

# Landscape schedules QLDC

Oral Submission\* Florence Micoud 2/09/2026

Wanaka is very beautiful and, we can all agree, it is degrading fast.  
I think it's fantastic that Mata-au beauty is recognised and protected.

I have submitted to include the whole of Studholme road South in the schedules map but the [UCLS opening legal submissions document](#) says it has been "*partially disagreed on the basis of expert evidence*". I couldn't find the evidence. **Can we have a look at this evidence please?**

**The panel answered that Studholme Road South zoning is "rural lifestyle" therefore not included in the process which focuses on "rural farming" zoning. I said that "rural" is "rural" and should be included.**

Now I have evidence: This is a view from the ridge of Studholme road to the West, this part is the Hawthenden farm, very well landscaped; it deserves being included in the schedule.

This part is the Studholme road view to the south, and the East, full of trees, full of birds, not one visible human impact, who can deny it's beautiful? But when I suggest including this area in the schedules maps, it gets rebutted. Page 10 of the document cited above, it says that my submission seeking to "*scheduling additional areas*" is "*out of scope*". However, on page 32, the document highlights the "*overarching direction*" to create maps, define values, capacity, character etc. **So which is it?** Why can't Studholme road be included in maps on the grounds that we can't change maps in a process designed to create maps?

Page 15 of the document says, for landscape preservation, there is no "*close its eyes*": if we protect what's behind, we need to protect what's in the front. So when we protect the Alpha fan, we should protect Studholme road too. I would like to understand what part of Studholme will be included. **What is "partially agreed"?**

Page 8 of the document, it says "*biodiversity*" is "*out of scope*". I find it really difficult to talk about landscapes without mentioning beauty, trees, birds and lizards. I have already identified and listed existing wildlife, currently endangered by loss of habitat. Even without further assessment, they are here and should be protected, by protecting their habitat. It's totally inherent to landscapes schedules. I live there and know the huge value of the Studholme South area for wildlife. **Why does this process make it so difficult for nature?**

I read somewhere in this report that "*to override the reasonable interests of people and communities would not be robust sustainable management*". Also "*If other issues arise that warrant a response, the Council can address those*". I believe this is important enough to warrant a response.

Further in the report, "*the panel*" must consider "*the risk of acting* (that is protecting landscape) *vs risk of not acting*". Acting here is stopping the urban sprawl and preserving beautiful nature, fostering shared land for tracks, for local food growing, fiber growing, creating a sustainable low-carbon resilient community in a world class abundant healthy environment OR

We could not act and see Wanaka become Queenstown, with total degradation of landscape and lifestyle quality, traffic... Clearly not acting is worse so I reiterate my request to include all of South Wanaka in the map.

"*Out of Scope*"! Well, no, it's the panel's choice. I know the community has chosen over and over again to restrain Wanaka growth and let other towns grow, with well connected transport. The essential role of local councils for climate action was highlighted in a recent Aspiring Conversation. It's in your hands.

Please refer to the Regenerative Urban Design article I wrote in July for info and links and I offer my help to realise it. **Who do I talk to now to take this further?**

**\*This text is not exactly what I said, recording [here](#) starting at 1h19mn. Text in green has been added afterwards.**