

21.22.18 PA ONL Cardrona Valley: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

The Cardrona Valley PA is a north-south oriented valley enclosed by the Cardrona Range/Harris Mountains to the west and the Pisa/Criffel Range to the east. The PA extends to the crest of the western Pisa Range flanks and to the landforms visually containing the valley to the west, including the eastern flanks of Mount Cardrona and a ridge of Mount Alpha. In a north-south direction the PA starts just north of Timber Creek and ends at Blackmans Creek about 3.25 kilometres upstream of Cardrona village. The majority of the Cardrona Ski Area Sub-Zone falls within the area.

Physical Attributes and Values

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

Important landforms and land types:

1. A deeply cut fault valley with a flat alluvial floor of up to 700m in width below Cardrona Village, narrowing above this point.
2. The Pisa/Criffel Range: the westernmost and highest element of the characteristic 'basin and range' fault block landscape that stretches across Central Otago. The parallel schist ranges of this sequence are characterised by broad planar crests and frequent tors. The western flanks of the range are relatively even in gradient and form a linear eastern 'wall' to the valley, with few significant ridges or gullies apart from Tuohys Gully.
3. Cardrona low hills: low hills and terraces of strongly weathered sandstone-dominant gravels between the valley floor and the main Cardrona Range/Harris Mountains. An angular ridge and gully landform, with alluvial flats and small terraces.
4. The Cardrona Range/Harris Mountains: dissected mountain slopes and hummocky slump topography with scattered schist outcrops and schist tors at higher elevations on Mount Cardrona.
5. Contains the Geopreservation Sites: Branch Creek Road faulted aggradation on an alluvial surface; and the NW Cardrona Fault at Blackmans Creek. These are regionally significant and not considered vulnerable to most human activities.

Important hydrological features:

6. The Ōrau (Cardrona River) is the most important water course within the PA, flowing the length of the valley. It is a usually shallow water course with gravel substrate, low banks, and substantial seasonal and weather-related flow variations. There are also significant surface water–shallow groundwater interactions with the river having adjacent influent and effluent reaches that may vary temporally. Significant floods occasionally spread across the valley floor (for example 1878 and 1999).
7. Other larger water courses are Tuohys Creek, Branch Burn (McPhees Creek) and Spotts Creek.
8. The water courses within the valley are a fishery resource and spawning habitat. They provide habitat for longfin eels, kōaro, upland bullies and Clutha flathead galaxias (nationally critical) and brown and rainbow trout.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

- 9. Particularly noteworthy vegetation types include:
 - a. Kānuka shrubland on mountain slopes towards the Upper Clutha mouth of the valley.
 - b. Grey shrubland communities on lower elevation south and east facing slopes and within prominent gullies in the Spotts Creek, Branch Creek and Boundary Creek catchments and bordering the main stem of the Cardrona River upstream of Cardrona township. Some of these shrublands are SNAs. The shrublands support tree daisy communities, including the At-Risk Declining *Olearia lineata*. Patches of bracken are common in and around areas of shrubland.
 - c. *Dracophyllum* shrubland on shady wetter faces and within gullies.
 - d. Distinct gradient of indigenous vegetation types on Mount Cardrona from mixed grey shrubland-exotic grassland near the valley floor to mid slope short tussock grasslands in the montane zone to tall snow tussock grasslands and mixed snow tussockland-*Dracophyllum* spp. and herbfield communities in the sub-alpine and alpine zones. Small alpine wetlands (cushion and sedge bogs) occur in the upper basins on Mount Cardrona associated with low gradient streams and flushes.
- 10. Other characteristic vegetation types are:
 - a. Improved irrigated pasture on the valley floor, on flats within the Cardrona hills, and on some lower slopes of the Pisa/Criffel Range.
 - b. Short tussock over-sown with pasture on the lower and mid-slope mountain faces and Cardrona hills.
 - c. Crack willows lining the Cardrona River and other water courses.
 - d. Groups of exotic shelter trees around station homesteads, including distinctive mature Lombardy poplars.
 - e. Plantation of Douglas fir near Spotts Creek.
- 11. Valued habitat for skinks and geckos, a wide range of invertebrate species (including the threatened flightless shield bug and Otago endemic grasshopper), New Zealand falcon, Australasian harrier, New Zealand pipit, South Island oystercatchers, banded dotterels, black fronted tern, paradise shelduck and grey duck.
- 12. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, crack willow, sweet briar and lupin.
- 13. Animal pest species include deer, goats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, mice and rats.

Important land use patterns and features:

- 14. On the less developed slopes, including some areas which have been retired for conservation and recreation purposes, a natural dryland vegetation cover including tussock grasslands prevails. In the valley floors and on the more accessible slopes and terraces the predominant land use is pastoral farming, although some areas have been retired for conservation and recreation. The Cardrona Ski Area Sub-Zone Alpine Resort partly within the PA, and the Southern Hemisphere Proving Ground and Nordic Skiing Snow Farm are just outside of and accessed through the PA on the Pisa Range. Access roads to these activities are visually prominent within the landscape. Apart from Cardrona Valley Road and some roads around Cardrona Village which are sealed, all public and private access roads are unsealed.
- 15. Cardrona Village (Settlement Zone) is the main settlement within the valley, but significant urban development is anticipated and is starting to occur within the Mount Cardrona Special Zone. Some rural living development is present north and south of the village, and there is also a loose cluster of tourism-

Commented [JH1]: Typographical correction to align with standard Schedule format.

Commented [JH2]: OS 67 Upper Clutha Environmental Society - text added, taken from body of submission (as it improves the description of land use patterns and features). Not submitted changes to wording per se.

Commented [JH3]: OS 178.17 Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP (although not submitted wording per se).

Commented [JH4]: Amendment by JHLA.

Commented [JH5]: Amendment by JHLA.

Commented [JH6]: Amendment by JHLA.

Commented [JH7]: Amendment by JHLA.

Commented [JH8]: OS 166.46 RealNZ Limited (although not submitted wording per se).

related development near the Cardrona Alpine Resort Road intersection. Widely spaced station homestead clusters set within areas of mature exotic trees are a feature of the flats and lower valleys, and there are a few consented but undeveloped building platforms in the Timber Creek gully on Hillend Station.

Commented [JH9]: OS 113.9 Anderson Branch Creek Ltd

16. Cardrona Alpine Resort and the Soho Basin Ski Area on the upper eastern slopes of Mount Cardrona comprise a significant built development within the landscape but are not visually prominent from the valley floor.

Commented [JH10]: OS 178.34 Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP (although not submitted wording per se).

Commented [JH11]: OS 178.34 Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP (although not submitted wording per se).

Commented [JH12]: Amendment by JHLA.

17. With the exception of Cardrona Village and development near the Cardrona Alpine Resort Road intersection, buildings are generally well integrated within the landscape by existing landform features and/or established trees, so they are not highly visible from Cardrona Valley Road.
18. Aurora Energy electricity distribution lines servicing the village, skifields and proving ground follow the valley floor, and there are substation sites adjacent to Cardrona Valley Road.
19. Gravel extraction has been undertaken at times in the Cardrona River and side streams.

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

20. Rich history of 19th century gold mining and early European pastoral farming throughout the valley, with numerous archaeological and heritage features. These include the Roaring Meg and Little Criffel pack tracks, river flat ground sluicing and tailings, hydraulic sluiced cliffs, the Criffel Face and Tuohys Gully sluicings and reservoirs, water races, tunnels, dredge remains, domestic sites and homestead sites associated with historic farming. There are large, sluiced cliffs and water races extending along almost the entire length of the valley and at Mount Cardrona.
21. Historic route between Wānaka and Queenstown, and between Cromwell and Cardrona via Tuohys Gully.
22. Scheduled heritage sites include: Old Butchery, Tuohy's Gully (QLDC ref. 500); Studholme Nursery Plaque, Cardrona Road (QLDC ref. 510), Hotel façade, hall and church, Cardrona (QLDC ref. 510).

Mana whenua features and their locations:

23. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
24. The Ōrau (Cardrona River) has been identified as a wāhi tūpuna by Kāi Tahu.

Associative Attributes and Values

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

Mana whenua associations and experience:

25. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
26. The Ōrau is a traditional ara tawhito (travel route) linking Whakatipu-Wai-māori Whakatipu-Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) with Lakes Wānaka and Hāwea. It also provided access to the natural bridge on the Kawarau River.
27. Ōrau is also recorded as a kāika mahika kai where tuna (eels), pora ('Māori turnip'), āruhe (fernroot) and weka were gathered.

Commented [JH13]: OS 77.44 Kai Tahu ki Otago OS188.44 Te Rūnunga o Ngāi Tahu

28. The mana whenua values associated with the ONL include, but may not be limited to, mahika kai, ara tawhito, nohoaka.

Important historic attributes and values:

29. The very strong associations of the valley with 19th century gold mining, with physical evidence of mining activities and associated settlement, preservation and interpretation of mining areas on both conservation and private, and names of claims being retained in place names.
30. Strong associations with a high country dryland vegetation cover including tussock grasslands contrasting with pastoral farming, including historic buildings, homestead clusters/former sites, and features, places and station names.
31. Historic route between the Upper Clutha and Whakatipu Basins.

Commented [JH14]: OS 67 Upper Clutha Environmental Society - text added, taken from body of submission (as it improves the description of land use patterns and features). Not submitted changes to wording per se.

Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

32. A nationally and regionally renowned scenic and historic route between Queenstown and Wānaka, and a gateway for both the Upper Clutha Basin and the Whakatipu Basin.
33. A nationallyAn internationally recognised tourist, high performance alpine sport, and recreational destination.
34. High country dryland vegetation character, including tussock grasslands, punctuated with exposed rock outcrops at higher altitudes.

Commented [JH15]: OS 166.47 RealNZ Limited

Commented [JH16]: OS 166.47 RealNZ Limited

Commented [JH17]: OS 67 Upper Clutha Environmental Society - text added, taken from body of submission (as it improves the description of land use patterns and features). Not submitted changes to wording per se.

Important recreation attributes and values:

35. Very popular destination for trout fishing, mountain biking, hiking, horse trekking, snowsportskiing and Nordic skiing, as well as visits to historic sites and commercial recreation activities such as the distillery, mountain carting and shuttle services in the summer season for mountain biking/hiking and horse trekking providers.
36. The area features the highly popular Cardrona Alpine Resort and Soho Basin Ski Area (within the Ski Area Sub-Zone), providing a year-round destination offering snow-based recreation such as skiing/snowboarding in winter and hiking/mountain biking opportunities in the summer. Year-round activities are also facilitated here, such as sightseeing, star gazing, mountain carting. The access road to Snow Farm (a ski touring area) is also within the PA area.
37. Popular walking trails including: Tuohys Track/Roaring Meg Pack Track, Spotts Creek Track, Little Criffel Track.
38. The Cardrona Valley Road is a popular route for both locals and visitors due to the distinct and engaging valley views.
39. Other popular tracks include the diverse mountain biking trails network at Cardrona Alpine Resort and horse trekking trails within the valley.
40. The area is also a location for high performance sport. E.g., skiing, snowboarding and LANDSAR training.

Commented [JH18]: OS 166.48 RealNZ Limited although not submitted wording per se.

Commented [JH19]: OS 166.48 RealNZ Limited

Commented [JH20]: OS 185.2 Cardrona Distillery Ltd

Commented [JH21]: OS 178.35 Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP.

Commented [JH22]: OS 113.11 Anderson Branch Creek Ltd (although not submitted wording per se).

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

Legibility and Expressiveness • Views to the area • Views from the area • Naturalness • Memorability • Transient values • Remoteness / Wildness • Aesthetic qualities and values

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

41. Easily legible form of the valley, with long views available up and down, and the close steep mountain walls or hills providing a strong sense of enclosure. Landforms are highly expressive of their formative processes and the open character of the mountains due to the low, dryland vegetation cover, including tussock grasslands means that the hummocky or gullied surface of the land is clearly displayed.

Commented [JH23]: OS 67 Upper Clutha Environmental Society - text added, taken from body of submission (as it improves the description of land use patterns and features). Not submitted changes to wording per se.

Particularly important views to and from the area:

42. Dramatic and highly attractive views from Cardrona Valley Road to the contained valley floor and enclosing mountains. The scale of the landforms and their proximity dwarf the viewer, giving a sense of sublime grandeur. There is a progressive opening up of views as people move down the valley, particularly north of the Cardrona Village node. From this point the consistent 'wall' of the Pisa/Criffel range, with its open, natural and relatively wild character, dominates views across the sparsely inhabited 'working farm' rural foreground. To the west, views are often enclosed by the pastoral land of the Cardrona low hills but in places (eg. north of Cardrona Village, Branch Creek, Spotts Creek and Timber Creek) vistas open out to the rugged and often snow-covered Mount Cardrona and Harris Mountains in the distance. The Cardrona Alpine Resort is reasonably difficult to see from the road and the Mount Cardrona Station Special Zone is largely screened by rising topography.
43. Spectacular panoramic views from the skifield roads, Cardona Alpine Resort and Little Criffel Track, taking in the greener and more vegetated valley, and the contrasting open expanses of tawny or craggy surrounding mountains, with glimpses to the Upper Clutha Basin in the north.

Commented [JH24]: OS 130.5 The Roberts Family Trust

Naturalness attributes and values:

44. The landscape is perceived as having a high level of naturalness, particularly to the south of the Cardrona settlement. Little apparent with little human modification is present on the mountain slopes and Cardrona hills other than roads, tracks, pasture improvements and fencing. Natural spread of kānuka, grey shrubland and bracken on the mountain slopes and gullies, and remaining tussocklands on the mountains enhance the naturalness of the landscape.
45. The presence of development on the valley floor, in Cardrona Village, in Mount Cardrona Special Zone, and in the Ski Area Sub-Zone at the skifields (including their access roads) modifies perceptions of naturalness, but pastoral land on the valley floor is still perceived as a pleasant rural foreground to the mountains and hills and retains a significant level of naturalness. The ski areas, village and special zones are nodes of human occupation and development within a landscape dominated by natural patterns and farming land use.

Commented [JH25]: OS 113.13 Anderson Branch Creek Ltd (although not submitted wording per se).

Commented [JH26]: OS 178.45 Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP

Commented [JH27]: OS 178.20 Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP (although not submitted wording per se).

Commented [JH28]: Amendment by JHLA.

Commented [JH29]: OS 166.49 RealNZ Limited OS 178.20 Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek holdings No.1 LP

Memorability attributes and values:

46. Highly memorable journey through a large, enclosed valley with views of dramatic mountain ranges, largely clothed in dryland vegetation / tussock grasslands enhanced by their changing vegetation colours and snow cover across the seasons.
47. Highly memorable views from elevated roads, tracks and ski areas fields within the PA that take in the entire valley form and its relationship to the Upper Clutha Basin.

Commented [JH30]: OS 67 Upper Clutha Environmental Society - text added, taken from body of submission (as it improves the description of land use patterns and features). Not submitted changes to wording per se.

Commented [JH31]: Term amended by JHLA to be consistent with OS 166.49.

Transient attributes and values:

48. Seasonal snowfall and ice, large variations in the Cardrona River flow, changing green, brown and tawny gold of pastoral areas, the characteristic autumn colours of poplars and willows, changes in the play of light and shadow on the hummocky mountain slopes, and the presence of birdlife and stock.

Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

49. A sense of remoteness and wildness can be experienced on walking and mountain biking tracks within the landscape, including Tuohys Track and Spotts Creek Track and in locations away from Cardrona Valley Road on the high-country stations and the Cardrona Ski Area when viewing the surrounding landscape.

Commented [JH32]: OS 166.50 RealNZ Limited although not submitted wording per se.

Aesthetic attributes and values:

50. The experience of the values identified above by a significant number of residents and visitors travelling on Cardrona Valley Road or visiting Cardrona village and the ski areas fields (including access roads).

Commented [JH33]: Term amended by JHLA to be consistent with OS 166.49.

51. More specifically:

- a. The muscular unmodified slopes of the Pisa/Criffel range with their relatively even gradient and crest.
- b. The craggy ~~tussock covered~~ Cardrona Range/Harris Mountains largely clothed in natural dryland vegetation including tussock grasslands.
- c. The contrast between the mountains and the pastoral alluvial flats and terraces in the valley floor and on the low hills in the valley floor.
- d. The strong sense of enclosure within a long, straight and legible valley.
- e. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
 - i. the open tussock grasslands and indigenous shrublands on the mountain slopes;
 - ii. the presence of snow and ice during winter months;
 - iii. the contrasting and changing colours of sky, mountain slopes, snow cover and rocky outcrops;
 - iv. the play of light and shadow on the mountain slopes;
 - v. the historic buildings and scattered station homestead clusters in the valley and Cardona hills;
 - vi. the rural character and mature exotic trees within the valley;
 - vii. the autumn colours of willows and poplars on the valley floor, contributing to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

Commented [JH34]: OS 67 Upper Clutha Environmental Society - text added, taken from body of submission (as it improves the description of land use patterns and features). Not submitted changes to wording per se.

Commented [JH35]: OS 67 Upper Clutha Environmental Society - text added, taken from body of submission (as it improves the description of land use patterns and features). Not submitted changes to wording per se.

Commented [JH36]: OS 67 Upper Clutha Environmental Society - text added, taken from body of submission (as it improves the description of land use patterns and features). Not submitted changes to wording per se.

Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

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

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

These various physical, associative and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA ONL Cardrona Valley come together and can be summarised as follows:

- (a) **High physical values** due to the high value landforms, faulted valley, Cardrona River, the range of vegetation features and habitats, and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
- (b) **Very high associative values** relating to the mana whenua associations with the area, the historic attributes of the valley, the very strong shared and recognised values, and the popularity of the area as a tourism and recreational destination.
- (c) **High perceptual values** relating to:
 - i. The legibility and expressiveness values deriving from the visibility and openness of the landscape, enabling a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
 - ii. The aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its dramatic and highly appealing visual character and the large number of people visiting or moving through the valley.
 - iii. An impression of high naturalness arising from the dominance of the more natural landscape over built development and landform modification.

Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONL Cardrona Valley for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – **some** landscape capacity for activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features, particularly ~~within the Cardrona Ski Area Sub-Zone~~. Activities should be: located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of existing natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement and enhance public access; ~~and protect the area's ONL values.~~
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** – **some** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are: co-located with existing facilities; designed to be of sympathetic scale, appearance and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; ~~and protect the area's ONL values.~~ **Very limited to no** landscape capacity for tourism-related activities outside of the Settlement Zone and Mount Cardrona ~~Station Special Zone~~ ~~except where co-located with the Settlement Zone on the valley floor and is: of a modest or sympathetic scale; has a low-key, visually recessive 'rural' character; integrates appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhances public access; integrates a strong defensible edge to avoid the potential risk of development sprawl; and complements the existing character of Cardrona settlement.~~
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **some** landscape capacity on the valley floor that maintains scenic views from roads.
- v. **Earthworks** – **limited** landscape capacity for earthworks and trails that protect historic, naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns. **Some** capacity for public walking and cycle trails.

Commented [JH37]: OS 89.2 Cardrona Village Limited (supports notified capacity ratings)

Commented [JH38]: OS 113.15 Anderson Branch Creek Limited (although not submitted wording per se).

Commented [JH39]: Full sub-zone name added by JHLA.

Commented [JH40]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [JH41]: OS 67.6 Upper Clutha Environmental Society (supports capacity rating).

Commented [JH42]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [JH43]: Wording added from ODP by JHLA. This zone is not shown in the PDP mapping.

Commented [JH44]: OS 185.004 Cardrona Distillery Ltd

Commented [JH45]: OS 153.7 Cardrona Valley Farms Ltd

Commented [JH46]: OS 67.6 Upper Clutha Environmental Society (supports capacity rating).

Commented [JH47]: OS 99.1 Upper Clutha Tracks Trust (supports capacity)

Commented [JH48]: OS 73.25 Bike Wanaka Inc. OS 99.1 Upper Clutha Tracks Trust

- vi. **Farm buildings** – **limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction** – **no to very limited** landscape capacity for gravel extraction in the Cardrona River riverbed only that protects the naturalness and aesthetic attributes and values of the ONL.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low key 'rural' roading on the valley floor that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns. **Very limited** landscape capacity for additional roads, upgrades or expansions to existing roads, carparking areas and passing bays on the enclosing mountain slopes of the valley.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that it is screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- x. **Renewable energy generation** – **no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. **Limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Production Forestry** – **very limited to no** landscape capacity for small scale production forestry on the valley floor.
- xii. **Rural living** – **limited** landscape capacity for rural living development co-located with existing development on the valley floor and Cardrona hills and sited so that it is set back from Cardrona Valley Road and contained by landform and/or existing vegetation – with the location, scale and design of any proposal ensuring that it is generally difficult to see from external viewpoints. **Very limited** landscape capacity for rural living development close to Cardrona Village or Mount Cardrona Special Zone without cumulative adverse effects on the rural character and naturalness of the PA.
- xiii. **Passenger lift systems Gondolas** – **limited** landscape capacity to improve public access to focal recreational areas higher in the mountains via non-vehicular transportation modes such as gondolas, provided they are positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, are located and designed to be recessive in the landscape, and protect the area's ONL values.

Commented [JH49]: OS 77.15 Kai Tahu ki Otago OS 188.16 Te Rūnunga o Ngāi Tahu

Commented [JH50]: OS 178.43 Soho Ski Area Ltd and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP (although not submitted wording per se).

Commented [JH51]: OS 70.36 Transpower NZ Ltd

Commented [JH52]: Typographical error (as 3.3.38 and 3.3.41 refers to 'forestry').

Commented [JH53]: OS 67.7 Upper Clutha Environmental Society (although not submitted capacity sought).

Commented [JH54]: OS 74.2 John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [JH55]: Amendment by JHLA to be consistent with BGLA wording for (xiii)

Commented [JH56]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

21.22.18 Cardrona Valley ONL Schedule

11 AUGUST 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley ONL Schedule". New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Red text relates to a submission point that has not been specifically captured in the "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley ONL Schedule". This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **Five examples identified.**

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

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 2.2	John Robert Binney	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 is retained as notified.	Submission is in support	Accept submission.
OS 2.5	John Robert Binney	Oppose	That the Cardrona River Outstanding Natural Landscape be wrapped around to an extended Mount Barker Rural Character Landscape so that it joins the Lake McKay Station Outstanding Natural Landscape.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions) and ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS 67.5	Julian Haworth on behalf of Upper Clutha Environmental Society	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to clarify attributes versus values, such as pastoral intensification and plantations, plus the pests, which are landscape attributes.	The PA Schedules deliberately state at the 'start' of the Summary of Landscape Values section that the summary draws from the "combined physical, associative and perceptual attributes and values" described in the preceding part of the Schedules (i.e., the more detailed explanation of Physical, Associative and Perceptual attributes and values). In my opinion, these two aspects are critical to the correct interpretation of the PA Schedules by plan users, as they signal the interrelationship between attributes and values and the importance of reading the Schedules as a whole rather than simply focussing on the relatively brief Summary of Landscape Values which have been distilled down from the complexity of landscape values in each of the PAs that have been evaluated. I refer to Ms Gilbert's EiC, which addresses this matter in more detail.	Reject submission.
OS 67.6	Julian Haworth on behalf of Upper Clutha Environmental Society	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is generally supported in terms of the capacity rating for visitor and tourism activities and urban expansion however, the schedule needs to be amended to change the capacity for rural living to 'Very limited'.	The submitter suggests the capacity for rural living be decreased from 'limited' to 'very limited' in the capacity section. In the capacity section of the schedule, (xii) rural living partly includes a 'very limited' capacity scenario where rural living is located "...close to Cardrona Village or Mount Cardrona Special Zone without cumulative adverse effects on the rural character and naturalness of the PA." And so, the submission point is partly met. Relying on my knowledge of the area, fieldwork, careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), it is my opinion that the 'qualifications' set out in Schedule 21.22.18 capacity (xii) also play an important role in this regard, as they	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				serve to 'curb' the inappropriate proliferation of rural living development within the PA.	
OS 67.7	Julian Haworth on behalf of Upper Clutha Environmental Society	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended so it is unlikely that there will be capacity for exotic forests and no capacity for exotic conifer forests.	<p>The submitter suggests the capacity for forestry be amended so there is 'no' capacity for exotic forests. In the capacity section of the schedule, (xi) has a 'very limited' capacity for <i>small scale production forestry on the valley floor</i>. The schedules do not differentiate between different types of forestry and use the District Plan's definition for 'Forestry Activity'.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area, fieldwork, careful review of the GIS mapping resources (including contours, and aerial imagery), there is a small area of production forestry in the PA. On this basis, I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.18 Capacity are appropriate:</p> <p>(xi) Production Forestry –very limited to no landscape capacity for small scale production forestry on the valley floor.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS 70.36	Ainsley McLeod on behalf of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	<p>I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.18 Capacity are appropriate:</p> <p>(ix) utilities and regionally significant infrastructure - limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that it is screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location, and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.</p>	Accept submission.
OS 73.23	Ian Greaves on behalf of Bike Wanaka Inc.	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley be amended to remove reference to limited or very limited capacity for new cycling and walking trails.	Addressed in response to OS 73.25.	Accept submission.
OS 73.25	Ian Greaves on behalf of Bike Wanaka Inc.	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley be amended to include the following Walking and Cycling trails: some landscape capacity for additional trails that are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.	<p>In the Landscape capacity section at (v), trails are included within the broader earthworks category which has a 'limited' capacity. However, it is my opinion that walking and cycling trails generally involve a relatively low level of earthworks, and that there would be capacity for this to occur. On this basis, I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.18 Capacity are appropriate:</p> <p>(v) earthworks – limited landscape capacity for earthworks and some capacity for public walking and cycling trails that protect historic, naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 77.15	Michael Bathgate on behalf of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18.vii. mineral extraction be amended to no landscape capacity for mineral extraction. The submission also seeks that consistent terminology be used throughout schedules re mineral extraction.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Mineral extraction from the Ōrau (Cardrona) riverbed is currently permitted in accordance with Otago Regional Council and QLDC river management strategy consents. I consider that the following amendment to the wording in Schedule 21.22.18 Capacity is appropriate: (vii) Mineral extraction – very limited to no landscape capacity for gravel extraction in the Ōrau (Cardrona River) riverbed only that protects the naturalness and aesthetic attributes and values of the ONL.	Accept submission in part.
OS 77.25	Michael Bathgate on behalf of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18.xiii. gondolas be amended to include the words: ...preserve the natural character of wetlands, lakes, rivers and their margins; protect mana whenua associations and values, particularly for those areas identified as wāhi tūpuna, statutory acknowledgements or nohoaka;...	The intention of the submission is agreed with, although adding the submitted information is considered to be repetitive and not add clarity to the schedule text. Addressed in more detail by Ms Gilbert in her EiC. Of note; 'Gondolas' in the PA schedules has been changed to 'Passenger lift systems' to better align with the definitions for passenger lift systems (which includes gondolas) in the District Plan where such transport is not limited to being located only within a Ski Area Sub-Zone.	Reject submission.
OS 77.44	Michael Bathgate on behalf of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley paragraph 26 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Amend spelling	Accept submission.
OS 89.1	James Gardner-Hopkins on behalf of Cardrona Village Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley be amended so that it specifically excludes its application to the Cardrona Settlement Zone.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions) and ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation. The PAs capture non rural zoned land, but do not apply to those zones. Addressed in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22, by Ms Gilbert in her EiC and the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 89.2	James Gardner-Hopkins on behalf of Cardrona Village Limited	Support	That landscape capacity for schedule 21.22.18 be retained as notified or strengthened to further limit and/or generally restrict development outside of the Cardrona Settlement Zone, Cardrona Ski Area Sub-Zone and the Mount Cardrona Special Zone.	No discussion required other than to note the Schedule 21.22.18 text changes recommended in Response to Submissions Version of Schedule 21.22.18 (July 2023).	Accept submission.
OS 99.1	John Wellington on behalf of Upper Clutha Tracks Trust	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.	Addressed in response to OS 73.25	Accept submission.
OS 113.7	Carey Vivian on behalf of Anderson Branch Creek Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is rejected as notified as it fails to recognise that outstanding natural landscapes, outstanding natural features, and rural character landscapes categories only apply to Rural zones landscapes.	The PAs capture non rural zoned land, but do not apply to those zones. Addressed by Ms Gilbert in her EiC and the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 113.8	Carey Vivian on behalf of Anderson Branch Creek Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to remove the Cardrona Village Settlement Zone and Mount Cardrona Special Zone from the mapping of priority areas.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions) and ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation. Addressed by Ms Gilbert in her EiC and the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	
OS 113.9	Carey Vivian on behalf of Anderson Branch Creek Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [15] under the heading land use patterns and features the schedule notes 'widely spaced station homestead clusters are a feature of the flats and lower valleys'. It should be noted that homestead clusters often involve numerous buildings and areas of mature exotic trees.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. However, relying on my knowledge of the area and fieldwork, careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I recommend the following changes to the schedule wording: [15] Cardrona Village (Settlement Zone) is the main settlement within the valley, but significant urban development is anticipated and is starting to occur within the Mount Cardrona Special Zone. Some rural living development is present north and south of the village, and there is also a loose cluster of tourism-related development near the Cardrona Alpine Resort Road intersection. Widely spaced station homestead clusters set within areas of mature exotic trees are a feature of the flats and lower valleys, and there are a few consented but undeveloped building platforms in the Timber Creek gully on Hillend Station.	Accept submission in part.
OS 113.10	Carey Vivian on behalf of Anderson Branch Creek Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended so that the relationship of mana whenua associations, Wāhi Tūpuna Chapter and consultation with mana whenua for applications are clarified.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 113.11	Carey Vivian on behalf of Anderson Branch Creek Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [35] under the heading important recreation attributes and values the schedule fails to note the valley drive through by residents and visitors.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. However, relying on my knowledge of the area, fieldwork (including travelling on from Cardrona Valley Road), careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I recommend the following additional paragraph to the schedule under 'Important recreation attributes and values.' [38] (note new paragraph numbering) The Cardrona Valley Road is a popular route for both locals and visitors due to the distinct and engaging valley views.	Accept submission.
OS 113.12	Carey Vivian on behalf of Anderson Branch Creek Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [40] under the heading particularly important views to and from the area the schedule fails to note that there are occasional farm based nodes featuring exotic trees.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The schedule mentions ' <i>...sparsely inhabited 'working farm' rural foreground.</i> ' at [42] (note new numbering) which could be read as occasional farm based nodes set among trees. Also partly addressed at OS 113.9 above. The changes to the wording as submitted do not materially alter the intent of [42] in my opinion.	Reject submission.
OS 113.13	Carey Vivian on behalf of Anderson Branch Creek Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [42] under the heading naturalness attributes and values the schedule incorrectly notes that 'the landscape is perceived as having a high level of naturalness, with little human modification'. There is a difference in naturalness between the southern half of the valley, south of the Cardrona Settlement being wild and natural,	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. However, relying on my knowledge of the area, including fieldwork, careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
			and the northern half of the valley being predominantly pastoral valley floor.	imagery), I recommend the following wording change to the schedule: [44] (note new numbering) The landscape is perceived as having a high level of naturalness, particularly to the south of the Cardrona settlement. Little apparent with little human modification is present on the mountain slopes and Cardrona hills other than roads, pasture improvements and fencing. Natural spread of kānuka, grey shrubland and bracken on the mountain slopes and gullies, and remaining tussocklands on the mountains enhance the naturalness of the landscape.	
OS 113.14	Carey Vivian on behalf of Anderson Branch Creek Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardona Valley be rejected as notified as at [47] the sense of remoteness is only perceived in the southern half of the valley.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area, fieldwork, careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), in my opinion a sense of remoteness is also felt in the north end of the PA - particularly at higher elevations. Also partly addressed in response to OS 113.13 (submission accepted).	Reject submission.
OS 113.15	Carey Vivian on behalf of Anderson Branch Creek Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [i] landscape capacity it is stated that commercial recreation activities make reference to the Ski Area Sub-Zone.	The PAs capture Non-Rural Zone land, but do not apply to those zones. However, I recommend the below amendment to the schedule wording that better reflects the above paragraph: i. Commercial recreational activities – some landscape capacity for activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features, particularly within the Cardrona Ski Area Sub-Zone. Activities should be: located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of existing natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protect the area’s ONL values.	Accept submission in part.
OS 113.16	Carey Vivian on behalf of Anderson Branch Creek Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended so that the landscape capacity schedules are at a landscape character unit level rather than a site-specific level.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Ms Gilbert's EIC addresses the question of the appropriate scale for landscape assessment in relation to the PA Schedules work. The Topic 2.2 Decision (December 2019) directs at [171], that the assessment of the ONF/L Priority Areas be undertaken for the feature or landscape <u>as a whole</u> (rather than at a landscape character unit scale). I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that capacity ratings are assessed at a PA level and that site specific landscape assessments would be required as part of future resource consent or plan change applications that may identify varying landscape values, attributes and capacities.	Reject submission.
OS 113.17	Carey Vivian on behalf of Anderson Branch Creek Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is rejected as notified or amended to address that at [iii] landscape capacity it is stated that urban expansions has no capacity. The Settlement Zone could potentially expand in a modest way to utilise landscape edges while expanding the township.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area, fieldwork and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that the 'no' capacity rating for urban expansions is appropriate from a landscape perspective within the PA.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				Urban expansion within the PA would, in my view fail to protect landscape values, and in particular, perceptual and associative values. As such, removing the 'no' capacity rating or retaining it and allowing for for urban land use activity via 'qualifiers' in the schedule providing for expansion around the Settlement Zone is not supported.	
OS 113.18	Carey Vivian on behalf of Anderson Branch Creek Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is rejected as notified as at [iv] intensive agriculture and [vi] farm buildings it is stated that each activity has some landscape capacity and limited landscape capacity respectively. It is submitted that the landscape capacity schedules are at a landscape character unit level rather than a site specific level.	Addressed in response to OS 113.16.	Reject submission.
OS 124.1	Maddy Familton on behalf of Mount Cardrona Station Limited	Oppose	That the mapping of the landscape categories in the Cardrona Valley Outstanding Natural Landscape be amended in accordance with 3.1B5(e) and policies of section 6.3.1 to not apply to Ski Area Subzones, urban areas, and Special Zones.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions) and ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation. The PAs capture Non-Rural Zone land, but do not apply to those zones. Addressed by Ms Gilbert in her EiC and the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	Reject submission.
OS 124.2	Maddy Familton on behalf of Mount Cardrona Station Limited	Oppose	That land zoned Mount Cardrona Station Special Zone and Ski Area Sub Zone within the Cardrona Valley ONL priority area be removed.	Addressed in response to OS 124.1.	Reject submission.
OS 124.3	Maddy Familton on behalf of Mount Cardrona Station Limited	Oppose	That the Cardrona Valley ONL Priority Area Landscape Schedule 21.22.18 be removed from Mount Cardrona Station Limited land.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions) and ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS 124.4	Maddy Familton on behalf of Mount Cardrona Station Limited	Oppose	That features/associations of importance identified in the landscape schedules for example Heritage or Wāhi Tūpuna should be identified and addressed in the provisions of topic chapters (e.g. Chapter 39 Wāhi Tūpuna), and otherwise deleted.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS130.1	Maddy Familton on behalf of The Roberts Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to clarify the circumstances in which Council planners will utilise the information in the landscape schedules and to clarify in what instances Council planners processing resource consents will refer back to Chapter 3 provisions and utilise the landscape schedules.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 130.2	Maddy Familton on behalf of The Roberts Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to clarify the extent of the capacity rating scale within the landscape schedules. It should be clear from the rating scale how these interrelate with the wording used in the provisions from Chapter 3.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 130.3	Maddy Familton on behalf of The Roberts Family Trust	Oppose	That the Section 32 report for the landscape schedule is deficient in that it does not adequately evaluate the costs, benefits, efficiency and effectiveness of the options or of the landscape schedules' provisions and should be rejected as notified.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 130.4	Maddy Familton on behalf of The Roberts Family Trust	Oppose	That the consultation undertaken for the landscape schedules was deficient and should be undertaken again.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 130.5	Maddy Familton on behalf of The Roberts Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended at Paragraph 40 to provide additional clarity to the landscape schedule. <i>"The Mount Cardrona <u>Station</u> Special Zone is largely screened <u>from the road</u> by rising topography."</i>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area, fieldwork and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), in my opinion the submitted text does not materially change the intent of the schedule wording. However the zone name as per the District Plan warrants correction. As such I recommend the below amendment to the schedule wording:</p> <p>[42] (note new paragraph numbering) Dramatic and highly attractive views from Cardrona Valley Road to the contained valley floor and enclosing mountains. The scale of the landforms and their proximity dwarf the viewer, giving a sense of sublime grandeur. There is a progressive opening up of views as people move down the valley, particularly north of the Cardrona Village node. From this point the consistent 'wall' of the Pisa/Criffel range, with its open, natural and relatively wild character, dominates views across the sparsely inhabited 'working farm' rural foreground. To the west, views are often enclosed by the pastoral land of the Cardrona low hills but in places (eg. north of Cardrona Village, Branch Creek, Spotts Creek and Timber Creek) vistas open out to the rugged and often snow-covered Mount Cardrona and Harris Mountains in the distance. The Cardrona Alpine Resort is reasonably difficult to see from the road and the Mount Cardrona <u>Station</u> Special Zone is largely screened by rising topography.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS 130.6	Maddy Familton on behalf of The Roberts Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended at Paragraph 41 to remove the words 'skifield roads, Cardrona Alpine Resort and' from the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area, fieldwork, and from personal experience skiing at Cardrona, there are many panoramic and spectacular views available from the ski field access roads and Cardrona Alpine Resort.</p> <p>This is supported by ski area and other advertising imagery.</p> <p>As such the submitted text is not supported.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 130.7	Maddy Familton on behalf of The Roberts Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to delete the sentence under landscape capacity (xii) 'Very limited landscape capacity for rural living development close to Cardrona Village or Mount Cardrona Special Zone without cumulative adverse effects on the rural character and naturalness of the PA'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area, fieldwork and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that the capacity for rural living is appropriately rated as 'very limited' close to Cardrona Village and Mount Cardrona Special Zone in order to avoid cumulative effects.</p> <p>Referencing the existing level of development, I consider that the issue of cumulative effects in relation to future rural living development is of particular relevance. It is important that patterns of rural settlement and open pastoral landscapes</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				<p>have clearly defined transition points. Rural living at a capacity greater than 'very limited' around existing settlements would lead to a fragmentation of the settled/pastoral transitional boundary in my opinion.</p> <p>I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that capacity ratings are assessed at a PA level and that site specific landscape assessments would be required as part of future resource consent applications that may identify varying landscape (values and) capacities.</p> <p>Also partly addressed in the response to OS 113.17.</p>	
OS 130.8	Maddy Familton on behalf of The Roberts Family Trust	Oppose	That alternatively to the relief sought in this submission additional or consequential relief necessary or appropriate to address the matters raised in this submission and/or the relief requested in this submission, including any such other combination of plan provisions, objectives, policies, rules and standards provided that the intent of this submission is enabled.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 130.9	Maddy Familton on behalf of The Roberts Family Trust	Oppose	That if the relief sought in this submission is not granted that the landscape schedules are rejected and withdrawn.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 153.2	Dan Curley on behalf of Cardrona Valley Farms Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended as outlined in this submission before being adopted.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 153.7	Dan Curley on behalf of Cardrona Valley Farms Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to change the landscape capacity for tourism related activities outside of the Settlement zone and Mount Cardrona special zone.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. No specific change in the capacity rating is sought.</p> <p>However, relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), it is my opinion that there would be a 'very limited to no' level of capacity for tourism-related activities. On this basis, I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.18 Capacity are appropriate:</p> <p>(ii) Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – some landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are: co-located with existing facilities; designed to be of sympathetic scale, appearance and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values. Very limited to no landscape capacity for tourism-related activities outside of the Settlement Zone and Mount Cardrona Station Special Zone <u>except where co-located with the Settlement Zone on the valley floor and is: of a modest or sympathetic scale; has a low-key, visually recessive 'rural' character; integrates appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhances public access; integrates a strong defensible edge to avoid the potential risk of development sprawl; and complements the existing character of Cardrona settlement.</u></p>	Accept submission.
OS 153.8	Dan Curley on behalf of Cardrona Valley Farms Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to change the landscape capacity for farm buildings.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. No specific change in the capacity rating is sought.</p> <p>The PA schedules account for existing land use activity, permitted activity, and consented but unbuilt development.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				<p>consider that the capacity for (vi) farm buildings (beyond what is permitted) is appropriately rated as 'limited'.</p> <p>I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that capacity ratings are assessed at a PA level and that site specific landscape assessments would be required as part of future resource consent applications that may identify varying landscape (values and) capacities.</p>	
OS 153.9	Dan Curley on behalf of Cardrona Valley Farms Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to change the landscape capacity for earthworks.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. No specific change in the capacity rating is sought.</p> <p>The PA schedules account for existing land use activity, permitted activity, and consented activity.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that the capacity for (v) earthworks (beyond what is permitted) is appropriately rated as 'limited'.</p> <p>I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that capacity ratings are assessed at a PA level and that site specific landscape assessments would be required as part of future resource consent applications that may identify varying landscape (values and) capacities.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 153.10	Dan Curley on behalf of Cardrona Valley Farms Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to change the landscape capacity for intensive agriculture.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. No specific change in the capacity rating is sought.</p> <p>The PA schedules account for existing land use activity, permitted activity, and consented activity.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that the capacity for (iv) intensive agriculture (beyond what is permitted) is appropriately rated as 'some'.</p> <p>I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that capacity ratings are assessed at a PA level and that site specific landscape assessments would be required as part of future resource consent applications that may identify varying landscape (values and) capacities.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 153.11	Dan Curley on behalf of Cardrona Valley Farms Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to change the landscape capacity for rural living.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. No specific change in the capacity rating is sought.</p> <p>The PA schedules account for existing land use activity, permitted activity, and consented but unbuilt development.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that the capacity for (xii) rural living is appropriately rated as 'limited' and 'very limited' (depending on location in the PA).</p> <p>I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that capacity ratings are assessed at a PA level and that site specific landscape assessments would be required as part of future resource consent applications that may identify varying landscape (values and) capacities.</p> <p>Also addressed in response to OS 130.7.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 153.14	Dan Curley on behalf of Cardrona Valley Farms Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to not consider ski area roads as public places.	The schedule wording does not consider ski area roads as 'public places', however, such roads are often available for use by the public when access is made available by the private road owner. As such, the submitted text is not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 153.15	Dan Curley on behalf of Cardrona Valley Farms Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended so terminology adopted by the schedules is required to be consistent with wording applied by the Proposed District Plan.	The submitter does not explain which PDP terminology they prefer in this regard. Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report	N/A
OS 153.16	Dan Curley on behalf of Cardrona Valley Farms Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to change the landscape capacity so it is explicitly stated that these categories do not apply to Ski Area Sub Zones. Accordingly, the Cardrona Ski Area Sub Zone cannot be mapped to form part of a priority area.	The PAs capture non rural zoned land, but do not apply to those zones. In part G of the Topic 2: Rural Landscapes Joint Witness Statement (29 October 2020), it was the opinion of the planners / landscape experts that the scheduling should capture all zones – as it would be artificial to develop schedules for an area that excludes parts of that area. Also addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 159.1	Dan Curley on behalf of Ann Lockhart and Blyth Adams	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is opposed and should be deferred until the methodology is re-considered and applied.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 159.2	Dan Curley on behalf of Ann Lockhart and Blyth Adams	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to give effect to the submitter's relief in this submission.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 159.4	Dan Curley on behalf of Ann Lockhart and Blyth Adams	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended so each schedule includes a more robust disclaimer/statement that reinforces the very broad brush approach that has been applied to landscape assessment in the priority area.	Addressed by Ms Gilbert in her EiC and the reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 159.5	Dan Curley on behalf of Ann Lockhart and Blyth Adams	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is rejected as notified as the conclusions reached in the schedule to describe the related capacity of potential land uses are too conclusive.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Ms Gilbert's EiC addresses the question of the whether the capacity ratings are too conclusive and the appropriateness of considering potentially suitable future uses as part of the PA Schedules work. I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that capacity ratings are assessed at a PA level and that site specific landscape assessments would be required as part of future resource consent or plan change applications that may identify varying landscape values, attributes and capacities. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that the landscape capacity ratings advised in the Response to Submissions Version of 21.22.18 are appropriate from a landscape perspective. I also note that the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 signals that the capacity ratings in the PA Schedules are for the PA as a whole (rather than for a site) and that detailed site specific landscape assessments will be required as part of resource consent and plan change applications that may identify different land (values and) capacity. It also incorporates a number of amendments to improve clarity for plan users with respect to the capacity ratings.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 159.6	Dan Curley on behalf of Ann Lockhart and Blyth Adams	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to not consider ski area roads as public places. Views of future development from these privately owned properties should not be considered as views from a public place.	Addressed in response to OS 153.14.	Reject submission.
OS 159.7	Dan Curley on behalf of Ann Lockhart and Blyth Adams	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended so the terminology adopted by the schedules is consistent with wording applied by the Proposed District Plan.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 164.2	Dan Curley on behalf of James and Jane Paterson (Robrosa Station)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to give effect to the submitters relief outline in this submission.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 164.4	Dan Curley on behalf of James and Jane Paterson (Robrosa Station)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended so each schedule includes a more robust disclaimer/statement that reinforces the very broad brush approach that has been applied to landscape assessment in the priority area.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS 164.5	Dan Curley on behalf of James and Jane Paterson (Robrosa Station)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is rejected as notified as the conclusions reached in the schedule to describe the related capacity of potential land uses are too conclusive.	Addressed in response to OS 159.5.	Reject submission.
OS 164.6	Dan Curley on behalf of James and Jane Paterson (Robrosa Station)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended so cumulative effects do not form part of the capacity rating for rural living in the landscape schedule.	Addressed in response to OS130.7.	Reject submission.
OS 164.7	Dan Curley on behalf of James and Jane Paterson (Robrosa Station)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley be amended to address that the schedules do not properly reflect the landscape capacity of the priority area, nor in founding assessment, the environment anticipated by the District Plan.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that the landscape capacity ratings advised in the Response to Submissions Version of 21.22.18 are appropriate from a landscape perspective. Ms Gilbert's EIC also addresses this matter in more detail. Further, in my review of submissions, I have carefully considered the rating of capacity in terms of the environment anticipated by the District Plan.	Reject submission.
OS 164.8	Dan Curley on behalf of James and Jane Paterson (Robrosa Station)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley be amended to address that the stated capacity is too conclusive and lacks sufficient contemplation of potentially suitable future land uses within parts of the priority area.	Addressed in response to OS 159.5.	Reject submission.
OS 164.9	Dan Curley on behalf of James and Jane Paterson (Robrosa Station)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended to not consider ski area roads as public places.	Addressed in response to OS 153.14.	Reject submission.
OS 164.10	Dan Curley on behalf of James and Jane Paterson (Robrosa Station)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley is amended so the terminology adopted by the schedules is required to be consistent with wording applied by the Proposed District Plan.	Addressed in response to OS 153.15.	N/A
OS 166.46	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 Land use patterns and features paragraph 14 delete the words: 'all public and private access roads are unsealed'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				<p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), several roads additional to Cardrona Valley Road around Cardrona Village appear to be sealed.</p> <p>I recommend the following changes to the schedule wording:</p> <p>[14] Predominant land use is pastoral farming, although some areas have been retired for conservation and recreation. The Cardrona Alpine Resort within the PA, and the Southern Hemisphere Proving Ground and Nordic skiing Snow Farm just outside and accessed through the PA. Access roads to these activities are visually prominent within the landscape. Apart from Cardrona Valley Road and some roads around Cardrona Village which are sealed, all public and private access roads are unsealed.</p>	
OS 166.47	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 Important shared and recognised attributes and values at paragraph 33 be amended from national to international, and add high performance alpine sports so that it reads: An internationally recognised tourist, high performance alpine sport, and recreation destination.	<p>I recommend the following changes to the schedule wording:</p> <p>[33] An internationally recognised tourist, high performance alpine sport, and recreational destination.</p>	Accept submission.
OS 166.48	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 Important recreation attributes and values paragraph 34 be amended to add 'inclusive of snowboarding' to the brackets after skiing in the first sentence.	<p>I recommend the following changes to the schedule wording:</p> <p>[35] (note new paragraph numbering) Very popular destination for trout fishing, mountain biking, hiking, horse trekking, skiing and Nordic skingsnowsports, as well as visits to historic sites and commercial recreation activities such as mountain carting and shuttle services in the summer season for mountain biking/hiking and horse trekking providers.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS 166.49	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 Naturalness attributes and values paragraph 43 add ski areas to the final sentence so that it reads: The ski areas, village and special zones are nodes of human occupation and development within a landscape dominated by natural patterns and farming land use.	<p>I recommend the following changes to the schedule wording:</p> <p>[45] (note new paragraph numbering) The presence of development on the valley floor, in Cardrona Village, in Mount Cardrona Special Zone, and at the ski fields (including their access roads) modifies perceptions of naturalness, but pastoral land on the valley floor is still perceived as a pleasant rural foreground to the mountains and hills and retains a significant level of naturalness. The ski areas, village and special zones are nodes of human occupation and development within a landscape dominated by natural patterns and farming land use.</p>	Accept submission.
OS 166.50	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 Remoteness and wildness attributes and values paragraph 47 be amended to include Cardrona Alpine Resort so that it reads: A sense of remoteness and wilderness can be experienced from the mountains including the Cardrona Alpine Resort and on walking and mountain bike tracks within the landscape... .	<p>I recommend the following changes to the schedule wording:</p> <p>[49] (note new paragraph numbering) A sense of remoteness and wildness can be experienced on walking and mountain biking tracks within the landscape, including Tuohys Track and Spotts Creek Track and in locations away from Cardrona Valley Road on the high-country stations and the Cardrona Ski Area when viewing the surrounding landscape.</p>	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 166.51	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18.i Commercial recreational activities be amended to add the words connected to, delete the words 'located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of existing natural landscape elements' and delete 'and protect the area's ONL values', so that it reads: Commercial recreational activities - some landscape capacity for activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features, particularly within or connected to the Ski Area Sub-Zones. Activities should be designed to be a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character, integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Of note, reference to 'protect ONL values' has been deleted from the PA Schedules as it is unnecessarily repetitive of the Chapter 3 policies which apply to ONLs within the district.</p> <p>As such, the submitted changes to the wording do not materially alter the intent of the schedule wording in my opinion.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 166.52	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18.ii Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended to delete the words 'and protect the area's ONL values. No landscape capacity for tourism related activities outside the Settlement Zone and Mount Cardrona Special Zone'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that tourism-related activities (resorts) outside the Settlement zone and Mount Cardrona special zone is appropriately rated as having 'no' capacity.</p> <p>Tourism related activities (resorts) are potentially large and cover large areas of land. Such development could lead to an unwanted 'peppering' of the Cardrona Valley PA with sporadic built forms. The preference for concentrated patterns of development is addressed in the response to OS 130.7.</p> <p>As such, the submitted changes to the wording are not supported.</p> <p>Of note, reference to 'protect ONL values' has been deleted from the PA Schedules as it is unnecessarily repetitive of the Chapter 3 policies which apply to ONLs within the district.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 166.53	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18.v Earthworks be amended to add the words: Some landscape capacity if associated with recreation (including commercial recreation) or within or connected to the Ski Area Sub-zones.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Recreation (including commercial recreation) sought in the submission is non-specific. Earthworks <u>within</u> Ski Area Sub-Zones are subject to their own zone rules. I also consider that the capacity for earthworks is appropriately rated as 'limited' for this PA given the level of existing and consented development across the area, including access roads traversing mountain slopes.</p> <p>As such, the submitted changes to the wording are not supported.</p> <p>I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that capacity ratings are assessed at a PA level and that site specific landscape assessments would be required as part of future resource consent or plan change applications that may identify varying landscape (values and) capacities, which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 166.54	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18.viii Transport infrastructure be amended to add: Some landscape capacity if associated with recreation (including commercial recreation) or within or connected to the Ski Area Sub-Zones, including Gondolas.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Recreation (including commercial recreation) stated in the submission is non-specific. Transport infrastructure <u>within</u> Ski Area Sub-Zones is subject to its own zone rule framework. I also consider that the capacity for transport infrastructure is appropriately rated as 'limited' and 'very limited' for this PA</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				<p>given the level of existing and consented development across the area, including access roads traversing mountain slopes.</p> <p>I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that capacity ratings are assessed at a PA level and that site specific landscape assessments would be required as part of future resource consent or plan change applications that may identify varying landscape (values and) capacities.</p> <p>Gondolas, now amended at (xiii) in the schedules to 'Passenger lift systems' (which include gondolas) will be subject to activity standards within the Ski Area Sub-Zone and have a 'limited' capacity rating at (xiii) in the Landscape Capacity section, outside of the Ski Area Sub-Zone.</p> <p>As such, the submitted changes to the wording are not supported.</p>	
OS 166.55	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18.ix Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended to add: Some landscape capacity if associated with recreation (including commercial recreation) or within or connected to the Ski Area Sub-Zones.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Recreation (including commercial recreation) stated in the submission is non-specific. Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure <u>within</u> Ski Area Sub-Zones are subject to their own zone rules. I also consider that the capacity for utilities and regionally significant infrastructure is appropriately rated as 'limited' for this PA given the level of existing and consented development within the area.</p> <p>As such, the submitted changes to the wording are not supported.</p> <p>I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that capacity ratings are assessed at a PA level and that site specific landscape assessments would be required as part of future resource consent or plan change applications that may identify varying landscape (values and) capacities.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 166.56	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18.x Renewable energy generation be amended to change commercial to large, limited capacity to some, and discretely located to small and community scale so that it reads: no landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy generation. Some landscape capacity for small and community-scale renewable energy generation.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Of note; renewable energy generation is assessed at two activity levels for ONL/Fs: 'commercial scale' or 'small-scale'. 'Community-scale' renewable energy generation falls within 'commercial scale'.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that the capacity for small-scale renewable energy generation is appropriately rated as 'limited' in this PA given the level of existing and consented development within the area. Renewable energy generation at a 'commercial scale' is appropriately rated as 'no' capacity in my opinion due to its potential large scale.</p> <p>As such, the changes to the wording as submitted are not supported.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 166.57	Ben Farrell on behalf of RealNZ Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18.xiii Gondolas be deleted in its entirety.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Of note; 'Gondolas' in the PA schedules has been changed to 'passenger lift systems' to better align with the definitions for passenger lift systems (which includes gondolas) in the District</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				<p>Plan where such transport is not limited to being located only within a Ski Area Sub-Zone.</p> <p>I also consider that the capacity for passenger lift systems is appropriately rated as 'limited' for this PA given the level of existing and consented development within the area.</p>	
OS 178.1	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the PA boundary of 21.22.18 be amended over the Ski Area Sub Zone boundary, or if it is to remain, that it is provided for through an appropriate exception regime.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions) and ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.</p> <p>The PAs capture Non-Rural Zone land, but do not apply to those zones.</p> <p>Addressed by Ms Gilbert in her EiC and the reporting planner in the S42A Report.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 178.2	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the Outstanding Natural Landscape be removed from the Ski Area Sub Zone, or if it is to remain, that it is provided for through an appropriate exception regime.	Addressed in response to OS 178.1.	Reject submission.
OS 178.3	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That should the schedules be retained, that the submitter land, Soho Ski Area (Section 10-11 Survey Office Plan 459834; Section 5 Block 1 Knuckle Peak Survey District; Section 83 Survey Office Plan 357952) be made a separate character unit.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions) and ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.</p> <p>The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that landscape capacity is evaluated at a PA level within the Schedule. A determination of capacity levels at scales smaller than this (such as at a landscape character, or site-specific level) would form part of landscape assessments for resource consent and plan change applications.</p> <p>Landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there are likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment.</p> <p>This means that there is an acknowledgement that a finer grained assessment as part of a site-specific proposal may determine a higher capacity for a land use which may give the submitter some comfort in this regard.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 178.4	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That 21.22.18 be deleted.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS 178.5	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That 21.22.18 and associated schedules should reflect the existing activities in the Outstanding Natural Landscape.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The focus of the PA schedules is to identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected while providing a high-level indication of the landscape capacity of the PA for a range of land use activities. The Landscape Capacity section of the schedule includes a range of 'development characteristics' that are likely to be associated with appropriate development (for each land use type), within the PA. As such, the PA schedules acknowledge the dynamics of landscape</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				change and anticipate the broad parameters or characteristics that are likely to make such change appropriate in terms of landscape values including visual amenity values. This matter is also addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A report.	
OS 178.10	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the existing attributes in the Soho Ski Area including recreation activities, opportunities for accommodation and lodge development and its attractiveness to tourists be recognised as important parts of the values and character of the ONL.	Recreational attributes and values are addressed at [35 – 40] in the schedule (note new paragraph numbering) which includes mention of the Soho Basin Ski Area. At 'Summary of Landscape Values' (b) 'very high associative values' are concluded, part of which is due to the PAs popularity as a tourism and recreational destination. The PA Schedule identifies the attributes and values that contribute to the 'outstanding-ness' of the priority area, with the methodology applied, drawing from Te Tangi a te Manu. The purpose of the PA Schedule is not to identify development opportunities. A broad range of existing attributes in the PA are acknowledged sufficiently in the Schedule in my opinion.	Reject submission.
OS 178.16	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That 21.22.18 be deleted from the variation.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS 178.17	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the 'land use patterns and features section of 21.22.18 be amended to refer to the Soho Ski Area within the Priority Area.	Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources, I recommended the below changes to the schedule wording: [14] Predominant land use is pastoral farming, although some areas have been retired for conservation and recreation. The Cardrona Ski Area Sub-Zone Alpine Resort Ski Area Sub-Zone Alpine Resort partly within the PA, and the Southern Hemisphere Proving Ground and Nordic Skiing Skiing Snow Farm are just outside of and accessed through the PA on the Pisa Range . Access roads to these activities are visually prominent within the landscape. Apart from Cardrona Valley Road, all public and private access roads are unsealed.	Accept submission in part.
OS 178.18	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the 'important recreation attributes and values' section of 21.22.18 be amended to refer to the Soho Ski Area within the PA.	Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources, I recommended the below changes to the schedule wording: [36] (note new paragraph numbering) The area features the highly popular Cardrona Alpine Resort and Soho Basin Ski Area and Soho Basin Ski Area (within the Ski Area Sub-Zone), providing a year-round destination offering snow-based recreation such as skiing/snowboarding in winter and hiking/mountain biking opportunities in the summer. Year-round activities are also facilitated here, such as sightseeing, star gazing, mountain carting. The access road to Snow Farm (a ski touring area) is also within the PA area.	Accept submission.
OS 178.19	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the 'particularly important views to and from this area' section of 21.22.18 be amended to replace 'wall' of the Pisa Criffle range to 'slopes'	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Ms Gilbert's evidence in chief (EiC) addresses such wording where she notes that: "...the PA Schedules are intended to provide a guidance resource that incorporates technical landscape vocabulary to describe the landscape values and landscape capacity (at a PA level)... the terminology used within the PA Schedules is	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				<p><i>generally well understood by the landscape profession and is acknowledged and referenced in landscape related case law. So, while such terminology may not be evident in the District Plan or may be perceived as subjective, it has an established and accepted use within the lexicon of the landscape profession."</i></p> <p>In my opinion, while some terms are considered by the submitter to be subjective, they are used in the schedule to help describe the landscape in a way that most people understand.</p> <p>'Wall' is sometimes used by landscape architects to better describe a very steep, uniform and broad face. Slopes on the other hand can be both steep or gentle in gradient.</p> <p>As such, the changes to the wording as submitted are not supported.</p>	
OS 178.20	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the 'naturalness attributes and values' section of 21.22.18 be amended to include additional recognition of the Ski Area Sub Zone and the exception regime in the Proposed District Plan.	<p>I recommended the below changes to the schedule wording:</p> <p>[45] (note new paragraph numbering) The presence of development on the valley floor, in Cardrona Village, in Mount Cardrona Special Zone, and in the Ski Area Sub Zone at the skifields (including their access roads) modifies perceptions of naturalness, but pastoral land on the valley floor is still perceived as a pleasant rural foreground to the mountains and hills and retains a significant level of naturalness. The village and special zones are nodes of human occupation and development within a landscape dominated by natural patterns and farming land use.</p> <p>Under 'Naturalness attributes and values' in the schedule, I consider that it would be out of context to mention the Exception Zone regime here.</p> <p>Ms Gilbert's evidence in chief (EiC) addresses the Exception Zones where they intersect with the PAs in terms of acknowledging these zones' landscape values and associated capacity.</p>	Accept submission in part.
OS 178.21	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the landscape capacity of commercial recreation activities in 21.22.18 be amended to recognise that there is more than some landscape capacity for activities within the Soho Ski Area, to reflect the nature of the exception zoning regime and the scale of consenting and built development already.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>'Some' is the highest capacity rating.</p> <p>The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the Schedules do not apply to permitted activities, including within Exception Zones. The PAs capture Non-Rural Zone land, but do not apply to those zones. The PA schedules similarly took account of consented and built development within Exception Zones when they were drafted.</p> <p>As such, any amendments as requested by the submission are not considered necessary.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 178.22	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section of 21.22.18 be changed to amend the landscape capacity of tourism-related activities outside of the Settlement Zone and Mount Cardrona Special Zone to include the Ski Area Sub Zone, including Soho Ski Area.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. No specific change in the capacity rating is sought.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that tourism-related activities (resorts) outside the Settlement zone and Mount Cardrona special zone is appropriately rated as having 'no' capacity.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				Tourism related activities (resorts) are potentially large and cover large areas of land. Such development could lead to an unwanted 'peppering' of the Cardrona Valley PA with sporadic built forms. The preference for concentrated patterns of development is addressed in the response to OS 130.7. As such, any amendments to the capacity rating are not supported.	
OS 178.23	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the 'landscape capacity' section of 21.22.18 be amended to provide for earthworks in the Ski Area Sub Zone.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. No specific changes in the wording at (v) is sought. Earthworks <u>within</u> the Ski Area Sub-Zone are provided in the District Plan, subject to specific zone rules.	Reject submission.
OS 178.24	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the 'landscape capacity' section of 21.22.18 be amended to specify the types of activities against which the capacity for the ONL to absorb or ranked or listed and at what scale.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the capacity descriptions are based on the scale of the PA and should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites. Within the 12 land uses identified by the Court for consideration with respect to landscape capacity, there is a very large range of potential development scales and styles provided for. To provide a meaningful analysis for every potential landuse typology and their respective range of scales within each PA Schedule would be onerous and make the schedules unnecessarily long. Further, the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that site specific landscape assessments would be required as part of future resource consent or plan change applications that may identify varying landscape (values and) capacities. As such, any amendments to the schedule are not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 178.25	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the capacity description of visitor accommodation/lodge and additional recreation activities in the landscape schedule section in 21.22.18 be amended to reflect the ability of the Ski Area Sub Zone to absorb further visitor accommodation.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The activities sought in the submission and their 'capacity' levels within the Ski Area Sub-Zone are provided for in the District Plan, subject to specific zone rules. The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the Schedules do not apply to permitted activities, including within Exception Zones. The PAs capture Non-Rural Zone land, but do not apply to those zones. The PA schedules similarly took account of consented and built development within Exception Zones when they were drafted. As such, any amendments to the schedule are not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 178.26	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section of 21.22.18 reflect existing and planned development opportunities, and associated amenities and utilities	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Other than existing uses, what is sought does not form part of the identification of the landscape values of the PA and its capacity ratings. Planned development opportunities, and associated amenities and utilities may or may not protect landscape values. Therefore, the appropriateness or otherwise of such development change would be appropriately addressed via a comprehensive and robust landscape assessment, as signalled in the Preamble to the Schedule 21.22. As such, any amendments to the schedule are not supported.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 178.27	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That if the landscape capacity section are retained, much of the Outstanding Natural Landscape terraces be amended to moderate or high capacity for additional subdivision, visitor accommodation, recreation, access, earthworks and associated and ancillary activities.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Section 3 of the PA Schedules Methodology Report explains the capacity rating scale which does not include a 'moderate' or 'high' rating (and noting that this explanatory detail is incorporated into the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to assist plan users).</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), the terraces are highly legible landforms, providing contrast with the steeper terrain above and below them contributing to ONL values.</p> <p>As such, the submitters intent to increase development capacity on these landforms is not supported.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 178.28	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section of 21.22.18 be amended to provide for appropriate alternative landscape character such as opportunities of industrial and other land development and associated enhancements through landscaping, pest management and planting to improve biodiversity and conservation values.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>'Other' land development is non-specific. It is unclear what 'alternative landscape character' means. Of note industrial activities would be inconsistent with an RMA s6(b) landscape. Relying on the definition of these activities in PDP Chapter 2, such development is in my opinion, inappropriate within an ONF/L as would not protect the landscape values of the PA as they are outlined in the schedule (see <i>Long Bay</i> and <i>High Country Rosehip</i>).</p> <p>Landscape enhancement through control or eradication of pest plants and animals, along with landscape restoration is included in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of land uses, signalling the type of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that is likely to be appropriate within the PA ONF/L (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>The submitted amendments to the schedule are not supported.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 178.29	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That in the 'general description' section of 21.22.18 be amended to include the following 'including Soho Ski Area' as well as 'and is identified as an Exception Zone under the PDP, as shown below. The Cardrona Valley PA is a north-south oriented valley enclosed by the Cardrona Range/Harris Mountains to the west and the Pisa/Criffel Range to the east. The PA extends to the crest of the Pisa Range flanks and to the landforms visually containing the valley to the west, including the eastern flanks of Mount Cardrona and a ridge of Mount Alpha. In a north-south direction the PA starts just north of Timber Creek and ends at Blackmans Creek about 3.25 kilometres upstream of Cardrona village. The majority of the Cardrona Ski Area Sub Zone, including Soho Ski area, falls within the area and is identified as an Exception Zone under the PDP.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The Cardrona Ski Area Sub-Zone is included in the 'General Description of the Area' which is considered to be sufficient. The Soho Ski Basin is within the Cardrona Ski Area Sub-Zone. Under this heading, I consider that it would be out of context to comment that the Ski Area Sub-Zone is an Exception Zone under the PDP.</p> <p>The interplay between the PAs and Exception Zones is addressed in detail by Ms Gilbert in her EiC and the reporting planner in the S42A Report.</p> <p>As such, the submitted amendments to the schedule wording are not supported.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 178.30	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That the 'important landforms and land types' section of 21.22.18 be amended to include a new limb below. The Ski Area Subzone which contains more modified landforms as a result of earthworks modifications, access, utilities, water storage and built development.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>This section of the schedule focuses on a description of natural landforms and geomorphological processes, rather than modified landscapes resulting from commercial development.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				As such, the submitted amendments to the schedule wording are not supported.	
OS 178.31	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 include only those areas identified Significant Natural Area, otherwise further mapping be undertaken to understand the location of features listed in the 'important ecological features and vegetation types' section.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. With respect to the suggestion that the Schedule 21.22.18 should identify areas of ecological and habitat value beyond SNAs (which are many), this goes beyond the identification of the important ecological features and vegetation of the PA as a whole or as part of a Schedule of Landscape Values for incorporation into the District Plan. In my opinion, this level of detail would be identified as part of a comprehensive and robust landscape and ecological assessment for a site-specific resource consent or plan change application.	Reject submission.
OS 178.32	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That a new limb be added to the 'important ecological features and vegetation types' section of 21.22.18 as follows Opportunities to remove plant and pest species through subdivision and development proposals are encouraged.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Point [9] is part of the section 'Important ecological features and vegetation types' in the schedule which describes the existing situation only. This is appropriate for a Schedule of Landscape Values. The appropriateness or otherwise of future development opportunities would be normally addressed via a comprehensive and robust landscape assessment, as signalled in the Preamble to the Schedule 21.22.	Reject submission.
OS 178.33	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That 21.22.18 paragraph 14 'land use patterns and features section' be amended by striking out Cardrona Alpine Resort and replacing it with Cardrona Ski Area Subzone and that the following be added to the second to last sentence: ' as well as built form within the subzone including ski field infrastructure, accommodation, and landform modification' as well as striking out 'all public and private access roads are unsealed'.	Addressed at OS 178.17 (submission point accepted in part). No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), in my opinion ski field infrastructure, accommodation and landform modification (other than the access roads) are not visually prominent. As such, the submitted wording change to the schedule is not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 178.34	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That 16 under the 'land use features and patterns' section of 21.22.18 be amended by adding an additional sentence below. Soho ski area also exhibits built form and landform modification.	I recommended the below changes to the schedule wording: [16] Cardrona Alpine Resort and the Soho Basin Ski Area on the upper eastern slopes of Mount Cardrona comprise is a significant built development within the landscape but areis not visually prominent from the valley floor.	Accept submission in part.
OS 178.35	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That 21.22.18 paragraph 35 'important recreation attributes and values' section be amended by adding 'and Soho Ski Area'; 'on mountain accommodation and living' and 's to all the ski areas are highly visible' (the s making road plural) and striking out to Snow Farm (a ski touring area is also), so that it reads as follows: The area features the highly popular Cardrona Alpine Resort and Soho Ski Area (within the Ski are Sub-Zone), providing a year-round destination offering on mountain accommodation and living, snow-based recreation such as skiing/snowboarding in winter and hiking/mountain biking opportunities in summer. Year-round activities are also facilitated here, such as sightseeing, star gazing, mountain carting. The access roads to all the ski areas are highly visible within the	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. However, I recommended the below change to the schedule wording: [36] (note new paragraph numbering) The area features the highly popular Cardrona Alpine Resort and Soho Basin Ski Area (within the Ski Area Sub-Zone), providing a year-round destination offering snow-based recreation such as skiing / snowboarding in winter and hiking / mountain biking opportunities in the summer. Year-round activities are also	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
			PA area.	facilitated here, such as sightseeing, star gazing, mountain carting. The access road to Snow Farm (a ski touring area) is also within the PA area. The other submitted wording changes to the schedule are not supported.	
OS 178.36	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That 21.22.18 paragraph 39 'legibility and expressiveness attributes and values' be amended by adding a new sentence: However the upper valley does not provide long distance views along the valley due to multiple intervening ridges.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The intent of the submission point is considered to be adequately met in the wording at [42] (note new paragraph numbering) <i>"There is a progressive opening up of views as people move down the valley, particularly north of the Cardrona Village node"</i> . This may provide the submitter with some comfort.	Reject submission.
OS 178.37	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That 21.22.18 paragraph 40 'particularly important views to and from the area' section be amended by adding, 'with loss of intermittent views from intervening rides, by striking out 'wall' and replacing it with 'slopes', and by striking out 'the Cardona Alpine Resort is reasonably difficult to see from the road' and replacing it with 'parts of the SAZs', and by striking out 'is largely screened by rising topography', and replacing it with 'Are visible from the road, although are an expected aspect of this landscape'.	Addressed in response to OS 178.36 (regarding 'loss of views due to intervening ridges') (submission rejected). Addressed in response to OS 178.19 (regarding 'wall'). (submission rejected). Addressed in response to OS 178.33 (regarding visibility of development within the Ski Area Sub-Zone) (submission accepted). The other submitted wording changes to the schedule are not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 178.38	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That (a) in the summary of landscape values section of 21.22.18 be amended by deleting 'and the mana whenua features'.	The Priority Area Schedules have been reviewed by a cultural expert. No such amendment was recommended in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS 178.39	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That (c) (iii) in the summary of landscape values section of 21.22.18 be amended by striking out 'an impression of high' and replacing it with 'a contrast in'; by striking out 'dominance of the' and replacing it with 'broader'; striking out 'over' and replacing it with 'with pockets of' and by adding 'within ski fields', so that it reads as follows: A contrast in naturalness arising from the broader more natural landscape with pockets of built development and landform modification within ski fields.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), in my opinion the scheduled text is appropriately worded. As such the submitted wording is not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 178.40	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That (i) in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.18 be amended by striking out 'some' and replacing with 'moderate', adding 'or connecting to' and striking out 'optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of' and replacing it with 'integrate with'; striking out 'sympathetic' and replacing it with 'appropriate', adding 'where appropriate, or' and striking out 'protect' and adding in 'provide for' so that it reads as follows: Commercial recreational activities - Moderate landscape capacity for activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features, particularly within, or connecting to, the Ski Area Sub-Zone. Activities should be: located to integrate with the existing natural landscape elements; designed to be of an appropriate scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement where appropriate, or; enhance public access; and provide for the area's ONL values.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. 'Moderate' is not one of the capacity descriptors (addressed in response to OS 178.27). Further additional development described in (i) beyond ('or connecting to') the Cardrona Ski Area Sub-Zone and presumably outside of the Mount Cardrona Station Special Zone and Settlement Zone would potentially undermine ONL values. As such the submitted wording is not supported.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 178.41	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That ii in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.18 be amended by a series of changes: add 'within SASZs', replace 'some' with 'moderate', delete 'co-located with existing facilities'; delete 'sympathetic' and replace it with 'an appropriate'; add a '/' between enhancement and enhance; add 'where appropriate'; strike out 'protect' and add in 'provide for'; and delete 'no landscape capacity for tourism related activities outside of the Settlement Zone and Mount Cardrona Special Zone', so that it reads as follows: Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - Moderate landscape capacity within SASZs for visitor accommodation activities that are designed to be an appropriate scale, appearance and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement/enhance public access where appropriate; and provide for the area's ONL values.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. 'Moderate' is not one of the capacity descriptors, addressed in response to OS 178.27. Of note; reference to protecting ONL values is now deleted from the Landscape Capacity sections of the PA schedules as it is unnecessarily repetitive of the Chapter 3 policies which apply to ONLs within the district. The development outcome reflecting the submitted changes would potentially undermine ONL values. As such the submitted wording is not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 178.42	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That v in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.18 be amended by adding the following sentence: Moderate capacity for earthworks within Ski Area Sub Zones that enhance recreation opportunities and integrate with existing natural landform patterns.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. 'Moderate' is not one of the capacity descriptors addressed in response to OS 178.27. Activities within Exception Zones are subject to their own earthworks rules. As such, the submitted wording is not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 178.43	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That viii in the landscape capacity section of 21.22.18 be amended by a series of changes: Strike out 'limited' and replace with 'moderate'; strike out 'very limited' and replace with 'moderate'; strike out 'additional roads' and replace with 'upgrades or expansions of existing roads'; and add the in the following: 'including car parking, passing bays, and support utilities. Moderate landscape capacity to facilitate alternative non-road transport to the Ski Area Sub-Zones.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. 'Moderate' is not one of the capacity descriptors addressed in response to OS 178.27. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I recommended the below changes to the schedule wording: (viii). Transport infrastructure – limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low key 'rural' roading on the valley floor that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns. Very limited landscape capacity for additional roads, <u>upgrades or expansions to existing roads, carparking areas and passing bays</u> on the enclosing mountain slopes of the valley.	Accept submission in part.
OS 178.44	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That 21.22.18.xiii landscape capacity be amended by a series of changes: strike out limited and replace with moderate; strike out 'sympathetic to the' and replace with 'integrated with', and strike out 'and protect the area's ONL values', so that it reads as follows: Gondolas - Moderate landscape capacity to improve public access to focal recreational areas higher in the mountains via non-vehicular transportation modes such as gondolas, provided they are positioned in a way that is integrated with landform, are designed to be recessive in the landscape.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. 'Moderate' is not one of the capacity descriptors addressed in response to OS 178.27. Of note; reference to protecting ONL values is now deleted from the Landscape Capacity sections of the PA schedules as it is unnecessarily repetitive of the Chapter 3 policies which apply to ONLs within the district. 'Sympathetic to' and 'integrated with' have similar meaning or intent. As such the submitted wording changes are not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 178.45	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That 21.22.18 paragraph 42 in the naturalness attributes and values section be amended by adding 'tracks' and 'sluicing areas' to the first sentence, and 'while the original beech forest is absent' to the last sentence.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours,	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I recommended the below changes to the schedule wording: [44] (note new paragraph numbering) The landscape is perceived as having a high level of naturalness, with little human modification present on the mountain slopes and Cardrona hills other than roads, tracks , pasture improvements and fencing. Natural spread of kānuka, grey shrubland and bracken on the mountain slopes and gullies, and remaining tussocklands on the mountains enhance the naturalness of the landscape.	
OS 178.46	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That 21.22.18 paragraph 43 in the naturalness attributes and values section be amended to replace 'at the skifields' with 'within the SASZ/ski fields'; replace 'retains a significant level of' with 'although has a low level of' and by adding; are exception zones under the PDP, and replaces 'dominated' with 'otherwise contextualised by' as well as a grammatical change to read as follows: The presence of development on the valley floor, in Cardrona Village, in Mount Cardrona Special Zone, and within the SASZ/ski fields (including their access roads) modifies perceptions of naturalness. Pastoral land on the valley floor is still perceived as a pleasant rural foreground to the mountains and hills although has a low level of naturalness. The village and special zones are exception zones under the PDP, and are nodes of human occupation and development within a landscape otherwise contextualized by natural patterns and farming land use.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Partly addressed above in the response to OS 166.49. Case law supports the identification of areas that are dominated by pastoral uses (and other agriculture/horticulture related uses) as having naturalness values that allow the land to qualify for consideration as an RMA s6(b) landscape (e.g., <i>Man O'War Station</i>). Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), in my opinion the remaining submitted changes to the schedule wording are inappropriate. As such the submitted wording changes are not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 178.47	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That 21.22.18 paragraph 44 in the memorability attributes and values section be amended by striking out 'large' and adding 'intermittent', so it reads as follows: Highly memorable journey through an enclosed valley with intermittent views of dramatic mountain ranges, enhanced by changing vegetation colours and snow cover across the seasons.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), in my opinion the Cardrona Valley is a large , enclosed valley. 'Intermittent views' as submitted suggest the presence of many and regular roadside obstacles, which in my experience are relatively few and far between. As such the submitted wording changes are not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 178.48	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That 21.22.18 paragraph 47 in the remoteness and wildness attributes and values section be amended by adding 'modified lower pasture land, the ski field areas, and" as follows: A sense of remoteness and wildness can be experienced on walking and mountain biking tracks within the landscape, including Tuohys Track and Spotts Creek Track and in locations away from Cardrona Valley Road, modified lower pasture land, the ski field areas, and on the high-country stations.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), while there may be parts of the modified lower pastureland where a sense of remoteness and wildness may be experienced from, most parts of these areas are influenced by Cardrona Valley Road and traffic on it, which detracts from this experience. As such it is inappropriate to include this area in [49] (note new paragraph numbering) in my opinion.	Reject submission.
OS 178.49	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That in 49a of the aesthetic attributes and values section of 21.22.18 be amended by deleting 'muscular'	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Descriptive terminology is addressed in response to OS 178.19. 'Muscular' is a metaphor often used by landscape architects to help describe a landscape that has highly legible (and visual)	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				geomorphological processes, usually where there is by low or no vegetation cover. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) 'muscular' used at [51a] (note new paragraph numbering) is an appropriate term.	
OS 178.50	Rosie Hill on behalf of Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings No.1 LP	Oppose	That a new limb be added to 49 in the aesthetic attributes and values section of 21.22.18 as follows: high quality and attractive built form within ski fields	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. It is not considered that the relatively recent built forms within the ski fields contribute to ONL values, compared with historic buildings and homesteads. As such it is inappropriate to include built forms within the ski fields in [51] (e) v (note new paragraph numbering), in my opinion.	Reject submission.
OS 185.1	Scott Edgar on behalf of Cardrona Distillery Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley be rewritten to acknowledge the presence of the Cardrona Distillery and the contribution it makes to the landscape values of the Outstanding Natural Landscape.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), viewing the distillery complex from several viewpoints including elevated ones, it is my opinion that the distillery forms one part of the '...loose cluster of tourism-related development' in the valley floor and need not be 'picked out' individually. It is also considered that built development generally contributes little if anything to natural values. As such the submitted wording is not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 185.2	Scott Edgar on behalf of Cardrona Distillery Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley land use patterns and features, important recreation and attributes values, particularly important views, and aesthetic and naturalness values and attributes be amended to better acknowledge the distillery activities.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I do not support the submission that distillery activities contribute to ONL values in terms of 'particularly important views to and from the area', 'aesthetic attributes and values' and 'naturalness attributes and values'. However, I recommend the below changes to the schedule wording: [35] (note new paragraph numbering) Very popular destination for trout fishing, mountain biking, hiking, horse trekking, skiing and Nordic skisnowsports , as well as visits to historic sites and commercial recreation activities such as the distillery , mountain carting and shuttle services in the summer season for mountain biking/hiking and horse trekking providers. The Cardrona Valley Road is a popular route for both locals and visitors due to the distinct and engaging valley views.	Accept submission in part.
OS 185.3	Scott Edgar on behalf of Cardrona Distillery Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18 be amended to address distillery activities, associated rural industrial, commercial recreation and tourism activities and buildings.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Distillery activities would fall within (i) Commercial recreational activities in the capacity section of the schedule which has a capacity rating of 'some' capacity. As such, part of the submission is met. Also addressed in response to OS 185.2. 'Associated rural industrial' is not specified by the submitter. 'Tourism-related activities' are defined as 'resorts' in the PA schedule. This activity and rural industrial activities would be	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				inconsistent with an RMA s6(b) landscape and would in my opinion be inappropriate within an ONL/F as it would not protect the landscape values of the PA as they are outlined in the schedule (see <i>Long Bay</i> and <i>High Country Rosehip</i>).	
OS 185.4	Scott Edgar on behalf of Cardrona Distillery Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18 is amended from limited or very limited to some landscape capacity for distillery activities, associated rural industrial, commercial recreation and tourism activities on the distillery site (Lot 1 DP 479579 held in Record of Title 676834).	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Distillery activities would fall within (i) Commercial recreational activities in the capacity section of the schedule which has a capacity rating of 'some' capacity. As such, part of the submission is met. Also addressed in response to OS 185.3.	Reject submission.
OS 185.5	Scott Edgar on behalf of Cardrona Distillery Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18.ii Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities is amended to state some landscape capacity for tourism related activities outside the Settlement Zone and Mt Cardrona Special Zone provided they are suitably designed and co-located with existing facilities.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. No specific change in the capacity rating is sought. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that tourism-related activities (resorts) outside the Settlement zone and Mount Cardrona special zone is appropriately rated as having 'no' capacity. Tourism related activities (resorts) are potentially large and cover large areas of land. Such development could lead to an unwanted 'peppering' of the Cardrona Valley PA with sporadic built forms. The preference for concentrated patterns of development is addressed in the response to OS 130.7. As such, any amendments to the capacity rating are not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 188.16	Elisha Young-Ebert on behalf of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18.vii. mineral extraction be amended to no landscape capacity for mineral extraction.	Addressed in response to OS 77.15.	Accept submission in part.
OS 188.26	Elisha Young-Ebert on behalf of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18.xiii. gondolas be amended to include the words: ...preserve the natural character of wetlands, lakes, rivers and their margins; protect mana whenua associations and values, particularly for those areas identified as wāhi tūpuna, statutory acknowledgements or nohoaka;... .	Addressed in response to OS 77.25.	Reject submission.
OS 188.44	Elisha Young-Ebert on behalf of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley paragraph 26 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Addressed in response to OS 77.44.	Accept submission.