

Appendix D –Assessment Against Proposed District Plan Objectives and Policies

Appendix D - Assessment Against Relevant Objectives and Policies – Operative District Plan

Chapter 3 – Strategic Direction

Objective/Policies	Comment
3.2.1.6	<p>Dr Galloway considers the proposed development will result in significant amenity enhancements for local residents, visitors and tourists by providing public access to further trails on Mt Iron and Little Mt Iron. Mr Baxter concludes the proposed development, with the proposed design controls promoting a consistent pattern of single level dark coloured dwellings, will protect the exiting amenity of the landscape (Baxter evidence para 61). No known sites of cultural significance would be affected by the proposal and no cultural effects are anticipated as a result of the proposal. The proposal provides for the control of pest plant and animal species to support the site’s indigenous flora and fauna. As the proposal specifically recognises and provides for rural amenity, landscape character, and healthy ecosystems I consider it is in accordance with this objective.</p>
3.2.4.1	<p>The proposal includes components that will protect and restore indigenous habitat and species, improve the health and resilience of ecosystems and control pest weed and animal species and so is in accordance with this objective. The proposal has been specifically developed to manage the resources of Mt Iron so as to specifically protect and actively enhance ecological amenities.</p>
3.2.4.2/3.2.4.2.1	<p>This objective protects areas with significant nature conservation values. As above, the proposal through the MIPRL enables the protection of nature conservation values and ecological values of the Mt Iron area, and protection of significant habitats of indigenous fauna.</p>
3.2.4.3	<p>This proposal achieves this objective by specifically recognising and providing for a methodology for the management of indigenous biodiversity to maintain and enhance ecosystem health over a large area of predominantly indigenous vegetation and the control of weed and pest species. Specific objectives and policies are proposed to minimise the removal of existing indigenous vegetation and are directive in maintaining and enhancing the ecological values of Mt Iron and Little Mt Iron (not just the MIPRL area). Dr Lloyd has considered the effects of the vegetation removal required to provide for the residential sites and <i>"I understand that the proposed building platforms in this area would require clearance of 1.1 ha of kānuka woodland, out of a total of 10.9 ha of kānuka woodland within the proposed zone (and a much larger extent of kānuka woodland elsewhere on Mt Iron and Little Mt Iron). This level of clearance would have minimal effect on indigenous forest birds given the extent of forest bird habitat available locally (Attachment 8), and the effects of indigenous vegetation clearance could easily be dealt with through positive actions that would be of benefit to the SNAs on Mt Iron"</i>. Planting of ecologically valuable indigenous trees is also proposed including planting broadleaved forest restoration planting on 0.5 hectares adjacent to SNA E18D_2 in the saddle between Mt Iron and Little Mt Iron to provide a seed source for colonisation of planted tree species into kanuka woodland elsewhere on Mt Iron and Little Mt Iron (see also Dr Lloyd’s paras 57 and 58).</p>
3.2.4.4/3.2.4.4.1	<p>This proposal and more specifically the objectives and policies of the MIPRL require that nature conservation and ecological values of all Mt Iron are protected, and made accessible to the community. Further, the MIPRL objectives require the control and eradication of wilding tree species. These are ongoing permanent obligations that are to be secured by legal methods at no cost to the wider</p>

	community. Prescribed species lists for planting within the zone will also achieve the outcomes sought to reduce potential spread of exotic vegetation.
3.2.4.7/3.2.4.7.1	This objective seeks to facilitate public access to the natural environment. One of the key components of the proposal is the enhancement of public access to the natural environment. This proposal specifically enhances public access to Mt Iron by legalising existing informal tracks and providing public access to Little Mt Iron. Dr Galloway considers (at para 56) that formalising the existing informal trails on the northern side of Mt Iron, providing access to Little Mt Iron and the commuter trail along the base of Mt Iron would add considerable value to the existing recreational amenities.
3.2.5.1	The quality of the Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Outstanding Natural Features is protected by this objective. This subdivision and development, while in an area with ONF classification, is considered appropriate in the context of the development surrounding and on the lower slopes of Mt Iron, and more particularly appropriate as a result of the significant secured and ongoing ecological, public access and recreation benefits that will arise from the proposal.
3.2.5.3	This objective seeks to direct new urban subdivision, use or development to occur in those areas which have potential to absorb change without detracting from landscape and visual amenity values. The proposed MIPRL zone enables rural lifestyle development at a density of 1.3ha per dwelling which is not development at an urban density.
3.2.5.4/3.2.5.4.1-3.2.5.4.2	Environmental and social effects of the proposal are expected to be limited as the site is already developed for lower density residential use (three existing houses) and is on the periphery of existing residential development. The proposal is considered to provide for ongoing significant ecological, public access and recreation benefits at no cost to the public. The proposal will create a rural living opportunity in an appropriate location which will protect landscape qualities.
3.2.5.5/ 3.2.5.5.1/ 3.2.5.5.2	Any productive farming use of the site would face significant challenges due to a number of factors, including size, topography, nature of soils, and the extent of the identified Significant Natural Area. In addition, the site is adjoined on its northern and western sides by residential uses. The proposal seeks to preserve nature conservation values which are otherwise inconsistent with farming activities.
3.2.6.3/ 3.2.6.3.1/ 3.2..6.3.2	This objective seeks to provide a high quality network of open spaces and community facilities. The proposal provides for increased open space by opening Mt Iron and Little Mt Iron for recreational activities that are not currently legally available and the commuter trail along the base of Mt Iron. Dr Galloway considers (at para 31) that formalising the existing informal trails on the northern side of Mt Iron, providing access to Little Mt Iron and the commuter trail would add considerable value to the existing recreational amenities.
3.2.6.4/3.2.6.4.2	Policy 3.2.6.4.2 provides for Council-led and private design and development of public spaces and built development to maximise the opportunity for recreational and commuting walking and cycling. As above, this proposal directly provides for recreational and commuting walking and cycling in the way of legalising trails on Mt Iron and Little Mt Iron.

Chapter 4 – Urban Development

Objective/Policies	Comment
4.2.2	This objective provides for Urban Growth Boundaries to be established as tools to manage the growth of major centres within distinct and defendable urban edges. This proposal is on the periphery of the Wanaka residential zone and the density of proposed development will not undermine defendable urban edges of the Urban Growth Boundary. In addition, with restrictive rules provided by the MIPRL zone, the application specifically reinforces a defendable urban edge. I therefore consider the proposal to be in accordance with this objective.
4.2.8 / 4.2.8.1	This objectives and associated policy seek to manage the scale and location of the urban growth of Wanaka. The application is consistent with the outcomes sought as the proposed development is not urban and, as stated above, will reinforce the adjoining urban growth boundary.

Chapter 6 – Landscapes

Objective/Policies	Comment
6.3.1/6.3.1.2, 6.3.1.6, 6.2.1.10- 11	Policy 6.3.1.2 “ <i>subdivision and development [within ONFs will be] inappropriate in almost all locations, meaning successful applications will be exceptional cases</i> ”. As discussed above under Objective 3.2.5.1, this proposal will result in an appropriate development of an ONF area. I consider that this proposal is an exceptional case given the significant and privately funded ecological and public recreational benefits that would arise from development enabled by these provisions. One of the key components of the proposal is the enhancement of public access to the natural environment. This proposal specifically enhances public access to Mt Iron by legalising existing informal tracks and providing public access to Little Mt Iron. The rural lifestyle development of up to 15 dwellings has been comprehensively designed in areas where the proposed development can be absorbed by the landscape and within the existing indigenous vegetation. No sites of cultural significance would be affected by the proposal and no cultural effects are anticipated as a result of the proposal. I consider the proposal in accordance with this objective and these policies.
6.3.2/6.3.2.1-5	As above under Objective 6.3.1, the proposed dwellings locations can be absorbed by the landscape and within the existing indigenous vegetation. They are not considered to degrade landscape character and visual amenity or result in a cumulative effect. Objective 3.2.5.4 (above) considers quality, character and amenity values.
6.3.3/6.3.3.1	As above under Objectives 3.2.5.1 and 6.3.1, this subdivision and development, while in an area with an ONF classification, is considered appropriate in the context of the surrounding development and on the lower slopes of Mt Iron, and more particularly appropriate as a result of the significant secured and ongoing ecological, public access and recreation benefits that will arise from the proposal.
6.3.5/6.3.5.1, 6.3.5.2	Objective 6.3.5 seeks to ensure “ <i>subdivision and development does not degrade landscape character and diminish visual amenity values of the Rural Landscapes (RLC)</i> .” There are some strong policies such as 6.3.5.1 and 6.3.5.2 that would only allow development where

	<p>it would “not degrade landscape quality or character, or diminish visual amenity values identified for any Rural Landscape” and similarly avoid adverse effects from development that would be highly visible from public places. As discussed above, I consider this proposal does not degrade landscape quality or character or diminish visual amenity or be highly visible from public places and is therefore in accordance with this objective and these policies. The evidence of Dr Galloway considers that providing public access to further trails on Mt Iron and Little Mt Iron would result in significant amenity enhancements for local residents, visitors and tourists.</p>
--	---

Chapter 22 – Rural Residential and Rural Lifestyle

Objective/Policies	Comment
22.2.1/22.2.1.1, 22.2.1.4--8	<p>This objective and associated policies seeks to maintain and enhance the district’s landscape quality, character and visual amenity values while enabling rural living opportunities in areas that can absorb development. The proposal is considered to be in accordance with this objective and these policies. As above, the proposed dwelling locations can be absorbed by the landscape and existing vegetation and will not be highly visible from external to the site. Taking proposed design controls into account, dwellings on the building platforms will be difficult to perceive. Dr Lloyd recommends the use of low flammability indigenous species in green break around houses to reduce the spread of fire and provide restoration of broadleaved forest (para 61).</p>
22.2.2/22.2.2.1-2	<p>Policy 22.2.2.1 provides for residential development as permitted activities in the Rural Lifestyle Zone and Policy 22.2.2.2 states any development located on the periphery of residential and township areas, shall avoid undermining the integrity of the urban rural edge and where applicable, the urban growth boundaries. This proposal directly achieves these policies.</p>

Chapter 33 – Indigenous Vegetation and Biodiversity

Objective/Policies	Comment
33.2.1/33.2.1.1-4, 33.2.1.6-8, 33.2.1.10	<p>This objective and associated policies seeks the protection, maintenance and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity. As discussed above under Objectives 3.2.1.6, 3.2.4.1 and 3.2.4.3, this proposal achieves this objective by specifically recognising and providing for a methodology for the management of indigenous biodiversity over 117 hectares to maintain and enhance ecosystem health and biodiversity over a large area of predominantly indigenous vegetation and the control of weed and pest species.</p>
33.2.2/33.2.2.1-3	<p>The protection and enhancement of Significant Natural Areas are a key component of this application. It is proposed to amend the Significant Natural Area E18C on the northern side of Mt Iron and extend it on the southern side. The Mt Iron SNA was originally proposed to have an area of 48.08 hectares and the currently proposed SNA has an area of 53.9 hectares. This is a 5.8 hectare increase of the area of the SNA. I further note that Dr Lloyd considers that the proposed SNA extent “has much higher ecological value than the notified Mt Iron SNA C, and will deliver much better protection for the ecological values on the Mt Iron site.” The intrinsic values of ecosystems have been specifically considered in this proposal and the revised SNA defined to protect a wider range of the significant</p>

	ecosystems on Mt Iron. In addition to this specific protection the proposal provides for the protection of the balance of Mt Iron and Little Mt Iron's indigenous vegetation and ecosystems. I therefore consider the proposal to be in accordance with this objective and these policies.
33.2.3/33.2.3.2-3	As above, this development is considered to maintain indigenous biodiversity values. Planting of ecologically valuable indigenous trees is proposed including broadleaved forest restoration planting on 0.5 hectares adjacent to SNA E18D_2 in the saddle between Mt Iron and Little Mt Iron to provide a seed source for colonisation of planted tree species into kanuka woodland elsewhere on Mt Iron and Little Mt Iron (see also Dr Lloyd's paras 55 and 56).

Chapter 34 – Wilding Exotic Trees

Objective/Policies	Comment
34.2.1/34.2.1.2-3	As discussed above under Objective 3.2.4.4, this proposal, and more specifically the objectives and policies of the MIPRL, require nature conservation and ecological values of all Mt Iron are protected. Further, the MIPRL objectives require the control and eradication of wilding tree species. These are ongoing permanent obligations that are to be secured by legal methods at no cost to the wider community.