development. The submission is rejected. Further submissions from the NZTA (FS109.62) and Queenstown Park Limited (FS1097.93) seeking the submission is advanced from the respective perspectives of the State highway and a 'proposed gondola' are also rejected for the same reason.

- 9.209. Provision 6.4.1.2 is *'The landscape categories apply only to the Rural Zone. The Landscape Chapter and Strategic Direction Chapter's objectives and policies are relevant and applicable in all zones where landscape values are at issue.'*
- 9.210. The intent of this provision is that the landscape assessment matters and rules⁴¹ apply only within the Rural Zone. Like the ODP's District Wide; Landscape and Visual Amenity chapter, the objectives and policies of the Landscape Chapter of the PDP applies to any activity where landscape values are at issue.
- 9.211. In the context of district plan administration, the application of the Landscape chapter provisions are naturally constrained by the underlying development right of a particular zone. For example, permitted activities are not subject to the provisions because there would not be any resource consent application required. Controlled activities would generally be unlikely to be required to be considered against higher order objectives and policies because of the planning framework that has been afforded to these activities. However, depending on why a resource consent was required, any restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity would be subject to the objective and policies of the Landscape Chapter if landscape was a matter at issue (as is the case with the ODP and the use of the District Wide provisions).
- 9.212. The submission of 443 and 452 (Trojan Helmet Ltd) seek that the provisions of the Landscape Chapter apply only to the Rural Zone. For the reasons set out above, and to emphasise that the Landscape Chapter is located within the PDP Strategic section, these submissions are not considered appropriate and are rejected.
- 9.213. Submitter 836 (Arcadian Triangle Ltd) states that the provision is awkwardly worded, and recommends changes, noting that the Strategic Direction Chapter does not need to be identified because it 'obviously informs the entire plan'. While some points are accepted, the requested relief is not supported in its entirety because the amendments would cancel the ability of the Landscape Chapter objectives and policies to be applied in other zones. That is the complete opposite of the meaning and wording as notified in Provision 6.4.1.2.
- 9.214. Submitter 694 (Glentui Heights Ltd) and 712 (Bobs Cove Developments Ltd) have also requested that clarification is required that the landscape objectives and policies do not apply to the Rural Residential Zone. As set out above, the meaning and wording of Provision 6.4.1.2 confirms that the Landscape Chapter objectives and policies would apply to these zones where landscape values are at issue and there is the ability to do so without any constraints imposed on the parameters that can be assessed.
- 9.215. Submitter 696 (Millbrook Country Club Ltd) requests clarification as to whether the landscape objectives and policies for the ONF, ONL and RL⁴² classifications apply to zones such as the Millbrook Zone. To assist with responding to the submission and interpreting the provision generally, I have phrased the matter as a broader question: 'Because the landscape classifications are applied in the Rural Zone, would Objectives 6.3.3, 6.3.4 and 6.3.5 that refer respectively to the ONF, ONL and RL landscapes as identified on the planning maps⁴³ be applicable to other zones located within rural areas?' I consider that they do, in particular

⁴¹ For example Rules 21.4.1, 21.4.5 – 12.4.12 and the assessment matters in Part 21.7 of the PDP.

⁴² Refer to 6.3.3, 6.3.4 and 6.3.5.

⁴³ Noting that the location of these is yet to be finalised at the hearing on landscape lines.

noting that policy 6.3.3.2 seeks to protect ONF's by managing development adjacent in the ONL or RL landscapes.

- 9.216. Discretion would need to be applied as to whether the ONL or RL objectives and policies are relevant.
- 9.217. Scenarios would be that activities in the Millbrook Zone⁴⁴ would be assessed against the Landscape Chapter's objectives and policies, in particular Objective 6.3.5 because the surrounding Rural Zoned area is classified RL. A different scenario is that the ONL objective and policies would be more relevant to an activity in the Rural Lifestyle Zone at Makarora⁴⁵, or an activity within the Arcadia Special Zone⁴⁶ because it is clear the surrounding Rural Zoned land is classified ONL.
- 9.218. I also emphasise that, similar to the application of the ODP Landscape and Visual Amenity objectives and policies⁴⁷ and in my experience administering the ODP, in practice, an activity would be likely to be a substantial departure from the activities contemplated within the respective zone or be of a substantial scale to require an assessment against the Landscape Chapter's objectives and policies. The rationale for these zones, having gone through bespoke plan change processes is to contemplate specified activities and that these (readily contemplated) activities are not subject to the ODP District Wide objective and policies and PDP Strategic Chapters.
- 9.219. Provision 6.4.1.2, has two main components. Separated as follows, the first sentence is:
- The landscape categories apply only to the Rural Zone.
- The second sentence is:
- The Landscape Chapter and Strategic Direction Chapter's objectives and policies are relevant and applicable in all zones where landscape values are at issue.'
- 9.220. Arcadian Triangle Limited's submission is accepted where the two limbs could be separated so that the first sentence 'The landscape categories apply only to the Rural Zone' is located in provision 6.4.1.3, which confirms in what areas of the Rural Zone the landscape categories apply.
- 9.221. Provision 6.4.1.3 is:
- The landscape categories do not apply to the following within the Rural Zones:
- a. Ski Area Activities within the Ski Area Sub Zones.
 - b. The area of the Frankton Arm located to the east of the Outstanding Natural Landscape line as shown on the District Plan maps.
 - c. The Gibbston Character Zone.
 - d. The Rural Lifestyle Zone.
 - e. The Rural Residential Zone.
- 9.222. The provision provides clarification that these areas located within the rural section of the PDP are not subject to the landscape categories. This is particularly critical for the areas in (a) and (b) because they are zoned Rural, but belong within a sub-zone/sub set of the Rural Zone. The areas identified in (c) – (e) are well established to anybody familiar with the ODP planning framework - the landscape classifications do not apply in terms of rules or application of the assessment matters, which are located within Part 21 Rural Zone in any case. However, clarification is provided for those who are unfamiliar with the plan and application of the annotations on the planning maps.

⁴⁴ Refer to PDP Planning Map 26.

⁴⁵ Refer to PDP Planning Map 05.

⁴⁶ Refer to PDP Planning Map 09.

⁴⁷ ODP Part 4.2 District Wide.

- 9.223. Submitters 407 (Mt Cardrona Station) and 836 (Arcadian Triangle Limited) have also taken issue with clause (a) where it excludes only Ski-Area Activities within the Ski Area Sub Zones because, in the view of Arcadian Triangle Ltd, excluding an activity, and not an area 'means that the landscape categories apply to some activities within the Ski Area Sub Zones. That is a nonsense'.
- 9.224. It is important that the provision clarifies exactly what is exempt from the landscape classifications. The Ski Area Sub Zones are located within the ONL, and the exemptions provide for anticipated activities within identified areas. In the situation that an activity not fitting the definition of Ski Area Activity is proposed within the Ski Area Sub Zone, and it requires a resource consent (e.g. non-farming) it is important that it is subject to the full assessment of the provisions of the PDP, primarily the rule framework, assessment matters in Chapter 21 (Rural Zone) and the full objective and policies of the Landscape Chapter. For information, the definition of Ski Area Activities in the both ODP and PDP is:

Ski Area Activities	Means the use of natural and physical resources for the purpose of providing for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) recreational activities either commercial or non commercial (b) chairlifts, t-bars and rope tows to facilitate commercial recreational activities. (c) use of snowgroomers, snowmobiles and 4WD vehicles for support or operational activities. (d) activities ancillary to commercial recreational activities. (e) in the Waiorau Snow Farm Ski Area Sub Zone vehicle and product testing activities, being activities designed to test the safety, efficiency and durability of vehicles, their parts and accessories.
----------------------------	--

- 9.225. Identifying a type of activity in the provision is appropriate and already established In the ODP and PDP through the management of farm buildings.⁴⁸ The method is also accepted in terms of s76(4) (District Rules) of the RMA.
- 9.226. For the reasons set out above, this point is rejected and it is recommended that the reference to ski area activities is retained.
- 9.227. A valid point made by Arcadian Triangle Ltd is the provision that confirms that landscape categories apply only to the Rural Zones would be better suited in provision 6.4.1.3, than as notified within 6.4.1.2. Changes are recommended to Provision 6.4.1.3. This matter is related to clarity.
- 9.228. Provision 6.4.1.4 is: '*The landscape categories apply to lakes and rivers. Except where otherwise stated or shown on the Planning Maps, lakes and rivers are categorised as outstanding natural landscapes*'.
- 9.229. Arcadian Triangle Ltd opposes the provision and has made the following supporting statement, which is supported by several further submissions:

(a) Policy 6.4.1.4 is unnecessary and inappropriate and legally incorrect. Lakes and rivers are features. The landscape categories apply to landscapes. There is no issue with lakes and rivers within identified ONLs comprising part of that ONL, but it is a separate exercise to classify an individual lake or river as an ONL (rather than an ONF), and any such approach is not supported by the Council's s32 Analysis.

- 9.230. In Section 3.2 of her evidence, Dr Read has confirmed that the PDP as notified identified the landscape classification of any particular lake or river where it was different to the landscape classification of the surrounding Rural Zone. I agree that the provision can be removed because it is unnecessary.
- 9.231. Provision 6.3.1.5 is '*Where a utility is to be located within the Rural Zone and requires resource consent as a discretionary activity, the objectives and policies of the landscape chapter are applicable*'.

⁴⁸ Farm Buildings are addressed in the rural hearing, set for a later date.

- 9.232. The meaning is purely for clarification associated with the range of activities that have been identified in the PDP Energy and Utilities Chapter (Chapter 30). This does not disqualify non-complying activities, for example, but to confirm that activities including small scale and community-distributed electricity generation and solar water heating, and renewable electricity generation activities, or lines and support structures and wind electricity generation (Rules 30.4.3, 30.4.5, 30.4.12, 30.5.3) could have landscape related impacts and are required to be assessed against the objectives and policies of the Landscape Chapter.
- 9.233. No submissions have been recorded against this provision. It is recommended the rule is retained as notified.

10. Conclusion

- 10.1. On the basis of my analysis within this evidence, I recommend that the changes within the Revised Chapter in **Appendix 1** are accepted.
- 10.2. The changes will improve the clarity and administration of the Plan; contribute towards achieving the objectives of the Plan and Strategic Direction goals in an effective and efficient manner and give effect to the purpose and principles of the RMA.



Craig Barr
Senior Planner
19 February 2015

Appendix 1. Recommended Revised Chapter

LANDSCAPE 6

Key: Recommend changes to notified chapter are shown in underlined text for additions and ~~strike through text~~ for deletions. Dated 19 February 2016.

6 Landscape

6.1 Purpose

The purpose of this chapter is to recognise the landscape as a significant resource to the ~~the~~ District and region. This resource requires protection from inappropriate activities that could degrade its qualities, character and values.

Comment [CB1]: Minor typographical amendment.

Landscapes have been categorised to provide certainty of their importance to the District, to align with regional and national legislation and to provide decision makers with a basis to consider the appropriateness of activities when having regard to the RMA. ~~In~~ particular, Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes as matters of national importance.

Comment [CB2]: Minor grammatical amendment.

6.2 Values

The District's landscapes are of significant value to the people who live in, work in or visit the District. The District relies in a large part for its social and economic wellbeing on the quality of the landscape, open spaces and environmental image.

The landscapes consist of a variety of landforms created by uplift and glaciations, which include mountains, ice-sculpted rock, scree slopes, moraine, fans, a variety of confined and braided river systems, valley floors and lake basins. These distinct landforms remain easily legible and strong features of the present landscape.

Indigenous vegetation also contributes to the quality of the District's landscapes. Whilst much of the original vegetation has been modified, the colour and texture of indigenous vegetation within these landforms contribute to the distinctive identity of the District's landscapes.

The open character of productive farmland is a key element of the landscape character which can be vulnerable to degradation from subdivision, development and non-farming activities. The prevalence of large farms and landholdings contributes to the open space and rural working character of the landscape. The predominance of open space over housing and related domestic elements is a strong determinant of the character of the District's rural landscapes.

Some rural areas, particularly those closer to Queenstown and Wanaka town centres and within parts of the Wakatipu Basin, have an established pattern of housing on smaller landholdings. The landscape character of these areas has been modified by vehicle accesses, earthworks and vegetation planting for amenity, screening and shelter, which have reduced the open character exhibited by larger scale farming activities.

While acknowledging these rural areas have established housing, a substantial amount of subdivision and development has been approved in these areas and the landscape values of these areas are vulnerable to degradation from further subdivision and development. It is realised that rural ~~lifestyle~~ living development has a finite capacity if the District's distinctive rural landscape values are to be sustained.

Comment [CB3]: Submitters 375, 430, 456.

The lakes and rivers both on their own and, when viewed as part of the distinctive landscape, are a significant element of the national and international identity of the District and provide for a wide range of amenity and recreational opportunities. They are nationally and internationally recognised as part of the reason for the District's importance as a visitor destination, as well as one of the reasons for residents to belong to the area. Managing the landscape and recreational values on the surface of lakes and rivers is an important District Plan function.

Landscapes have been categorised into three classifications within the Rural Zone. These are Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL) and Outstanding Natural Features (ONF), where their use, development and protection are a matter of national importance under Section 6 of the RMA. The Rural Landscapes ~~C~~-classification (RLC) makes up the remaining Rural Zoned land and has varying

Comment [CB4]: Minor grammatical amendment.

Comment [CB5]: Submitter 456.

Queenstown Lakes District Council Proposed District Plan 2015 Appendix 1 s42a. File Reference: Chp. 6 S42A

LANDSCAPE 6

types of landscape character and amenity values. Specific policy and assessment matters are provided to manage the potential effects of subdivision and development in these locations.

6.3 Objectives and Policies

6.3.1 Objective - The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development.

Policies

~~6.3.1.1 Identify the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features on the Planning Maps.~~

~~6.3.1.2 Identify the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features on the Planning Maps and C-classify the Rural Zoned landscapes in the District as:~~

- Outstanding Natural Feature (ONF)
- Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL)
- Rural Landscape Classification (RLC)

~~6.3.1.32~~ That subdivision and development proposals located within the Outstanding Natural Landscape, or an Outstanding Natural Feature, be assessed against the assessment matters in provisions 21.7.1 and 21.7.3 because subdivision and development is inappropriate in almost all locations, meaning successful applications will be exceptional cases.

~~6.3.1.43~~ That subdivision and development proposals located within the Rural Landscape be assessed against the assessment matters in provisions 21.7.2 and 21.7.3 because subdivision and development is inappropriate in many locations in these landscapes, meaning successful applications will be, on balance, consistent with the assessment matters.

~~6.3.1.54~~ Avoid uUrban subdivision and urban development in the Rural Zones shall:

- Avoid degradation of the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes:
- Be located only in those parts of the Rural Landscape that have capacity to absorb change.

~~6.3.1.65~~ Enable rural lifestyle living through applying Rural Lifestyle, Zone and Rural Residential and Resort Zone plan changes in areas where the landscape can accommodate change.

~~6.3.1.76~~ When locating urban growth boundaries or extending urban settlements through plan changes, avoid impinging on Outstanding Natural Landscapes or Outstanding Natural Features and minimise disruption degradation to of the values derived from open rural landscapes.

~~6.3.1.87~~ Ensure that the location and direction of lights does not cause glare to other properties, roads, and public places or avoids degradation of the night sky, landscape character and sense of remoteness where it is an important part of that character.

~~6.3.1.98~~ Ensure the District's distinctive landscapes are not degraded by forestry and timber harvesting activities.

~~6.3.1.409~~ Recognise that low-intensity pastoral farming on large landholdings contributes to the District's landscape character.

Comment [CB6]: Submitters 456, 761, 375, 430.

Comment [CB7]: Submitters 768, 806, 356.

Comment [CB8]: Submitters 456, 696.

Comment [CB9]: Grammatical amendment. Refer to para. 9.85.

Comment [CB10]: Submitters 761 & 806.

LANDSCAPE 6

6.3.1.4410 Recognise the importance of protecting the landscape character and visual amenity values, particularly as viewed from public places.

6.3.1.4211 Recognise and provide for the protection of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes with particular regard to values relating to cultural and historic elements, geological features and matters of cultural and spiritual value to Tangata Whenua, including Tōpuni.

6.3.1.12 Regionally significant infrastructure shall be located to avoid degradation of the landscape, while acknowledging location constraints.

Comment [CB11]: Submitters 805, 635, 433. Also further submissions from SPARK, Chorus, Vodafone, BRANZ.

6.3.2 Objective - Avoid adverse cumulative effects on landscape character and amenity values caused by incremental subdivision and development.

Policies

6.3.2.1 Acknowledge that subdivision and development in the rural zones, specifically residential development, has a finite capacity if the District's landscape quality, character and amenity values are to be sustained.

6.3.2.2 Allow residential subdivision and development only in locations where the District's landscape character and visual amenity would not be degraded.

6.3.2.3 Recognise that proposals for residential subdivision or development in the Rural Zone that seek support from existing and consented subdivision or development have potential for adverse cumulative effects, particularly where the subdivision and development would constitute sprawl along roads.

Comment [CB12]: Minor grammatical amendment.

6.3.2.4 Have particular regard to the potential adverse effects on landscape character and visual amenity values from infill within areas with existing rural lifestyle development or where further subdivision and development would constitute sprawl along roads.

6.3.2.5 Ensure incremental changes from subdivision and development do not degrade landscape quality, character or openness as a result of activities associated with mitigation of the visual effects of proposed development such as screening planting, mounding and earthworks.

6.3.3 Objective - Protect, maintain or enhance the District's Outstanding Natural Features (ONF).

Comment [CB13]: Minor typographical amendment.

Policies

6.3.3.1 Avoid subdivision and development on Outstanding Natural Features that does not protect, maintain or enhance Outstanding Natural Features.

6.3.3.2 Ensure that subdivision and development in the Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Rural Landscapes adjacent to Outstanding Natural Features would not degrade the landscape quality, character and visual amenity of Outstanding Natural Features.

6.3.4 Objective - Protect, maintain or enhance the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL).

Policies

6.3.4.1 Avoid subdivision and development that would degrade the important qualities of the landscape character and amenity, particularly where there is no or little capacity to absorb change.

6.3.4.2 Recognise that large parts of the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes include working farms and accept that viable farming involves activities which may modify the landscape, providing the quality and character of the Outstanding Natural Landscape is not adversely affected.

LANDSCAPE 6

- 6.3.4.3 Have regard to adverse effects on landscape character, and visual amenity values as viewed from public places, with emphasis on views from formed roads.
- 6.3.4.4 The landscape character and amenity values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape are a significant intrinsic, economic and recreational resource, such that large scale renewable electricity generation or new large scale mineral extraction development proposals including windfarm or hydro energy generation are not likely to be compatible with the Outstanding Natural Landscapes of the District.
- 6.3.5 Objective - Ensure subdivision and development does not degrade landscape character and diminish visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes (RLC).**

Policies

- 6.3.5.1 Allow subdivision and development only where it will not degrade landscape quality or character, or diminish the visual amenity values identified for any Rural Landscape.
- 6.3.5.2 Avoid adverse effects from subdivision and development that are:
- Highly visible from public places and other places which are frequented by members of the public generally (except any trail as defined in this Plan); and
 - Visible from public roads.
- 6.3.5.3 Avoid planting and screening, particularly along roads and boundaries, which would degrade openness where such openness is an important part of the landscape quality or character.
- 6.3.5.4 Encourage any landscaping to be sustainable and consistent with the established character of the area.
- 6.3.5.5 Encourage development to utilise shared accesses and infrastructure, and to locate within the parts of the site where they it will be least visible, and have the least minimise disruption to the landform and rural character.
- 6.3.5.6 Have regard to the adverse effects from subdivision and development on the open landscape character where it is open at present.
- 6.3.6 Objective - Protect, maintain or enhance the landscape quality, character and visual amenity provided by the lakes and rivers and their margins from the adverse effects of structures and activities.**

Policies

- 6.3.6.1 Control the location, intensity and scale of buildings, jetties, moorings and utility infrastructure structures on the surface and margins of water bodies and ensure these structures maintain or enhance the landscape quality, character and amenity values.
- 6.3.6.2 Recognise the character of the Frankton Arm including the established jetties and provide for these on the basis that the visual qualities of the District's distinctive landscapes are maintained and enhanced.
- 6.3.6.3 Recognise the urban character of Queenstown Bay and provide for structures and facilities providing they protect, maintain or enhance the appreciation of the District's distinct landscapes.
- 6.3.7 Objective - Recognise and protect indigenous biodiversity where it contributes to the visual quality and distinctiveness of the District's landscapes.**

Policies

- 6.3.7.1 Encourage subdivision and development proposals to promote indigenous biodiversity protection and regeneration where the landscape and nature conservation values would

Queenstown Lakes District Council Proposed District Plan 2015 Appendix 1 s42a. File Reference: Chp. 6 S42A

Comment [CB14]: Submitters 836 & 635.

Comment [CB15]: Grammatical amendment. Refer to para. 9.173.

LANDSCAPE 6

be maintained or enhanced, particularly where the subdivision or development constitutes a change in the intensity in the land use or the retirement of productive farm land.

- 6.3.7.2 Avoid indigenous vegetation clearance where it would significantly degrade the visual character and qualities of the District's distinctive landscapes.

6.3.8 Objective - Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District's landscapes.

Policies

- 6.3.8.1 Acknowledge the contribution tourism infrastructure makes to the economic and recreational values of the District.
- 6.3.8.2 Recognise that commercial recreation and tourism related activities locating within the rural zones may be appropriate where these activities enhance the appreciation of landscapes, and on the basis they would protect, maintain or enhance landscape quality, character and visual amenity values.
- 6.3.8.3 Exclude identified Ski Area Sub Zones from the landscape categories and full assessment of the landscape provisions while controlling the impact of the ski field structures and activities on the wider environment.
- 6.3.8.4 Provide a separate regulatory regime for the Gibbston Valley, identified as the Gibbston Character Zone, in recognition of its contribution to tourism and viticulture while controlling the impact of buildings, earthworks and non-viticulture related activities on the wider environment.

6.4 Rules

6.4.1 Application of the landscape provisions

- 6.4.1.1 The term 'subdivision and development' includes subdivision, identification of building platforms, any buildings and associated activities such as roading, earthworks, lighting, landscaping, planting and boundary fencing and access / gateway structures.
- 6.4.1.2 ~~The landscape categories apply only to the Rural Zone.~~ The Landscape Chapter and Strategic Direction Chapter's objectives and policies are relevant and applicable in all zones where landscape values are at issue. **Comment [CB16]:** Submitter 836.19
- 6.4.1.3 The landscape ~~categories~~ assessment matters apply only to the Rural Zone, and for clarification purposes do not apply to the following areas within the Rural Zones:
- a. Ski Area Activities within the Ski Area Sub Zones.
 - b. The area of the Frankton Arm located to the east of the Outstanding Natural Landscape line as shown on the District Plan maps.
 - c. The Gibbston Character Zone.
 - d. The Rural Lifestyle Zone.
 - e. The Rural Residential Zone.
- 6.4.1.4 ~~The landscape categories apply to lakes and rivers. Except where otherwise stated or shown on the Planning Maps, lakes and rivers are categorised as outstanding natural landscapes.~~ **Comment [CB18]:** Submitter 836.22
- 6.4.1.5~~4~~ Where a utility is to be located within the Rural Zone and requires resource consent as a discretionary activity, the objectives and policies of the landscape chapter are applicable.

Appendix 2. List of Submitters and Recommended Decisions

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
	21	Alison Walsh			21.38		Support	Accept		Entire report
	21	Alison Walsh			21.39		Support	Accept		Entire report
	22	Raymond Walsh			22.1		Support	Accept		Entire report
	98	Tony Ray	Juie Q.T. Limited	Mactodd	98.2		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	110	Alan Cutler			110.14		Other		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		110.14	FS1097.18	Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	115	Florence Micoud			115.4		Other		Out of scope outside TLA/DP function	
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		115.4	FS1097.19	Oppose		Out of scope outside TLA/DP function	
	117	Maggie Lawton			117.2		Other	Reject		Entire report
	121	Lindsay Topp		Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	121.1		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	145	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc)		145.12		Other	Reject		Entire report
	1347	Tim Burdon	Lakes Land Care		145.12	FS1347.8	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
	1012	Alison Devlin	Willowridge Developments Limited		145.12	FS1012.38	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 3 Rural	
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		145.12	FS1097.32	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
	1162	James Wilson Cooper		GTOODD Law	145.12	FS1162.12	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1254	Warwick Goldsmith	Allenby Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	145.12	FS1254.114	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	145	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc)		145.18		Oppose	Reject		Entire report
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		145.18	FS1097.37	Oppose	Reject		Entire report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
	1162	James Wilson Cooper		GTODD Law	145.18	FS1162.18	Oppose	Accept		Entire report
	1313	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	C/- Boffa Miskell Ltd	145.18	FS1313.76	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1347	Tim Burdon	Lakes Land Care		145.18	FS1347.10	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
	1254	Warwick Goldsmith	Allenby Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	145.18	FS1254.118	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	145	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc)		145.21		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		145.21	FS1097.38	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1162	James Wilson Cooper		GTODD Law	145.21	FS1162.21	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1254	Warwick Goldsmith	Allenby Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	145.21	FS1254.121	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	145	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc)		145.30		Other	Reject		Entire report
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		145.30	FS1097.43	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
	1162	James Wilson Cooper		GTODD Law	145.30	FS1162.30	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1313	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	C/- Boffa Miskell Ltd	145.30	FS1313.74	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1313	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	C/- Boffa Miskell Ltd	145.30	FS1313.79	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1254	Warwick Goldsmith	Allenby Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	145.30	FS1254.125	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	145	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc)		145.33		Oppose	Reject		Entire report
	1029	Campbell Hodgson	Universal Developments Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	145.33	FS1029.4	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1336	Louise Taylor	Peninsula Bay Joint Venture	Mitchell Partnerships	145.33	FS1336.6	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		145.33	FS1097.47	Support	Reject		Entire report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		145.33	FS1097.48	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
	1162	James Wilson Cooper		GTODD Law	145.33	FS1162.33	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1313	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	C/- Boffa Miskell Ltd	145.33	FS1313.82	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1254	Warwick Goldsmith	Allenby Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	145.33	FS1254.126	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	177	Andrew Lovelock	Universal Developments Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	177.11		Other		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1085	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		177.11	FS1085.9	Support	Accept in Part		Issue 5
	1061	Amy Wilson-White	Otago Foundation Trust Board	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	177.11	FS1061.16	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		177.11	FS1097.50	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
	187	Nicholas Kiddle			187.3		Support	Accept		Entire report
	221	Susan Cleaver			221.8		Other		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1085	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		221.8	FS1085.11	Support	Reject		Entire report
	238	NZIA and Architecture+Women Southern	NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern		238.3		Other	Reject		Entire report
	1107	Greame Todd	Man Street Properties Ltd	GTODD Law	238.3	FS1107.8	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		238.3	FS1117.7	Support	Reject		Entire report
	1226	Tim Williams	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.3	FS1226.8	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1234	Tim Williams	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.3	FS1234.8	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1239	Tim Williams	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.3	FS1239.8	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1241	Tim Williams	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.3	FS1241.8	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
	1248	Tim Williams	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.3	FS1248.8	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1249	Tim Williams	Tweed Development Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.3	FS1249.8	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		238.3	FS1097.70	Support	Reject		Entire report
	1242	Antony & Ruth Stokes			238.3	FS1242.31	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 2 Commercial	
	265	Phillip Bunn			265.9		Other		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	313	John Langley			313.1		Support	Reject		Entire report
	315	Scott Edgar	The Alpine Group Limited	Southern Land	315.4		Support	Accept		Entire report
	315	Scott Edgar	The Alpine Group Limited	Southern Land	315.5		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		315.5	FS1097.143	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	335	Nic Blennerhassett			335.5		Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	338	Nick Geddes	Middleton Family Trust	Attn: Nick Geddes Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	338.5		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1270	Maree Baker-Galloway	Hansen Family Partnership	Anderson Lloyd	338.5	FS1270.78	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1289	Authorised Representative	Oasis In The Basin Association		338.5	FS1289.27	Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		338.5	FS1097.150	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	340	Ros & Dennis Hughes			340.4		Other	Accept in Part		Refer Policy 6.3.1.8
	353	Kristan Stalker			353.2		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	355	Louise Taylor	Matukituki Trust	c/- Mitchell Partnerships Ltd	355.18		Not Stated	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	355.18	FS1282.14	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
	1320	Scott Edgar	Just One Life Limited	Southern Land Ltd	355.18	FS1320.18	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
	356	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust Limited	C/- Mitchell Partnerships.co.nz	356.35		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report
	373	Geoff Deavoll	Department of Conservation		373.11		Support	Accept in Part		Entire report
	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		373.11	FS1015.22	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
	1347	Tim Burdon	Lakes Land Care		373.11	FS1347.28	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 3 Rural	
	378	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	378.9		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1049	Campbell Hodgson	LAC Property Trustees Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	378.9	FS1049.9	Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1095	Campbell Hodgson	Nick Brasington	Galloway Cook Allan	378.9	FS1095.9	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	378.9	FS1282.31	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		378.9	FS1097.242	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	378	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	378.33		Not Stated	Reject		Entire Report
	1049	Campbell Hodgson	LAC Property Trustees Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	378.33	FS1049.33	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
	1095	Campbell Hodgson	Nick Brasington	Galloway Cook Allan	378.33	FS1095.33	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	378.33	FS1282.43	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
	384	Richard Burdon	Glen Dene Ltd		384.4		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1132	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		384.4	FS1132.29	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	396	Sam Buchan	James Canning Muspratt	Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	396.1		Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
	399	Sam Buchan	Peter and Margaret Arnott	Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	399.5		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1061	Amy Wilson-White	Otago Foundation Trust Board	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	399.5	FS1061.62	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
	1270	Maree Baker-Galloway	Hansen Family Partnership	Anderson Lloyd	399.5	FS1270.62	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	400	Sam Buchan	James Cooper	Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	400.8		Not Stated		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	401	Sam Buchan	Max Guthrie	Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	401.1		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	404	Ben Farrell	Sanderson Group Ltd	John Edmonds & Associates Ltd	404.5		Oppose		Deferred to after the hearing of mapping and location of UGB's	
	1259	Maree Baker-Galloway	Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Anderson Lloyd	404.5	FS1259.34	Support		Deferred to after the hearing of mapping and location of UGB's	
	1267	Maree Baker-Galloway	DV Bill and Jan Walker Family Trust	Anderson Lloyd	404.5	FS1267.33	Support		Deferred to after the hearing of mapping and location of UGB's	
	408	Amy Wilson-White	Otago Foundation Trust Board	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	408.3		Oppose		Deferred to after the hearing of mapping and location of UGB's	
	1167	Peter and Margaret Arnott		GTODD Law	408.3	FS1167.6	Oppose		Deferred to after the hearing of mapping and location of UGB's	
	1270	Maree Baker-Galloway	Hansen Family Partnership	Anderson Lloyd	408.3	FS1270.32	Support		Deferred to after the hearing of mapping and location of UGB's	
	409	Neil McDonald		Attn: Neil McDonald Clark Fortune McDonald & Associates	409.1		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		409.1	FS1097.275	Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	413	Sam Buchan	Trustees of the Blennerhassett Family Trust	Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	413.2		Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	434	Bruce Grant		L M Consulting Limited	434.4		Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	442	David and Margaret Bunn			442.9		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		442.9	FS1097.424	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	451	Carey Vivian	Martin McDonald and Sonya Anderson	Vivian + Espie Limited	451.4		Not Stated		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1261	Warwick Goldsmith	Bridesdale Farm Developments Limited	Anderson Lloyd	451.4	FS1261.11	Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	459	Carey Vivian	Tony McQuilkin	Vivian + Espie Limited	459.2		Not Stated		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
	1122	Rebecca Wolt	BSTGT Limited	Lane Neave	459.2	FS1122.3	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	463	Zuzana Millson			463.1		Oppose	Reject		Entire report
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		463.1	FS1097.435	Support	Reject		Entire report
	492	Carey Vivian	Jane & Richard Bamford	Vivian + Espie Limited	492.3		Not Stated		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1261	Warwick Goldsmith	Bridesdale Farm Developments Limited	Anderson Lloyd	492.3	FS1261.6	Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	495	Carey Vivian	Darryl Sampson & Louise Cooper	Vivian + Espie Limited	495.3		Not Stated		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	501	David Broomfield	Woodlot Properties Limited		501.6		Not Stated		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1102	Bob and Justine Cranfield			501.6	FS1102.6	Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1289	Authorised Representative	Oasis In The Basin Association		501.6	FS1289.6	Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1189	Brett Giddens	FII Holdings Ltd	Town Planning Group Limited	501.6	FS1189.12	Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1195	Brett Giddens	The Jandel Trust	Town Planning Group Limited	501.6	FS1195.11	Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1270	Maree Baker-Galloway	Hansen Family Partnership	Anderson Lloyd	501.6	FS1270.86	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	568	Sean Dent	Grant Laurie Bissett	Southern Planning Group	568.6		Other		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	570	Sean Dent	Shotover Hamlet Investments Limited	Southern Planning Group	570.5		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1297	Robert Stewart		Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	570.5	FS1297.5	Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	574	Sean Dent	Skyline Enterprises Limited	Southern Planning Group	574.2		Other		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
	1063	Peter Fleming	Peter Fleming and Others		574.2	FS1063.20	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
	580	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		580.2		Other	Accept in Part		Refer Issue 5

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
	580	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		580.5		Other	Reject		Refer Issue 6
	636	James Aoake	Crown Range Holdings Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	636.2		Not Stated		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	642	Peter D Ball	Mandalea Properties		642.5		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	643	James Aoake	Crown Range Enterprises	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	643.8		Not Stated	Reject		Issue 1
	1313	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	C/- Boffa Miskell Ltd	643.8	FS1313.46	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
	643	James Aoake	Crown Range Enterprises	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	643.22		Not Stated		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	661	Scott Edgar	Land Information New Zealand	Southern Land Limited	661.2		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1036	Bill, Kirsty and Stuart Sharpe	Sharpe Family Trust		661.2	FS1036.7	Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	670	Lynette Joy Hamilton			670.2		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	1310	Anna-Marie Chin			670.2	FS1310.8	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	688	James Aoake	Justin Crane and Kirsty Mactaggart	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	688.4		Oppose	Reject		Entire report
	693	James Aoake	Private Property Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	693.5		Oppose	Reject		Entire report
	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		693.5	FS1097.659	Support	Reject		Entire report
	693	James Aoake	Private Property Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	693.6		Oppose	Reject		Entire report
	702	James Aoake	Lake Wakatipu Stations Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	702.3		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report
	702	James Aoake	Lake Wakatipu Stations Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	702.4		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report
	710	Brett Giddens	Reavers NZ Limited	Town Planning Group Limited	710.1		Other		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	773	John & Jill Blennerhassett			773.11		Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
	776	Scott Edgar	Hawthenden Limited	Southern Land Limited	776.1		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	800	F M A Taylor			800.1		Other		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.55		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report
	807	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		807.76		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	813	John and Rosemary Tylden	Milstead Trust trustees		813.1		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
	820	Carey Vivian	Jeremy Bell Investments	Vivian & Espie Limited	820.14		Not Stated		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		820.14	FS1034.158	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.1 Purpose	238	NZIA and Architecture+Women Southern	NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern		238.83		Other	Reject		Entire report
6.1 Purpose	1107	Greame Todd	Man Street Properties Ltd	GTODD Law	238.83	FS1107.88	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.1 Purpose	1226	Tim Williams	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.83	FS1226.88	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.1 Purpose	1234	Tim Williams	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.83	FS1234.88	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.1 Purpose	1239	Tim Williams	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.83	FS1239.88	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.1 Purpose	1241	Tim Williams	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.83	FS1241.88	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.1 Purpose	1248	Tim Williams	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.83	FS1248.88	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.1 Purpose	1249	Tim Williams	Tweed Development Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.83	FS1249.88	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.1 Purpose	1242	Antony & Ruth Stokes			238.83	FS1242.111	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 2 Commercial	
6.1 Purpose	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.12		Oppose	Reject		Purpose
6.1 Purpose	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.12	FS1097.742	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.1 Purpose	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.23		Other	Accept in Part		Entire report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.1 Purpose	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.23	FS1287.51	Support	Accept in Part		Entire Report
6.2 Values	110	Alan Cutler			110.2		Other	Reject		Entire Report
6.2 Values	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		110.2	FS1097.17	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
6.2 Values	238	NZIA and Architecture+Women Southern	NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern		238.84		Other	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	1107	Greame Todd	Man Street Properties Ltd	GTODD Law	238.84	FS1107.89	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.2 Values	1226	Tim Williams	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.84	FS1226.89	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.2 Values	1234	Tim Williams	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.84	FS1234.89	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.2 Values	1239	Tim Williams	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.84	FS1239.89	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.2 Values	1241	Tim Williams	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.84	FS1241.89	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.2 Values	1248	Tim Williams	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.84	FS1248.89	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.2 Values	1249	Tim Williams	Tweed Development Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.84	FS1249.89	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.2 Values	1255	Warwick Goldsmith	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Anderson Lloyd	238.84	FS1255.23	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	1242	Antony & Ruth Stokes			238.84	FS1242.112	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 2 Commercial	
6.2 Values	251	Megan Justice	PowerNet Limited	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	251.4		Support	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	1092	Tony MacColl	NZ Transport Agency		251.4	FS1092.4	Support	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	1115	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Wharves Limited		251.4	FS1115.3	Support	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		251.4	FS1097.91	Support	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	375	Jeremy Carey-Smith		Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	375.7		Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.2 Values	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	375.7	FS1282.21	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
6.2 Values	430	Amy Wilson-White	Ayrburn Farm Estate Ltd	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	430.4		Other	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.2 Values	1084	Wendy Clarke			430.4	FS1084.5	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.2 Values	1086	J Hadley			430.4	FS1086.7	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.2 Values	1087	Robyn Hart			430.4	FS1087.5	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.2 Values	1099	Brendon and Katrina Thomas			430.4	FS1099.4	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.2 Values	1129	Graeme Hill		Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	430.4	FS1129.4	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.2 Values	1133	John Blair		Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	430.4	FS1133.5	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.2 Values	1050	Campbell Hodgson	Jan Andersson	Galloway Cook Allan	430.4	FS1050.24	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.2 Values	1082	J and R Hadley			430.4	FS1082.21	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.2 Values	1089	Mark McGuiness			430.4	FS1089.23	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.2 Values	1146	Lee Nicolson			430.4	FS1146.22	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.2 Values	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		430.4	FS1097.282	Support		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.2 Values	433	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Queenstown Airport Corporation	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	433.46		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.2 Values	1077	John Beckett	Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)		433.46	FS1077.28	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.2 Values	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		433.46	FS1097.332	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.2 Values	1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		433.46	FS1117.181	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.2 Values	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.13		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.2 Values	1160	Warren Hanley	Otago Regional Council	Fraser McRae	437.13	FS1160.12	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
6.2 Values	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.13	FS1097.743	Support	Reject		Entire Report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.2 Values	442	David and Margaret Bunn			442.6		Other	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.8		Other	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		456.8	FS1097.434	Support	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.42		Support	Accept		Entire report
6.2 Values	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.42	FS1034.42	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	1209	Richard Burdon			600.42	FS1209.42	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.2 Values	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.37		Other	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	1154	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farm Ltd	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	608.37	FS1154.8	Support	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	1158	Amy Wilson-White	ZJV (NZ) Ltd	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	608.37	FS1158.4	Support	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		608.37	FS1015.101	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.37	FS1034.195	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		608.37	FS1097.569	Support	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	755	Don Robertson	Guardians of Lake Wanaka	Department of Conservation	755.9		Other	Reject		Entire report
6.2 Values	805	Aileen Crow	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Beca Limited	805.40		Other	Reject		Entire report
6.3 Objectives and Policies	110	Alan Cutler			110.3		Other	Reject		Entire report
6.3 Objectives and Policies	238	NZIA and Architecture+Women Southern	NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern		238.85		Other	Reject		Entire report
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		238.85	FS1097.75	Support	Reject		Entire report
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1107	Greame Todd	Man Street Properties Ltd	GTODD Law	238.85	FS1107.90	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1226	Tim Williams	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.85	FS1226.90	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1234	Tim Williams	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.85	FS1234.90	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1239	Tim Williams	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.85	FS1239.90	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1241	Tim Williams	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.85	FS1241.90	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1248	Tim Williams	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.85	FS1248.90	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1249	Tim Williams	Tweed Development Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.85	FS1249.90	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1242	Antony & Ruth Stokes			238.85	FS1242.113	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 2 Commercial	
6.3 Objectives and Policies	632	James Aoake	RCL Queenstown Pty Ltd, RCL Henley Downs Ltd, RCL Jacks	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	632.3		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1217	Tim Williams	HL Dowell and MJM Brown Home Trust	C/- Southern Planning Group	632.3	FS1217.4	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 8 Special Zones	
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1219	Scott Freeman	Bravo Trustee Company	J M Smith C/- Southern Planning Group	632.3	FS1219.4	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 8 Special Zones	
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1252	Tim & Paula Williams			632.3	FS1252.4	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 8 Special Zones	
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1277	Michael Coburn	Jacks Point Residents and Owners Association		632.3	FS1277.7	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 8 Special Zones	
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1316	Grant & Anne Harris	Harris-Wingrove Trust		632.3	FS1316.3	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 8 Special Zones	
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1275	Chris Ferguson	"Jacks Point" (Submitter number 762 and 856)	Boffa Miskell	632.3	FS1275.177	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 8 Special Zones	
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1283	MJ and RB Williams and Brabant			632.3	FS1283.117	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 8 Special Zones	
6.3 Objectives and Policies	636	James Aoake	Crown Range Holdings Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	636.4		Not Stated	Reject		Issue 1 and entire s42a
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1313	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	C/- Boffa Miskell Ltd	636.4	FS1313.45	Oppose	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and entire s42a
6.3 Objectives and Policies	669	C & M Burgess	Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	669.8		Oppose	Reject		Issue 1 and entire s42a

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3 Objectives and Policies	1313	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	C/- Boffa Miskell Ltd	669.8	FS1313.47	Oppose	Accept in Part		Issue 1 and entire s42a
6.3 Objectives and Policies	798	Warren Hanley	Otago Regional Council		798.1		Support	Accept		Entire report
6.3 Objectives and Policies	807	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		807.74		Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3 Objectives and Policies	807	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		807.75		Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.1 Objective 1	197	Jeffrey Hylton			197.21		Support	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3.1 Objective 1	248	Scott Freeman	Shotover Trust	Southern Planning Group	248.13		Other	Reject		6.3.1 Objective 1
6.3.1 Objective 1	285	Debbie MacColl			285.8		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
6.3.1 Objective 1	1221	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Robins Farm Limited	Tim Williams C/- Southern Planning Group	285.8	FS1221.1	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1 Objective 1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		285.8	FS1097.126	Support	Reject		6.3.1 Objective 1
6.3.1 Objective 1	288	Barn Hill Limited			288.2		Other		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
6.3.1 Objective 1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		288.2	FS1097.132	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
6.3.1 Objective 1	294	Steven Bunn			294.2		Other		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
6.3.1 Objective 1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		294.2	FS1097.135	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
6.3.1 Objective 1	300	Rob Jewell			300.2		Support	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	325	John Young	Solobio Ltd - owner of Matukituki Station	Duncan White Paterson Pitts Partners (Wanaka) Ltd	325.1		Support	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	355	Louise Taylor	Matukituki Trust	c/- Mitchell Partnerships Ltd	355.4		Other	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	355.4	FS1282.5	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	1320	Scott Edgar	Just One Life Limited	Southern Land Ltd	355.4	FS1320.8	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		355.4	FS1097.203	Support	Reject		Entire Report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1 Objective 1	375	Jeremy Carey-Smith		Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	375.8		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	375.8	FS1282.22	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		375.8	FS1097.235	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	380	Charlotte Mill	Villa dellago		380.14		Support	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	430	Amy Wilson-White	Ayrburn Farm Estate Ltd	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	430.5		Other	Accept in Part		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	1084	Wendy Clarke			430.5	FS1084.6	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1 Objective 1	1086	J Hadley			430.5	FS1086.8	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1 Objective 1	1087	Robyn Hart			430.5	FS1087.6	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1 Objective 1	1099	Brendon and Katrina Thomas			430.5	FS1099.5	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1 Objective 1	1129	Graeme Hill		Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	430.5	FS1129.5	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1 Objective 1	1133	John Blair		Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	430.5	FS1133.6	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1 Objective 1	1349	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust	MITCHELL PARTNERSHIPS LIMITED	430.5	FS1349.7	Support	Reject		Issue 2 and Objective 1
6.3.1 Objective 1	1349	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust	MITCHELL PARTNERSHIPS LIMITED	430.5	FS1349.8	Support	Reject		Issue 2 and Objective 2
6.3.1 Objective 1	1050	Campbell Hodgson	Jan Andersson	Galloway Cook Allan	430.5	FS1050.25	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1 Objective 1	1082	J and R Hadley			430.5	FS1082.22	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1 Objective 1	1089	Mark McGuiness			430.5	FS1089.24	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1 Objective 1	1146	Lee Nicolson			430.5	FS1146.23	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1 Objective 1	433	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Queenstown Airport Corporation	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	433.47		Other	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1 Objective 1	1106	Matthew McCallum-Clark	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Incite	433.47	FS1106.5	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.2

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1 Objective 1	1208	Ross Langford	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Incite	433.47	FS1208.5	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.3
6.3.1 Objective 1	1253	Matthew McCallum-Clark	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Incite	433.47	FS1253.5	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.4
6.3.1 Objective 1	1077	John Beckett	Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)		433.47	FS1077.29	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.5
6.3.1 Objective 1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		433.47	FS1097.333	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.6
6.3.1 Objective 1	1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		433.47	FS1117.182	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.7
6.3.1 Objective 1	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.14		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	1160	Warren Hanley	Otago Regional Council	Fraser McRae	437.14	FS1160.13	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.14	FS1097.744	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.9		Other	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1 Objective 1	590	Sam Kane			590.2		Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
6.3.1 Objective 1	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.24		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1 Objective 1	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	598.24	FS1282.74	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1 Objective 1	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.24	FS1287.52	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1 Objective 1	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.43		Support	Accept		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1 Objective 1	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.43	FS1034.43	Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1 Objective 1	1209	Richard Burdon			600.43	FS1209.43	Support	Accept		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1 Objective 1	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.38		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1 Objective 1	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.38	FS1034.196	Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1 Objective 1	635	Joanne Dowd	Aurora Energy Limited	Delta Utility Services Limited	635.27		Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1 Objective 1	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.5		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1 Objective 1	768	Mark Laurenson	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	Burton Planning Consultants Limited	768.8		Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1 Objective 1	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.56		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.1	325	John Young	Solobio Ltd - owner of Matukituki Station	Duncan White Paterson Pitts Partners (Wanaka) Ltd	325.8		Support	Accept		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.1	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.15		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.15	FS1097.745	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1.1	528	Warwick Goldsmith	Shotover Country Limited	Anderson Lloyd	528.3		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		528.3	FS1097.502	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.1	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.6		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.1	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.57		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.2	325	John Young	Solobio Ltd - owner of Matukituki Station	Duncan White Paterson Pitts Partners (Wanaka) Ltd	325.9		Support	Accept		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.2	375	Jeremy Carey-Smith		Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	375.9		Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.2	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	375.9	FS1282.23	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.2	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.16		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.16	FS1097.746	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1.2	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.10		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.2	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.58		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	249	Alison Devlin	Willowridge Developments Limited		249.9		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		249.9	FS1097.88	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	251	Megan Justice	PowerNet Limited	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	251.5		Other	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1092	Tony MacColl	NZ Transport Agency		251.5	FS1092.5	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1115	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Wharves Limited		251.5	FS1115.4	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		251.5	FS1097.92	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	355	Louise Taylor	Matukituki Trust	c/- Mitchell Partnerships Ltd	355.5		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	355.5	FS1282.6	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.3	1320	Scott Edgar	Just One Life Limited	Southern Land Ltd	355.5	FS1320.9	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		355.5	FS1097.204	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	375	Jeremy Carey-Smith		Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	375.10		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		375.10	FS1015.31	Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	375.10	FS1282.24	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		375.10	FS1097.239	Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	378	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	378.14		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1049	Campbell Hodgson	LAC Property Trustees Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	378.14	FS1049.14	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1095	Campbell Hodgson	Nick Brasington	Galloway Cook Allan	378.14	FS1095.14	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1.3	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	378.14	FS1282.32	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		378.14	FS1097.245	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.17		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1.3	1160	Warren Hanley	Otago Regional Council	Fraser McRae	437.17	FS1160.14	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.17	FS1097.747	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1.3	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.11		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	502	Warwick Goldsmith	Allenby Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	502.3		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1012	Alison Devlin	Willowridge Developments Limited		502.3	FS1012.49	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	502.3	FS1282.46	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1.3	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.23		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.23	FS1015.59	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	519.23	FS1282.55	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.3	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.23	FS1356.23	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	581	Katia Fraser	Lesley and Jerry Burdon	Lesley and Jerry Burdon	581.7		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	581.7	FS1282.65	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		581.7	FS1097.527	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.25		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	598.25	FS1282.75	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.3	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.25	FS1287.53	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		598.25	FS1097.532	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		598.25	FS1117.232	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.26		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	621.26	FS1282.94	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.3	624	D & M Columb		John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	624.16		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	635	Joanne Dowd	Aurora Energy Limited	Delta Utility Services Limited	635.28		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		635.28	FS1097.643	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	805	Aileen Crow	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Beca Limited	805.41		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.3	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	805.41	FS1282.108	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.3	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.59		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	355	Louise Taylor	Matukituki Trust	c/- Mitchell Partnerships Ltd	355.6		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	355.6	FS1282.7	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1.4	1320	Scott Edgar	Just One Life Limited	Southern Land Ltd	355.6	FS1320.10	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		355.6	FS1097.205	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.18		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1.4	1160	Warren Hanley	Otago Regional Council	Fraser McRae	437.18	FS1160.15	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
6.3.1.4	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.18	FS1097.748	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1.4	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.12		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	513	Maree Baker-Galloway	Jenny Barb	Anderson Lloyd	513.11		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		513.11	FS1097.447	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	515	Maree Baker-Galloway	Wakatipu Equities	Anderson Lloyd	515.9		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		515.9	FS1097.477	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	522	Vanessa Robb	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Anderson Lloyd	522.12		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	522.12	FS1292.61	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	531	Maree Baker-Galloway	Crosshill Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	531.9		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	532	Maree Baker-Galloway	Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	Anderson Lloyd	532.10		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		532.10	FS1071.68	Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		532.10	FS1322.14	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	534	Warwick Goldsmith	Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	Anderson Lloyd	534.10		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		534.10	FS1322.50	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	535	Warwick Goldsmith	G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	Anderson Lloyd	535.10		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1.4	1068	Keri & Roland Lemaire-Sicre			535.10	FS1068.10	Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		535.10	FS1071.23	Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		535.10	FS1322.87	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	537	Vanessa Robb	Slopehill Joint Venture	Anderson Lloyd	537.11		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1120	Michael Brial			537.11	FS1120.15	Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1256	Warwick Goldsmith	Ashford Trust	Anderson Lloyd	537.11	FS1256.29	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1286	Mr M and Mrs J Henry		Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	537.11	FS1286.20	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	537.11	FS1292.15	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.27		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	598.27	FS1282.77	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.4	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.27	FS1287.55	Support	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.39		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.39	FS1034.197	Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	635	Joanne Dowd	Aurora Energy Limited	Delta Utility Services Limited	635.29		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.7		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	805	Aileen Crow	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Beca Limited	805.42		Other	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.4	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	805.42	FS1282.109	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.4	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.60		Oppose	Reject		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1
6.3.1.5	356	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust Limited	C/- Mitchell Partnerships.co.nz	356.5		Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1 and 6.3.1.5
6.3.1.5	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.19		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1.5	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.19	FS1097.749	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1.5	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.27		Not Stated	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1 and 6.3.1.5
6.3.1.5	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	621.27	FS1282.95	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.5	719	Tony MacColl	NZ Transport Agency		719.28		Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1 and 6.3.1.5
6.3.1.5	768	Mark Laurenson	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	Burton Planning Consultants Limited	768.16		Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1 and 6.3.1.5
6.3.1.5	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		768.16	FS1097.705	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1 and 6.3.1.5
6.3.1.5	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	768.16	FS1287.137	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1 and 6.3.1.5
6.3.1.5	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.61		Not Stated	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1 and 6.3.1.5
6.3.1.5	1313	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	C/- Boffa Miskell Ltd	806.61	FS1313.52	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1 and 6.3.1.5
6.3.1.5	1349	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust	MITCHELL PARTNERSHIPS LIMITED	806.61	FS1349.16	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Objective 6.3.1 and 6.3.1.5
6.3.1.6	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.20		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1.6	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.20	FS1097.750	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.1.6	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.13		Other	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	513	Maree Baker-Galloway	Jenny Barb	Anderson Lloyd	513.12		Other	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	515	Maree Baker-Galloway	Wakatipu Equities	Anderson Lloyd	515.10		Other	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		515.10	FS1097.475	Support	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	522	Vanessa Robb	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Anderson Lloyd	522.13		Other	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	522.13	FS1292.62	Support	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	531	Maree Baker-Galloway	Crosshill Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	531.10		Other	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		531.10	FS1097.510	Support	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1.6	532	Maree Baker-Galloway	Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	Anderson Lloyd	532.11		Other	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		532.11	FS1071.69	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1.6	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		532.11	FS1322.15	Support	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	534	Warwick Goldsmith	Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	Anderson Lloyd	534.11		Other	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		534.11	FS1322.51	Support	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	535	Warwick Goldsmith	G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	Anderson Lloyd	535.11		Other	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	1068	Keri & Roland Lemaire-Sicre			535.11	FS1068.11	Oppose		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
6.3.1.6	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		535.11	FS1071.24	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1.6	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		535.11	FS1322.88	Support	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	537	Vanessa Robb	Slopehill Joint Venture	Anderson Lloyd	537.12		Other	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	1120	Michael Brial			537.12	FS1120.16	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1.6	1256	Warwick Goldsmith	Ashford Trust	Anderson Lloyd	537.12	FS1256.30	Support	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	1286	Mr M and Mrs J Henry		Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	537.12	FS1286.21	Support	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	537.12	FS1292.16	Support	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.40		Other	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.40	FS1034.198	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.1.6	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		608.40	FS1097.578	Support	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1.6	696	James Aoake	Millbrook Country Club Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	696.7		Oppose	Accept in Part		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.6	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.62		Other	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.5.1
6.3.1.7	378	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	378.15		Other	Reject		Objective1 Policy 6.3.1.7
6.3.1.7	1049	Campbell Hodgson	LAC Property Trustees Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	378.15	FS1049.15	Oppose	Accept in Part		Objective1 Policy 6.3.1.7
6.3.1.7	1095	Campbell Hodgson	Nick Brasington	Galloway Cook Allan	378.15	FS1095.15	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1.7	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	378.15	FS1282.33	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.7	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		378.15	FS1097.246	Support	Reject		Objective1 Policy 6.3.1.7
6.3.1.7	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.63		Oppose	Reject		Objective1 Policy 6.3.1.7
6.3.1.8	340	Ros & Dennis Hughes			340.1		Support	Accept in Part		Objective 6.3.1.7
6.3.1.8	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.28		Not Stated	Reject		Objective 6.3.1.7
6.3.1.8	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	621.28	FS1282.96	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.8	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		621.28	FS1097.616	Support	Reject		Objective 6.3.1.7
6.3.1.8	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.8		Oppose	Accept in Part		Objective 6.3.1.7
6.3.1.8	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.64		Oppose	Accept in Part		Objective 6.3.1.7
6.3.1.9	117	Maggie Lawton			117.14		Other	Reject		Objective 1 Policy 6.3.1.9. The submission is unclear in terms of what is sought by seeking to provide linkages with indigenous vegetation and biodiversity.
6.3.1.10	238	NZIA and Architecture+Women Southern	NZIA Southern and Architecture + Women Southern		238.86		Other	Reject		Entire report
6.3.1.10	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		238.86	FS1097.76	Support	Reject		Entire report
6.3.1.10	1107	Greame Todd	Man Street Properties Ltd	GTODD Law	238.86	FS1107.91	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1.10	1226	Tim Williams	Ngai Tahu Property Limited & Ngai Tahu Justice Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.86	FS1226.91	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3.1.10	1234	Tim Williams	Shotover Memorial Properties Limited & Horne Water Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.86	FS1234.91	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3.1.10	1239	Tim Williams	Skyline Enterprises Limited & O'Connells Pavillion Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.86	FS1239.91	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3.1.10	1241	Tim Williams	Skyline Enterprises Limited & Accommodation and Booking Agents	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.86	FS1241.91	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3.1.10	1248	Tim Williams	Trojan Holdings Limited & Beach Street Holdings Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.86	FS1248.91	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3.1.10	1249	Tim Williams	Tweed Development Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	238.86	FS1249.91	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3.1.10	1242	Antony & Ruth Stokes			238.86	FS1242.114	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 2 Commercial	
6.3.1.10	325	John Young	Solobio Ltd - owner of Matukituki Station	Duncan White Paterson Pitts Partners (Wanaka) Ltd	325.10		Support	Accept in Part		Objective 6.3
6.3.1.10	590	Sam Kane			590.3		Support	Accept in Part		Objective 6.3
6.3.1.10	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.44		Other	Accept in Part		Objective 6.3
6.3.1.10	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.44	FS1034.44	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.1.10	1209	Richard Burdon			600.44	FS1209.44	Support	Reject		Objective 6.3
6.3.1.10	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	600.44	FS1282.86	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.10	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.65		Other	Reject		Objective 6.4
6.3.1.11	325	John Young	Solobio Ltd - owner of Matukituki Station	Duncan White Paterson Pitts Partners (Wanaka) Ltd	325.11		Support	Accept		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	356	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust Limited	C/- Mitchell Partnerships.co.nz	356.6		Support	Accept		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	378	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	378.16		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1049	Campbell Hodgson	LAC Property Trustees Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	378.16	FS1049.16	Oppose	Accept in Part		Objective 1

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1.11	1095	Campbell Hodgson	Nick Brasington	Galloway Cook Allan	378.16	FS1095.16	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1.11	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	378.16	FS1282.34	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.11	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		378.16	FS1097.247	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	502	Warwick Goldsmith	Allenby Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	502.4		Oppose	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1012	Alison Devlin	Willowridge Developments Limited		502.4	FS1012.50	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	502.4	FS1282.47	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.11	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		502.4	FS1097.442	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	513	Maree Baker-Galloway	Jenny Barb	Anderson Lloyd	513.13		Oppose	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		513.13	FS1097.452	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	515	Maree Baker-Galloway	Wakatipu Equities	Anderson Lloyd	515.11		Oppose	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		515.11	FS1097.478	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.24		Oppose	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.24	FS1015.60	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	519.24	FS1282.56	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.11	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.24	FS1356.24	Oppose	Accept in Part		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		519.24	FS1097.485	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	522	Vanessa Robb	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Anderson Lloyd	522.14		Oppose	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	522.14	FS1292.63	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		522.14	FS1097.493	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	531	Maree Baker-Galloway	Crosshill Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	531.11		Oppose	Reject		Objective 1

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1.11	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		531.11	FS1097.511	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	532	Maree Baker-Galloway	Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	Anderson Lloyd	532.12		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		532.12	FS1071.70	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1.11	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		532.12	FS1322.16	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	534	Warwick Goldsmith	Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	Anderson Lloyd	534.12		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		534.12	FS1322.52	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	535	Warwick Goldsmith	G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	Anderson Lloyd	535.12		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1068	Keri & Roland Lemaire-Sicre			535.12	FS1068.12	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1.11	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		535.12	FS1071.25	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1.11	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		535.12	FS1322.89	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	537	Vanessa Robb	Slopehill Joint Venture	Anderson Lloyd	537.13		Oppose	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1256	Warwick Goldsmith	Ashford Trust	Anderson Lloyd	537.13	FS1256.31	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1286	Mr M and Mrs J Henry		Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	537.13	FS1286.22	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	537.13	FS1292.17	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1120	Michael Brial			537.13	FS1120.17	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.1.11	581	Katia Fraser	Lesley and Jerry Burdon	Lesley and Jerry Burdon	581.8		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	581.8	FS1282.66	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.11	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		581.8	FS1097.528	Support	Reject		Objective 1

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1.11	590	Sam Kane			590.4		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.45		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.45	FS1034.45	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.1.11	1040	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird		600.45	FS1040.49	Oppose	Accept in Part		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1209	Richard Burdon			600.45	FS1209.45	Support	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	600.45	FS1282.87	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.11	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.41		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.41	FS1034.199	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.1.11	696	James Aoake	Millbrook Country Club Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	696.8		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.9		Oppose	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	791	Tim Burdon			791.8		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	794	Tim Burdon	Lakes Land Care		794.8		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.66		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	809	Stephen Quin	Queenstown Lakes District Council		809.3		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.11	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		809.3	FS1097.719	Oppose	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.12	355	Louise Taylor	Matukituki Trust	c/- Mitchell Partnerships Ltd	355.7		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.12	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	355.7	FS1282.8	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.12	1320	Scott Edgar	Just One Life Limited	Southern Land Ltd	355.7	FS1320.11	Oppose	Accept in Part		Objective 1
6.3.1.12	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		355.7	FS1097.206	Support	Reject		Objective 1

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.1.12	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.29		Not Stated	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.12	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	621.29	FS1282.97	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.1.12	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.67		Other	Reject		Objective 1
6.3.1.12	810	Tim Vial	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou and Hokonui Runanga collectively Manawhenua	KTKO Ltd	810.29		Not Stated	Reject		Objective 1 and refer to the Tangata Whenua Chapter 5 Section 42a report
6.3.2 Objective 2	145	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc)		145.9		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report
6.3.2 Objective 2	1162	James Wilson Cooper		GTODD Law	145.9	FS1162.9	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3.2 Objective 2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		145.9	FS1097.29	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3.2 Objective 2	1254	Warwick Goldsmith	Allenby Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	145.9	FS1254.111	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report
6.3.2 Objective 2	248	Scott Freeman	Shotover Trust	Southern Planning Group	248.14		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	255	Noel Beggs	N.W. & C.E. BEGGS		255.4		Support	Accept in Part		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	285	Debbie MacColl			285.9		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	356	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust Limited	C/- Mitchell Partnerships.co.nz	356.7		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		356.7	FS1097.208	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	378	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	378.17		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1049	Campbell Hodgson	LAC Property Trustees Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	378.17	FS1049.17	Oppose	Accept in Part		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1095	Campbell Hodgson	Nick Brasington	Galloway Cook Allan	378.17	FS1095.17	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2		Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	378.17	FS1282.35	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.2 Objective 2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		378.17	FS1097.248	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.2 Objective 2	380	Charlotte Mill	Villa dellago		380.15		Support	Accept		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	430	Amy Wilson-White	Ayrburn Farm Estate Ltd	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	430.6		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1084	Wendy Clarke			430.6	FS1084.7	Oppose	Accept		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1086	J Hadley			430.6	FS1086.9	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2	1087	Robyn Hart			430.6	FS1087.7	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2	1099	Brendon and Katrina Thomas			430.6	FS1099.6	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2	1129	Graeme Hill		Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	430.6	FS1129.6	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2	1133	John Blair		Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	430.6	FS1133.7	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2	1349	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust	MITCHELL PARTNERSHIPS LIMITED	430.6	FS1349.9	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1050	Campbell Hodgson	Jan Andersson	Galloway Cook Allan	430.6	FS1050.26	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2	1082	J and R Hadley			430.6	FS1082.23	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2	1089	Mark McGuiness			430.6	FS1089.25	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2	1146	Lee Nicolson			430.6	FS1146.24	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2	1349	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust	MITCHELL PARTNERSHIPS LIMITED	430.6	FS1349.10	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		430.6	FS1097.283	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.21		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.2 Objective 2	1160	Warren Hanley	Otago Regional Council	Fraser McRae	437.21	FS1160.16	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
6.3.2 Objective 2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.21	FS1097.751	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.2 Objective 2	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.14		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		456.14	FS1097.429	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.2 Objective 2	513	Maree Baker-Galloway	Jenny Barb	Anderson Lloyd	513.14		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		513.14	FS1097.453	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	515	Maree Baker-Galloway	Wakatipu Equities	Anderson Lloyd	515.12		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		515.12	FS1097.479	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.25		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.25	FS1015.61	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	519.25	FS1282.57	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.2 Objective 2	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.25	FS1356.25	Oppose	Accept in Part		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		519.25	FS1097.486	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	522	Vanessa Robb	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Anderson Lloyd	522.15		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	522.15	FS1292.64	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1349	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust	MITCHELL PARTNERSHIPS LIMITED	522.15	FS1349.18	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		522.15	FS1097.494	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	528	Warwick Goldsmith	Shotover Country Limited	Anderson Lloyd	528.4		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		528.4	FS1097.503	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	531	Maree Baker-Galloway	Crosshill Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	531.12		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		531.12	FS1097.512	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	532	Maree Baker-Galloway	Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	Anderson Lloyd	532.13		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.2 Objective 2	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		532.13	FS1071.71	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		532.13	FS1322.17	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	534	Warwick Goldsmith	Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	Anderson Lloyd	534.13		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		534.13	FS1322.53	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	535	Warwick Goldsmith	G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	Anderson Lloyd	535.13		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1068	Keri & Roland Lemaire-Sicre			535.13	FS1068.13	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		535.13	FS1071.26	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		535.13	FS1322.90	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	537	Vanessa Robb	Slopehill Joint Venture	Anderson Lloyd	537.14		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1120	Michael Brial			537.14	FS1120.18	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2 Objective 2	1256	Warwick Goldsmith	Ashford Trust	Anderson Lloyd	537.14	FS1256.32	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1286	Mr M and Mrs J Henry		Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	537.14	FS1286.23	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	537.14	FS1292.18	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	581	Katia Fraser	Lesley and Jerry Burdon	Lesley and Jerry Burdon	581.9		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	581.9	FS1282.67	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.2 Objective 2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		581.9	FS1097.529	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.28		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	598.28	FS1282.78	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.2 Objective 2	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.28	FS1287.56	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.2 Objective 2	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.46		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.46	FS1034.46	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.2 Objective 2	1209	Richard Burdon			600.46	FS1209.46	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.42		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.42	FS1034.200	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.2 Objective 2	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.30		Not Stated	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	621.30	FS1282.98	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.2 Objective 2	624	D & M Columb		John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	624.17		Not Stated	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.10		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		761.10	FS1015.126	Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	768	Mark Laurenson	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	Burton Planning Consultants Limited	768.15		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		768.15	FS1015.135	Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.68		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2 Objective 2	809	Stephen Quin	Queenstown Lakes District Council		809.4		Not Stated	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.22		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.2.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.22	FS1097.752	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.2.1	513	Maree Baker-Galloway	Jenny Barb	Anderson Lloyd	513.15		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		513.15	FS1097.448	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	515	Maree Baker-Galloway	Wakatipu Equities	Anderson Lloyd	515.13		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		515.13	FS1097.480	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.2.1	522	Vanessa Robb	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Anderson Lloyd	522.16		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	522.16	FS1292.65	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	531	Maree Baker-Galloway	Crosshill Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	531.13		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	537	Vanessa Robb	Slopehill Joint Venture	Anderson Lloyd	537.15		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	1120	Michael Brial			537.15	FS1120.19	Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	1256	Warwick Goldsmith	Ashford Trust	Anderson Lloyd	537.15	FS1256.33	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	1286	Mr M and Mrs J Henry		Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	537.15	FS1286.24	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	537.15	FS1292.19	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	581	Katia Fraser	Lesley and Jerry Burdon	Lesley and Jerry Burdon	581.10		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	581.10	FS1282.68	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.2.1	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.47		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.47	FS1034.47	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.2.1	1209	Richard Burdon			600.47	FS1209.47	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.1	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.69		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	378	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	378.18		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1049	Campbell Hodgson	LAC Property Trustees Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	378.18	FS1049.18	Oppose	Accept in Part		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1095	Campbell Hodgson	Nick Brasington	Galloway Cook Allan	378.18	FS1095.18	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2.2	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	378.18	FS1282.36	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.2.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		378.18	FS1097.249	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.2.2	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.23		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.2.2	1160	Warren Hanley	Otago Regional Council	Fraser McRae	437.23	FS1160.17	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
6.3.2.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.23	FS1097.753	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.2.2	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.15		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		456.15	FS1097.430	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	513	Maree Baker-Galloway	Jenny Barb	Anderson Lloyd	513.16		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		513.16	FS1097.454	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	515	Maree Baker-Galloway	Wakatipu Equities	Anderson Lloyd	515.14		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		515.14	FS1097.476	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		515.14	FS1117.195	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	522	Vanessa Robb	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Anderson Lloyd	522.17		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	522.17	FS1292.66	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		522.17	FS1097.495	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	531	Maree Baker-Galloway	Crosshill Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	531.14		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	532	Maree Baker-Galloway	Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	Anderson Lloyd	532.14		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		532.14	FS1071.72	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2.2	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		532.14	FS1322.18	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	534	Warwick Goldsmith	Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	Anderson Lloyd	534.14		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		534.14	FS1322.54	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.2.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		534.14	FS1097.514	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	535	Warwick Goldsmith	G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	Anderson Lloyd	535.14		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1068	Keri & Roland Lemaire-Sicre			535.14	FS1068.14	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2.2	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		535.14	FS1071.27	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2.2	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		535.14	FS1322.91	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	537	Vanessa Robb	Slopehill Joint Venture	Anderson Lloyd	537.16		Not Stated	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1120	Michael Brial			537.16	FS1120.20	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2.2	1256	Warwick Goldsmith	Ashford Trust	Anderson Lloyd	537.16	FS1256.34	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1286	Mr M and Mrs J Henry		Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	537.16	FS1286.25	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	537.16	FS1292.20	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	581	Katia Fraser	Lesley and Jerry Burdon	Lesley and Jerry Burdon	581.11		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	581.11	FS1282.69	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.2.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		581.11	FS1097.530	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.43		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.43	FS1034.201	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.2.2	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.31		Not Stated	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	621.31	FS1282.99	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.2.2	696	James Aoake	Millbrook Country Club Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	696.9		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.2	1349	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust	MITCHELL PARTNERSHIPS LIMITED	696.9	FS1349.13	Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.2.2	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.11		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.3	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.24		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.2.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.24	FS1097.754	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.2.3	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.16		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.3	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.48		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.3	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.48	FS1034.48	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.2.3	1209	Richard Burdon			600.48	FS1209.48	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.3	719	Tony MacColl	NZ Transport Agency		719.29		Support	Accept		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.3	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.12		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.3	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		761.12	FS1015.127	Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.4	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.25		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.2.4	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.25	FS1097.755	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.2.4	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.17		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.4	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.13		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.5	117	Maggie Lawton			117.15		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.5	378	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	378.19		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.5	1049	Campbell Hodgson	LAC Property Trustees Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	378.19	FS1049.19	Oppose	Accept in Part		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.5	1095	Campbell Hodgson	Nick Brasington	Galloway Cook Allan	378.19	FS1095.19	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.2.5	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	378.19	FS1282.37	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.2.5	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.26		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.2.5	1160	Warren Hanley	Otago Regional Council	Fraser McRae	437.26	FS1160.18	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.2.5	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.26	FS1097.756	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.2.5	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.18		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.5	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.29		Other	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.5	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	598.29	FS1282.79	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.2.5	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.29	FS1287.57	Support	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.5	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.32		Not Stated	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.5	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	621.32	FS1282.100	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.2.5	624	D & M Columb		John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	624.18		Not Stated	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.5	696	James Aoake	Millbrook Country Club Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	696.11		Not Stated	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.2.5	755	Don Robertson	Guardians of Lake Wanaka	Department of Conservation	755.13		Not Stated	Reject		Objective 5
6.3.2.5	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.14		Oppose	Reject		Issues 1,2,4 and Objective 6.3.2
6.3.3 Objective 3	285	Debbie MacColl			285.10		Other	Reject		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3 Objective 3	1221	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Robins Farm Limited	Tim Williams C/- Southern Planning Group	285.10	FS1221.2	Support	Reject		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3 Objective 3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		285.10	FS1097.127	Support	Reject		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3 Objective 3	355	Louise Taylor	Matukituki Trust	c/- Mitchell Partnerships Ltd	355.8		Oppose	Reject		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.5
6.3.3 Objective 3	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	355.8	FS1282.9	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.3 Objective 3	1320	Scott Edgar	Just One Life Limited	Southern Land Ltd	355.8	FS1320.1	Oppose	Reject		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.6
6.3.3 Objective 3	380	Charlotte Mill	Villa dellago		380.16		Support	Accept		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.7
6.3.3 Objective 3	433	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Queenstown Airport Corporation	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	433.48		Other	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.3 Objective 3	1106	Matthew McCallum-Clark	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Incite	433.48	FS1106.6	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.3 Objective 3	1208	Ross Langford	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Incite	433.48	FS1208.6	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.3 Objective 3	1253	Matthew McCallum-Clark	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Incite	433.48	FS1253.6	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.3 Objective 3	1077	John Beckett	Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)		433.48	FS1077.30	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.3 Objective 3	1092	Tony MacColl	NZ Transport Agency		433.48	FS1092.13	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.3 Objective 3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		433.48	FS1097.334	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.3 Objective 3	1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		433.48	FS1117.183	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.3 Objective 3	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.49		Support	Accept		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3 Objective 3	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.49	FS1034.49	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.3 Objective 3	1209	Richard Burdon			600.49	FS1209.49	Support	Accept		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3 Objective 3	768	Mark Laurenson	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	Burton Planning Consultants Limited	768.9		Support	Accept in Part		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.1	355	Louise Taylor	Matukituki Trust	c/- Mitchell Partnerships Ltd	355.9		Oppose	Reject		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.1	1320	Scott Edgar	Just One Life Limited	Southern Land Ltd	355.9	FS1320.3	Oppose	Accept in Part		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.1	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	355.9	FS1282.10	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.3.1	375	Jeremy Carey-Smith		Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	375.11		Support	Reject		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.1	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		375.11	FS1015.32	Oppose	Reject		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.1	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	375.11	FS1282.25	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.3.1	375	Jeremy Carey-Smith		Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	375.12		Support	Reject		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.1	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	375.12	FS1282.26	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.3.1	805	Aileen Crow	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Beca Limited	805.43		Other	Accept in Part		Issue 3 and new policy within objective 6.3.1
6.3.3.1	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	805.43	FS1282.110	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.3.1	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.70		Other	Reject		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.2	355	Louise Taylor	Matukituki Trust	c/- Mitchell Partnerships Ltd	355.10		Oppose	Reject		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.3.2	1320	Scott Edgar	Just One Life Limited	Southern Land Ltd	355.10	FS1320.2	Oppose	Accept in Part		Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.2	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	355.10	FS1282.11	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.3.2	375	Jeremy Carey-Smith		Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	375.13		Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.2	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	375.13	FS1282.27	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.3.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		375.13	FS1097.240	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.2	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.26		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.2	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.26	FS1015.62	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.2	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	519.26	FS1282.58	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.3.2	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.26	FS1356.26	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		519.26	FS1097.487	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.2	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.30		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.2	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	598.30	FS1282.80	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.3.2	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.30	FS1287.58	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.3.2	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.71		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	282	Sarah Burdon			282.1		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	285	Debbie MacColl			285.11		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	1221	Alexander Kenneth Robins	Robins Farm Limited	Tim Williams C/- Southern Planning Group	285.11	FS1221.3	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	325	John Young	Solobio Ltd - owner of Matukituki Station	Duncan White Paterson Pitts Partners (Wanaka) Ltd	325.2		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	355	Louise Taylor	Matukituki Trust	c/- Mitchell Partnerships Ltd	355.11		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	355.11	FS1282.12	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4 Objective 4	1320	Scott Edgar	Just One Life Limited	Southern Land Ltd	355.11	FS1320.12	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.4 Objective 4	380	Charlotte Mill	Villa dellago		380.17		Other		Out of scope outside TLA/DP function	
6.3.4 Objective 4	433	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Queenstown Airport Corporation	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	433.49		Other	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.4 Objective 4	1106	Matthew McCallum-Clark	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Incite	433.49	FS1106.7	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.4 Objective 4	1208	Ross Langford	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Incite	433.49	FS1208.7	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.4 Objective 4	1253	Matthew McCallum-Clark	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Incite	433.49	FS1253.7	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.4 Objective 4	1077	John Beckett	Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)		433.49	FS1077.31	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.4 Objective 4	1092	Tony MacColl	NZ Transport Agency		433.49	FS1092.14	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.4 Objective 4	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		433.49	FS1097.335	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.4 Objective 4	1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		433.49	FS1117.184	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.4 Objective 4	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.27		Other	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.27	FS1015.63	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	519.27	FS1282.59	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4 Objective 4	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.27	FS1356.27	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.31		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	598.31	FS1282.81	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4 Objective 4	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.31	FS1287.59	Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.50		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.50	FS1034.50	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.4 Objective 4	1209	Richard Burdon			600.50	FS1209.50	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.4 Objective 4	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.49		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		608.49	FS1015.102	Oppose	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.49	FS1034.207	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.4 Objective 4	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		608.49	FS1097.579	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		608.49	FS1117.246	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.33		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	621.33	FS1282.101	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4 Objective 4	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.34		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	621.34	FS1282.102	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4 Objective 4	624	D & M Columb		John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	624.19		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	624	D & M Columb		John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	624.20		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	768	Mark Laurenson	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	Burton Planning Consultants Limited	768.10		Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4 Objective 4	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.72		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.1	325	John Young	Solobio Ltd - owner of Matukituki Station	Duncan White Paterson Pitts Partners (Wanaka) Ltd	325.12		Support	Accept		Entire report
6.3.4.1	375	Jeremy Carey-Smith		Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	375.14		Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.1	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		375.14	FS1015.33	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.1	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	375.14	FS1282.28	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		375.14	FS1097.241	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.1	378	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	378.20		Other	Reject		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.4.1	1049	Campbell Hodgson	LAC Property Trustees Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	378.20	FS1049.20	Oppose	Accept in Part		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.1	1095	Campbell Hodgson	Nick Brasington	Galloway Cook Allan	378.20	FS1095.20	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.4.1	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	378.20	FS1282.38	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		378.20	FS1097.252	Support	Reject		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.1	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.27		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.4.1	1160	Warren Hanley	Otago Regional Council	Fraser McRae	437.27	FS1160.19	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
6.3.4.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.27	FS1097.757	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.4.1	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.28		Oppose	Reject		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.1	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.28	FS1015.64	Support	Reject		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.1	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	519.28	FS1282.60	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4.1	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.28	FS1356.28	Oppose	Accept in Part		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.1	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.32		Other	Reject		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.1	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	598.32	FS1282.82	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4.1	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.32	FS1287.60	Support	Accept in Part		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.1	805	Aileen Crow	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Beca Limited	805.44		Other	Reject		Issue 3 and new policy within objective 6.3.1
6.3.4.1	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	805.44	FS1282.111	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4.1	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.73		Other	Reject		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.2	325	John Young	Solobio Ltd - owner of Matukituki Station	Duncan White Paterson Pitts Partners (Wanaka) Ltd	325.13		Support	Accept		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.2	590	Sam Kane			590.5		Support	Accept		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.2	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.51		Support	Accept		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.2	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.51	FS1034.51	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.4.2	1209	Richard Burdon			600.51	FS1209.51	Support	Accept		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.4.2	791	Tim Burdon			791.9		Support	Accept		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.2	794	Tim Burdon	Lakes Land Care		794.9		Support	Accept		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.2	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.74		Other	Reject		Issues 2, 4 and Objectives 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.3	325	John Young	Solobio Ltd - owner of Matukituki Station	Duncan White Paterson Pitts Partners (Wanaka) Ltd	325.14		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.3	355	Louise Taylor	Matukituki Trust	c/- Mitchell Partnerships Ltd	355.12		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.3	1320	Scott Edgar	Just One Life Limited	Southern Land Ltd	355.12	FS1320.4	Oppose	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.3	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	355.12	FS1282.13	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4.3	378	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	378.21		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.3	1049	Campbell Hodgson	LAC Property Trustees Limited	Gallaway Cook Allan	378.21	FS1049.21	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.3	1095	Campbell Hodgson	Nick Brasington	Gallaway Cook Allan	378.21	FS1095.21	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.4.3	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	378.21	FS1282.39	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4.3	581	Katia Fraser	Lesley and Jerry Burdon	Lesley and Jerry Burdon	581.12		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.3	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	581.12	FS1282.70	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4.3	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.52		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.3	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.52	FS1034.52	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.4.3	1209	Richard Burdon			600.52	FS1209.52	Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.3	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.75		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.4	325	John Young	Solobio Ltd - owner of Matukituki Station	Duncan White Paterson Pitts Partners (Wanaka) Ltd	325.15		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.4	1085	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		325.15	FS1085.4	Oppose	Reject		Issue 6
6.3.4.4	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.28		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.4.4	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.28	FS1097.758	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.4.4	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.29		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.4	1085	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		519.29	FS1085.1	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.4	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.29	FS1015.65	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.4	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	519.29	FS1282.61	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4.4	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.29	FS1356.29	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.4	580	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		580.3		Other	Reject		Issue 6
6.3.4.4	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.33		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.4	1085	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		598.33	FS1085.2	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.4	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	598.33	FS1282.83	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.4.4	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.33	FS1287.61	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.4	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.76		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.4.4	1085	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		806.76	FS1085.3	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.3 and 6.3.4
6.3.5 Objective 5	285	Debbie MacColl			285.12		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	380	Charlotte Mill	Villa dellago		380.18		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	380	Charlotte Mill	Villa dellago		380.19		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	430	Amy Wilson-White	Ayrburn Farm Estate Ltd	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	430.7		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1084	Wendy Clarke			430.7	FS1084.8	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1087	Robyn Hart			430.7	FS1087.8	Oppose	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1099	Brendon and Katrina Thomas			430.7	FS1099.7	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.5 Objective 5	1129	Graeme Hill		Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	430.7	FS1129.7	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5 Objective 5	1133	John Blair		Graeme Todd GTODD LAW	430.7	FS1133.8	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5 Objective 5	1050	Campbell Hodgson	Jan Andersson	Galloway Cook Allan	430.7	FS1050.27	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5 Objective 5	1082	J and R Hadley			430.7	FS1082.24	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5 Objective 5	1086	J Hadley			430.7	FS1086.10	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5 Objective 5	1089	Mark McGuiness			430.7	FS1089.26	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5 Objective 5	1146	Lee Nicolson			430.7	FS1146.25	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5 Objective 5	1349	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust	MITCHELL PARTNERSHIPS LIMITED	430.7	FS1349.11	Support		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5 Objective 5	1349	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust	MITCHELL PARTNERSHIPS LIMITED	430.7	FS1349.12	Support		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5 Objective 5	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		430.7	FS1097.284	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	433	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Queenstown Airport Corporation	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	433.50		Other	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.5 Objective 5	1106	Matthew McCallum-Clark	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Incite	433.50	FS1106.8	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.5 Objective 5	1208	Ross Langford	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Incite	433.50	FS1208.8	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.5 Objective 5	1253	Matthew McCallum-Clark	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Incite	433.50	FS1253.8	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.5 Objective 5	1077	John Beckett	Board of Airline Representatives of New Zealand (BARNZ)		433.50	FS1077.32	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.5 Objective 5	1092	Tony MacColl	NZ Transport Agency		433.50	FS1092.15	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.5 Objective 5	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		433.50	FS1097.336	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1
6.3.5 Objective 5	1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		433.50	FS1117.185	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report in particular Issue 3 and new policy within Objective 6.3.1

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.5 Objective 5	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.29		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.5 Objective 5	1160	Warren Hanley	Otago Regional Council	Fraser McRae	437.29	FS1160.20	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire Report
6.3.5 Objective 5	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.29	FS1097.759	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.5 Objective 5	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.19		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		456.19	FS1097.431	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	513	Maree Baker-Galloway	Jenny Barb	Anderson Lloyd	513.17		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		513.17	FS1097.455	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	515	Maree Baker-Galloway	Wakatipu Equities	Anderson Lloyd	515.15		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		515.15	FS1097.463	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	522	Vanessa Robb	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Anderson Lloyd	522.18		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	522.18	FS1292.67	Support	Reject		Issues 1, 2, 4 and all objectives and policies
6.3.5 Objective 5	528	Warwick Goldsmith	Shotover Country Limited	Anderson Lloyd	528.5		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		528.5	FS1097.504	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	531	Maree Baker-Galloway	Crosshill Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	531.15		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	532	Maree Baker-Galloway	Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	Anderson Lloyd	532.15		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		532.15	FS1071.73	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5 Objective 5	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		532.15	FS1322.19	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	534	Warwick Goldsmith	Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	Anderson Lloyd	534.15		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		534.15	FS1322.55	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.5 Objective 5	535	Warwick Goldsmith	G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	Anderson Lloyd	535.15		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1068	Keri & Roland Lemaire-Sicre			535.15	FS1068.15	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5 Objective 5	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		535.15	FS1071.28	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5 Objective 5	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		535.15	FS1322.92	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	537	Vanessa Robb	Slopehill Joint Venture	Anderson Lloyd	537.17		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1120	Michael Brial			537.17	FS1120.21	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5 Objective 5	1256	Warwick Goldsmith	Ashford Trust	Anderson Lloyd	537.17	FS1256.35	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1286	Mr M and Mrs J Henry		Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	537.17	FS1286.26	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	537.17	FS1292.21	Support	Reject		Issues 1, 2, 4 and all objectives and policies
6.3.5 Objective 5	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.34		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.34	FS1287.62	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.53		Support	Accept		Objective 6.4.3
6.3.5 Objective 5	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.53	FS1034.53	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1209	Richard Burdon			600.53	FS1209.53	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.44		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.44	FS1034.202	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.35		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	624	D & M Columb		John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	624.21		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.5 Objective 5	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.15		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		761.15	FS1015.128	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	768	Mark Laurenson	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	Burton Planning Consultants Limited	768.11		Support	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5 Objective 5	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.77		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.30		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.5.1	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.20		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		456.20	FS1097.432	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	513	Maree Baker-Galloway	Jenny Barb	Anderson Lloyd	513.18		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		513.18	FS1097.456	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	515	Maree Baker-Galloway	Wakatipu Equities	Anderson Lloyd	515.16		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		515.16	FS1097.464	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	522	Vanessa Robb	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Anderson Lloyd	522.19		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	522.19	FS1292.68	Support	Reject		Issues 1, 2, 4 and all objectives and policies
6.3.5.1	531	Maree Baker-Galloway	Crosshill Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	531.16		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	537	Vanessa Robb	Slopehill Joint Venture	Anderson Lloyd	537.18		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	1120	Michael Brial			537.18	FS1120.22	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5.1	1256	Warwick Goldsmith	Ashford Trust	Anderson Lloyd	537.18	FS1256.36	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	1286	Mr M and Mrs J Henry		Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	537.18	FS1286.27	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.5.1	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	537.18	FS1292.22	Support	Reject		Issues 1, 2, 4 and all objectives and policies
6.3.5.1	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.35		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.35	FS1287.63	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.45		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.45	FS1034.203	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	696	James Aoake	Millbrook Country Club Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	696.10		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	1349	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust	MITCHELL PARTNERSHIPS LIMITED	696.10	FS1349.14	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.16		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		761.16	FS1015.129	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.78		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.1	1349	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust	MITCHELL PARTNERSHIPS LIMITED	806.78	FS1349.17	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	248	Scott Freeman	Shotover Trust	Southern Planning Group	248.15		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	356	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust Limited	C/- Mitchell Partnerships.co.nz	356.8		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		356.8	FS1097.209	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.31		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.5.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.31	FS1097.760	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.5.2	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.21		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		456.21	FS1097.433	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	513	Maree Baker-Galloway	Jenny Barb	Anderson Lloyd	513.19		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.5.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		513.19	FS1097.457	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	515	Maree Baker-Galloway	Wakatipu Equities	Anderson Lloyd	515.17		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		515.17	FS1097.465	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	522	Vanessa Robb	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Anderson Lloyd	522.20		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	522.20	FS1292.69	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		522.20	FS1097.496	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	528	Warwick Goldsmith	Shotover Country Limited	Anderson Lloyd	528.6		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		528.6	FS1097.505	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	531	Maree Baker-Galloway	Crosshill Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	531.17		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		531.17	FS1097.513	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	532	Maree Baker-Galloway	Bill & Jan Walker Family Trust c/- Duncan Fea (Trustee) and (Maree Baker Galloway/Warwick Goldsmith)	Anderson Lloyd	532.16		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		532.16	FS1071.74	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5.2	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		532.16	FS1322.20	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	534	Warwick Goldsmith	Wayne Evans, G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry	Anderson Lloyd	534.16		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		534.16	FS1322.56	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	535	Warwick Goldsmith	G W Stalker Family Trust, Mike Henry, Mark Tylden, Wayne French, Dave Finlin, Sam Strain	Anderson Lloyd	535.16		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1068	Keri & Roland Lemaire-Sicre			535.16	FS1068.16	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.5.2	1071	The Secretary	Lake Hayes Estate Community Association		535.16	FS1071.29	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5.2	1322	Jayne Macdonald	Juie Q.T. Limited		535.16	FS1322.93	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	537	Vanessa Robb	Slopehill Joint Venture	Anderson Lloyd	537.19		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1120	Michael Brial			537.19	FS1120.23	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5.2	1256	Warwick Goldsmith	Ashford Trust	Anderson Lloyd	537.19	FS1256.37	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1286	Mr M and Mrs J Henry		Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	537.19	FS1286.28	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	537.19	FS1292.23	Support	Reject		Issues 1, 2, 4 and all objectives and policies
6.3.5.2	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.46		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.46	FS1034.204	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	696	James Aoake	Millbrook Country Club Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	696.12		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1349	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust	MITCHELL PARTNERSHIPS LIMITED	696.12	FS1349.15	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.17		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		761.17	FS1015.130	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.2	805	Aileen Crow	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Beca Limited	805.45		Other	Accept in Part		Issue 3 and new policy within objective 6.3.1
6.3.5.2	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.79		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	356	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust Limited	C/- Mitchell Partnerships.co.nz	356.9		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		356.9	FS1097.210	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.32		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.5.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.32	FS1097.761	Support	Reject		Entire Report

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.5.3	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.22		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	513	Maree Baker-Galloway	Jenny Barb	Anderson Lloyd	513.20		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	513	Maree Baker-Galloway	Jenny Barb	Anderson Lloyd	513.21		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	513	Maree Baker-Galloway	Jenny Barb	Anderson Lloyd	513.22		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	515	Maree Baker-Galloway	Wakatipu Equities	Anderson Lloyd	515.18		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		515.18	FS1097.466	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	522	Vanessa Robb	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Anderson Lloyd	522.21		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	522.21	FS1292.70	Support	Reject		Issues 1, 2, 4 and all objectives and policies
6.3.5.3	522	Vanessa Robb	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Anderson Lloyd	522.22		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	522.22	FS1292.71	Support	Reject		Issues 1, 2, 4 and all objectives and policies
6.3.5.3	531	Maree Baker-Galloway	Crosshill Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	531.18		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	537	Vanessa Robb	Slopehill Joint Venture	Anderson Lloyd	537.20		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	1120	Michael Brial			537.20	FS1120.24	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5.3	1256	Warwick Goldsmith	Ashford Trust	Anderson Lloyd	537.20	FS1256.38	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	1286	Mr M and Mrs J Henry		Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	537.20	FS1286.29	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	537.20	FS1292.24	Support	Reject		Issues 1, 2, 4 and all objectives and policies
6.3.5.3	537	Vanessa Robb	Slopehill Joint Venture	Anderson Lloyd	537.21		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	1120	Michael Brial			537.21	FS1120.25	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.5.3	1256	Warwick Goldsmith	Ashford Trust	Anderson Lloyd	537.21	FS1256.39	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	1286	Mr M and Mrs J Henry		Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	537.21	FS1286.30	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	537.21	FS1292.25	Support	Reject		Issues 1, 2, 4 and all objectives and policies
6.3.5.3	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.47		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.3	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.47	FS1034.205	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.5.3	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.80		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.4	248	Scott Freeman	Shotover Trust	Southern Planning Group	248.16		Other	Reject		Policy 6.3.5.3, not 6.3.5.4 as submission requests. . Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.4	356	Louise Taylor	X-Ray Trust Limited	C/- Mitchell Partnerships.co.nz	356.10		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.4	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.33		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.5.4	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.33	FS1097.762	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.5.4	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.81		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.5	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.34		Oppose	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.5.5	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.34	FS1097.763	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.5.5	635	Joanne Dowd	Aurora Energy Limited	Delta Utility Services Limited	635.30		Other	Accept in Part		Policy 6.3.5.5
6.3.5.5	719	Tony MacColl	NZ Transport Agency		719.30		Support	Accept in Part		Policy 6.3.5.5
6.3.5.5	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.82		Support	Reject		Policy 6.3.5.5
6.3.5.5	836	Warwick Goldsmith	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Anderson Lloyd	836.18		Not Stated	Accept in Part		Policy 6.3.5.5
6.3.5.5	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		836.18	FS1097.725	Support	Accept in Part		Policy 6.3.5.5
6.3.5.6	248	Scott Freeman	Shotover Trust	Southern Planning Group	248.17		Other	Reject		Policy 6.3.5.3, not 6.3.5.4 as submission identifies. Entire report and in particular Objective 6.3.5
6.3.5.6	456	Amy Wilson-White	Hogans Gully Farming Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	456.23		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Policy 6.3.5.5 and 6.3.5.6

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.5.6	513	Maree Baker-Galloway	Jenny Barb	Anderson Lloyd	513.23		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Policy 6.3.5.5 and 6.3.5.6
6.3.5.6	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		513.23	FS1097.458	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Policy 6.3.5.5 and 6.3.5.6
6.3.5.6	515	Maree Baker-Galloway	Wakatipu Equities	Anderson Lloyd	515.19		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Policy 6.3.5.5 and 6.3.5.6
6.3.5.6	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		515.19	FS1097.467	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Policy 6.3.5.5 and 6.3.5.6
6.3.5.6	522	Vanessa Robb	Kristie Jean Brustad and Harry James Inch	Anderson Lloyd	522.23		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Policy 6.3.5.5 and 6.3.5.6
6.3.5.6	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	522.23	FS1292.72	Support	Reject		Issues 1, 2, 4 and all objectives and policies
6.3.5.6	531	Maree Baker-Galloway	Crosshill Farms Limited	Anderson Lloyd	531.19		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Policy 6.3.5.5 and 6.3.5.6
6.3.5.6	537	Vanessa Robb	Slopehill Joint Venture	Anderson Lloyd	537.22		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Policy 6.3.5.5 and 6.3.5.6
6.3.5.6	1120	Michael Brial			537.22	FS1120.26	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.5.6	1256	Warwick Goldsmith	Ashford Trust	Anderson Lloyd	537.22	FS1256.40	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Policy 6.3.5.5 and 6.3.5.6
6.3.5.6	1286	Mr M and Mrs J Henry		Vanessa Robb, Anderson Lloyd	537.22	FS1286.31	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Policy 6.3.5.5 and 6.3.5.6
6.3.5.6	1292	Roger and Carol Wilkinson		Maree Baker-Galloway, Anderson Lloyd	537.22	FS1292.26	Support	Reject		Issues 1, 2, 4 and all objectives and policies
6.3.5.6	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.48		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Policy 6.3.5.5 and 6.3.5.6
6.3.5.6	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.48	FS1034.206	Oppose	Reject		Entire report
6.3.5.6	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.83		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Policy 6.3.5.5 and 6.3.5.6
6.3.6 Objective 6	380	Charlotte Mill	Villa dellago		380.20		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6 Objective 6	580	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		580.6		Other	Reject		Issue 6 and Objective 6
6.3.6 Objective 6	1040	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird		580.6	FS1040.29	Oppose	Accept in Part		Issue 6 and Objective 6

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.6 Objective 6	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.36		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6 Objective 6	635	Joanne Dowd	Aurora Energy Limited	Delta Utility Services Limited	635.31		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6 Objective 6	755	Don Robertson	Guardians of Lake Wanaka	Department of Conservation	755.10		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6 Objective 6	766	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Wharves GP Limited		766.14		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6 Objective 6	1341	Ben Farrell	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds & Associates Ltd	766.14	FS1341.10	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6 Objective 6	768	Mark Laurenson	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	Burton Planning Consultants Limited	768.12		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6 Objective 6	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.84		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.1	110	Alan Cutler			110.15		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.1	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.37		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.1	635	Joanne Dowd	Aurora Energy Limited	Delta Utility Services Limited	635.32		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.1	755	Don Robertson	Guardians of Lake Wanaka	Department of Conservation	755.11		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.1	766	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Wharves GP Limited		766.15		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.1	1341	Ben Farrell	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds & Associates Ltd	766.15	FS1341.11	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.1	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.85		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.1	810	Tim Vial	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou and Hokonui Runanga collectively Manawhenua	KTKO Ltd	810.30		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6 and refer to the Tangata Whenua Chapter 5 Section 42a report
6.3.6.2	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.38		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.2	766	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Wharves GP Limited		766.16		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.6.2	1341	Ben Farrell	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds & Associates Ltd	766.16	FS1341.17	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.2	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.86		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.3	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.39		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.3	766	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Wharves GP Limited		766.17		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.3	1341	Ben Farrell	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds & Associates Ltd	766.17	FS1341.16	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.6.3	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.87		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 6
6.3.7Objective 7	373	Geoff Deavoll	Department of Conservation		373.12		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	373.12	FS1287.4	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	1347	Tim Burdon	Lakes Land Care		373.12	FS1347.29	Oppose		Deferred to Hearing Stream 3 Rural	
6.3.7Objective 7	378	Kirsty O'Sullivan	Peninsula Village Limited and Wanaka Bay Limited (collectively referred to as "Peninsula Bay Joint Venture" (PBJV))	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	378.22		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	1049	Campbell Hodgson	LAC Property Trustees Limited	Galloway Cook Allan	378.22	FS1049.22	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	1095	Campbell Hodgson	Nick Brasington	Galloway Cook Allan	378.22	FS1095.22	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.7Objective 7	1282	Scott Edgar	Longview Environmental Trust	Southern Land Ltd	378.22	FS1282.40	Oppose	Accept		Entire Report
6.3.7Objective 7	380	Charlotte Mill	Villa dellago		380.21		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.30		Other	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.30	FS1015.66	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.30	FS1356.30	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.36		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.7Objective 7	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.36	FS1287.64	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.50		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		608.50	FS1015.103	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.50	FS1034.208	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		608.50	FS1097.580	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		608.50	FS1117.247	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	761	Chris Ferguson	ORFEL Ltd	Boffa Miskell Ltd	761.18		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		761.18	FS1015.131	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	768	Mark Laurenson	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	Burton Planning Consultants Limited	768.13		Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7Objective 7	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.88		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.1	117	Maggie Lawton			117.16		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.1	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.31		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.1	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.31	FS1015.67	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.1	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.31	FS1356.31	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		519.31	FS1097.488	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.1	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.37		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.1	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.37	FS1287.65	Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.2	519	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	519.32		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.7.2	1015	Bernie Napp	Straterra		519.32	FS1015.68	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.2	1356	Graeme Todd	Cabo Limited	GTodd Law	519.32	FS1356.32	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		519.32	FS1097.489	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.2	598	Bernie Napp	Straterra		598.38		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.2	1287	Maree Baker-Galloway	New Zealand Tungsten Mining Limited	Anderson Lloyd	598.38	FS1287.66	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.2	600	David Cooper	Federated Farmers of New Zealand		600.54		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.2	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		600.54	FS1034.54	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.2	1209	Richard Burdon			600.54	FS1209.54	Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.7.2	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.89		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 7
6.3.8 Objective 8	255	Noel Beggs	N.W. & C.E. BEGGS		255.5		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8 Objective 8	285	Debbie MacColl			285.13		Support	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8 Objective 8	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		285.13	FS1097.128	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8 Objective 8	380	Charlotte Mill	Villa dellago		380.22		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8 Objective 8	437	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Company Ltd	437.35		Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.8 Objective 8	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		437.35	FS1097.764	Support	Reject		Entire Report
6.3.8 Objective 8	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.51		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8 Objective 8	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.51	FS1034.209	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8 Objective 8	610	Chris Ferguson	Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek No. 1 LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	610.1		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8 Objective 8	613	Chris Ferguson	Treble Cone Investments Limited.	Boffa Miskell	613.1		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 8

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.8 Objective 8	768	Mark Laurenson	Z Energy Ltd, BP Oil NZ Ltd and Mobil Oil NZ Ltd	Burton Planning Consultants Limited	768.14		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8 Objective 8	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.90		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8 Objective 8	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.91		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.1	610	Chris Ferguson	Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek No. 1 LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	610.2		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.1	613	Chris Ferguson	Treble Cone Investments Limited.	Boffa Miskell	613.2		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.1	677	James Aoake	Amrta Land Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	677.6		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.1	1035	Mark Crook			677.6	FS1035.6	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.8.1	1074	Alistair Angus			677.6	FS1074.6	Support		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.8.1	1312	AG Angus			677.6	FS1312.6	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.8.1	1364	John and Kay Richards			677.6	FS1364.6	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.8.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		677.6	FS1097.656	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.1	1117	Jenny Carter	Remarkables Park Limited		677.6	FS1117.270	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.1	696	James Aoake	Millbrook Country Club Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	696.13		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		696.13	FS1097.661	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.2	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.52		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.2	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.52	FS1034.210	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.2	610	Chris Ferguson	Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek No. 1 LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	610.3		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		610.3	FS1097.581	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.8.2	613	Chris Ferguson	Treble Cone Investments Limited.	Boffa Miskell	613.3		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		613.3	FS1097.589	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.2	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.40		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		621.40	FS1097.607	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.2	677	James Aoake	Amrta Land Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	677.7		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.2	1035	Mark Crook			677.7	FS1035.7	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.8.2	1074	Alistair Angus			677.7	FS1074.7	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.8.2	1312	AG Angus			677.7	FS1312.7	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.8.2	1364	John and Kay Richards			677.7	FS1364.7	Oppose		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.3.8.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		677.7	FS1097.657	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.2	696	James Aoake	Millbrook Country Club Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	696.14		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.2	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		696.14	FS1097.662	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.2	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.92		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.2	810	Tim Vial	Te Runanga o Moeraki, Kati Huirapa Runaka ki Puketeraki, Te Runanga o Otakou and Hokonui Runanga collectively Manawhenua	KTKO Ltd	810.31		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8 and refer to the Tangata Whenua Chapter 5 Section 42a report
6.3.8.3	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.53		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.3	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.53	FS1034.211	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.3	610	Chris Ferguson	Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek No. 1 LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	610.4		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.3	613	Chris Ferguson	Treble Cone Investments Limited.	Boffa Miskell	613.4		Not Stated	Accept		Entire report and in particular Objective 8

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.3.8.3	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.93		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.3.8.3	1229	Scott Dent	NXski Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	806.93	FS1229.31	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular Objective 8
6.4 Rules	168	Garry Strange			168.3		Other		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.4 Rules	300	Rob Jewell			300.3		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4 Rules	625	John Wellington	Upper Clutha Track Trust		625.12		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4 Rules	1347	Tim Burdon	Lakes Land Care		625.12	FS1347.92	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4 Rules	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		625.12	FS1097.629	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1 Application of the landscape provisions	110	Alan Cutler			110.16		Other	Reject		6.4 and rules in the Rural zone and definition for building and QLDC practice note on irrigators. http://www.qldc.govt.nz/planning/resource_concepts/practice_notes/
6.4.1 Application of the landscape provisions	671	Mandy Kennedy	Queenstown Trails Trust		671.2		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1 Application of the landscape provisions	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		671.2	FS1097.649	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.1	251	Megan Justice	PowerNet Limited	C/- Mitchell Partnerships Limited	251.6		Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.1	1092	Tony MacColl	NZ Transport Agency		251.6	FS1092.6	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.1	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		251.6	FS1097.93	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.2	443	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	443.8		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.2	452	Amy Wilson-White	Trojan Helmet Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	452.8		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.2	669	C & M Burgess	Cook Adam Trustees Limited, C & M Burgess	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	669.9		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.2	694	James Aoake	Glentui Heights Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	694.21		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.4.1.2	696	James Aoake	Millbrook Country Club Ltd	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	696.15		Not Stated	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.2	712	James Aoake	Bobs Cove Developments Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	712.11		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.2	836	Warwick Goldsmith	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Anderson Lloyd	836.19		Not Stated	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.2	1085	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		836.19	FS1085.6	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.3	407	Amy Wilson-White	Mount Cardrona Station Limited	Brown & Company Planning Group Ltd	407.4		Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		407.4	FS1097.265	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.3	580	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		580.4		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular Issue 6 and 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.3	1040	Sue Maturin	Forest and Bird		580.4	FS1040.28	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular Issue 6 and 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.3	608	Chris Ferguson	Darby Planning LP	Boffa Miskell Ltd	608.54		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.3	1085	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		608.54	FS1085.5	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.3	1034	Julian Haworth	Upper Clutha Environmental Society (Inc.)		608.54	FS1034.212	Oppose	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.3	631	Shelley Chadwick	Cassidy Trust	Webb Farry Lawyers	631.3		Support	Accept		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.3	671	Mandy Kennedy	Queenstown Trails Trust		671.3		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.3	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.94		Other		Deferred to the hearing on mapping	
6.4.1.3	836	Warwick Goldsmith	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Anderson Lloyd	836.20		Not Stated	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.3	836	Warwick Goldsmith	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Anderson Lloyd	836.21		Not Stated	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.3	1229	Scott Dent	NXski Limited	C/- Southern Planning Group	836.21	FS1229.33	Support	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.3	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		836.21	FS1097.726	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules

Chapter6 - Landscape

Lowest Clause	Submitter	Name	Organisation	Agent	Original Point No	Further Submission No	Submitter Position	Planner Recommendation	Deferred or Rejected	Issue Reference
6.4.1.4	621	James Aoake	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds + Associates Ltd	621.41		Not Stated	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.4	755	Don Robertson	Guardians of Lake Wanaka	Department of Conservation	755.12		Other	Reject		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.4	806	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		806.95		Other		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
6.4.1.4	1085	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		806.95	FS1085.8	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
6.4.1.4	1341	Ben Farrell	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds & Associates Ltd	806.95	FS1341.18	Support		Deferred to the landscape line location hearing	
6.4.1.4	836	Warwick Goldsmith	Arcadian Triangle Limited	Anderson Lloyd	836.22		Not Stated	Accept		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.4	1085	Daniel Druce	Contact Energy Limited		836.22	FS1085.7	Oppose	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.4	1341	Ben Farrell	Real Journeys Limited	John Edmonds & Associates Ltd	836.22	FS1341.30	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.4	1342	Ben Farrell	Te Anau Developments Limited	John Edmonds & Associates Ltd	836.22	FS1342.20	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules
6.4.1.4	1097	Jenny Carter	Queenstown Park Limited		836.22	FS1097.727	Support	Accept in Part		Entire report and in particular 6.4 - Rules

Appendix 3. Section 32 Report/link to s32 report



Section 32 Evaluation Report

Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone

Contents

Section 32 Evaluation Report: Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone	2
1. Purpose of the report	2
2. Statutory Context	2
3. Iwi Management Plans	5
4. Regional Planning Documents	7
5. Resource Management Issues	10
6. Purpose and Options	22
7. Scale and Significance Evaluation	36
8. Evaluation of proposed Objectives Section 32 (1) (a)	36
9. Evaluation of the proposed provisions Section 32 (1) (b).....	61
10. Efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions	89
11. The risk of not acting	89
References	89

Section 32 Evaluation Report: Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone

1. Purpose of the report

Section 32 of the *Resource Management Act 1991* (the Act) requires objectives in plan change proposals to be examined for their appropriateness in achieving the purpose of the Act, and the policies and methods of those proposals to be examined for their efficiency, effectiveness and risk in achieving the objectives (MFE, 2014).

Accordingly, this report provides an analysis of the key issues, objectives and policy response to be incorporated within the Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone chapters of the Proposed District Plan.

As required by section 32 of the RMA, this report provides the following:

- An overview of the applicable **Statutory Policy Context**.
- Description of the **Non-Statutory Context** (strategies, studies and community plans) which have informed proposed provisions.
- Description of the **Resource Management Issues** which provide the driver for proposed provisions
- An **Evaluation** against Section 32(1)(a) and Section 32(1)(b) of the Act, that is:
 - Whether the objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the RMA's purpose (s32(1)(a)).
 - Whether the provisions (policies and methods) are the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives (S32(1)(b)), including:
 - identifying other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives,
 - assessing the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving the objectives, and
 - summarising the reasons for deciding on the provisions.
- A **level of detail** that corresponds to the scale and significance of the environmental, economic, social and cultural effects that are anticipated from the implementation of the proposal (s32(1)(c)).
- Consideration of **Risk**.

2. Statutory Context

Resource Management Act 1991

The purpose of the Act requires an integrated planning approach and direction, as reflected below:

5 Purpose

- (1) *The purpose of this Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources.*
- (2) *In this Act, sustainable management means managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural well-being and for their health and safety while—*
 - (a) *sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and*
 - (b) *safeguarding the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil, and ecosystems; and*
 - (c) *avoiding, remedying, or mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.*

The assessment contained within this report considers the proposed provisions in the context of advancing the purpose of the Act to achieve the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The

District's landscapes and natural environment are highly recognised and valued. The Council's Economic Development Strategy 2015 states:

'The outstanding scenery makes the District a highly sought after location as a place to live and visit.' And, 'The environment is revered nationally and internationally and is considered by residents as the area's single biggest asset.'

The Queenstown Lakes District is one of the fastest growing areas in New Zealand and the recent estimates (refer to more detail in the Strategic Directions Section 32 report) predict that the District will continue to experience significant population growth over the coming years, largely off the back of strong forecasted growth in visitors. A strategic policy approach is essential to manage future growth pressures in a logical and coordinated manner to promote the sustainable management of the valued landscape, nature conservation, productive land and infrastructure resources within the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone.

Section 31 of the Act outlines the function of a territorial authority in giving effect to the purpose of the Act:

31 Functions of territorial authorities under this Act

(1) Every territorial authority shall have the following functions for the purpose of giving effect to this Act in its district:

(a) the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district

Section 31 provides the basis for objectives, policies, and methods within a District Plan, to manage the effects of use, development or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district.

Consistent with the intent of Section 31, the proposed provisions of the Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone Chapters enable an integrated approach to the management of the multiple resources within the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone.

Section 6 Matters of National Importance is of direct relevance to the Rural and Landscape chapters.

6 Matters of National Importance

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:

- (a) the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
- (b) the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
- (c) the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna:*
- (d) the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers:*
- (e) the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga:*
- (f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
- (g) the protection of protected customary rights*

Section 7 Other matters also includes a number of matters directly relevant to these chapters.

7 Other matters

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall have particular regard to—

- (a) kaitiakitanga:*
- (aa) the ethic of stewardship:*
- (b) the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources:*
- (ba) the efficiency of the end use of energy:*
- (c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values:*
- (d) intrinsic values of ecosystems:*
- (e) [Repealed]*
- (f) maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment:*
- (g) any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources:*
- (h) the protection of the habitat of trout and salmon:*
- (i) the effects of climate change:*
- (j) the benefits to be derived from the use and development of renewable energy.*

In particular, Section 7(b) requires regard is had to the efficient use and development of natural and physical resources. The Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone contain land utilised for primary production purposes.

Local Government Act 2002

Section 14 - Principles relating to local authorities

Sections 14(c), (g) and (h) of the Local Government Act 2002 are also of relevance in terms of policy development and decision making:

- (c) when making a decision, a local authority should take account of—*
 - (i) the diversity of the community, and the community's interests, within its district or region; and*
 - (ii) the interests of future as well as current communities; and*
 - (iii) the likely impact of any decision on the interests referred to in subparagraphs (i) and (ii):*
- (g) a local authority should ensure prudent stewardship and the efficient and effective use of its resources in the interests of its district or region, including by planning effectively for the future management of its assets; and*
- (h) in taking a sustainable development approach, a local authority should take into account—*
 - (i) the social, economic, and cultural interests of people and communities; and*
 - (ii) the need to maintain and enhance the quality of the environment; and*
 - (iii) the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations*

As per Part II of the RMA, the provisions emphasise a strong intergenerational approach, considering not only current environments, communities and residents but also those of the future. They demand a future focussed policy approach, balanced with considering current needs and interests. Like the RMA, the provisions also emphasise the need to take into account social, economic and cultural matters in addition to environmental ones.

Section 14(g) is of relevance in so far as a planning approach emphasises that the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone comprises the majority of the District's valued landscapes, surface of waterbodies, indigenous biodiversity and rural productive land resources.

Having regard to these provisions, the planning approach is to not interpret these provisions through a single lens, but to manage the resource for the benefit of the District and wider region. The approach through this review is to provide a balanced framework in the District Plan to manage these resources appropriately. Furthermore, there is an emphasis on presenting the provisions in a manner that is clearly interpreted to facilitate effective and efficient District Plan administration.

3. Iwi Management Plans

When preparing or changing a district plan, Section 74(2A)(a) of the RMA states that Council's must take into account any relevant planning document recognised by an iwi authority and lodged with the territorial authority, to the extent that its content has a bearing on the resource management issues of the district.

The following iwi management plans are relevant:

The Cry of the People, Te Tangi a Taurira: Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan 2008 (MNRMP 2008)

Section 3.4, Takitimu Me Ona Uri: High Country and Foothills contain the following policies that have specific regard to subdivision and development:

3.4.2 High Country Pastoral Farming

Policy 1. Encourage sustainable pastoral farm land management practice whereby impacts on soil, vegetation and water quality are minimised.

3.4.8 Access and Tourism

Policy 2. Development that includes building activity should consider specific landscape and geographical features and the significance of these to Ngāi Tahu Whānui. Activity whereby buildings will protrude above ridgelines or displace site of cultural significance should be avoided.

Part 3.5.10: General Water Policy: includes,

Policies:

3. Protect and enhance the mauri, or life supporting capacity, of freshwater resources throughout Murihiku.

4. Manage our freshwater resources wisely, mō tātou, ā, mō ngā uri ā muri ake nei, for all of us and the generations that follow.

5. Promote the management of freshwater according to the principle of ki uta ki tai, and thus the flow of water from source to sea.

6. Promote catchment management planning (ki uta ki tai), as a means to recognise and provide for the relationship between land and water.

16. Prioritise the restoration of those waterbodies of high cultural value, both in terms of ecological restoration and in terms of restoring cultural landscapes.

17. Ensure that activities in upper catchments have no adverse effect on mahinga kai, water quality and water quantity in lower catchments.

Part 3.5.19: Riparian Zones, includes the following policies:

Policy 6. Avoid stock access to riparian zones and streambeds, except when required for intermittent vegetation control.

Policy 7. Encourage fencing of streams to protect riparian vegetation, and promote healthy riparian establishment.

3.4.14 Protecting Sites of Significance in High Country and Foothill Areas

Policy 6. Avoid compromising unidentified, or unknown, sites of cultural significance as a consequence of ground disturbance associated with land use, subdivision and development.

Section 3.5, Southland Plains: Te Rā a Takitimu contains the following policies that have specific regard to subdivision and development:

3.5.2 Wastewater

9. Encourage creative, innovative and sustainable approaches to wastewater disposal that make use of the best technology available, and that adopt principles of waste reduction and cleaner production (e.g. recycling grey water for use on gardens, collecting stormwater for a pond that can then be used for recreation in a new subdivision).

3.5.7 Subdivision and Development

Policies 1- 18 of the MNRMP contain a range of policies that are relevant to Subdivision and Development, and cover iwi involvement in planning processing and plan development, and interaction with developers and iwi, particularly where there may be significant effects, long term planning and cumulative effects, avoiding adverse effects on the natural environment and advocating for the use of esplanades reserves.

Kāi Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan 2005 (KTKO NRMP 2005)

Part 10: Clutha/Mata-au Catchments *Te Riu o Mata-au* outlines the issues, and policies for the Clutha/Mata-au Catchments. Included in this chapter is a description of some of the Kāi Tahu ki Otago values associated with the Clutha/Mata-au Catchments. Generic issues, objectives and policies for all catchments across the Otago Region are recorded in Chapter 5 Otago Region.

The following policies are of particular relevance;

5.3.4: Bank Erosion:

Policy 43. To discourage activities on riverbanks that have the potential to cause or increase bank erosion.

Policy 44. To encourage the planting of indigenous vegetation from the local environs to help reduce continual erosion of the edge of rivers.

5.3.4: Land Use and management

Policy 54. To promote land use that suits the type of land and climatic conditions.

Policy 55. To encourage the exclusion of stock from waterways.

Policy 56. To oppose the draining of wetlands. All wetlands are to be protected.

Policy 57. To require a programme to monitor the effect of stock and agricultural activity on groundwater quality be established.

Policy 58. To promote integrated riparian management throughout entire catchments.

Policy 59. To oppose the indiscriminate use of chemicals or poisons in or near waterways.

5.6.4 Cultural Landscapes General Policies

Subdivisions:

1. *To discourage subdivisions and buildings in culturally significant and highly visible landscapes.*
2. *To encourage a holistic planning approach to subdivisions between the Local Government Agencies that takes into account the following:*
 - i. *All consents related to the subdivision to be sought at the same time.*
 - ii. *Protection of Kāi Tahu ki Otago cultural values.*
 - iii. *Visual amenity.*
 - iv. *Water requirements.*
 - v. *Wastewater and storm water treatment and disposal.*
 - vi. *Landscaping.*
 - vii. *Location of building platforms.*
3. *To require that where any earthworks are proposed as part of a subdivision activity, an accidental discovery protocol is to be signed between the affected papatipu Rūnaka and the Company .*
4. *To require applicants, prior to applying for subdivision consents, to contact Kāi Tahu ki Otago to determine the proximity of the proposed subdivision to sites of significance identified in the resource inventory.*
5. *To require public foot access along lakeshores and riverbanks within subdivisions.*

Land Use 10.2.3 Wai Māori Policies in the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment

9. *To encourage the adoption of sound environmental practices, adopted where land use intensification occurs.*
10. *To promote sustainable land use in the Clutha/Mata-au Catchment.*
11. *To encourage all consents related to subdivision and lifestyle blocks are applied for at the same time including, land use consents, water consents, and discharge consents.*

4. Regional Planning Documents

Operative Regional Policy Statement 1998

Section 74 of the Act requires that a district plan prepared by a territorial authority must “give effect to” any operative Regional Policy Statement. The operative *Otago Regional Policy Statement 1998* is the relevant regional policy statement to be given effect to within the District Plan.

The operative RPS contains a number of objectives and policies of relevance to this plan change, specifically Objectives 5.4.1 to 5.4.4 (Land) and related policies which, in broad terms promote the sustainable management of Otago’s land resource by:

- Maintaining and enhancing the primary productive capacity and life supporting capacity of land resources;
- Avoid, remedy or mitigate degradation of Otago’s natural and physical resources resulting from activities utilising the land resource;
- Protect outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.

Objective 9.4.3 (Built Environment) and related policies are relevant and seek to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of Otago's built environment on Otago's natural and physical resources, and promote the sustainable management of infrastructure.

These objectives and policies highlight the importance of the rural resource both in terms of the productive resources of the rural area and the protection of the District's outstanding natural features and landscapes.

Proposed Regional Policy Statement 2015

Section 74 of the Act requires that a District Plan must "have regard to" any proposed regional policy statement.

The Proposed RPS was notified for public submissions on 23 May 2015, and contains the following objectives and policies relevant to landscape, Rural Zone and the Gibbston Character Zone:

Proposed RPS 2015 Objective	Objectives	Policies	Relevance to the review of the Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone chapters
The principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi are taken into account in resource management decision.	1.1	1.1.1, 1.1.2	Statutory Acknowledgement Areas in the Queenstown Lakes District associated with the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 are located within the Rural Zone. In addition, the lakes and rivers and majority of indigenous vegetation is contained within the Rural Zone. Refer to the respective Section 32 reports for these.
Kai Tahu values, rights and customary resources are sustained	1.2	21.2.1, 1.2.2, 1.2.3	The Landscape, Rural and Gibbston Character Zone chapters manage land that is of interest and value in terms of culture and practices, ancestral lands, water, site, wahi tapu and other taoka.
The values of Otago's natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced	2.1	2.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.1.5, 2.1.6, 2.1.7	Without falling out of scope or unnecessarily duplicating functions, the integrated management of resources includes the management of activities with regard to freshwater values, margins of water bodies, soil values, ecosystem and biodiversity values, recognising values of natural features and landscapes.
Otago's significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced	2.2	2.2.1, 2.2.2, 2.2.3, 2.2.4, 2.2.5, 2.2.6, 2.2.14, 2.2.15, Schedule 4, Schedule 5	The Rural Zone contains the majority of the District's land that contains significant natural areas, outstanding natural features and landscapes, special amenity landscapes and the soil resource for the productive use of land.
Natural resource systems and their	2.3	2.3.1, 2.3.2	Applying an integrated approach to the management of Otago's physical resources to

interdependencies are recognised.			achieve sustainable management. To ensure that effects of activities on the whole of a resource are considered when that resource is managed by sub-units.
Protection, use and development of natural and physical resources recognises environmental constraints.	3.1	3.1.1	The Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone contain areas of varying sensitivity that may create opportunities or constraints for activities seeking to utilise the respective resource.
Risk that natural hazards pose to the communities are minimised.	3.2	3.2.1, 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6, 3.2.7, 3.2.8, 3.2.9, 3.2.10, 3.2.11	The Rural Zone and Gibbston Zone contain land that is subject to natural hazards. Many non-farming activities including residential activity require resource consent as a discretionary activity and this provides the Council with the opportunity to assess the risk of natural hazards to development proposals.
Good quality infrastructure and services meet community needs. Infrastructure of national and regional significance is managed in a sustainable way. Energy supplies to Otago's communities are secure and sustainable.	3.4 and 3.5	3.4.1, 3.4.2, 3.4.3, 3.4.4, 3.5.1, 3.5.2, 3.5.3,	While much of the Districts infrastructure is located within urban areas. Roads, Airports, and utilities pass through or affect the development potential of the Rural Zone and Gibbston Zone. Also, often the resource is located within the Rural areas. The creation and maintenance of these need to be managed to be protected and to avoid impacts on users and receivers.
Energy Supplies to Otago's communities are secure and sustainable	3.6	3.6.1, 3.6.2, 3.6.3, 3.6.4, 3.6.5, 3.6.6	Much of the District's energy supplies are located within the Rural Zone, noting the Hydro Generation zone is not in the scope of stage 1 of review.
Urban growth is well designed and integrates effectively with adjoining urban and rural environments.	3.8	3.8.1, 3.8.2, 3.8.3	The maintenance of rural landscape values and retention of soil resource is co-dependant on the strategic planning of urban areas and the certainty provided by the identification of urban growth boundaries.
Public access to areas of value to the community is maintained or enhanced.	4.1	4.1.1	Public trails are contained within the rural zone. Public access is often raised as an issue that presents both opportunities and constraints for development proposals and the maintenance of productive activities.
Sufficient land is managed and protected for economic production.	4.3	4.3.1, 4.3.2, 4.3.6	Notwithstanding the value of the landscape and recreational resources to the District, The rural economy is an important component and the protection of the soil resource is recognised. The retention of productive farms can also

			assist with the maintenance of large landholdings that contribute to the predominance of open spaces and low intensity of housing and subdivision of land for rural lifestyle purposes.
Otago's communities can make the most of the natural and built resources available for use.	4.4	4.4.3	Both permitted farming and viticulture and horticulture activities, in addition to other development proposals that seek to locate in the rural areas can degrade ecosystem health and recognition for opportunities to enhance existing areas.
Adverse effects of using and enjoying Otago's natural and built environment are minimised	4.5	4.5.1, 4.5.4, 4.5.5, 4.5.6, 4.5.7, 4.5.8	People are drawn to the rural areas for a wide range of farming and entrepreneurial opportunities and recreational activities. How these activities are managed will impact the communities' experience of the resource.

The evaluation and provisions have regard to the Proposed RPS. In particular, there are consistencies in the application of the Proposed RPS Schedule 4 '*Criteria for the identification of outstanding natural features and landscapes*' and the proposed District Plan assessment matters in outstanding natural landscapes and features, for guiding decision makers when considering proposals for activities within identified outstanding natural landscapes and features.

5. Resource Management Issues

This review seeks to address a number of key issues (detailed below), whilst also strengthening the existing provisions by providing more targeted objectives and policies, making the Plan easier to understand and improving certainty to what activities are permitted in the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character zones and whether they require a resource consent.

The resource management issues set out in this section have been identified from the following sources:

- Wanaka Land Demands – Review of the Wanaka Structure Plan (2007)
- Plan Change 05b – Glenorchy Township Zone Boundary 'The Bible Terrace'
- Plan Change 07 – Residential Flats
- Plan Change 09 – Farm Buildings on Outstanding Natural Features
- Plan Change 13 – Kioromoko
- Plan Change 14 – Makarora Rural Lifestyle Zone
- Plan Change 18 – Mt Cardrona
- Plan Change 20 – Wanaka Urban Boundary
- Plan Change 21 – Queenstown Urban Boundary
- Plan Change 24 – Community and Affordable Housing
- Plan Change 28 – Trails
- Plan Change 33 – Non-Residential Activities in the Residential, Rural Living and Township Zones
- Plan Change 48 – Signs
- Plan Change 49 – Earthworks
- Hawea Community Plan 2003
- Luggate Community Plan 2003
- Makarora Community Plan 2003
- Tomorrow's Queenstown

- Wanaka 2020
- Rural General Zone Monitoring Report 2009
- Rural Living Zones Monitoring report 2009
- Informal Airports Research Report 2012
- QLDC Liquefaction Hazard 2013, prepared by Tonkin and Taylor Limited
- Otago regional Council Natural hazard reports
- 'When is enough, enough? Dealing with cumulative effects under the Resource Management Act. A paper by Philip Milne for Horizons Regional Council. 2008
- Read Landscapes Limited 'Report to Queenstown Lakes District Council on appropriate landscape classification boundaries within the District, with particular reference to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features' 2014.
 - Peer review on the Wakatipu component by Ben Espie landscape planner
 - Peer review on the Wanaka/Upper Clutha component by Anne Steven landscape architect
- Read Landscapes Limited 'Wakatipu Basin Residential Subdivision and Development: Landscape Character Assessment' 2014.
- 'High Level Review of Proposed District Plan Provisions – Landscape Issues' Ben Espie Landscape Planner. 20 November 2014.
- National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011.
- Ministry for the Environment. 2011. *National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011: Implementation Guide*. Wellington: Ministry for the Environment.
- National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management 2014
- Otago Regional Council Regional Policy Statement 1998
- Kai Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan, 2005
- Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan 2008
- Dairy NZ. Sustainable Dairying Water Accord.
- Relevant legislative changes enacted since the Plan became operative

Consultation

Consultation on the District Plan Review and management of the rural zones was initiated in 2010 and included the following:

- Rural Discussion Document and Brochure in 2010, with feedback invited via the Council's website
- A series of articles in the Otago Daily Times titled 'Our Rural Future' in 2010, with opinion pieces from Anne Steven (Landscape Architect), Clive Geddes (Former Mayor), Council staff, Julian Haworth (Upper Clutha Environmental Society), Peter Constantine (Planner) and Richard Burdon (Farmer).
- Meeting with Federated Farmers and farmers at Mt Burke 11 May 2010
- Meeting with Department of Conservation 28 November 2011
- Meeting with Upper Clutha Environmental Society (UCES) 28 November 2011
- Meeting with the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust 10 January 2012
- Meeting with the NZTA 24 May 2012
- Meeting with NZIA and NZILA 30 April 2012
- Meeting with planning commissioners 11 October 2012
- Stall and posters at the Lake Hayes and Wanaka A & P Shows 2012
- Meeting of the Council's Resource Management Focus Group 2014 and 2015
- January 9 – February 10 2015 Draft provisions and Section 32 reports placed on the Council's website and circulated to persons on the Council's District Plan Review distribution list, persons with an interest in the changes and statutory consultation parties required by the RMA
- Written feedback from in the order of 40 persons/groups
- Meeting with Federated Farmers 16 February 2015

- Attended and spoke at the Hawea Community Association Meeting 10 January 2015 at Lake Hawea.
- Invited to meeting with Farmers 10 February 2015 at Wanaka, all from Upper Clutha area except Mark Hasselman from Glenorchy.

The key issues are:

Issue 1: The management of the District's landscapes

Introduction

The District's landscapes are of significant value to the people who live, work or visit the District, and need to be protected from inappropriate subdivision, development and use.

The existing provisions have been operative in the order of ten years. A number of plan changes have resolved issues that have arisen, whilst monitoring reports and decisions on resource consents have identified issues associated with the existing provisions.

The planning rules for managing subdivision and development in the Rural General Zone are unique compared to many other parts of rural New Zealand in that there is no minimum allotment size for landholdings in the Rural General Zone. What this does is prevent any 'development right' for residential subdivision and development, associated with a minimum landholding area, but requires proposals for subdivision and development to prove that the development would be appropriate in terms of effects on the landscape.

Whilst the existing provisions place emphasis on whether a proposal will be appropriate in terms of adverse effects on the landscape resource, on the other hand, the absence of a minimum allotment size (along with associated plan provisions) does not establish an easily measurable baseline on the potential limit of the capacity of the landscape to absorb development.

When subdivision and development are proposed, the existing provisions require an appraisal of the development site to determine whether the landscape values are one of an 'outstanding natural feature', 'outstanding natural landscape', 'visual amenity landscape' or, 'other rural landscape'. On this basis an assessment of the proposal is undertaken against a prescribed suite of 'assessment criteria'. All such activities generally fall into the class of a 'discretionary' resource consent, which, in broad terms means that the Council can assess any matters relevant to the application, and can decline applications.

The Council's Rural Monitoring Report 2009, examined the effectiveness of the existing operative provisions and reflected on the amount of residential subdivision and development that had been consented in the Rural General Zone.

The Monitoring Report had a particular focus on subdivision and development in the Wakatipu Basin, an area which has received a relatively high number of resource consent applications and approvals for subdivision and development. The Wakatipu Basin has also been subject to private plan changes to create rural lifestyle living and resort activities and accommodation.

A key theme of the Rural Monitoring Report 2009 was whether the existing provisions were effectively managing cumulative effects of residential subdivision and development. The Monitoring Report identified that the cumulative effects of development pressure within the Wakatipu Basin were not being effectively managed. The report identified a lack of connection between the objectives and policies of the landscape categories identified within the Plan and the assessment matters. The report suggested that these could more explicitly outline the desired landscape outcome, particularly for the areas subject to the 'Visual Amenity Landscapes category' assessment criteria.

Wakatipu Basin

Other work associated with this review focusing on the Wakatipu Basin is a study by Read Landscapes Limited, titled 'Wakatipu Basin Residential Subdivision and Development: Landscape Character Assessment 2014'. The Read Landscapes study examined the landscape of the Wakatipu Basin and made recommendations on the options of future management of subdivision and development. This study includes consideration of the benefits of changing the planning rules to require a minimum allotment size in the Wakatipu Basin, and areas within the Wakatipu Basin where the landscape has capacity for additional subdivision and development or has reached a threshold. The report also provided a critique of the existing assessment criteria provisions.

The findings of the Read Landscapes study suggested that the existing 'discretionary regime' is the best way to manage subdivision and development in the Wakatipu Basin, and the existing assessment criteria should be clarified, with the inclusion of performance standards to help assess the merits of subdivision and development.

The Read Landscapes study also concluded that the most appropriate way to encourage development to locate where it is appropriate from a landscape perspective is to rezone those locations to Rural Lifestyle, an existing zone already established in parts of the Wakatipu Basin. The Rural Lifestyle zone requires a site size of not less than one hectare with an average site size of two hectares over the area to be subdivided.

Proposed rezoning of identified areas of the Rural General zone in the Wakatipu Basin to Rural Lifestyle Zone

The Read Landscapes report identified the following locations as being capable of supporting rural lifestyle subdivision and development without substantial impact on the Wakatipu Basin's landscape values:

- The 'Hawthorn Triangle' area
- The Fitzpatrick Basin
- Mooney Road area
- Alec Robins Road area
- An extension to the existing Rural Lifestyle zone at the Dalefield Road area

The reasons these areas are suitable for Rural Lifestyle zoning are set out in the Read Landscapes Limited report¹. It is noted these areas have been considered in a landscape management perspective on the wider Wakatipu Basin.

These areas have either had a degree of subdivision and development occurred, or has capacity for residential subdivision at the density provided in the Rural Lifestyle Zone. In the case of these areas, establishing a density baseline of 2ha average, with lots up to 1ha protects these areas from higher intensity subdivision and development.

District Wide Rural General Zone

A deficiency with the existing 'Visual Amenity Landscape' landscape provisions is that they anticipate the maintenance, if not the creation of, a specific type of landscape, being 'arcadian' or 'pastoral in the poetic sense'. However, much of the land subject to the provisions has a different landscape character.

Parts of the District's rural areas within the existing 'visual amenity landscape' comprise a rural working landscape, characterised by relatively large paddocks and an absence of domestic buildings and associated activities and curtilage that can reduce the open character characterised by pastoral farming. In areas, the predominant introduced vegetation patterns are for sheltering stock and paddocks, rather than creating amenity and shelter associated with housing. The landscape character of these areas, and the management

¹ Read Landscapes Limited 'Wakatipu Basin Residential Subdivision and Development: Landscape Character Assessment' 2014.

of them with regard to subdivision and development do not benefit from the existing visual amenity landscape provisions.

Generally, the assessment criteria are regarded as complex and repetitive, particularly with regard to the matters relating to cumulative effects. In particular, the Visual Amenity Landscape criteria have a focus on maintaining and enhancing 'arcadian' and 'pastoral in the poetic sense'² landscape values. While these attributes may be present in some areas of the Wakatipu Basin, they do not represent the landscape character of the other areas, yet must be applied to large parts of the District when assessing resource consent application for subdivision and development. Many areas are classified as a visual amenity landscape by default because they do not have the attributes of an ONF or ONL (District Wide or Wakatipu Basin). This further highlights the potential unsuitability of the visual amenity landscape.

Although the process for assessing proposals is strict, this matter may be a reason why there have been a relatively high number of residential building platforms approved in the Wakatipu and Wanaka Basins. It is difficult to suggest, or for the Council to quantify when the amount of consented development has reached a cumulative adverse effect, when the provisions in the operative District Plan tend to anticipate the creation of a 'arcadian' or 'pastoral in the poetic sense' landscape.

Much of the existing 'Visual Amenity landscape' of the Rural General Zone has a landscape character, typified by a rural working environment and larger landholdings. For instance, areas such as the Wanaka and Hawea Basins, Luggate and parts of the Crown Terrace are for the most part located within the visual amenity landscape but do not exhibit the characteristics of an 'arcadian' or 'pastoral in the poetic sense' visual amenity landscape.

Landscape Categories

As described above, all subdivision and development is subject to assessment criteria which require an analysis of the development site to determine what landscape category applies. With the exception of a few areas where Environment Court rulings have determined the landscape classification, and these are contained in Appendix 8 (Landscape Categories) of the operative District Plan, most applications are subject to this process. Furthermore, decisions on resource consent applications, both determined by the Council and the Environment Court that take a specific view on the landscape classification the proposal is located within, make that judgement for the purposes of a specific application. Unless directed by the Environment Court, a decision on a resource consent cannot amend the District Plan to include the decision made on the location of a landscape line.

The existing process does not constitute efficient resource management practice. Identifying the landscape classification will provide certainty.

The Council's project to identify the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features commenced prior to the Government indicated making changes to Part 2 of the RMA (section 6, matters of national importance³, being '*the protection of specified outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development*'). Identifying these features and including them in the planning maps will provide certainty to the community and will enhance the effective and efficient administration of the District Plan. While these changes have not been advanced, there is a direction from

² QLDC Operative District Plan part 4.2.4. District Wide, Landscape, issues, Maintenance and enhancement of Visual Amenity landscapes.

Also refer to Read Landscapes Limited 'Report to Queenstown Lakes District Council on appropriate landscape classification boundaries within the District, with particular reference to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features' 2014. Ss 3.1.1 – 3.1.4

³ Report of the Minister for the Environment's Resource Management Act 1991 Principles Technical Advisory Group. February 2012. <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/rma/tag-rma-section6-7/tag-rma-section6-7.pdf>.

Ministry for the Environment. 2013. *Improving our resource management system. A discussion document*. Wellington: Ministry for the Environment. <http://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/rma/improving-our-resource-management-system-discussion-document.pdf>

other national and regional planning provisions that it is best practice for district councils to identify matters of national importance (outstanding natural landscapes and features, and significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna). Such planning provisions include the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2015⁴ and the National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry Consultation Document June 2015⁵.

Read Landscapes Limited has undertaken to categorise the outstanding natural landscapes and features of the District (Attachment 1a). The assessment is not a study based on first principles. It builds on the landscape categorisation partially completed throughout the District and contained with Appendix 8 of the operative District Plan. References have also been drawn from decision on resource consents and plan changes that relate to development proposals at specific locations.

The study was peer reviewed by two local landscape architects (Attachments 1b and 1c), familiar with the existing planning rules and experienced with landscape assessments in the district. A further landscape assessment by Paul Smith of Vivian and Espie limited has been undertaken in the southern part of the Upper Clutha area (Attachment 1d).

The study, subsequent peer reviews and commentary has formed the basis of the identified outstanding natural features and landscapes.

The district contains landscapes of national significance that are internationally renowned and require protection from inappropriate development. The identification of the district's outstanding natural landscapes and features is a significant advancement of the effective protection and management of the District's landscapes through this review.

Objective and Policies

The operative district wide landscape chapter has one stated objective:

Subdivision, use and development being undertaken in the District in a manner which avoids, remedies or mitigates adverse effects on landscape and visual amenity values.

A review of decisions on notified resource consent applications indicates the District Wide Landscape and Rural General Zone objectives and policies are often overlooked. A reason may be that decision makers, having worked through a long and complex set of prescribed assessment criteria which seek to identify whether the actual and potential effects on the environment will be minor, see little merit in trawling through policy derived from an objective which seeks the same.

While the objective is the foundation of the provisions, it is considered the related 43 (more or less) policies grouped into 17 themes primarily contained in the existing District Wide chapter do not offer appropriate specificity and value over and above the assessment criteria, many of which are structured and phrased as policies in themselves.

The existing suite of objective, policies and assessment criteria would benefit from clarification, consolidation and require linkage to the proposed strategic directions chapter.

Issue 2: The management of Farming Activities

Existing and anticipated farming activities (Reverse Sensitivity)

⁴ <http://www.orc.govt.nz/Publications-and-Reports/Regional-Policies-and-Plans/Regional-Policy-Statement/Otago-Regional-Policy-Statement-Review/>

⁵ <http://mpi.govt.nz/news-and-resources/consultations/proposed-national-environmental-standard-for-plantation-forestry/>

A range of activities are expected to occur in the rural areas that create odour, noise and dust, traffic generation and heavy vehicle traffic. Provided these effects do not constitute a genuine nuisance or health risk, they shall be accepted as anticipated components of rural activities.

It is acknowledged the Rural Zone is considered by many a desirable place to live and to also undertake commercial activities. It is important to recognise the importance of farming and established activities to the District and protect the viability of farming.

Rural Amenity

Intensive farming activities have the potential to generate significant and sustained traffic generation, odour, noise, lighting and visual effects. The effects of more intensive farming, particularly a change in the intensity of pastoral farming practices has the potential for amenity effects on neighbouring residential neighbours and a reduction in rural amenity values where these effects are apparent from public areas.

The operative provisions have standards relating to factory farming, with permitted standards for pig and poultry factory farming. In the Hawea and Luggate area there has been a relatively recent shift from traditional pastoral sheep farming to dairy farming and dairy grazing supported by irrigation. The resultant visual changes to the landscape from the use of pivot and linear irrigators and the consistent lush pasture must be accepted as an anticipated change within the ambit of permitted farming activities⁶. The management of the take and use of ground and surface water and the discharge of contaminants to land and water are a function of the Regional Council⁷.

Activities associated with more intensive types of pastoral farming such as dairy farming have the potential to create adverse effects on rural amenity associated with milking sheds, large buildings for housing animals and effluent storage ponds.

These activities have the potential for noise, odour and visual amenity effects associated with the hours of operation of milking sheds, and the sustained and repetitive use and the location of plant and materials that generate noise and odour.

While farm buildings are anticipated in the rural areas, large buildings used for intensive farming and associated infrastructure can also have the potential for adverse effects on landscape values.

The management of the potential effects on rural amenity from intensive farming is an important resource management issue.

Contamination of water bodies from dairy grazing stock

Dairy farming constitutes a more intensive use of land with generally higher numbers of stock located in relatively small areas, than traditional pastoral deer, sheep and beef farming grazing situations. In particular, higher intensities can occur where dairy grazing stock are break-fed or wintered in relatively small paddocks and supplemented with food.

Where dairy grazing stock have access to water bodies, the potential for stock to damage riparian areas and contaminate water bodies is higher in than traditional lower intensity farming.

Stock entering water bodies has the potential for contamination resulting from pugging, release of sediments and turbidity. Livestock grazing on the banks of water bodies can cause damage to riparian areas, reducing the ability for vegetation to establish which can affect fauna habitat, and degrade amenity values. Livestock,

⁶ The removal of indigenous vegetation which requires a resource consent and/or where earthworks resource consents are required is a different matter that is recognised as having potential for biodiversity and landscape effects, and is not an anticipated farming activity.

⁷ Section 30(1)(e)-(f) RMA

by grazing on the banks of water bodies and entering them to drink, directly input animal wastes to waterways. The resulting pollution degrades water bodies and amenity values.

Dairy farming and its effects are relevant to the function of the territorial authority to '*achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district*' (S31(1)(a) RMA), and currently falls within the ambit of permitted farming activities in the operative District Plan. .

It is necessary to manage the potential adverse effects of land uses where the stocking rates are higher and the nature and scale of the type of stock could have a higher potential for adverse effects on water bodies and riparian areas than less intensive forms of farming. The potential adverse effects that can result from stock degrading water bodies is not only a water quality issue. Degraded riparian areas can reduce indigenous biodiversity, landscape and amenity values.

It is proposed to add a new policy and rule that complements the functions of the Otago Regional Council by encouraging dairy grazing stock to be kept out of water bodies and the immediate margins.

Introducing a new rule to encourage the exclusion of dairy grazing stock from water bodies will also complement the Dairy NZ, The Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord⁸. In particular, this will address the circumstances where there is the potential for a third party or person not bound to the Accord to graze dairy stock.

This is because the Accord excludes dairy grazing situations where the land is used under a third party grazing arrangement between the owner of dairy cattle and another landowner for the purpose of temporary grazing. Or, where land that is owned or leased by the same person or entity as the milking platform but which is not regularly used for dairy grazing.

The Accord's definition of 'land used regularly for dairy grazing' is *Land used each year for grazing dairy cattle throughout the off-season (i.e. that part of the year when cows are not being milked)*.

In these instances there is no obligation to comply with the Accord and it cannot be relied upon in the absence of provisions under RMA plans. The introduction of a rule in the District Plan will encourage persons responsible for grazing dairy cattle to exclude stock from water bodies, irrespective of them being bound to The Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord.

The Otago Regional Council, Regional Plan: Water, Rule 12.C.0.1 prohibits any activity that would contaminate a water body. The rule is effects based and has qualifiers with regard to any odour being 'objectionable', or a 'conspicuous' oil or grease film, scum or foam. A District Plan rule could intervene with the use of land in a certain way that is likely to result in an adverse effect that would not achieve sustainable management of natural and physical resources. This could include excluding stock from riparian areas and water bodies where the nature of the grazing activity would be more likely than not to have an adverse effect.

Excluding dairy grazing stock from water bodies and requiring an identified buffer area to ensure riparian areas are not damaged manages rural amenity values and wider landscape values. , In this regard the proposed rule is within the scope of the function of a territorial authority and district plans to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district. Protecting waterbodies and riparian areas from degradation is relevant to Section 6 – Matters of National Importance:

6 Matters of National Importance

⁸ <http://www.dairynz.co.nz/media/209792/Sustainable-Dairying-Water-Accord.pdf>

In achieving the purpose of this Act, all persons exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall recognise and provide for the following matters of national importance:

- (a) the preservation of the natural character of the coastal environment (including the coastal marine area), wetlands, and lakes and rivers and their margins, and the protection of them from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
- (b) the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
- (c) the protection of areas of significant indigenous vegetation and significant habitats of indigenous fauna:*
- (d) the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes, and rivers:*
- (e) the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga:*
- (f) the protection of historic heritage from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development:*
- (g) the protection of protected customary rights*

Parts (a), (b), (d) and (e) are relevant as a function of territorial authority in this context. The provisions would not overlap the rules of the Otago Regional Plan: Water, these have a specific focus on water quality.

Farm Buildings

The operative District Plan places significant emphasis on the protection of the landscape resource through the 'discretionary regime' resource consent process. The majority of resource consent applications for subdivision and development in the rural area are processed on a notified basis.

An exception exists for buildings used for farming activity (with the exception of residential activity and residential buildings). Plan Change 9 'Farm Buildings on outstanding natural features' established rules which encourage farmers to locate farm buildings outside of outstanding natural features. It does so by requiring a controlled activity class of resource where certain qualifiers are met and a restricted discretionary class of resource consent for the location of buildings if the qualifiers are not met.

The Council has the ability to decline a restricted discretionary class of resource consent, while in the case of a controlled activity, the Council must grant the consent but can impose conditions relevant to the specified matters of control.

As stated in Plan Change 9⁹, it is acknowledged that farmers play a very important role in the stewardship of the landscape and that farm buildings are an integral part of this function. Through the outcome of the plan change, the Council accepted that where there is a landholding of over 100 hectares, certain requirements are met associated with the density of buildings, elevation, and the proposal is a genuine farm building, the building should be allowed as a controlled activity, subject to controls on external appearance, servicing and location.

Having investigated the administration of the rule and in particular noted the difference in complexity, time, and information requirements for farm buildings (as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity resource consent) compared to non-farming buildings (Discretionary activity resource consent), the rule is effective in that it provides for farm buildings while protecting the landscape resource and visual amenity.

It is considered however, the administration of the rules has resulted in inefficiencies. The costs associated with even small scale, simple resource consents are not trivial. Currently, the deposit fee for a controlled

9

http://www.qldc.govt.nz/assets/OldImages/Files/District_Plan_Changes/Plan_Change_9_downloads/Council_Decision/PC_9_Decision_on_farm_buildings_on_natural_features.pdf

activity consent is \$768.75, and Council planning officer's time is currently recovered at a rate in the order of \$117.00 per hour, in addition to administration cost recovery and a \$100 deposit fee for monitoring. It is reasonable for an applicant to expect to pay in the order of \$650.00 - \$1500.00 inclusive of GST for a simple, controlled activity resource consent application for a farm building.

In the context of the costs of a relatively small farm building such as a hay, silage or implement shed, a kitset variety, without services could be in the order of \$8,000 - \$15,000 inclusive of GST plus construction costs. The ratio to costs of obtaining resource consent relative to the cost of the building could be in the order of 15%.

While the protection of the landscape is a significant resource management issue, the administration of the District Plan and associated costs passed onto applicants associated with administration of the District Plan are also relevant considerations of the review and evaluation of the appropriateness under section 32.

It is considered that efficiencies can be made without a reduction in landscape and rural amenity protection. The existing standards generally provide for landscape protection, and with the addition of standards to control colour, bulk and location, it is considered both reasonable and efficient that farm buildings can be allowed as a permitted activity, subject to compliance with the existing rule for farm buildings and the addition of standards to control colour and location.

Issue 3: Effective and Efficient Resource Management

The construction and alteration of buildings located within a building platform requires resource consent as a controlled activity under the operative District Plan. The established approach is that a controlled activity resource consent is generally considered to provide an acceptable balance between an applicant being certain consent would be granted, and the Council being able to ensure developments are undertaken in accordance with the specified matters of control.

In the Rural General Zone, these include location, external appearance, access and servicing. Aspects of these matters of control are considered inefficient because the merits of whether a building is appropriate in that location have already been considered as part of the consent to identify a building platform.

In addition, site specific matters have been addressed and any mitigation considered appropriate or necessary will be attached to the approval associated with that building platform. These are generally registered on the site's computer freehold register in the form of a consent notice (subdivision) or covenant (resource consent for residential activity/building platform).

Generally these conditions will set out controls on the bulk, height, and colour of buildings, servicing, and any landscaping requirements. A departure from these requirements would result in enforcement or the requirement to apply for resource consent for a variation to these conditions, which require a 'discretionary' class of resource consent.

Without undermining the emphasis on managing the visual effects of buildings, ensuring development is consistent with the conditions attached to the 'approval in principle', and the importance of protecting the district's landscape resource, it is considered standards can be introduced that enable the construction and alteration to buildings as a permitted activity subject to performance standards controlling colour and the bulk and location of buildings.

It is acknowledged that the Council would not have as much control over landscaping. It is also considered that the emphasis on any landscaping would be better dealt with at the time of subdivision, particularly where integrated landscaping affecting the entire area to be subdivided would be beneficial.

The adequacy of servicing can be assessed through the building consent process and applications would be subject to compliance checks with the District Plan and other conditions, as for all building consent applications.

Issue 4: Commercial Activities

There is a lack of specificity in the operative District Plan's objectives and policies relating to non-farming activities and non-residential activity. The maintenance of rural amenity values and a pattern of development consistent with the expectations of inhabitants is an important determinant of the character and amenity of the rural area.

In addition, the objectives and policies do not specifically recognise the desire for some commercial activities whether passive or recreational to locate within the Rural General Zone. It is acknowledged that in some cases these activities could enhance the experiences available within the district.

The acknowledgement that there is a place in the Rural Zone for some types of commercial activities, subject to intensity and scale is an important resource management issue.

Issue 5: Managing the existing Ski Area Subzones

The operative provisions recognise the importance of the skiing and tourism industry to the District and notwithstanding the location of ski fields amidst the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes they provide significant concessions within the existing identified Ski Area Subzones, chiefly being that the landscape categories and assessment matters for development do not apply to skiing activities within the Ski Field Subzones. The provisions should reinforce the encouragement of ski area activities within these subzones.

The effectiveness and efficiency of the objectives and policies can be improved. However, there are not any significant matters identified in this zone that need changing.

Issue 6: Managing the Gibbston Character Zone

The purpose of the Gibbston Character Zone is to provide primarily for viticulture and commercial activities with an affiliation to viticulture within the confined space of the Gibbston Valley.

The zone is recognised as having a distinctive character and sense of place. The soils and microclimate within this area and the availability of water have enabled development for viticulture to the extent that this is an acclaimed wine producing area.

The zone has experienced residential subdivision and development. This creates the potential to degrade the distinctive character and create conflict with established and anticipated intensive viticulture activities.

The operative provisions provide concessions for activities with an affiliation to viticulture, and the landscape categories do not apply, notwithstanding the location of the zone in what is otherwise part of an outstanding natural landscape. There is concern that residential subdivision and development in the eastern part of the zone has diminished the soil resource for viticulture activities.

The on-going vitality of viticulture activities in the zone is an important resource management issue. The effectiveness and efficiency of the provisions can be improved. However, overall, there are not any significant issues identified in this zone.

Efficiencies similar to those identified in the Rural General zone exist, where the construction of buildings within an approved platform could be introduced as a permitted activity.

Issue 7: Miscellaneous and existing Provisions

Provisions to be retained

Where no significant issues have been identified, provisions will be retained. Where relevant, changes to phrasing are considered prudent to assist with clarity, and the structure and layout of the proposed district plan.

There are also areas of the Rural General zone where resource consents have been given effect to, or longstanding activities have rendered the existing zoning and provisions no longer appropriate. These include areas where an urban subdivision has been established or the land is located within the proposed urban growth boundary. In these cases an urban zone is likely to be more appropriate. The identification of these areas and specific provisions are identified in the residential s32 evaluations.

Activity status of activities not specified in the provisions

The proposed structure of the Rural Zone provisions has a more prescriptive framework and focus than the operative District Plan provisions. Where an activity is not specified by the provisions (i.e. an activity based framework) resource consent would be required because the activity is not contemplated. Section 76(4)(e) of the Act provides a territorial authority the discretion to apply such a rule.

This framework is logical and provides clarity and assists with understanding whether or not an activity requires a resource consent or not. In addition, it is difficult to anticipate every potential activity that may seek to locate in the rural zones and requiring a resource consent for these activities that are not contemplated as a non-complying status directs attention¹⁰ to the objectives and policies of the District Plan to determine whether they are appropriate and meet the purpose of the RMA.

Assessment of these applications against the relevant policies of the Strategic Directions, District wide and urban growth policies allow a holistic view to be taken of whether an activity is appropriate.

Plan Change 35 – Queenstown Airport Air Noise Boundaries

Where provisions of this Plan Change are settled they have been included.

Residential Flat

The operative provisions in the Rural General zone require a controlled activity resource consent for a residential flat. Of note, the respective rule does not contain any specified matters of control.

The 'General' assessment matters in provision 5.4.1 state:

(iii) In the case of Controlled and Discretionary Activities, where the exercise of the Council's discretion is restricted to the matter(s) specified in a particular standard(s) only, the assessment matters taken into account shall only be those relevant to that/these standard(s).

(iv) In the case of Controlled Activities, the assessment matters shall only apply in respect to conditions that may be imposed on a consent.

Whilst the assessment matters at the end of the Rural General Chapter contain 'general' matters it is doubtful whether these matters are applicable in both a technical and practical sense to residential flats.

¹⁰ Section 76(4)(e) and Section 104D RMA 1991

In the Gibbston Character Zone, the provisions are silent on residential flats, therefore, residential flats are a permitted activity pursuant to Operative District Plan Rule 5.7.3.1 'Permitted Activities'.

Residential flat as a land use sits within the ambit of residential unit. The Operative District Plan's Transportation provisions require car parking and access as permitted standards and, any servicing related aspects can be controlled via the building approval process.

Provisions relating to buildings are provided for in the respective bulk and location or building platform requirements.

For these reasons the permitted status of residential flat will be reviewed.

6. Purpose and Options

The purpose of the Landscape Chapter is to recognise the landscape as a significant resource to the District and to protect it from inappropriate subdivision and development.

The purpose of the Rural Zone is to provide for farming activities and manage the effects of other activities seeking to utilise the rural land resource (ie, skiing, commercial recreation activities, mining, forestry and industrial activities). The Rural Zone contains the majority of the District's outstanding natural landscapes and features and nature conservation values.

The purpose of the Gibbston Character Zone is to provide for farming activities, specifically viticulture and affiliated commercial activities.

The Landscape (Strategic Direction and Landscape Chapter) and Rural Zone provisions have a direct relationship with each other because the majority of the District's landscape resource is located within the Rural Zone. The landscape categories and rules directly associated with the landscape categories are contained within the Rural Zone.

Strategic Directions

The objectives and policies of the Strategic Directions chapter of the proposed District Plan are relevant to this assessment.

In general terms, and within the context of this review, these goals and objectives are met by:

- Protecting the landscape resource from inappropriate subdivision and development;
- Enabling anticipated farming activities in the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone;
- Recognising the important role of tourism and the interrelationship with landscape and the Rural areas;
- Identifying and providing for Rural Lifestyle subdivision and development within the Wakatipu Basin where the landscape has capacity to absorb that development;
- Protecting amenity values in the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone;
- Creating efficiencies in the administration of the District Plan and reducing costs for the community;
- Avoiding commercial activities that have the potential to undermine the amenity of the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone and the role of commercial centres;
- Avoiding urban subdivision and development not located within the urban growth limits;

Determining the most appropriate methods to resolve the issues identified will enable the Plan to give effect to the Otago RPS, the relevant parts of the Strategic Directions chapter, and ultimately meet the purpose of the RMA.

As required by section 32(1)(b) RMA, the following section considers various broad options considered to address each issue, and makes recommendations as to the most appropriate course of action in each case.

Broad options considered to address issues

Issue 1: The management of the District's landscapes

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with targeted modification where necessary

Option 3: Comprehensive modification to the operative provisions **(Recommended)**

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Amend operative provisions	Option 3: Comprehensive changes
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The objectives and policies do not align with the Proposed Strategic Directions chapter. • The integrity of the existing objective and policy framework has been weakened by subdivision in the rural environment at an urban density. The landscape resource is subject to potential degradation from further urban subdivision in the Rural General zone. • It is recognised that the assessment criteria are overly complex, repetitive and would benefit from improvement. • It is inefficient to continue with the case-by-case classification of landscape categories. • The issue of cumulative effects of subdivision and development, particularly in the existing visual amenity landscape areas is not being adequately managed. • Retaining the existing approach of determining landscape classification on a case by case basis is inefficient for the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process (but this is required by legislation). • The identified deficiencies and absence of a connection with the strategic directions chapter would be likely to remain. • Minor changes to provisions which are considered less than effective and inefficient would be unlikely to resolve the inefficiencies highlighted in the Rural Monitoring report 2009. • Perceived cost associated with imposing landscape lines on the maps, irrespective of whether a development is proposed. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Costs associated with going through the District Plan Review process (but this is required by legislation). • The changes may result in a perceived or actual loss of development potential. • Perceived cost associated with imposing landscape lines on the maps, irrespective of whether a development is proposed.

	<p>applicants, council and does not promote effective and efficient administration of the District Plan.</p>		
<p>Benefits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains the established approach which parties are familiar with. • Low cost for Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retaining but improving the existing provisions may reduce some of the current ambiguity with the application of the existing rules. • Including the landscape lines provides certainty to applicants, the council and wider community, 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintaining the basis and structure of the existing assessment criteria but reducing identified deficiencies will improve on the existing framework, which has a strong emphasis on protecting the landscape resource, without removing important elements and criteria themes that have been established. • Strengthens linkages with the proposed Strategic Directions chapter. • Removes identified inefficiencies with the existing provisions. • Identification of landscape categories will provide more certainty of the expectations of landscape management in certain areas. • Manage identified issues and deficiencies such as cumulative effects and promotes more effective management of these issues. • Recognises the relationship between the landscape resource and tourism based commercial and recreational activities. • Removes lengthy District Plan text and provides opportunity for more concise statement of issues, objectives and policies. • Identification of areas within the Wakatipu Basin with capacity for Rural Lifestyle development provides the opportunity for rural lifestyle living in targeted areas, potentially reducing the pressure for subdivision and

			<p>development in the Wakatipu Basin Rural Zone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Including the landscape lines provides certainty to applicants, the council and wider community,
Ranking	3	2	1

Issue 2: The management of Farming Activities

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with targeted modification where necessary (**Recommended**)

Option 3: Comprehensive modification to the operative provisions

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Amend provisions where necessary	Option 3: Change the entire rules
Costs	<p><u>Reverse Sensitivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing policy is not clear and could be more effective. <p><u>Contamination of water bodies and riparian areas from dairy grazing stock</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Dairy farming and grazing of dairy cows is relatively new to the District. There is a potential for the contamination of water bodies if more intensive forms of farming are established and not effectively managed. Persons responsible for dairy grazing stock are not always bound to the 'The Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord', therefore, the Accord does not cover all potential situations where dairy stock could enter and contaminate water bodies. <p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inefficient resource management practice for the Council. Cost to the community for applying for resource consents and variations for 	<p><u>Reverse Sensitivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified, the provisions exist but can be clarified and strengthened by policy. <p><u>Contamination of water bodies and riparian areas from dairy grazing stock</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost to farmers who graze dairy stock to ensure stock are excluded from water bodies. Potential overlap with management plans required by dairy companies, however, the proposed rule addresses situations that may not be covered by plans such as the Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord. <p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council has less control, therefore potential for buildings to be located in visually sensitive areas compared to the existing level of control. <p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential landscape effects associated with location of farm buildings in 	<p><u>Reverse Sensitivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High cost to the Council for amending relative to the relatively minor changes identified as necessary. <p><u>Contamination of water bodies and riparian areas from dairy grazing stock</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost to farmers who graze dairy stock to ensure stock are excluded from water bodies. Potential overlap with Otago Regional Council rules. Potential overlap with management plans required by dairy companies, however, the provisions could address situations that may not be covered by plans such as the Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord. <p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> High cost to the Council for amending relative to the changes necessary.

	<p>anticipated development activities.</p>	<p>inappropriate locations.</p>	<p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential landscape effects associated with location of farm buildings in inappropriate locations. • The qualifiers in the rule for controlled activity status set a relatively high bar in terms of ensuring a low density of buildings. removing these would reduce this benchmark.
<p>Benefits</p>	<p><u>Reverse Sensitivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low cost for Council. • Ability for complete control over all farm buildings. <p><u>Contamination of water bodies and riparian areas from dairy grazing stock</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Less regulation for landowners and dairy grazers. • Less liability for persons responsible for dairy grazing stock to ensure compliance with provisions. 	<p><u>Reverse Sensitivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clearer parameters for activities that may impinge on the viability of farming activities. <p><u>Contamination of water bodies and riparian areas from dairy grazing stock</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages dairy grazers to exclude stock from water bodies. • Safeguards water bodies and riparian areas. • Addresses gaps in dairy company management plans implemented through The Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord associated with whether the land is 'regularly grazed' or the person responsible for the stock have contractual obligations with the dairy companies. • Is a more simple and direct rule than the Otago Regional Council effects based rule, and the exclusion of stock will promote the sustainable management of 	<p><u>Reverse Sensitivity</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides clearer parameters for activities that may impinge on the viability of farming activities. <p><u>Contamination of water bodies and riparian areas from dairy grazing stock</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourages farmers to exclude stock from water bodies. • Safeguards water bodies and riparian areas. • Addresses gaps in dairy company management plans implemented through The Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord associated with whether the land is 'regularly grazed' or the person responsible for the stock have contractual obligations with the dairy companies. • Is a more simple and direct rule than the Otago Regional Council effects based rule, and the exclusion of stock will promote the sustainable management of

		<p>natural and physical resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protects the margins of waterbodies. The Otago Regional Council rule does not appear to address this matter. <p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Efficiencies for owners of larger landholdings >100ha. 	<p>natural and physical resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protects the margins of waterbodies. The Otago Regional Council rule does not appear to address this matter. <p><u>Farm Buildings</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Could create standards that are easier to comprehend and administer.
Ranking	3	1	2

Issue 3: Effective and Efficient Resource Management

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with targeted modification where necessary (**Recommended**)

Option 3: Modification to all the operative provisions

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Amend Operative provisions	Option 3: Comprehensive changes
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inefficient resource management practice. • Cost to the community for applying for resource consents and variations for anticipated development activities. • The deficiencies in the rule structure create inefficiencies and create unnecessary layers of complexity. • The existing rule phrasing and resultant administration makes the District Plan difficult to understand and interpret for a lay person. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed 'permitted' range of colours is conservative. • Potential for visibility of buildings to increase, reduced control on landscaping on a site by site basis. • Short term inefficiency to the council where it would be likely to change internal processes to the review of servicing aspects via the building consent process. • Cost for Council to review the rules. • Reduced control of development by the Council. (however the development is already allowed and subject to conditions on the underlying approval of the building platform). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High cost to the Council relative to benefits from the changes compared to targeting identified issues. • Minor amendments to all provisions are addressed.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains the established approach which parties are familiar with. • Retains a relatively high level of control for the Council to manage the effects of activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides the community the opportunity to develop to a permitted activity and avoid costs and time associated with the resource consent process. • Increased efficiency for district plan administration. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides the community the opportunity to develop to a permitted activity and avoid costs and time associated with the resource consent process. • Increased efficiency for district plan administration.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low cost for Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provision for water and wastewater disposal are Building code requirements. Efficiencies to the Council and the applicant to remove this component from RMA reporting requirements. • Place emphasis on landscaping at the subdivision, reduced burden on individual landowners for landscape design. 	
Ranking	3	1	2

Issue 4: Commercial Activities

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with targeted modification where necessary (**Recommended**)

Option 3: Comprehensive modification to the operative provisions

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Maintain with modification where necessary	Option 3: Comprehensive modification
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing policy does not distinguish between commercial activities that have a genuine affiliation with the Rural Zone, nor do they appropriately justify why some commercial activities may be more appropriate than others. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Costs to the Council through the plan change. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High costs relative to the changes necessary.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low cost for Council. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthens existing policy and provides clearer parameters as to what type of commercial activity may be appropriate. Identifies the importance of vitality of commercial centres. Recognises the importance of commercial tourism and commercial recreation activities to the District. Provides consistency with the proposed strategic direction, including policy that recognises the diversification of farms to tourism and visitor related activities. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Same benefits as Option 2.
Ranking	3	1	2

Issue 5: Managing the existing Ski Area Subzones

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with modification where necessary **(Recommended)**

Option 3: Comprehensive modification to the operative provisions

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Minor modifications	Option 3: Comprehensive changes
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing policy does not justify the concession available to activities in the ski field sub zone. The existing policy does not recognise the benefits of tourism to the District's economy and wellbeing. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost for Council Large and potentially significant impact on ski field operators relative to any benefits identified in the issues.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthens existing policy and provides clearer parameters that enable skiing activities within the ski area subzones. Encourages consolidation of ski area activities within the sub zones, this principle is already established in the operative District Plan. Recognises the importance of commercial tourism and commercial recreation activities to the District. Provides consistency with the proposed strategic direction. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for greater control on ski field activities, or conversely potential for more enabling activities.
Ranking	2	1	3

Issue 6: Managing the Gibbston Character Zone

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with modification where necessary (**Recommended**)

Option 3: Comprehensive modification to the operative provisions

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Minor modifications	Option 3: Comprehensive changes
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The existing policy does not justify the existing exception available to winery activities. Some of the existing policies is not consistent with the strategic directions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cost for Council Large and potentially significant impact on landowners and viticulture in the Gibbston Valley relative to any benefits identified in the issues.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Strengthens existing policy and provides clearer parameters that enable winery buildings and viticulture activities within the Gibbston Character Zone. Recognises the importance of viticulture, commercial tourism and commercial recreation activities to the District. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for greater control on residential activity. Strengthens existing policy and provides clearer parameters that enable winery buildings and viticulture activities within the Gibbston Character Zone.
Ranking	2	1	3

Issue 7: Miscellaneous and existing Provisions

Option 1: Retain the operative provisions

Option 2: Maintain the majority of the provisions with modification where necessary (**Recommended**)

Option 3: Comprehensive modification to the operative provisions

	Option 1: Status quo/ No change	Option 2: Minor modifications	Option 3: Comprehensive changes
Costs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many of the existing policies do not justify the presence of the specific rules. • Many of the existing policies are not consistent with the strategic directions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost for Council • Large and potentially significant impact on landowners relative to any benefits identified in the issues.
Benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthens existing policy and provides clearer parameters to assist with the consideration of applications for resource consent for these activities. • Provides tangible policy for the existing rules. • Include provisions made operative by other plan changes where appropriate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for greater control of identified activities.
Ranking	2	1	3

7. Scale and Significance Evaluation

The level of detailed analysis undertaken for the evaluation of the proposed objectives and provisions has been determined by an assessment of the scale and significance of the implementation of the proposed provisions. In making this assessment, regard has been had to the following, namely whether the objectives and provisions:

- Result in a significant variance from the operative District Plan.
- Have effects on resources that are considered to be a matter of national importance in terms of section 6 of the Act
- Adversely affect those with specific interests, e.g., Tangata Whenua.
- Involve effects that have been considered implicitly or explicitly by higher order documents.
- Impose increased costs or restrictions on individuals, communities or businesses.

The level of detail of analysis in this report is moderate-high. The landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone chapters contain resources of strategic importance to the District, region and nation. Many elements of the Landscape, Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone chapters build on existing approaches within the operative District Plan, so there is not a significant change in policy direction.

However, a number of the provisions take general existing approaches further in terms of implementation. For example, the Operative District Plan sets out a framework of none, or very limited development right for non-farming activities, and for residential activity. The proposed objectives take these established principles further by providing for advancements including: the identification of landscape categorisations (lines); permitting farm buildings that would otherwise be a controlled activity; and providing more targeted, informed policy for non-farming activities that could be contemplated in the zones.

Other reasons for the moderate-high detail of analysis include that the provisions set an important direction for the balance of the District Plan. An example is the location of commercial recreation and commercial activities in the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone. The District's economy is largely based on the benefits derived from tourism and the landscape resource. The exemptions provided to ski area activities are not appropriately contemplated in the operative District Plan Provisions. Nor is the issue of commercial activities locating within the rural areas adequately guided.

The detail of analysis is high. The provisions are both high level and detailed in terms of the application and administration of the rules and assessment

8. Evaluation of proposed Objectives Section 32 (1) (a)

The identification and analysis of issues has helped define how Section 5 of the RMA should be articulated in terms of the Landscape, Rural and Gibbston Character Zones, This has informed a determination of the most appropriate objectives to give effect to Section 5 of the RMA in light of the issues.

Section 32(1)(a) requires an examination of the extent to which the proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act. The following objectives serve to address the key Strategic issues in the District:

<i>Proposed Objective</i>	<i>Appropriateness</i>
<p>Objective 6.3.1 (Landscape)</p> <p>The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development.</p>	<p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District's landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA)</p> <p>This objective establishes the framework for a wide range of landscape related provisions. The District contains high quality landscapes that are of national importance and these shall be recognised and provided for when considering development (S6 and 6(b) RMA). The Council, in exercising functions and powers under it, in relation to managing the use, development, and protection of natural and physical resources, shall have particular regard to the ethic of stewardship (S7(a) of the Act) and the broad range of rural landscapes with amenity values (S7(c) of the Act).</p> <p>The objective sets the framework for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognises the importance of landscape to tangata whenua as indicated by the iwi management plans in section 3 of this report. • Recognises that cultural and geological elements contribute to landscape values. Establishes a basis for policy to identify landscape categories and for them to be identified on the planning maps. • Establishes a basis for subdivision and development proposals to be assessed against the applicable assessment criteria. • Recognises the interrelationship between the location of urban growth boundaries and the landscape resource, with regard to future proposals for plan changes. • Discourages the establishment of urban subdivision by way of resource consent within the rural zones. • Recognises the importance of pastoral farming on large landholdings is an important determinant of landscape character. <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 'Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised.
<p>Objective 6.3.2 (Landscape)</p> <p>Avoid adverse cumulative effects on landscape character and amenity values caused by incremental subdivision and development.</p>	<p>Identifies the matter of cumulative effects of subdivision and development.</p> <p>Whilst it is acknowledged that the Rural areas have established rural lifestyle development, a substantial amount of subdivision and development has been approved in these areas and the landscape values of these areas are vulnerable to degradation from further subdivision and development. It is realised that rural lifestyle development has a finite capacity if the District’s distinctive rural landscape values are to be sustained.</p> <p>The landscape is dynamic and will continue to change. However, land use changes associated with productive farming activities can be very different to land use changes, patterns of planting and infrastructure activities that result from subdivision and development. While a proposal on its own may not be likely to have adverse visual effects, or represent a significant adverse change in landscape character, at some point, (if not already reached in some parts of the District), a threshold will be reached where any further residential subdivision and development in a location will have significant adverse effects on the valued character of the landscape.</p> <p>The culmination of multiple subdivision and development activity will have the potential to change the character of the landscape to the point that the landscape values will diminish. This is a significant issue for the District’s landscapes.</p> <p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises</p>

the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District's landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).

The objective recognises and provides for the protection of the landscape resource in terms of S6(b) of the RMA.

The Objective has regard to the following parts of Section 7 of the RMA:

- (a) kaitiakitanga:
- (aa) the ethic of stewardship:
- (c) the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values:
- (f) maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment:
- (g) any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources:

Strategic Directions:

- Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 'Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes.

Gives effect to the RPS:

- Objective s 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua).
- Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land).
- Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment).

Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:

- Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained
- Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago's natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised.
<p>6.3.3 (Landscape)</p> <p>Protect, maintain or enhance the district’s Outstanding Natural Features (ONF).</p>	<p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District’s landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).</p> <p>Establishes the importance of the Districts outstanding natural features category, that they are a matter of national importance under section 6(b) of the RMA.</p> <p>Establishes a basis for the policy of the management of subdivision and development of outstanding natural features.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ‘ Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective s 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or

	<p>enhanced.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>6.3.4 (Landscape)</p> <p>Protect, maintain or enhance the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL).</p>	<p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District's landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).</p> <p>Establishes the importance of the District's outstanding natural landscape category, that they are a matter of national importance under section 6(b) of the RMA.</p> <p>Establishes a basis for the policy of the management of subdivision and development of outstanding natural landscapes.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 'Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago's natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced Objective 2.2 – Otago's significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>6.3.5 (Landscape)</p> <p>Ensure subdivision and development does not degrade landscape quality or character or diminish visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes (RLC).</p>	<p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District's landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).</p> <p>Establishes the importance of the District's rural landscape category in terms of sections 7(c), (f) of the RMA.</p> <p>The objective replaces the operative District Plan provisions for visual amenity landscapes, recognising that the District's rural landscape values vary and the Operative District plan provisions focused on maintaining or creating a pastoral or arcadian character are not an appropriate response to managing the Districts landscapes that are below the threshold of an outstanding natural feature or landscape.</p> <p>Establishes a basis for the policy of the management of subdivision and development of rural landscapes.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago's natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>6.3.6 (Landscape) Protect, maintain or enhance the landscape quality, character and visual amenity provided by the lakes and rivers and their margins from the effects of structures and activities.</p>	<p>Recognises the importance of the District’s lakes and rivers and their contribution to the landscape resource.</p> <p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District’s landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).</p> <p>The lakes and rivers both on their own and, when viewed as part of the distinctive landscapes are a significant element to the national and international identity of the District and provide for a wide range of amenity and recreational opportunities. They are nationally and internationally recognised as part of the reasons for the District’s importance as a visitor destination, as well as one of the reasons for residents to belong to the area. Managing the landscape and recreational values on the surface of lakes and rivers is an important district plan function.</p> <p>The landscape values of the surface of lakes and rivers are a matter of national importance under section 6(b) of the RMA.</p> <p>Establishes a basis for the policy of the management of activities, subdivision and development which has the potential to affect the landscape values of the surface of lakes and rivers.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ‘Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes.

	<p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>6.3.7 (Landscape)</p> <p>Recognise and protect indigenous biodiversity where it contributes to the visual quality and distinctiveness of the District’s landscapes.</p>	<p>Indigenous vegetation also contributes to the quality of the District’s landscapes. Whilst much of the original vegetation has been modified the colour, texture and intrinsic value of vegetation within these landforms contribute to the distinctive identity of the District’s landscapes.</p> <p>Recognises the importance of indigenous biodiversity to the District’s distinctive landscapes.</p> <p>Establishes a basis for policy to manage the effects on landscape associated with indigenous vegetation clearance, and the opportunity for subdivision and development which constitutes a change in land use from traditional pastoral farming to consider opportunities for indigenous biodiversity protection or restoration.</p> <p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District’s landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).</p> <p>Recognises the interrelationship between landscape and indigenous biodiversity and nature conservation values. The objective recognises and provides for Section 6 (a), (b), (c) and has regard to sections 7(c), (f) of the RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ‘ Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development’.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.4.4 - Avoid Exotic vegetation with the potential to spread and naturalise. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). • Objective 10.3.1, 10.3.4 and 10.3.5 (Biota) <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>6.3.8 (Landscape)</p> <p>Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District’s landscapes.</p>	<p>The District relies, in large part for its social and economic well being on the quality of the landscape, open spaces and environmental image.</p> <p>The Objective acknowledges the existence of established skiing activities within established locations identified as sub-zones and their location amidst the District’s outstanding natural landscapes.</p> <p>Acknowledges the established viticulture commercial related activities within the Gibbston Character Zone.</p> <p>Acknowledges that tourism related activities are part of the District’s identity, the economic contribution they make and establishes a policy basis to consider the distinction between these activities and residential orientated subdivision and development.</p>

The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the importance of the landscape resource to the District and that the adverse effects of activities on the District's landscapes are avoided, remedied or mitigated (S5(2)(c) RMA).

The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.

Strategic Directions:

- Relevant to 3.2.1.1 - Recognise, develop and sustain the Queenstown and Wanaka central business areas as the hubs of New Zealand's premier alpine resorts and the District's economy.
- Relevant to 3.2.1.3 - Enable the development of innovative and sustainable enterprises that contribute to diversification of the District's economic base and create employment opportunities.
- Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 'Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained.
- Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes.

Gives effect to the RPS:

- Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua).
- Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land).
- Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment).

Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:

- Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained
- Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago's natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and

	<p>enhanced</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.1 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Enable farming, permitted and established activities while protecting, maintaining and enhancing landscape, ecosystem services, nature conservation and rural amenity values.</p>	<p>Sets direction for permitting farming activities and recognising established activities within the Rural Zone on the basis landscape, nature conservation and rural amenity values will be protected.</p> <p>The proposed objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act because it recognises the strong economic importance of farming activities while acknowledging the importance of the landscape, indigenous biodiversity and ecosystem services within the Rural Zone in terms of (S5(2)(c) RMA).</p> <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ‘Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development’. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment).

	<p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.2 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Sustain the life supporting capacity of soils.</p>	<p>Identifies the economic importance of farming activities and protecting the soil resource for current and future productive use. The objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act in accordance with Section 5.</p> <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised

<p>21.2.3 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Safeguard the life supporting capacity of water through the integrated management of the effects of activities.</p>	<p>Recognises the importance of the water resource in terms of the territorial authorities functions under s31 of the RMA.</p> <p>The objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act in accordance with Section 5 of the RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.4.6 Maintain or enhance the water quality of our lakes and rivers. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.1.4 - Promote development and activities that sustain or enhance the life-supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems. <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b), (d) and (g) RMA.</p> <p>Consistent with Goals 1, 4 and 5 of the draft Strategic Directions chapter.</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective s 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua).</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective 5.4.1 and policy and 5.5.5 (Land)</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objectives 6.4.2, 6.4.3 and policies 6.5.2, 6.5.4 and 6.5.5.</p> <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.4 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Manage situations where sensitive activities conflict with existing and anticipated activities in the Rural Zone.</p>	<p>Recognises the existence of established rural activities and other infrastructure and activities such as roading and that activities such as residential development has an expectation to not hinder these activities, providing the rural activity is being undertaken within reasonable limits. For instance, with particular regard to aspects such as odour, noise, lighting and traffic generation.</p> <p>The objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act in accordance with Section 5 of the RMA.</p>

	<p>The objective has regard to section 7(b), (d) and (g) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions: Consistent with Objective 3.2.1.5 - Maintain and promote the efficient operation of the District's infrastructure, including designated Airports, key roading and communication technology networks.</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective s 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). Gives effect to RPS objective 5.4.1 and policy and 5.5.5 (Land) Gives effect to RPS objectives 6.4.2, 6.4.3 and policies 6.5.2, 6.5.4 and 6.5.5.</p> <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago's natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago's significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.5 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Recognise for and provide opportunities for mineral extraction providing the location, scale and effects would not degrade amenity, water, landscape and indigenous biodiversity values.</p>	<p>The mineral resources of the District are important commercially. Mineral extraction, including gravel extraction and earthworks, has the potential to cause significant adverse effects on the environment.</p> <p>This objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act as it recognises for mineral extraction while having regard to the potential adverse effects of these activities Section 5(b) and (c).</p> <p>The management of mineral extraction is an important issue for the District.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.1.5 - Maintain and promote the efficient operation of the District's infrastructure, including designated Airports, key roading and communication technology networks.. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ' Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or

	<p>development in specified Rural Landscapes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to RPS Objective 12.4.1, 12.4.2 and policy 12.5.2 (Energy)</p> <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 4.3 – Sufficient land is managed and protected for economic production. • Related Policy 4.3.6: Managing locational needs for mineral and gas exploration, extraction and processing.
<p>21.2.6 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Encourage the future growth, development and consolidation of existing Ski Areas within identified Sub Zones, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment.</p>	<p>This objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the Act as it identifies and recognises the existence of skiing activities and established infrastructure within established ski area sub-zones. Encourages the consolidation of skiing activities and infrastructure within these areas.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 'Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes.

	<p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.7 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Separate activities sensitive to aircraft noise from existing airports through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wanaka: Retention of an area containing activities that are not sensitive to aircraft noise, within an airport’s Outer Control Boundary, to act as a buffer between airports and activities sensitive to aircraft noise (ASAN). • Queenstown: Retention of an area for Airport related activities or where appropriate an area for activities not sensitive to aircraft noise within an airport’s Outer Control Boundary to act as a buffer between airports and other land use activities. 	<p>The objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA because it acknowledges existing provisions and new provisions established through Plan Change 35 (as reflected by the Environment Court confirmed provisions of May 2013) and Plan Change 26 relating to avoiding conflict between established airports and noise sensitive activities, or activities that have potential to hinder the efficient operation of Queenstown and Wanaka airports. The provisions have been reworded slightly to correct inconsistencies between the outcomes of Plan Change 35 and Plan Change 26. Specifically, Plan Change 26 removed reference to “a greenfields area”, and whilst this was reflected in the Court confirmed provisions of Plan Change 35, it is understood this term was not intended to apply to the Queenstown airport. As a result, the objective has been separated to reflect the specific requirements of each airport; and reference to “a greenfields area” has been removed from both.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consistent with Objective 3.2.1.1 - Recognise, develop and sustain the Queenstown and Wanaka central business areas as the hubs of New Zealand’s premier alpine resorts and the District’s economy. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.1.5 - Maintain and promote the efficient operation of the District’s infrastructure, including designated Airports, key roading and communication technology networks. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 3.4 – Infrastructure of national and regional significance is managed in a reasonable way.
<p>21.2.8 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Avoid subdivision and development in areas that are identified as being unsuitable for development.</p>	<p>The objective is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA because it acknowledges an established policy in the operative District Plan for existing provisions that avoid development within identified building restriction areas.</p> <p>Also establishes the ability to apply district wide policy that may restrict the ability for subdivision and development in the Rural Zone. For instance, natural hazards, landscape, noise, hazardous substances, national Environmental Standard for contaminated land.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.2 - Manage development in areas affected by natural hazards. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 'Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development'. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 2.2 – Otago's significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised Objective 3.2 Risk that natural hazards pose to Otago's communities are minimised.

<p>21.2.9 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Ensure commercial activities do not degrade landscape values, rural amenity, or impinge on farming activities.</p>	<p>The objective is the most appropriate in terms of achieving the purpose of the RMA because it establishes that the location, scale and intensity of commercial activities can affect rural amenity, constrain established rural activities and compromise the vitality of zones where commercial activities are anticipated.</p> <p>Consistent with the following Strategic Directions objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.2.1.1 Objective - Recognise, develop and sustain the Queenstown and Wanaka central business areas as the hubs of New Zealand’s premier alpine resorts and the District’s economy. • 3.2.1.2 Objective - Recognise, develop and sustain the key local service and employment functions served by commercial centres and industrial areas outside of the Queenstown and Wanaka central business areas in the District. • 3.2.1.4 Objective - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • 3.2.5.1 Objective - Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development. • 3.2.5.2 Objective - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. <p>Gives effects to RPS objectives 5.4.1, 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.2, 5.5.3 and 5.5.4 (Land)</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment)</p> <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.10 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Recognise the potential for diversification of farms that utilises the natural or physical resources of farms and supports the sustainability of farming activities.</p>	<p>The objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA because it recognises the opportunity for alternative land uses on farms can help support the viability of traditional pastoral farming on large landholdings. The retention of large farming operations is a part of the character of the District’s landscape.</p> <p>Consistent with the following Strategic Directions objectives:</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3.2.5.3 Objective - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • 3.2.5.5 Objective - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effects to RPS objectives 5.4.1, 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.2, 5.5.3 and 5.5.4 (Land)</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment).</p> <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised • Objective 4.3 – Sufficient land is managed and protected for economic production
<p>21.2.11 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Manage the location, scale and intensity of informal airports.</p>	<p>Refer to separate section 32 evaluation for informal airports</p>
<p>21.2.12 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Protect, maintain and enhance the surface of lakes and rivers and their margins.</p>	<p>The surfaces of lakes and rivers have high nature conservation, recreational and passive recreational amenity values. Controls over water-based activities are necessary to manage:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse effects on water quality, visual amenity, recreational and passive amenity values • Safety and congestion associated with commercial boating operations • Structures and mooring lines • Managing effects from recreational boating activities. <p>For these reasons, the objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA. The Objective recognises and provides for Section 6 – Matters of National Importance. In particular Sections 6(a), (b), (d), (e) and (g).</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1, 5.5.5 and 5.5.6 (Land).</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objectives 6.4.4, 6.4.5, 6.4.7 and 6.4.8, and policies 6.5.1, 6.5.7, 6.5.9 and 6.5.10.</p>

	<p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>21.2.13 (Rural Zone)</p> <p>Enable rural industrial activities within the Rural Industrial Sub Zones, that support farming and rural productive activities, while protecting, maintaining and enhancing rural character, amenity and landscape values.</p>	<p>While the predominant land use within the Rural Zone is farming there is a range of industrial and service activities that are aligned with farming and rural productive activities and have historically located in rural areas.</p> <p>These activities of an industrial nature compliment and support farming and rural productive activities and include fencing and agricultural contractors yards, firewood operations, sawmills, factories and fabrication yards.</p> <p>Many of these activities, due to their scale and nature, are not ideally suited to industrial areas located within or adjacent to urban areas and by necessity seek to locate in rural areas. Consequently there are a number of established nodes on rural industrial development throughout the District.</p> <p>The objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA to recognise for rural service based and industrial in appropriate locations within the Rural Zone.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ‘ Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the

	<p>character of our landscapes.</p> <p>Gives effects to RPS objectives 5.4.1, 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.2, 5.5.3 and 5.5.4 (Land)</p> <p>Gives effect to RPS objective 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment).</p> <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised • Objective 4.3 – Sufficient land is managed and protected for economic production
<p>23.2.1 (Gibbston Character Zone)</p> <p>Protect the economic viability, character and landscape value of the Gibbston Character Zone by enabling viticulture activities and controlling adverse effects resulting from inappropriate activities locating in the Zone.</p>	<p>The objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA because it sets the direction for permitting farming activities, with an emphasis on viticulture, affiliated winery buildings and farm buildings on the basis that landscape, nature conservation and rural amenity values will be protected.</p> <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.1 ‘Protect the natural character of Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features from subdivision, use and development’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.2 - Minimise the adverse landscape effects of subdivision, use or development in specified Rural Landscapes. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.3 - Direct new subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.4 - Recognise there is a finite capacity for residential activity in rural areas if the qualities of our landscape are to be maintained. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes.

	<p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>23.2.2 (Gibbston Character Zone)</p> <p>Sustain the life supporting capacity of soils</p>	<p>The objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the Act because it identifies the economic importance of farming activities and protecting the soil resource for current and future productive use.</p> <p>Acknowledges the finite area of the Gibbston Character Zone.</p> <p>Recognises the importance of managing the spread of wilding species and siltation and erosion from earthworks activities.</p> <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land).

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
<p>23.2.3 (Gibbston Character Zone)</p> <p>Safeguard the life supporting capacity of water through the integrated management of the effects of activities.</p>	<p>Then objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA because it is an existing objective of the Operative District Plan that recognises the importance of the water resource to viticulture in the Gibbston Valley.</p> <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 ‘Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner’. Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. Objective 2.3 Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised

<p>23.2.4 (Gibbston Character Zone)</p> <p>Encourage land management practices that recognise and accord with the environmental sensitivity and amenity values of the Gibbston Character Zone.</p>	<p>Then objective is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA because it is an existing objective of the Operative District Plan that recognises the importance of the water resource to viticulture in the Gibbston Valley.</p> <p>The objective has regard to section 7(b) RMA.</p> <p>Strategic Directions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relevant to 3.2.1.4 - Recognise the potential for rural areas to diversify their land use beyond the strong productive value of farming, provided a sensitive approach is taken to rural amenity, landscape character and healthy ecosystems. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.2.1 'Ensure Urban development occurs in a logical manner'. • Consistent with Objective 3.2.5.5 - Recognise that agricultural land use is fundamental to the character of our landscapes. <p>Gives effect to the RPS:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objectives 4.4.1, 4.4.2, 4.4.3 and 4.4.5 (Manawhenua). • Objective 5.4.3 and policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.6 (Land). • Objective 9.4.1 and 9.4.3 and policy 9.5.4 (Built Environment). • Objectives 5.4.1, 5.4.2 and policies 5.5.2, 5.5.4 and 5.5.5 (Land) • Objectives 10.4.1, 10.4.2, 10.4.3 and policies 10.5.2, 10.5.3 and 10.5.4. <p>Has regard to the Proposed RPS 2015:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objective 1.2 – Kai Tahu values, rights and interests and customary resources are sustained • Objective 2.1 – The values of Otago’s natural and physical resources are recognised, maintained and enhanced • Objective 2.2 – Otago’s significant and highly-valued natural resources are identified, and protected or enhanced. • Objective 2.3 - Natural Resource systems and their interdependence are recognised
---	--

The above objectives are considered to be the most appropriate methods of achieving the purpose of the Act, as they identify and give direction as to the how the specific issues that pertain to the management of activities in the Rural Zone and Gibbston Character Zone, and any activities that have the potential to affect the District's landscape resource, are addressed.

9. Evaluation of the proposed provisions Section 32 (1) (b)

The following tables consider whether the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the relevant objectives. In doing so, it considers the costs and benefits of the proposed provisions and whether they are effective and efficient. For the purposes of this evaluation the proposed provisions are grouped together by resource management issue.

(Also refer to the Table detailing broad options considered above)

Issue 1: The management of the District's landscapes

6.3.1 (Landscape)– The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development.

6.3.2 (Landscape)– Avoid adverse cumulative effects on landscape character and amenity values caused by incremental subdivision and development.

6.3.3 (Landscape)– Protect, maintain or enhance the district's Outstanding Natural Features (ONF).

6.3.4 (Landscape)– Protect, maintain or enhance the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL).

6.3.5 (Landscape)– Ensure subdivision and development does not degrade landscape quality or character or diminish visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes (RLC).

6.3.6 (Landscape)– Protect, maintain or enhance the landscape quality, character and visual amenity provided by the lakes and rivers and their margins from the effects of structures and activities.

6.3.7 (Landscape)– Recognise and protect indigenous biodiversity where it contributes to the visual quality and distinctiveness of the District's landscapes.

6.3.8 (Landscape)– Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District's landscapes.

21.2.1 (Rural Zone)– Enable farming, permitted and established activities while protecting, maintaining and enhancing landscape, ecosystem services, nature conservation and rural amenity values.

21.2.5 (Rural Zone)– Recognise for and provide opportunities for mineral extraction providing the location, scale and effects would not degrade amenity, water, landscape and indigenous biodiversity values.

21.2.6 (Rural Zone)– Encourage the future growth, development and consolidation of existing Ski Areas within identified Sub Zones, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment.

21.2.8 (Rural Zone)– Avoid subdivision and development in areas that are identified as being unsuitable for development.

21.2.8 (Rural Zone)– Ensure commercial activities do not degrade landscape values, rural amenity, or impinge on farming activities.

23.2.1 (Gibbston Character Zone)– Protect the economic viability, character and landscape value of the Gibbston Character Zone by enabling viticulture activities and controlling adverse effects resulting from inappropriate activities locating in the Zone.

23.3.4 (Gibbston Character Zone)– Encourage land management practices that recognise and accord with the environmental sensitivity and amenity values of the Gibbston Character Zone.

Summary and broad assessment of the environmental, economic, social and cultural costs and benefits of the provisions that will achieve these objectives:

Landscape policies:

- Provide policies to facilitate the identification of outstanding natural landscapes and outstanding natural features that are of national importance pursuant to Section 6(b) of the RMA.
- Policy that requires the assessment criteria are applied and the roll-over of existing operative provisions in Part 1.5.3.iii of the District Plan which set out why resource consents are required as part of the management of the District's landscapes.
- Emphasis on managing potential cumulative effects of subdivision and development
- Clearer hierarchy where protection is necessary and where development could be located, or expected to locate, ONF, ONL and RLC landscapes.
- New policy for lakes and rivers and Indigenous biodiversity where the landscape is relevant. The existing operative district wide chapters for Lakes and rivers and Natural Environment are removed from the proposed district plan text.
- New policies on recognition of tourism and the relationship with landscape.

Assessment Criteria

- The structure of the existing assessment criteria has been retained. The assessment criteria have been refined to assist with investigation and whether the proposal is acceptable in terms of landscape character, visual amenity, the design and density of the proposal.
- Emphasis on assessing cumulative effects from residential subdivision and development.
- The landscape assessment matters for ONL and ONF focus on the attributes of the landscape that make it qualify as an ONL or ONF and to what extent the proposed activity will degrade/have adverse effects the landscape attribute.
 - The Outstanding Natural Landscapes and features of the District comprise large areas, and within these there will be locations that will have varying degrees of sensitivity to development. Undertaking an appraisal of the criteria provided in the assessment matters will inform both proponents and

decision makers of the appropriateness of a proposed development within the ONL/ONF.

- The landscape assessment matters for the RLC focus on identifying the important attributes on a case by case basis and to what extent the proposed development will degrade/have adverse effects on the landscape. The operative District Plan presumption on maintaining a 'visual amenity landscape' - pastoral and arcadian attributes has been removed.
- Direct consideration of compensation or positive effects such as the provision of walkways, or ecological restoration.

Landscape related rules:

- Subdivision and development in outstanding natural features and landscapes is retained as a discretionary activity.
- Subdivision and development in the rural landscape classification are a discretionary activity.
- The retention of no minimum area, and therefore no development rights for residential subdivision and development.
- Farm buildings: permitted largely based on existing operative standards that would require resource consent as a controlled activity (that have been changed to permitted activity standards).
- Subdivision and development: construction within building platforms and alterations up to 30% of existing buildings outside are a permitted activity subject to new rules to control the size and colour of buildings as a balancing mechanism to the removal of the controlled activity status and broad intervention and control of landscape matters associated with the rule.
- Jetties in the Frankton Arm are a restricted discretionary activity and the landscape assessment criteria do not apply (no landscape assessment). There are a range of performance standards based on the Jetties and moorings policy and if these are not complied with the proposed jetty would be non-complying class of resource consent.

Rural Policies

- Generally based around providing for farming and established activities such as roading while managing effects on landscape, amenity and nature conservation values.
- Recognises that diversification of farming to tourism and visitor accommodation based activities may support the ongoing viability of farming and retention of large landholdings. The retention of large landholdings has the potential to support the maintenance of the landscape qualities in certain locations.

Zoning Changes

- Identification of five areas in the Wakatipu Basin with capacity from a landscape perspective to absorb residential subdivision and development to the Rural Lifestyle Zone density constituting a minimum site size of 2 hectares average and individual sites to one hectare.
- Rezoning of land at Wyuna Station from Rural General to Rural Lifestyle.

<i>Landscape classifications</i>			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identification on the District Plan maps of the following landscape classifications: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outstanding natural features (ONF) • Outstanding natural landscapes (ONL) • Rural Landscapes Classification (RLC) • The proposed landscape classifications replace the following existing landscape categories: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operative District Plan Outstanding natural landscapes Wakatipu Basin: Proposed Outstanding Natural Landscapes • Operative District Plan Visual Amenity landscape and Other Rural Landscape: Proposed Rural Landscape Classification 			
<i>Proposed provisions</i>	<i>Costs</i>	<i>Benefits</i>	<i>Effectiveness & Efficiency</i>
<p>Policies:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i></p> <p>All Policies</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i></p> <p>21.2.1.1 to 21.2.1.8</p> <p>21.2.5.1 to 21.2.5.4</p> <p>21.2.6.1 to 21.2.6.3</p> <p>21.2.8.1, 21.2.8.2</p> <p>21.2.9.2 to 21.2.9.5</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i></p>	<p><i>Environmental</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Will allow more subdivision and development within the areas identified as suitable for Rural Lifestyle zoning. <p><i>Economic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential cost for persons who may have been intending to undertake development for the purposes of developing for profit in locations identified on the planning maps as ONL or ONF, or in the Rural Landscapes where the cumulative effects policy could reduce the probability for subdivision and development being granted (although these activities may have been likely to have been 	<p><i>Environmental</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enhances the protection of the remaining Rural Zoned District's landscape resource for present and future generations. <p><i>Economic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protecting the remaining landscape resource will ensure Queenstown Lakes District remains a desirable place to live and visit. Maintaining tourism and the desirability of Queenstown Lakes District as a destination. • Landscape classifications identified on the District Plan maps will save costs for applicants who currently require 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provisions are based on the existing structure of the operative provisions. The changes will improve the effectiveness at managing the districts landscape resource while creating efficiencies in the administration of the landscape criteria. • The provisions will be effective at managing the landscape resource to be consistent with the Operative and Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement and the proposed strategic directions chapter. • The provisions will provide more certainty and guidance for

<p>23.2.1.1, 23.2.1.3, 23.2.1.5, 23.2.1.6, 23.2.1.7, 23.2.1.8.</p> <p>23.34.4</p> <p>Rules:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i></p> <p>6.4.1</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i></p> <p>21.3.3</p> <p>21.4</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i></p> <p>23.4.1, 23.4.5 to 23.4.20.</p> <p>23.5.1 to 23.5.8.</p> <p><i>Assessment Matters</i></p> <p>Rural Zone 21.7</p> <p>Gibbston Character Zone 23.7</p>	<p>considered unacceptable in any case).</p> <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential social and cultural cost to persons not supportive of the changes. 	<p>an assessment on a case by case basis to determine the landscape classification.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clearer and certain District Plan provisions will reduce costs for Council, applicants and litigants associated with resource consent decisions based on clear and specific policy and assessment criteria. <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More certainty and safeguards will provide for people's wellbeing by protecting the landscape resource. 	<p>persons contemplating subdivision and development and locating farm buildings. The provisions will improve efficiency by identifying the landscape categories on the District Plan maps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provisions will create efficiencies by clearly setting out areas where subdivision and development is not likely to be appropriate and the assessment criteria and policies will provide clearer direction on where subdivision is likely to be appropriate.
<p>Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:</p>			
<p><i>Option 1: Impose a minimum site density standard to control subdivision and/or residential development.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The operative Rural General Zone provisions focus on the management of the landscape resource. No minimum area is identified and, consequently there is no perceived or actual development right to establish residential activity or buildings.</i> 		

- *Imposing a minimum density standard could be considered an effective tool to help manage the potential adverse effects of subdivision and development and in particular the cumulative effects of residential development. It is recognised that through the resource consent process it can be difficult to quantify whether a threshold has been reached with respect to adverse cumulative effects from subdivision and development, and that this might be more difficult where there is no minimum allotment size in the Rural Zone to use as an indicator of the appropriate intensity of residential development.*
- *Typically, a minimum density standard is imposed in rural areas to protect the soil resource and productive potential of rural land. Minimum density standards also provide a degree of certainty for inhabitants and neighbours with respect to amenity, and can provide parameters with regard to servicing and infrastructure limitations.*
- *In the context of these matters, imposing a minimum area requirement on rural land primarily to manage the impact of residential/commercial subdivision and development on the landscape could be criticised as being selected arbitrarily. The District's landscape character and ability to absorb change varies and what may be considered appropriate in one area may not suit others.*
- *For these reasons, imposing a minimum allotment size to achieve the purpose of the RMA is not more appropriate than the proposed Provisions.*

Issue 2: The management of Farming Activities

6.3.1 (Landscape) – The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development.

6.3.3 (Landscape) – Protect, maintain and enhance the district’s Outstanding Natural Features (ONF).

6.3.4 (Landscape) – Protect, maintain and enhance the District’s Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL).

6.3.5 (Landscape) – Ensure subdivision and development does not degrade landscape quality or character or diminish visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes (RLC).

6.3.7 (Landscape) – Recognise and protect indigenous biodiversity where it contributes to the visual quality and distinctiveness of the District’s landscapes.

6.3.8 (Landscape) – Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District’s landscapes.

21.2.1 (Rural Zone) – Enable farming, permitted and established activities while protecting, maintaining and enhancing landscape, ecosystem services, nature conservation and rural amenity values.

21.2.2 (Rural Zone) - Sustain the life supporting capacity of soils.

21.2.3 (Rural Zone) - Safeguard the life supporting capacity of water through the integrated management of the effects of activities.

21.2.4 (Rural Zone) – Manage situations where sensitive activities conflict with existing and anticipated activities in the Rural Zone.

21.2.8 (Rural Zone) – Ensure commercial activities do not degrade landscape values, rural amenity, or impinge on farming activities.

21.2.11 (Rural Zone) – Manage the location, scale and intensity of informal airports.

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

- Retention of farming as a permitted activity;

- Permit farm buildings subject to standards to protect the landscape resource in the ONL and RLC locations;
- Protect farming from activities that may seek to establish in the rural zone and constrain activities such as of a residential or commercial nature;
- Allow as a permitted activity the construction of farm buildings subject to standards on colour, location, size and height;
- Providing an exemption for small scale roadside side stalls so they do not require a resource consent;
- Retain the exemption for informal airports associated with farming activity
- The introduction of standards to control the potential effects of dairy farming buildings and infrastructure on rural amenity.
- Encouraging persons responsible for dairy grazing stock to exclude them from waterbodies by making it a prohibited activity.

Proposed Policies:

Policies:

Landscape

6.3.1.1, 6.3.1.2, 6.3.1.5, 6.3.1.8, 6.3.1.10, 6.3.1.11, 6.3.1.12, 6.3.3.1, 6.3.3.2, 6.3.4.1 to 6.3.4.3, 6.3.5.1 to 6.3.5.3, 6.3.6.1, 6.3.7.1, 6.3.8.1, 6.3.8.2

Rural Zone

21.2.1.1 to 21.2.1.8, 21.2.2.1 to 21.2.2.3, 21.2.3.1, 21.2.4.1 – 21.2.4.2, 21.2.10.1 – 21.2.10.3.

Rules:

Landscape

6.4.1

Rural Zone

All Rules. Noting the new rules or rules of particular scale and significance are given particular consideration below.

(Also refer to the miscellaneous and existing operative provisions to be retained (Issue 7)).

Proposed Rule	Costs: Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural	Benefits: Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<p>Rule 21.5.5</p> <p>Dairy Farming (Milking Herds, Dry Grazing and Calf Rearing)</p> <p>All effluent holding tanks, effluent treatment and effluent storage ponds, shall be located at least 300 metres from any formed road or adjoining property.</p> <p>Permitted activity standard, non-compliance results in a restricted discretionary class of resource consent.</p> <p>Discretion is restricted to all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Odour. • Visual prominence. • Landscape character. • Effects on surrounding properties. <p>Rule 21.5. 6</p> <p>Dairy Farming (Milking Herds, Dry Grazing and Calf Rearing)</p> <p>All milking sheds or buildings used to house or feed milking stock shall be located at least 300 metres from any adjoining</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Irrespective of the required setback, there will be a reduction in the control and ability to impose conditions mitigating environmental effects due to the loss of control associated with making farm buildings a permitted activity. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has potential to impose costs on dairy farm operators by requiring buildings and related infrastructure to be located further away from road boundaries and adjoining property boundaries. <p>Social and Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Removing the need to obtain a resource consent but requiring standards has the potential to create adverse effects where the prescribed 300 metre setback for the defined dairy infrastructure. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides safeguards for rural amenity values by imposing controls on dairy farming milking sheds and effluent ponds, recognising it is a more intensive type of farming than traditional sheep or beef farming and having a higher potential for degrading rural amenity values. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The standards are associated with making farm buildings a permitted activity. Allowing farm buildings as a permitted activity provides the opportunity for farmers to establish these buildings without the need to obtain a resource consent. • Provides for more flexibility in the rural zone for farming activities while maintaining rural amenity values. • Confirms farming as the anticipated and dominant activity in the Rural Zone. Provides certainty, economic wellbeing for farming operations, particularly large landholdings. <p>Social and Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides certainty for persons residing adjacent to working dairy 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provisions will provide effective management without unduly constraining permitted farming activities. • The provisions are not expected to create a high number of resource consents. • Overall, the proposed standards are considered an appropriate balance between making farm buildings permitted and managing the potential adverse effects of intensive farming activities.

<p>property or formed road.</p> <p>Permitted activity standard, non-compliance results in a restricted discretionary and discretionary classes of resource consent.</p>		<p>farms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides certainty for dairy farms as to where the infrastructure is expected to locate. 	
<p>Proposed Rule</p>	<p>Costs: Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural</p>	<p>Benefits: Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural</p>	<p>Effectiveness & Efficiency</p>
<p>Farm Buildings</p> <p>Rule 21.5.18 – location, landholding size and density of buildings.</p> <p>Permitted activity standard non-compliance would require a restricted discretionary activity class of resource consent.</p> <p>Rule 21.5.19 – exterior colour of buildings</p> <p>Permitted activity standard non-compliance would require a restricted discretionary activity class of resource consent.</p> <p>Rule 21.5.20 – Building Height Permitted activity standard non-compliance would require a discretionary activity class of</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The permitted activity could create adverse visual effects by removing the discretion for Council to control effects providing the qualifiers in the rule are met. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic effect associated with regulation, however the rules are introduced to balance the removal of rules that require a resource consent for any building. <p>Social and Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for social and cultural effects on persons from building begin established as a permitted activity. these could be the location of a permitted farm building that obstructs views from adjoining residential building platforms in the Rural Zone. 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The permitted standards provide a degree of safeguards for landscape and location of buildings adjacent to water bodies. The permitted standard qualifiers are conservative and encourage buildings to be sited in sympathetic locations with recessive colours. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Provides the opportunity to establish farm buildings as permitted activity and dispense with the uncertainty with applying for a resource consent. <p>Social and Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Better certainty for rural landowners with expectations around constructing permitted farm buildings. 	<p>Farm Buildings</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The provisions will create efficiencies for farmers, particularly where small scale buildings are proposed where the costs of obtaining resource may be high relative to the value of the work. The permitted standards are subject to conservative criteria based on the existing standards for farm buildings and will provide effective management in the context of the landscape management provisions. The permitted activity standards are not intended to provide for all farm buildings as permitted activities. Buildings over 500m² are not uncommon and in these situations assessment would be required on a case by case basis.

<p>resource consent.</p> <p>Rule 21.5.4 – setback of buildings from water bodies.</p> <p>Permitted activity standard non-compliance would require a restricted discretionary activity class of resource consent.</p>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The setback of buildings from waterbodies is effective in the context of the removal of a requirement for a resource consent.
Proposed Rule	Costs: Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural	Benefits: Environmental, Economic, Social and Cultural	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<p>Rule 21.5.7</p> <p>Dairy Farming (Milking Herds, Dry Grazing and Calf Rearing)</p> <p>Stock shall be prohibited from standing in the bed of, or on the margin of a water body.</p> <p>For the purposes of this rule:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Margin means land within 3.0 metres from the edge of the bed. Water body has the same meaning as in the RMA, but also includes any drain or water race that goes to a lake or river. <p>Permitted activity standard, non-compliance results in a prohibited</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None identified. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Measures will be required to exclude dairy grazing stock from water bodies by 3.0 metres. This will impose a cost associated with fencing infrastructure and time spent. However, the fencing need not be permanent. Cost for Council to undertake monitoring and compliance with the administration of the rule. Potential cost to persons whom do not comply with the rule and are subject to enforcement from the Council. <p>Social & Cultural</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Simple and direct rule to ensure that dairy grazing activity excludes stock from water bodies. By doing so there is greater certainty intensive farming practices would not degrade water bodies and riparian areas. Reduces potential for adverse effects on water bodies and amenity values. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduces costs associated with remediation to water bodies that have been damaged by grazing stock. Assists with maintaining rural amenity and the District's environmental image that is important to tourism. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definition of water body is consistent and complementary to the RMA and Otago Regional Council definitions of water bodies, in particular the definition of water bodies and drains as defined in the Otago Regional Plan: Water; Rule 12.C.0.1. The rule will be efficient to interpret and comply with because it is based on a specific activity, rather than the effects of an activity. The rule is easily complied with and is enforceable. The rule is efficient in that it captures both land regularly used for grazing and land that is not regularly used for grazing. Therefore covering activities potentially missed by The

class of activity.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential social cost to dairy grazing operators ensuring compliance. 	<p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complementing regional council functions will assist with protecting social and cultural values associated with the intrinsic values of water bodies. 	Sustainable Dairying: Water Accord.
Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:			
<p><i>Option 1: Require resource consents for certain types of farming (such as dairy farming and grazing) to allow the Council to have a higher degree of control on landscape and rural amenity values.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The changes to the landscape from irrigation include linear and pivot irrigators and a change in the year-round colour of improved pasture. These aspects could be regarded as an adverse effect on the landscape. Activities such as horticulture and viticulture also fit within the proposed District Plan definition of 'Farming Activity' and the establishment of these activities would have an impact on the existing landscape.</i> <i>Pivot and linear irrigators are not buildings and are not subject to the rules of the District plan http://www.qldc.govt.nz/assets/Uploads/Planning/QLDC-Practice-Note-1-Centre-Pivot-and-Linear-Irrigators.pdf</i> 		
<p><i>Option 2: Make farm buildings permitted irrespective of location or size of the respective landholding.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The District relies upon the landscape as a significant resource for its economic, cultural and social wellbeing. It is recognised that farming activities are also a significant driver of the economy and farming activities are a key determinant of rural character and, farm buildings are an integral component of farming. Notwithstanding this, removing controls on farm buildings, particularly for larger scale buildings within the outstanding natural landscapes or on outstanding natural features would not provide effective management of the landscape resource.</i> <i>The proposed criteria provide as a permitted activity for modest sized farm buildings on what are likely to be genuine farming operations on larger landholdings at least 100ha in area, with a density of not more than one building per 25ha, currently one per 50ha. There are higher numbers of rural-residential subdivision and development on smaller landholdings and the effect of the sprawl of these buildings should be contained. It would not be appropriate to accept accessory buildings that support rural residential lifestyle</i> 		

Contamination of water bodies from dairy grazing stock

Option 1: Retain policy, but have no rule and rely on Regional Council rules, such as Rule 12.C.0.1 of the Otago Regional Plan: Water.

Option 2: Require fencing of water bodies.

activities as farm buildings for the purposes of this rule.

Contamination of water bodies from dairy grazing stock

Option 1:

- The proposed rule is purposefully different to the Regional Plan Rule in that it is an activity based rule that identifies dairy grazing as having a higher potential for contamination and degrading rural amenity values, and the intrinsic values of water bodies. The relevant Regional Plan Rule is:*

12.C.0 Prohibited activities: *No resource consent will be granted*

12.C.0.1 The discharge of any contaminant to water, that produces an objectionable odour, or a conspicuous oil or grease film, scum, or foam in any:

(i) Lake, river or Regionally Significant Wetland; or

(ii) Drain or water race that flows to a lake, river, Regionally Significant Wetland or coastal marine area; or

(iii) Bore or soak hole, is a prohibited activity.

- The proposed rule will promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources by simply excluding activities that are likely to degrade nature conservation and amenity values.*
- The Regional Council rule (Rule 12.C.0.1) has qualifiers with regard to any odour being 'objectionable', or a 'conspicuous' oil or grease film, scum or foam. The proposed rule may have a higher standard of intervention than the Regional Council Rule, because it excludes the activity outright.*

Option 2:

- This option would impose potential costs associated with fencing off water bodies to exclude stock. It is recognised that dairy stock may be grazed in one-off situations, particularly where grazing is undertaken away from the milking platform. Temporary fences*

<p><i>Option 3: Not specify a waterbody margin area.</i></p>	<p><i>can be used to comply with the rule.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>It is considered best to leave the method to comply with the rule up to the persons responsible for the stock. This could be achieved by existing physical barriers such as hedgerows or by temporary electric fences.</i> <p><i>Option 3:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The definitions of water body and bed have been derived from the RMA interpretations. The Otago Regional Plan: Water, utilises similar definitions. For consistency and ease of interpretation, 'drains' where they flow to a lake or river have also been included, as identified in the Otago Regional Plan: Water; Rule 12.C.0.1.</i> • <i>A margin area has been set to ensure there is a buffer area between the bed of the water body and area where stock would be able to stand. This would assist with avoiding the potential for stock to trample and for excrement to enter the water body.</i> • <i>The width of the margin has been set at 3.0 metres. The margin is intended to exclude stock from directly standing on the edge of the waterbody and includes the provision for temporary fencing. The margin does not anticipate the retirement of land or riparian planting.</i> • <i>Should effective riparian planting be required, the margin may need to be wider. There is guidance available on this matter from other agencies. It is reiterated that the intention of the rule is to exclude dairy grazing stock from entering water bodies. The method for achieving compliance should be left to the persons responsible.</i>
--	---

<p><i>Option 4: Proposed Rule 21.5. 7</i></p> <p><u>Dairy Farming (Milking Herds, Dry Grazing and Calf Rearing)</u></p> <p>Do not provide as a prohibited activity and instead make it a controlled, restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The intent of the rule is to prevent intensive forms of farming degrading and creating significant adverse effects on water bodies and riparian areas. Providing the ability for a person to apply for a resource consent is counter intuitive to the encouragement to simply exclude stock from these relatively confined areas.</i> • <i>Providing the ability to apply for resource consent would be opening the door to a significant adverse effect and this would also leave the possibility for persons to apply for a resource consent on a retrospective basis. Neither of these scenarios would meet Section 5 of the RMA. The prohibited activity status is the most appropriate way to meet the purpose of the RMA.</i>
---	---

Issue 3: Effective and Efficient Resource Management

6.3.1 (Landscape) Our distinctive landscapes are protected from inappropriate subdivision and development.

21.2.1 (Rural Zone) Enable farming, permitted and established activities while protecting, maintaining and enhancing landscape, ecosystem services, nature conservation and rural amenity values.

21.2. 13 (Rural Zone) Enable rural industrial activities within the Rural Industrial Sub Zones, that support farming and rural productive activities, while protecting, maintaining and enhancing rural character, amenity and landscape values.

23.2.1 (Gibbston Character Zone) To protect the character and landscape value of the Gibbston Character Zone by enabling viticulture activities and controlling adverse effects resulting from inappropriate activities locating in the Zone.

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

- Replacing the existing controlled activity resource consent requirement to build, reclad, repaint and alter buildings within a building platform with a permitted activity rule allowing these activities. Also includes allowing alterations to buildings located outside platforms, subject to a maximum area being altered.
- Permitted activities for farm buildings, buildings located within approved building platforms and alterations to buildings outside of an approved building platform, subject to controls on colour, height, coverage and location.
- Permits farm buildings where they previously required resource consent as a controlled activity, subject to controls on location, size, height and colour.

- Introducing new standards that require buildings comply with a range of colours that meet a certain hue and light reflectance value.
- Rule 21.5.16 limits the permitted size of any single building to 500m². The reason for this is to provide a control on the visual dominance of buildings. Because the operative District Plan requires that even where a building is anticipated a controlled activity resource consent is required, the Council has control over the location, external appearance, colours and landscaping. The removal of control necessitates a building size maximum to control the permitted baseline of buildings and to enable the potential visual dominance and effects on landscape character and rural amenity to be considered through a restricted discretionary resource consent.
- Rule 21.5.4 is introduced to control the location of buildings adjacent to waterbodies. As described above, the removal of the controlled activity status for buildings removes the ability of the Council to assess the potential amenity and hazard related effects associated with locating buildings near waterbodies. A restricted discretionary rule enabling the Council to consider potential adverse effects on biodiversity, landscape, visual amenity, open spaces values and hazards is considered appropriate in these instances.
- Making residential flats a permitted activity.

Proposed provisions	Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<p>Policies:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.3.1.1, 6.3.1.2, 6.3.1.5, 6.3.1.10, 6.3.3.1, 6.3.3.2, 6.3.4.1, 6.3.4.2, 6.3.4.3, 6.3.5.1, 6.3.6.1</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> 21.2.1, 21.2.2, 21.2.3, 21.2.4, 21.2.5.</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i> 23.2.1.1, 23.2.1.4,</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council will not have the same level of control over aspects associated with the development such as 'nature conservation values', landscape plans and control on the 'external appearance' of buildings, only the colour to control the degree of visual prominence. However development would still be subject to any controls or obligations required by the subdivision consent or approval for the building platform. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for higher costs with subdivision than previously as any mitigation required for landscaping 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Permitting a range of reasonably conservative colours (20% LRV pre-finished steel, 30% LRV all other surfaces) will encourage applicants to utilise colours within this range to avoid applying for resource consent. • More emphasis for landscaping requirements to be at the time of subdivision. This would promote more integrated landscaping that would be responsive to the sensitivity of the surrounding landscape and whether any mitigation is required. • Any more conservative controls imposed on a site by a subdivision 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed provisions will replace the need for a resource consent by permitting buildings within a range of controls to ensure that anticipated development would maintain landscape values. The provisions are effective at managing the effects of buildings on the landscape resource. • The ability to build as a permitted activity significantly increases certainty and efficiency while permitted activities will be effective at achieving objectives and policies to maintain landscape values.

<p>23.2.1.5, 23.2.1.7, 23.2.1.8</p> <p>Rules:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.4.1</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> 21.4 – all relevant rules 21.5 – all relevant rules 21.6 – notification provisions.</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i> All relevant rules.</p>	<p>would be focused at this stage, as opposed to leaving it for individual future allotment owners.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for higher administration costs for Council to review permitted development as part of the building consent where previously this was recovered from the resource consent. <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Potential for adverse effects due to the reduction of control. 	<p>consent notice will still apply, thus ensuring location specific landscaping or mitigation of adverse effects and associated servicing requirements are provided for.</p> <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduced costs for applicants through resource consents and monitoring fees. Reduced cost for the Council through District Plan administration, including the requirement for development engineering staff to prepare RMA style reports on servicing. Removal of the potential for a ‘double up’ of processing where the existing controlled activity, matters of control for servicing (water supply, wastewater and stormwater) can be considered via the building consent application. Less delays in the overall build time and cost and more certainty for prospective development. <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> More certainty for people when they undertake anticipated development and small scale alterations to 	
---	---	--	--

		<p>houses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasis on landscaping applied at the time of subdivision to mitigate the effects of infrastructure and future buildings. More certainty for future landowners with regard to landscaping expectations when they build. 	
<p>Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:</p>			
<p><i>Option 1: Make buildings permitted with no controls on colour or maximum scale of buildings.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Would not control the effects of buildings while managing the landscape resource.</i> 		

Issue 4: Commercial Activities

6.3.1 (Landscape) The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development.

6.3.2 (Landscape) Avoid adverse cumulative effects on landscape character and amenity values caused by incremental subdivision and development.

6.3.3 (Landscape) Protect, maintain and enhance the district's Outstanding Natural Features (ONF).

6.3.4 (Landscape) Protect, maintain and enhance the District's Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL).

6.3.5 (Landscape) Ensure subdivision and development does not degrade landscape quality or character or diminish visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes (RLC).

6.3.6 (Landscape) Protect, maintain or enhance the landscape values of the lakes and rivers and their margins from the effects of structures and

activities.

6.3.8 (Landscape) Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District's landscapes.

21.2.1 (Rural Zone) Enable farming, permitted and established activities while protecting, maintaining and enhancing landscape, ecosystem services, nature conservation and rural amenity values.

21.2.2 (Rural Zone) Sustain the life supporting capacity of soils.

21.2.3 (Rural Zone) Safeguard the life supporting capacity of water through the integrated management of the effects of activities.

21.2.4 (Rural Zone) Manage situations where sensitive activities conflict with existing and anticipated activities in the Rural Zone.

21.2.5 (Rural Zone) Recognise for and provide opportunities for mineral extraction providing the location, scale and effects would not degrade amenity, water, landscape and indigenous biodiversity values.

21.2.6 (Rural Zone) Encourage the future growth, development and consolidation of existing Ski Areas within identified Sub Zones, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment.

21.2.9 (Rural Zone) Ensure commercial activities do not degrade landscape values, rural amenity, or impinge on farming activities.

21.2.10 (Rural Zone) Recognise the potential for diversification of farms that utilises the natural or physical resources of farms and supports the sustainability of farming activities.

21.2.11 (Rural Zone) Manage the location, scale and intensity of informal airports.

21.2.12 (Rural Zone) Protect, maintain and enhance the surface of lakes and rivers and their margins.

21.2.13 (Rural Zone) Enable rural industrial activities within the Rural Industrial Sub Zones, that support farming and rural productive activities, while protecting, maintaining and enhancing rural character, amenity and landscape values.

23.2.1 (Gibbston Character Zone) Protect the economic viability, character and landscape value of the Gibbston Character Zone by enabling viticulture activities and controlling adverse effects resulting from inappropriate activities locating in the Zone.

23.2.2 (Gibbston Character Zone) Sustain the life supporting capacity of soils.

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

- Policy that acknowledges the dependence of some commercial activities on the landscape resource and rural amenity values;
- Policy that recognises that commercial activities within the rural zones can impinge on farming activities and reduce the vitality of commercial centres;
- Retention of the majority of the existing rules relating to commercial activities in the Rural Zone;
- Increasing the permitted standard for land based outdoor commercial recreation activities from five to ten persons in any one group;
- Clarification of the existing rules relating to retail sales;
- Changing the existing permitted standard for 'other activities' to allow home occupation based commercial activities up to 150m² in the Rural Zone and 100m² in the Gibbston Character Zone;
- Non-complying activity status for industrial activities in the Rural Zone;
- Forestry activities in the ONL and ONF a non-complying activity;
- Enabling the use of informal airports as a permitted activity, subject to standards.
- Identification of a rural industry/service zone. Refer to specific section 32 evaluation.

Proposed provisions	Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<p>Policies:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.2.1.1 to 6.2.1.4, 6.2.1.7 to 6.2.1.12. 6.2.2.1 to 6.2.6.3 6.2.8.1 to 6.2..8.3</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> 21.2.2.1 – 21.2.2.3 21.2.3.1 21.2.4.1 – 21.2.4.2 21.2.5.1 – 21.2.5.4 21.2.6.1 – 21.2.6.3 21.2.7.1 - 21.2.7.4</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for larger range of permitted effects for home occupation activities • Increasing outdoor recreation activities from 5 to 10 will have a potential for higher adverse effects. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential costs for commercial or industrial operators seeking to locate in the Rural Zone <p>Social and Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for recreational users to be affected by larger groups of outdoor 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides control to assess the effects of industrial activities. • Provides clearer parameters around what may constitute suitable commercial activities in the Rural Zones. • Provides more appropriate basis to encourage commercial activities to locate in the zone where that activity is likely to be most appropriate and recognises commercial and tourism activities that have a genuine 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The provisions would provide effective control for activities that may have an adverse impact, while enabling activities that would have a low impact such as home occupation and outdoor commercial recreation activities. • The provisions introduce efficiencies in enabling persons to provide for small scale, low impact commercial activities while clarifying the operative provisions relating to commercial activities.

<p>21.2.9.1 – 21.2.9.6 21.2.11.1 – 21.2.11.2 21.2.12.1 – 21.2.12.10 21.2.13.1 – 21.2.13.2.</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i> 23.3.3, 23.3.4, 23.3.6</p> <p>Rules:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.4.1</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> 21.3 - 21.4 and 21.5 all relevant rules.</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i> 23.4.1, 23.4.12 to 23.4.20 Tables 2 and 3</p>	<p>commercial recreation activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potential for localised amenity effects from larger range of home occupation based activities. 	<p>affiliation with the landscape resource and farming activities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitable controls are in place for activities based on the scale and intensity of the activity. • Provides control to manage the effects of activities on the districts outstanding natural landscapes and features as required by Part 2 of the RMA. <p><i>Economic</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More certainty for commercial operators seeking to locate in the Rural Zones. • Enables small scale outdoor commercial operators to establish without the requirement to apply for a resource consent. <p><i>Social and Cultural</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for a range of small scale outdoor commercial recreation opportunities without the need to obtain resource consent. • Enables people to meet their needs on their own properties as part of home occupation activities, where these activities would have a low 	
--	---	--	--

		environmental impact.	
Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:			
<i>Option 1: Make all commercial activities require a resource consent</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Would be an unnecessary level of control on small commercial activities that are appropriate in the Rural Zones and have limited environmental impacts..</i> 	

<u>Issue 5: Managing the existing Ski Area Subzones</u>			
6.3.8 (Landscape) Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District’s landscapes.			
21.2.6 (Rural Zone) Encourage the future growth, development and consolidation of existing Ski Areas within identified Sub Zones, while avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects on the environment.			
Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy recognising the importance of skiing activities and their consolidation within the ski area subzones; • Retention of operative rules allowed the construction of buildings as a controlled activity; • A rule requiring a non-complying activity resource consent for ski area activities/commercial skiing (except heli-skiing) not located within the ski area sub zones; • Specific policy and rules for established vehicle testing activity at Waiorau Snow Farm area. 			
<i>Proposed provisions</i>	<i>Costs</i>	<i>Benefits</i>	<i>Effectiveness & Efficiency</i>

<p>Policies:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.2.8.1, 6.2.8.3</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> 21.2.6.1 to 21.2.6.3</p> <p>Rules:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.4.1</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> Table 1 and Table 8.</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains existing ski field and vehicle testing activities <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains the ongoing activities that provide for peoples well-being 	<p>The proposed provisions will assist with the identification of specific activities within the Rural Zone that make an important contribution to the district's economy and provide a recreational resource. The provisions will be effective in that they provide certainty to ski area activities within the sub zone areas while retaining control on the effects of activities.</p> <p>The provisions are enabling and maintain efficiencies to the ski field operators and established vehicle testing facilities.</p>
<p>Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:</p>			
<p><i>Option 1: More control on the adverse effects of building and activities in sensitive landscapes. Make buildings and ski area activities a restricted discretionary activity.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The existing provisions are enabling and more control on the scale and intensity of activities could be considered necessary. A review of the resource consents granted for ski area activities does not however, indicate to date, that there is a valid reason to change the provisions to make ski area activity buildings a class of resource consent that could result in a development being declined.</i> 		

Issue 6: Managing the Gibbston Character Zone

6.3.1 (Landscape) The District contains and values Outstanding Natural Features, Outstanding Natural Landscapes, and Rural Landscapes that require protection from inappropriate subdivision and development.

6.3.2 (Landscape)– Avoid adverse cumulative effects on landscape character and amenity values caused by incremental subdivision and development.

6.3.8 (Landscape) - Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District's landscapes.

23.2.1 (Gibbston Character Zone) Protect the economic viability, character and landscape value of the Gibbston Character Zone by enabling viticulture activities and controlling adverse effects resulting from inappropriate activities locating in the Zone.

23.2.2 (Gibbston Character Zone) Sustain the life supporting capacity of soils.

23.2.3 (Gibbston Character Zone) Safeguard the life supporting capacity of water through the integrated management of the effects of activities.

23.2.4 (Gibbston Character Zone) Encourage land management practices that recognise and accord with the environmental sensitivity and amenity values of the Gibbston Character Zone.

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

- Retention of the majority of existing provisions including the following changes:
 - Further enabling the construction and use of winery buildings by making them a controlled activity up to 500m², currently this is a restricted discretionary activity for the construction of any building;
 - Industrial activities associated with wineries and underground cellars a permitted activity, up to 300m²;
 - Retention of the existing policies of the Gibbston Character Zone;
 - Recognition of the Gibbston Character Zone in the landscape policy and confirmation that the landscape categorisations do not apply;
 - Retention of the assessment criteria for buildings, subject to modifications similar to the Rural Zone assessment criteria to reduce repetition and clarification;
- Refer to separate resource management issues for matters relating to effective and efficient resource management, commercial activities, informal airports and landscape for provisions affected by these issues.

Proposed provisions	Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<p>Policies:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.2.1.8, 6.2.2.3. 5.3.2.4. 5.3.9.2.</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i> All policies</p> <p>Rules:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.4.1</p> <p><i>Gibbston Character Zone</i> 23.4-23.7 – All rules.</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains emphasis on managing water and soil resource. Controlling effects of activities that may impinge on viticulture. <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retains importance of viticulture and winery buildings and the contribution these make to the District. <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides for peoples welling being who rely on the resources and established infrastructure and buildings as part of the districts wine making. • 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed provisions will be effective at providing for viticulture as the predominant activity, maintain amenity and controlling non-viticulture activities. • The provisions will not create inefficiencies for viticulture activities, or any established residential or commercial activities. The proposed phrasing will encourage efficient administration of the provisions.
<p>Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:</p>			
<p><i>Option 1: Remove the existing zone, rezone to Rural Zone and apply the landscape categories.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Viticulture fits under the ambit of farming activity and the main concession for new activities is that winery buildings are a restricted discretionary activity. While the Rural Zone provisions could also control the effects of subdivision and development in this location, the framework of the Gibbston Character Zone provides more certainty for activities associated with viticulture, including winery buildings and processing and manufacturing associated with wine making.</i> 		

Issue 7: Miscellaneous and existing Provisions

6.3.5 (Landscape) Recognise the dependence of tourism on the District's landscapes.

13.3.5 (Rural Zone) Recognise for and provide opportunities for mineral extraction providing the location, scale and effects would not degrade amenity, water, landscape and indigenous biodiversity values.

21.2.7 (Rural Zone) Separate activities sensitive to aircraft noise from existing airports through:

- **Wanaka: Retention of an area containing activities that are not sensitive to aircraft noise, within an airport's Outer Control Boundary, to act as a buffer between airports and activities sensitive to aircraft noise (ASAN).**
- **Queenstown: Retention of an area for Airport related activities or where appropriate an area for activities not sensitive to aircraft noise within an airport's Outer Control Boundary to act as a buffer between airports and other land use activities.**

21.2.8 (Rural Zone)– Avoid subdivision and development in areas that are identified as being unsuitable for development.

Summary of proposed provisions that give effect to these objectives:

- Proposed inclusion of policy to recognise and provide for a range of established rules.
- Existing status for the following activities substantially retained with minor modifications to phrasing or the matters of control:
 - Domestic livestock (Rule 21.4. 11)
 - Retail sales of farm and garden produce grown or produced on the site (Rule 21.4. 14) including a exemption for small scale roadside stalls
 - Commercial activities ancillary to and on the same site as recreational activities (Rule 21.4. 15)
 - Cafes and restaurants located in a winery complex within a vineyard (Rule 21.4. 17)
 - Forestry activities (Rule 21.4.2.21 and 21.4. 1)
 - Visitor accommodation (Rule 21.4.20)
 - Restrictions on activities adjacent to airports (Rule 21.4. 28 and 21.4. 29) and requirements for sound insulation within critical listening environments of activities sensitive to aircraft noise (limited to alterations and additions of existing buildings) (Rule 21.5.13) to reflect the outcomes of Plan Change 35 for the Queenstown Airport.
 - Mining activities (Rule 21.4.2.30 to 21.4.2.31)
 - Bulk and location of buildings (Table 2)
 - Factory Farming (Rule 21.4.2, 21.5.8 – 21.5.10)
 - Structures within road boundaries (Rule 21.4.2.45)
 - Retail sales associated produce grown or reared on site (Rule 21.5.14)
 - All activities relating to Closeburn Station (21.4.1 and Table 10)

Proposed provisions	Costs	Benefits	Effectiveness & Efficiency
<p>Policies:</p> <p><i>Landscape</i> 6.2.9.1, 6.2.9.2</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> 21.2.1.1 – 21.2.1.8 21.2.4.1 – 21.2.4.2, 21.2.5.1 to 21.2.5.4 21.2.7.1 to 21.2.7.4 21.2.8.1 to 21.2.8.2</p> <p>Rules:</p> <p><i>Rural Zone</i> Refer to the summary above.</p>	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified <p>Economic</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requirement for sound insulation and/or mechanical ventilation within the Air Noise boundaries of the Queenstown Airport will add some cost to development. However, the rule reflects the Environment Court confirmed provisions filed in May 2013; and seeks to achieve an appropriate management regime for land use around the airport. <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None identified 	<p>Environmental</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Operative provisions provide control for managing potential effects on the environment. <p>Economic</p> <p>Requirement for sound insulation and/or mechanical ventilation within the Air Noise boundaries of the Queenstown Airport will contribute to protecting the Queenstown Airport from reverse sensitivity effects; supporting the efficient operation of the airport and associated economic benefits to the District.</p> <p>Social & Cultural</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide certainty to the nature and scale of development. • Requirement for sound insulation and/or mechanical ventilation within the Air Noise boundaries will support appropriate level of amenity for activities sensitive to aircraft noise. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These provisions have not been identified as being necessary to change. • These provisions are considered to provide an effective degree of either permissiveness or control. They are not considered to create unnecessary inefficiencies.
<p><u>Alternative options considered less appropriate to achieve the relevant objectives and policies:</u></p>			
<p>Option 1: none identified.</p>			

10. Efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions

The above provisions are drafted to specifically address the resource management issues identified with the current provisions, and to enhance those provisions that already function well. A number of areas of the existing chapter have been removed to aid the readability of the Plan by keeping the provisions at a minimum, whilst still retaining adequate protection for the resource.

By simplifying the objectives, policies and rules (the provisions), the subject matter becomes easier to understand for users of the Plan both as applicant and administrator (processing planner). Removal of technical or confusing words and phrases also encourages correct use and interpretation. With easier understanding, the provisions create a more efficient consent process by reducing the number of consents required and by expediting the processing of those consents.

11. The risk of not acting

Section 32(c) of the RMA requires an assessment of the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions. It is not considered that there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions.

The issues identified and options taken forward are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. If these changes were not made there is a risk the District Plan would fall short of fulfilling its functions.

References

Also refer to any footnotes within the text

1. Read Landscapes Limited 'Report to Queenstown Lakes District Council on appropriate landscape classification boundaries within the District, with particular reference to Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features' 2014. - [link](#)
 - a. Peer review on the Wakatipu component by Ben Espie landscape planner - [link](#)
 - b. Peer review on the Wanaka/Upper Clutha component by Anne Steven landscape architect - [link](#)
 - c. Read Landscapes Limited. Post review amendments 16 October 2014 - [link](#)
 - d. Landscape assessment of Criffel Station and terrace escarpments near McKay Road 'QLDC Landscape categorisation Lines' by Paul Smith landscape Architect. 20 July 2015 - [link](#)
2. Read Landscapes Limited 'Wakatipu Basin Residential Subdivision and Development: Landscape Character Assessment' June 2014 - [link](#)
3. 'High Level Review of Proposed District Plan Provisions – Landscape Issues' Ben Espie Landscape Planner. 20 November 2014 - [link](#)
4. Ministry for the Environment. 2014. A guide to section 32 of the Resource management Act: incorporating changes as a result of the Resource Management Amendment Act 2013. Wellington. Ministry for the Environment - [link](#)

Appendix 4. Evidence. Dr Marion Read Landscape Architect

Appendix 5. Aerial photographs of the Wakatipu Basin and Wanaka area with approved building platforms.