

## 21.22.11 PA ONF Mount Iron: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

Mount Iron PA ONF comprises the summit and slopes of the hill between Wānaka and Albert Town, extending to the toe of the hill on the southern and eastern sides and to the urban-zoned land on the western and northern sides.

### 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 classic, highly visible large roche moutonnée landform. The 'upstream' north-western side is generally smooth, while the south-eastern 'downstream' side is steep, rough and craggy; the characteristic form of a roche moutonnée. Listed in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory as a site of National Importance as a 'particularly good example of a roche moutonnée' and 'an extremely well-defined landform of scientific/educational value'. The landform feature extends beyond the PA into urban areas on the western and northern flanks.

### Important ecological features and vegetation types

2. Extensive areas of regenerating kānuka woodland (*Kunzea serotina*) across much of the landform, mixed with grey shrubland dominated by matagouri, mingimingi and bracken, generally on the steeper and rockier terrain. More discrete areas of short tussock grassland, exotic grassland, cushionfield and turf communities occur on the summit plateau and western slopes of Mount Iron. The cushionfields and turfs in particular support nationally threatened plant species such as *Carmichaelia kirkii*, *Acaena rorida*, *Myosotis brevis* and *Pimelia serviceovillosa*. Kānuka and matagouri have a threat classification of At-Risk Declining.
3. Mount Iron is one of the best examples of roche moutonnée habitats in the Pisa Ecological District with a diversity of habitats and moderate species richness. The relatively large size of the site and its compactness are conducive to ecological attributes being self-sustained, but it is also an important component of a network of kānuka woodlands in the vicinity of the upper Mata-au Clutha River.
4. Revegetation with indigenous species is being implemented in some of the more open areas of the ONF.
5. The diversity of habitats afforded by the rocky terrain and various vegetation types provides suitable habitat for New Zealand falcon, bellbird, grey warbler, fantail and silvereye, skinks and geckos and an assemblage of native invertebrates.
6. Pest plants including wilding conifers, hawthorn and sycamore are scattered across much of the steeper southern and eastern sides of Mount Iron and have the potential to invade the kānuka woodland and the sensitive cushionfield and turf communities if not controlled.
7. Animal pest species include possums, stoats, rabbits, mice and rats.

**Commented [JH1]:** OS 77.31 Kai Tahu ki Otago  
OS 188.31 Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu

### Important land use patterns and features:

8. The majority of the PA is kānuka woodland or grey shrubland protected as conservation reserve, council reserve or by Significant Natural Area overlay. Some open retired pastoral areas are present on the western side and the rocky cliffs on the southern and south-eastern sides do not support tall vegetation.

**Commented [JH2]:** Typographical correction to align with standard Schedule format.

A network of walking tracks criss-crosses the landform and there are Wānaka water supply tanks on the north-western flank, as well as ~~two~~ **three** dwellings amidst the kānuka forest. There is ~~one dwelling and one other additional~~ **one additional** consented building platform on the eastern flank of the hill.

**Commented [JH3]:** OS 141.33 Allenby Farms Limited

**Commented [JH4]:** OS 141.33 Allenby Farms Limited

### Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations

9. No historic heritage or archaeological features have been identified/recorded to date within the ONF.

### Mana whenua features and their locations

10. 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.

#### 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

11. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.

### Important historic attributes and values

12. Mount Iron has some contextual significance as a key reference point within the early survey of the area.
13. Historic value as a visitor destination from the early 1900s on. A track to the summit was completed in 1906.

### Important shared and recognised values

14. Very important values as part of the identity and sense of place of Wānaka – a key feature in the everyday life of residents and a widely visible landmark from surrounding urban areas. Very strong shared values as a popular recreational destination for locals and for domestic and international visitors and as a quiet and natural environment in close proximity to the township.

### Important recreation attributes and values

15. Very popular walking destination for locals and visitors, with a network of trails, multiple access points from State Highway 84 and surrounding urban areas. Panoramic views of Lake Wānaka and the Upper Clutha Basin from the slopes and summit.

#### 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

16. Very prominent and isolated distinctive landform with a high degree of legibility and a strong visual contrast with the surrounding urban landscape.

### Particularly important views to and from the area

- 17. A prominent and distinctive component of views from surrounding areas of the Upper Clutha Basin, including Wānaka township, Albert Town and the southern parts of Lake Wānaka. Natural landmark at the entry to Wānaka from the east, where it dominates the entry experience.
- 18. Very highly valued panoramic views from the slopes and summit of the hill that allow people to locate themselves within the Upper Clutha Basin and to take in the urban and rural areas of the basin and the enclosing mountain ranges and lakes. Elevated viewpoints allow appreciation of the array of legible and expressive landforms within and surrounding the basin.

### Naturalness attributes and values

- 19. High level of naturalness due to the extent of regenerating indigenous vegetation and the largely unmodified nature of the landform. This is despite some more modified areas containing tracks, roading and structures.

### Memorability attributes and values

- 20. Highly memorable landform due to its size, isolation, dramatic cliffs, and indigenous vegetation cover.

### Transient attributes and values

- 21. The early summer mass flowering of kānuka, the passing effects of light and shade, and the variable presence of wildlife.

### Aesthetic attributes and values

- 22. High aesthetic attributes associated with the experience of the values identified above by a significant number of residents and visitors.
- 23. More specifically, this relates to:
  - a. The visual prominence and memorability of the landform;
  - b. The regenerating indigenous vegetation;
  - c. The high degree of contrast with surrounding urban areas; and
  - d. The easy accessibility and high level of use by locals and visitors.

### 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
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

The physical, associative and perceptual attributes and values described above for the PA ONF Mount Iron can be summarised as follows:

- (a) **Very high** physical values relating to the prominent and classic roche moutonnée landform, the predominance of regenerating indigenous vegetation with important habitat values for indigenous fauna, reflected in its partial SNA status and the mana whenua features association with the area.

Commented [JH5]: OS 141.44 Allenby Farms Ltd

- (b) **Very high** associative values relating to the mana whenua associations of the areas, the significant recreational attributes, historic farming use, and the strong shared and recognised values as part of the local and regional sense of place.
- (c) **High** perceptual values relating to the legibility, visual prominence, memorability and naturalness of the hill, its contrast with surrounding urban areas and the ability for people to access and experience the feature.

**Commented [JH6]:** OS 141.45 Allenby Farms Ltd

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA ONF Mount Iron for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **commercial recreational activities** – no landscape capacity.
- ii. **visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** - **very limited** landscape capacity to absorb visitor accommodation within existing buildings or building platforms. **No** landscape capacity for tourism-related activities.
- iii. **urban expansions** – no landscape capacity.
- iv. **intensive agriculture** – no landscape capacity.
- v. **earthworks** – **very limited to no** landscape capacity for earthworks and additional trails or access tracks that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **farm buildings** – no landscape capacity.
- vii. **mineral extraction** – no landscape capacity.
- viii. **transport infrastructure** – no landscape capacity.
- ix. **utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – **Very limited to no** landscape capacity. 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.
- xi. **production Forestry** – no landscape capacity.
- xii. **rural living** – no landscape capacity.

**Commented [JH7]:** OS 25.4 Janice Hughes  
OS 27.2 Rod and Anne Corbett  
OS 39.2 John Palmer  
OS 41.2 Dirk Van Walt  
OS 44.4 Brendon Fraher  
OS 55.5 Brent Will  
OS 58.1 Jon Sedon  
OS 97.3 Mark Richter  
(capacity change from 'very limited' to 'very limited to no' not sought per se)

**Commented [JH8]:** OS 70.25 Transpower NZ Ltd

**Commented [JH9]:** Typographical correction.

# 21.22.11 Mount Iron ONF Schedule

## 11 AUGUST 2023 FINAL

**Blue highlighted text:** captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.11 Mount Iron ONF 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) 21.22.11 Mount Iron ONF Schedule". This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **25 examples identified.**

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

## Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 5.1	Malcolm Burgess on behalf of Rob Roy Lane Residents Group	Oppose	That the description of the Outstanding Natural Feature boundary in landscape schedule 21.22.11 be amended to describe the western boundary extending to the cadastral boundaries of the existing urban development and not extending to the urban zoned land.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PA/ONF partly overlaps the Lower Density Suburban Residential Zoned land on the western side of Mount Iron. The submission seeks the ONF (and PA boundary) be remapped to the edge of the urban zoned land which is beyond the scope of the Variation. Further, the Mount Iron ONF boundary has been confirmed by the Environment Court.	Reject submission
OS 25.1	Janice Hughes	Oppose	That the landscape capacity assessment of landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron be amended.	Addressed in response to OS 25.	Submission points all accepted or accepted in part.
OS 25.2	Janice Hughes	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron capacity under ii. be amended to include 'no landscape capacity to absorb visitor accommodation other than within existing buildings' with the wording 'No landscape capacity for tourism-related activities' remaining.	The schedule wording appears to provide the same outcome as what the submission point seeks.	Accept submission.
OS 25.3	Janice Hughes	Support	That the reference 'No landscape capacity for tourism-related activities' in landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron be retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 25.4	Janice Hughes	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron landscape capacity under v. be amended to ensure that earthworks are limited to repairs, maintenance and renewal of existing walking-only trails and tracks.	Repairs, maintenance, and renewal of existing tracks are a permitted activity. From my own observations of the PA, including walking up Mount Iron, in my opinion Mount Iron is well endowed with trails. Additional trails may trigger cumulative effects through further vegetation cover change as well as earthworks, and the new trails themselves. As such, I recommend the following revision to the schedule wording:  (v) <b>earthworks – very limited to no</b> landscape capacity for earthworks and additional trails that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.	Accept submission in part.
OS 25.5	Janice Hughes	Oppose	That no additional roads are created in landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron.	'Roads' falls within (viii) <b>transport infrastructure</b> in the Landscape Capacity section of the PA schedule where roads have a 'no' capacity rating.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 25.6	Janice Hughes	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron landscape capacity include no landscape capacity for erection of shelters, huts, cabins and lodges.	Other than a <b>'very limited'</b> capacity for visitor accommodation within existing buildings or building platforms, no other buildings such as those identified in the submission point are provided for in the PA.	Accept submission.
OS 27.1	Rod and Anne Corbett	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron capacity under ii. be amended to include 'no landscape capacity to absorb visitor accommodation other than within existing buildings' with the wording 'No landscape capacity related activities' remaining.	Addressed in response to OS 25.2. Of note: The submitted retention of the wording 'No landscape capacity related activities' remaining is unclear.	Accept submission.
OS 27.2	Rod and Anne Corbett	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron landscape capacity under v. be amended to ensure that earthworks are limited to repairs, maintenance and renewal of existing walking-only trails and tracks.	Addressed in response to OS 25.4.	Accept submission in part.
OS 27.3	Rod and Anne Corbett	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron landscape capacity include no landscape capacity for erection of shelters, huts, cabins and lodges.	Addressed in response to OS 25.6.	Accept submission.
OS 35.1	Andrew Bartholomew	Oppose	That Landscape Capacity point ii visitor accommodation and tourism related activities, be changed to no landscape capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Tourism-related activities have a <b>'no'</b> capacity rating in the schedule and so this part of the submission point is agreed with. Visitor accommodation is rated as having <b>very limited</b> landscape capacity for development limited to being within existing buildings or building platforms. Relying on my knowledge of the area and careful review of aerial mapping (with building platforms) I consider this suggests a very small tolerance for such development which I consider to be appropriate within the PA.	Accept submission in part.
OS 35.2	Andrew Bartholomew	Oppose	That Landscape Capacity point v. earthworks be amended to no landscape capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Due to the number of trails on Mount Iron, which will require ongoing repair and maintenance, inevitably requiring earthworks. In my opinion a <b>'no'</b> capacity rating for earthworks would be inappropriate. However, in the Landscape Capacity section of the schedule, (v) earthworks has been decreased to a <b>'very limited to no'</b> capacity rating in response to another submission (see the response to OS25.4).	Reject submission.
OS 38.1	William Thomson	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.11.ii. be amended to 'no' capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 35.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS 38.2	William Thomson	Oppose	That Landscape Capacity 21.22.11.v earthworks be amended from 'very limited' to 'no' landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 35.2.	Reject submission.
OS 39.1	John Palmer	Oppose	That the Landscape Capacity point ii visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended from 'very limited' to 'no' landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 35.1.	Accept submission in part.
OS 39.2	John Palmer	Oppose	The Landscape Capacity schedule 21.22.11 v (earthworks) be amended to ensure that earthworks are limited to repairs, maintenance and renewal of existing walking-only trails and tracks.	Addressed in response to OS 25.4.	Accept submission in part.
OS 39.3	John Palmer	Oppose	That the Landscape Capacity should record that there is no capacity for shelters, huts, cabins, lodges, or other related buildings.	Addressed in response to OS 25.6.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 40.2	Niamh and Andrew Tomes	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 landscape capacity section point v be amended as follows "earthworks – very limited landscape capacity for earthworks and additional trails or access tracks that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns."	In agreement, no comment required, other than to note that an amendment to (v) has been made in response to OS 25.4 to decrease capacity to 'very limited to no'.	Accept submission.
OS 41.1	Dirk Van walt	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron capacity under ii. be amended to include 'no landscape capacity to absorb visitor accommodation other than within existing buildings' with the wording 'No landscape capacity related activities' remaining.	Addressed in response to OS 25.2.	Accept submission.
OS 41.2	Dirk Van walt	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron landscape capacity under v. be amended to ensure that earthworks are limited to repairs, maintenance and renewal of existing walking-only trails and tracks.	Addressed in response to OS 25.4.	Accept submission in part.
OS 41.3	Dirk Van walt	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron landscape capacity include no landscape capacity for erection of shelters, huts, cabins and lodges.	Addressed in response to OS 25.6.	Accept submission.
OS 44.1	Brendon Fraher	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.11 (ii) visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended to 'no landscape capacity for tourism related activities within existing or on proposed agreed or approved building platforms.'	Tourism-related activities has a rating of 'no' capacity without qualifiers and as such the submitted text is superfluous.	Reject submission.
OS 44.3	Brendon Fraher	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron landscape capacity include no landscape capacity for erection of shelters, huts, cabins and lodges.	Addressed in response to OS 25.6.	Accept submission.
OS 44.5	Brendon Fraher	Oppose	That 21.22.11 (v) be amended to limit earthworks to repairs and maintenance of existing tracks and trails only from a health and safety perspective and that earthworks not be allowed for roads or carparks on Mount Iron.	Partly addressed in response to OS 25.4. 'Roads' and 'carparks' fall within (viii) <b>transport infrastructure</b> in the Landscape Capacity section of the PA schedule where there is a 'no' capacity rating.	Accept submission in part.
OS 54.1	Janet Bartholomew	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.11.ii. visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended to no capacity for visitor accommodation.	Addressed in response to OS 35.1. This submission also mentions fire risk. While fire may be a legitimate risk to those within the Mt Iron PA, this is not a noteworthy landscape value that merits reference in a Schedule of Landscape Values.	Reject submission.
OS 54.2	Janet Bartholomew	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.11.v. earthworks be amended to no landscape capacity to absorb earthworks.	Addressed in response to OS 35.2. This submission also mentions risk from fire, earthquake, landslides, and deer fencing. While there may be a legitimate risk of these aspects within the Mt Iron PA, these are not noteworthy landscape values that merit reference in a Schedule of Landscape Values.	Reject submission.
OS 55.2	Brent Will	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.11 Mount Iron outstanding natural feature ii. be amended to ensure that no landscape activity to absorb visitor accommodation other than existing buildings and that there is no future development of existing buildings or building platforms.	With respect to the landscape capacity for the development of visitor accommodation, existing buildings or building platforms, I note that there is one consented but unbuilt platform within the PA and four existing dwellings. The PA Schedule advises a rating of <b>no</b> landscape capacity for rural living, farm buildings and commercial recreation activities (which can include buildings).	Accept submission in part.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				I consider the identified capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing consented development to be appropriate within the PA.	
OS 55.3	Brent Will	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron and the landscape capacity regarding that there is no capacity tourism-related activities should remain as notified.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 55.4	Brent Will	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron landscape capacity item v be amended so that earthworks are limited to repairs, maintenance and enhancement of existing trials.	Addressed in response to OS 25.4.	Accept submission in part.
OS 55.5	Brent Will	Oppose	That the activities listed in the landscape capacity of landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron outstanding natural feature record that there is no landscape capacity for the erection or construction of shelters, huts, cabins, lodges, carparks, or coming areas.	Addressed in response to OS 25.6. 'Carparks' falls within (viii) <b>transport infrastructure</b> in the Landscape Capacity section of the PA schedule ('no' capacity rating). It is unclear what 'coming areas' means.	Accept submission.
OS 56.1	Megan Davies (Hidden Hills Residents Association) on behalf of Hidden Hills Residents Association	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron landscape capacity visitor accommodation and tourism related activities (ii) be amended to 'no landscape capacity to absorb visitor accommodation within existing or new buildings or building platforms or elsewhere.'	Addressed in response to OS 35.1.	Reject submission.
OS 56.1B	Megan Davies (Hidden Hills Residents Association) on behalf of Hidden Hills Residents Association	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron "We submit that if this area is designated as a Recreation Reserve upon completion of the acquisition by QLDC from Allenby Farms Ltd, then section 45 of the Reserves Act 1977 would allow for the erection of shelters, huts, cabins, lodges and similar accommodation. The public can appreciate and enjoy the benefits of the outdoors and nature that Mount Iron provides without the need for such buildings. The proximity of Mount Iron to Wanaka township where there is plentiful accommodation provision negates the need for such structures on Mount Iron. Therefore, we submit that there is no landscape capacity for such structures."	Addressed in response to OS 25.6.	Accept submission.
OS 56.2	Megan Davies (Hidden Hills Residents Association) on behalf of Hidden Hills Residents Association	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.11.v. earthworks be amended to no landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 35.2.	Reject submission.
OS 56.3	Megan Davies (Hidden Hills Residents Association) on behalf of Hidden Hills Residents Association	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.11.viii. retain 'no landscape capacity' as notified.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 56.4	Megan Davies (Hidden Hills Residents Association) on behalf of Hidden Hills Residents Association	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.11.i-iv, vi, vii, ix-xii retain 'no landscape capacity' as notified.	Submission is in support. To clarify for the submitter, the landscape capacity rating for: (ii) has a <b>'very limited'</b> capacity to absorb visitor accommodation within existing buildings or building platforms in the 21.22.11 notified schedule. Relying on my knowledge of the area and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource	Accept submission in part.



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				consents and aerial imagery), I consider that these ratings to be appropriate from a landscape perspective.	
OS 58.1	Jon Sedon	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron landscape capacity item v be amended so that earthworks are limited to repairs, maintenance and enhancement of existing trails.	Addressed in response to OS 25.4.	Accept submission in part.
OS 58.2	Jon Sedon	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron landscape capacity under v. be amended to ensure that there is no landscape capacity for earthworks.	Addressed in response to OS 35.2.	Reject submission.
OS 58.3	Jon Sedon	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron should have no capacity for the development of any further structures within the reserve.	Addressed in response to OS 25.6.	Accept submission.
OS 70.25	Ainley McLeod on behalf of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron 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'.	I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.18 Capacity are appropriate:  (ix) <b>utilities and regionally significant infrastructure - limited</b> 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. <b>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.</b>	Accept submission.
OS 73.22	Ian Greaves on behalf of Bike Wanaka Inc.	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.11 Mount Iron be amended to remove reference to limited or very limited capacity for new cycling and walking trails.	Addressed in response to OS 73.24.	Reject submission.
OS 73.24	Ian Greaves on behalf of Bike Wanaka Inc.	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.21 Mount Iron 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.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  From my own observations of the PA, including walking up Mount Iron, in my opinion Mount Iron is well endowed with trails. Additional trails may trigger cumulative effects through further vegetation cover change as well as earthworks, and the new trails themselves.  As such the submission sought to increase capacity is not supported.  Note the capacity rating for (v) has been decreased from 'very limited' to 'very limited to no' in response to several submissions.	Reject submission.
OS 77.31	Michael Bathgate on behalf of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 paragraph 3 be amended to correct the spelling of Mata-au.	Spelling corrected to 'Mata-au'	Accept submission.
OS 97.1	Mark Richter	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.1.ii. visitor accommodation and tourism related activities be amended to: no landscape capacity to absorb visitor accommodation other than within existing buildings.	Addressed in response to OS 25.2.	Accept submission.
OS 97.2	Mark Richter	Support	That landscape capacity 21.22.11.ii. wording: no capacity for tourism related activities be retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 97.3	Mark Richter	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.1.v. earthworks be amended to limit earthworks to repairs, maintenance, and renewal of existing walking-only trails and tracks.	Addressed in response to OS 25.4.	Accept submission in part.
OS 97.4	Mark Richter	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.11 Mt Iron be amended to no landscape capacity for erection of shelters, huts, cabins and lodges as part of a Recreation Reserve.	Addressed in response to OS 25.6.	Accept submission.
OS 97.5	Mark Richter	Oppose	That any use of the proposed reserve on Mount Iron take account of the extreme fire danger, including car parks.	Addressed in response to OS 54.1.	Reject submission.
OS 141.1	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to adequately provide for 'interface issues' between the priority area and the adjacent Allenby Large Lot Residential (LLR) B zoned land.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Permitted development in the LLR B Zone will not be influenced or restricted by the adjacent Mount Iron ONF PA. However, any development in the LLR B Zone beyond what is permitted will need to take into account and likely provide an assessment of any effects that development may have on the attributes and values of the adjacent ONF. It is my opinion that the ONF/L land adjacent to an urban area often has an increased landscape sensitivity to development change 'next door' due to the role the 'edge' plays between the ONF/L and adjacent urban zoned land.	Reject submission.
OS 141.2	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to use new definitions to provide for the intent of capacity in landscapes with a different ability to absorb appropriate development. Revised capacity ratings are required if these are to be retained within the schedules.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The recommended amendments to the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble address this submission point to some degree. Refer to Ms Evans' section 42A report which discusses the use of definitions in the schedules. Further, 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 site-specific level) would form part of landscape assessments for resource consent and plan change applications. In other words, the capacity descriptions should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites.	Reject submission.
OS 141.3	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to more accurately recognise and provide for existing uses, their likely and anticipated future upgrade, replacement, or redevelopment.	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. The 'replacement' or 'upgrade' of an existing activity 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.	Reject submission.
OS 141.4	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to limit visibility to and across the land in question of this submission to important public viewpoints in the schedule.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Under 'Particularly important views to and from the area' at [17] public views to the PA are addressed. Such views are many and from several broad areas as Mount Iron is a prominent and highly visible landmark in the Upper Clutha Basin. Similarly views from Mount Iron looking outward are important [18]. The locations of any specific 'important public viewpoints' have not been provided by the submitter. Relying on my knowledge of the area, I consider that important public views will be numerous, spread over a very broad viewshed area. As such, it is of my opinion that 'important public viewpoints' would be best considered and	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				identified as part of an assessment of any future land use consent or plan change application.	
OS 141.5	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to recognise and provide for the benefits of change, enhancement, and remediation of land within the priority area.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of landuses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>It is also expected that such matters would be traversed in detail as part of a detailed (and more site specific) landscape assessment in support of a plan change or resource consent process.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 141.6	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to identify degradation and opportunities to remedy identified degradation.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>In my opinion, the current wording at [6 - 7] adequately describes the current condition of the PA where 'degradation' is concerned. No additional changes to wording in the schedule are considered necessary.</p> <p>With respect to the suggestion that the Schedule 21.22.11 should identify degradation and discuss the opportunities as to how such degradation may be remedied, this goes beyond the identification of the landscape values of the PA and capacity ratings of the PA as a whole. In my opinion, such opportunities would be best addressed as part of a comprehensive and robust landscape assessment for a site-specific resource consent or plan change application.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 141.7	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to account for the adjacent residential development anticipated and zoned to occur.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point suggesting how or why the schedule should be altered.</p> <p>At [16] the schedule states that the ONF has "...a <i>strong visual contrast with the surrounding urban landscape.</i>" Relying on my knowledge of the area (fieldwork including walking up Mount Iron), careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), in my opinion this is sufficient to describe the context of the PA. Under 'General Description of the Area' the PAs urban context is clearly articulated.</p> <p>Also, partly addressed in response to OS 141.1.</p>	Reject submission.
OS141.8	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to acknowledge that the zoned residential development adjacent to the priority area should not be limited by the values contained within the adjacent Mount Iron Outstanding Natural Feature/ will not impact upon those values.	Addressed in response to OS 141.1.	Reject submission.
OS 141.9	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to recognise that adjacent Outstanding Natural Feature land which is modified in its own right, can provide an effective rural living transition of development between the Large Lot Residential (LLR) B zoned land and the upper natural slopes of the Outstanding Natural Feature.	Addressed in response to OS 141.1.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 141.10	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to recognise that there is capacity to include further rural lifestyle development within the existing bush setting, as well as the upgrade, extension, and consolidation of existing lifestyle/residential activities.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>From my own observations of the PA (including walking up Mount Iron), in my opinion the capacity for additional rural lifestyle development and any upgrades, extension, and consolidation of existing lifestyle/residential activities (which would all fall within rural living in the capacity section of the schedule) is appropriately rated at 'no' capacity. The 'no' rating accounts for the highly natural character of the PA and the extremely limited existing level of rural living (two consented and one unbuilt platform) and other development.</p> <p>Further, 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 141.11	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to recognise the particular attributes existing in the area outlined in point 27 of the submission as part of the values and character of the Outstanding Natural Feature.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>In my opinion, the attributes listed and sought (a – h) in the submission are adequately addressed in the schedule under 'Important ecological features and vegetation types' (submitted point 'e'); under 'Important land use patterns and features' (submitted points a – c, f and h); and at [13], and [19] of the schedule. The other 'attributes' listed in the submission (points d and g) are minor only.</p> <p>No additional changes to the wording in the schedule are considered necessary.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 141.12	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to exclude the land in question of this submission from the landscape schedule.	<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>	Reject submission.
OS 141.13	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to otherwise provide for a separate character unit within the schedule for the land related to this submission as a lifestyle transition area.	<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>	Reject submission.
OS 141.14	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That if the mapping of the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is not amended that the landscape schedule be deleted.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A.
OS 141.15	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the capacity ratings of the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron are amended in terms of their descriptions linked to further anticipated development available to occur.	<p>The meaning of this submission point is unclear. No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The PA Schedules have been drafted and amended (where appropriate) in response to submissions - acknowledging the scale and character of anticipated development under the District Plan. This has resulted in amendments to the capacity evaluation for some activities.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 141.16	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That without derogating from the generality of the submission, the submitter seeks any additional, amended, consequential, or further relief in respect to the schedules reflects the matters raised in this submission.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A.
OS 141.17	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is not amended to accommodate the submission points contained within this submission that the schedule be deleted or otherwise withdrawn from the variation.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS 141.18	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended so the important landforms and types section of the schedule only describes features within the priority area.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submission does not highlight any features/descriptions that are not part of the PA ONF at [1] of the schedule. In my opinion, the text at [1] is limited to a description of the landform features within the PA, other than where it states: <i>"The landform feature extends beyond the PA into urban areas on the western and northern flanks."</i> This refers to the roche moutonnée landform which extends beyond the mapped PA and is appropriately described and qualified (as being outside the PA).	Reject submission.
OS 141.19	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended in the important and ecological features and vegetation types section to just refer to areas identified in the Proposed District Plan.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PA Schedules work has integrated review of the schedules by an ecological expert who supports the notified text. Further - SNAs are not the only source of ecological attributes and values. Other (non-SNA) areas of natural vegetation cover contribute strongly to the attributes and values of the ONF.	Reject submission.
OS 141.20	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at the important ecological features and vegetation types to be specified more accurately with respect to areas of identified ecological and habitat value.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. With respect to the suggestion that the Schedule 21.22.11 should identify areas of ecological and habitat value (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 141.21	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to remove the requirement of the removal or eradication of pest flora and fauna species.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Note: [6] and [7] include reference to the current situation regarding pest plant and animal species. There is no statement requiring for their removal (although their removal would be beneficial to the ONF). The approach to consideration of pest flora and fauna is explained further in the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble.	Reject submission.
OS 141.22	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to change the naturalness attributes and values from 'high' to 'moderate' or 'low'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork), careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that the level of naturalness is appropriately summarised as 'high' for the 21.22.11 PA ONF given the general lack of obvious development across the area and dominance of natural elements, patterns, and processes.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				I note that the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the assessment and summary conclusions are 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.	
OS 141.23	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That in 21.22.11 if the overall ranking of the naturalness attributes and values are not amended then the schedule be amended to include the stated values and low naturalness ranking of the submitters land (Lot 1 DP 539413 and Lot 4 DP 471320).	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. 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 site-specific level) would form part of landscape assessments for resource consent and plan change applications.	Reject submission.
OS 141.24	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to delete the landscape capacity section from the schedule.	Addressed by reporting planner in s42A Report.	N/A
OS 141.25	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That if the landscape capacity sections are to be retained in the landscape schedule, then much of the proposed Outstanding Natural Feature lower slopes need to be amended to have moderate or high capacity for additional subdivision, industrial and service activities, lifestyle, earthworks and associated and ancillary activities.	Addressed in response to OS 141.10 and OS 141.23. No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Of note_I consider that identifying capacity for industrial and service activities would be inconsistent with an RMA s6(b) landscape. Subdivision in itself has nil landscape effects, however if it intended to provide for urban expansions, this would also be inconsistent with an RMa s6(b) landscape. Lifestyle development, taken here to mean 'rural living' has 'no' landscape capacity in the schedule under (xii) and earthworks at (v) has 'very limited to no' landscape capacity. The submission is not clear what 'associated and ancillary activities' are. Such development beyond the capacity ratings set down in the schedule would, in my opinion diminish the PAs very high physical and associative values and high perceptual values as summarised in the schedule. Relying on the definition of these activities in PDP Chapter 2, such development is in my opinion, inappropriate within an ONL/F as would not protect the landscape values of the PA as they are outlined in the schedule. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork), careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), the lower slopes within the PA exhibit largely similar landscape characteristics as the upper slopes do. As such, it is of my opinion that it would be inappropriate to increase the capacity levels on the lower slopes within the PA for urban expansions, rural living and earthworks activities.	Reject submission.
OS 141.25 A	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	<i>"The current capacity rankings contradict what is actually lawfully established already, or likely to occur within parts of the ONF, in particular the Appendix 3 Land, where there are existing and planned rural living opportunities and associated amenities and utilities."</i>	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PA schedules account for existing land use activity, permitted activity, and consented but unbuilt development.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 141.25 B	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	<i>"There is no discussion around the appropriateness of the existing landscape character. There is an assumption that it must be maintained or that some earlier landscape character is the optimum. The submitter considers that there may be future enhancement and change to character in a positive way, and that alternative landscape character could be more appropriate and what people would value more. There is a persistent underlying concept that expanses of open pasture are to be preserved, however the Submitter supports that the schedule could provide for opportunities of industrial and other land development, and associated enhancements through landscaping, pest management, and planting to improve biodiversity and conservation values."</i>	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Industrial development is addressed at 141.25 above. 'Other land development' is non-specific.</p> <p>Enhancement of the ONF through pest flora and fauna management and planting to improve biodiversity and conservation values is supported. The approach taken to pest management throughout the schedules is addressed in the proposed amendments to the preamble.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork), careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that the landscape attributes, values and capacities set out in the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule are appropriate.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 141.26	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at the general description of the area to include reference to the northern slopes of the priority area containing significant landscape modifications through consented and established activities such as residential developments. Also to include reference to the traditional farming land use of the priority area.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The northern slopes within the PA are largely natural. The northern slopes outside the PA include urban development at varying densities which would appear to be the focus of this submission point. The broader urban context is acknowledged in the Schedule under 'General Description of the Area'.</p> <p>In my opinion, traditional farming activities are adequately addressed in the schedule under 'Important land use patterns and features'.</p> <p>As such the submitted changes to the schedule are not supported.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 141.27	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at point 1 to remove the sentence 'The landform feature extends beyond the PA into urban areas on the western and northern flanks'.	Addressed in response to OS 141.18.	Reject submission.
OS 141.28	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to specifically define the areas included in relation to important ecological features and vegetation types.	Addressed in response to OS 141.20.	Reject submission.
OS 141.29	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at point 4 to make minor typographical changes and to include the sentence 'Opportunities to further enhance and support these should be encouraged through future subdivision and development applications'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Point [4] addresses 'Important ecological features and vegetation types' 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 appropriately addressed via a comprehensive and robust landscape assessment, as signalled in the Preamble to the Schedule 21.22.</p>	Reject submission point.
OS 141.30	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at point 6 to make minor typographical amendments and to replace the words 'if not controlled' with 'These should be effectively controlled through district plan provisions or other legal mechanisms, associated with subdivision and development proposals'.	Reference to "These should be effectively controlled through district plan provisions or other legal mechanisms, associated with subdivision and development proposals" is a matter of District Plan policy rather than a landscape attribute or value.	Reject submission.
OS 141.31	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at point 6 to include the words 'Recognise the ability to effectively control pest' and 'through district plan provisions or other legal mechanisms, associated with subdivision and development proposals'.	Addressed in response to OS141.29 above.	Reject submission point.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 141.32	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron at 'new' point 8 is amended to include a point under the title important ecological landforms and vegetation types regarding the lower northern slopes of the Outstanding Natural Feature containing indigenous vegetation types planted by the landholder and parts of the priority area being a working operational farm.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. In my opinion, this submission point is adequately addressed at [4], [8] and (b) under Summary of Landscape Values in the schedule.	Reject submission.
OS 141.33	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at point 8 to remove mention to the point being applicable to the majority of the priority area and instead being in reference to 'parts' of it. Also that reference is included in point 8 of conservation reserve or Significant Natural Overlay 'as defined in District Plan Maps' and to include reference to the modified curtilage areas, access roads, fencing and infrastructure associated with them.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. In my opinion, the schedule wording accurately describes the PAs land use patterns and features. However, there appear to be three constructed dwellings in the ONF and one unbuilt consented platform. As such, I recommend the following amendment to the schedule wording. [8]: The majority of the PA is kānuka woodland or grey shrubland protected as conservation reserve, council reserve or by Significant Natural Area overlay. Some open retired pastoral areas are present on the western side and the rocky cliffs on the southern and south-eastern sides do not support tall vegetation. A network of walking tracks criss-crosses the landform and there are Wānaka water supply tanks on the north-western flank, as well as <del>two</del> <b>three</b> dwellings amidst the kānuka forest. There is one <del>dwelling and one other additional</del> consented building platform on the eastern flank of the hill.	Partly accept submission.
OS 141.34	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at point 13 to change the year of completion of the Mount Iron summit track to 1906.	The year 1906 is included at [13] therefore it appears there is agreement with the submission point.	Accept submission.
OS 141.35	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at point 14 to include reference to 'the more prominent upper slopes' regarding important values and to also reference the lower northern flanks in private ownership.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Land ownership is typically not addressed as part of a Schedule of Landscape Values. As such it is of my opinion that the content at [14] is appropriate. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork), careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), the landscape values of the upper and lower slopes within the PA are the same. As such the submitted changes to the schedule are not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 141.36	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at point 16 to include the sentence 'Lower northern flanks provide for an effective rural living transition area between urban development and the more natural upper slopes of the ONF'.	Addressed in response to OS 141.1.	Reject submission.
OS 141.37	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at point 17 to reference how the upper slopes of the priority area provide a prominent and distinctive component of views from surrounding areas, and to include the sentence 'Viewpoints from the northern side are within the context of urban development and area influenced by existing rural living development on the ONF from Hidden Hills'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submitted text change is not considered necessary and in my opinion is adequately covered at [17] already.	Reject submission.



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 141.38	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at point 18 to remove the words 'slopes and'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submission infers that there are no panoramic views from the slopes of Mount Iron. From my own observations of the PA (including walking up Mount Iron on the public track), panoramic views from the slopes of Mount Iron from the track are widespread and valued.	Reject submission.
OS 141.39	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at point 19 to include reference to the 'high level of naturalness' on the upper prominent slopes of the Outstanding Natural Feature.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The submitted text change is not considered necessary and in my opinion is adequately covered in [19] already.	Reject submission.
OS 141.40	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended under the title naturalness attributes and values to include a point about the low to moderate level of naturalness on the lower northern flanks of the priority area.	Addressed in response to OS 141.26.	Reject submission.
OS 141.41	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended under the title naturalness attributes and values to include a point about the lower northern flanks of the priority area being highly modified through long established residential and farming activities.	Addressed in response to OS 141.26.	Reject submission.
OS 141.42	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended under the title aesthetic attributes and values to include a point regarding the moderate aesthetic attributes within the lower northern flanks which exhibit established residential dwellings and associated curtilage areas.	Addressed in response to OS 141.26.	Reject submission.
OS 141.43	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended at point 23(c) to include the reference to a rural lifestyle transition area of the lower northern flanks of the priority area in regard to the high degree in contrast with the priority area and the surrounding urban area.	Addressed in response to OS 141.1.	Reject submission.
OS 141.44	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to change the very high rating of physical values associated with the priority area to only apply to the upper slopes of the Outstanding Natural Feature and to reference 'identified Significant Natural Areas.	I recommend the following rewording to the Summary or Landscape Values:  (a) <b>Very high</b> physical values relating to the prominent and classic roche moutonnée landform, the predominance of regenerating indigenous vegetation with important habitat values for indigenous fauna, <a href="#">reflected in its partial SNA status</a> and the mana whenua features association with the area.	Partly accept submission.
OS 141.45	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to change the rating of associative values relating to the mana whenua associations of the area from 'very high' to 'high'. Also to include reference to 'existing residential and historic farming uses.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The Priority Area Schedules have been reviewed by a cultural expert. No such amendment was recommended in this regard. Existing residential development is minimal within the PA/ONF and does not contribute to associative values, other than for occupants in my opinion. However, the ONF has/is farmed and so the submission point raised is valid. I suggest the below change to the Summary or Landscape Values:  (b) <b>Very high</b> associative values relating to the mana whenua associations of the areas, <a href="#">the significant recreational attributes, historic farming use</a> , and the strong shared and	Partly accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				recognised values as part of the local and regional sense of place.	
OS 141.46	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to include the words 'the upper parts of the hill excluding the lower north-western flanks and areas adjacent to the urban zoning' in the landscape values relating to legibility, visual prominence, memorability and naturalness of the priority area.	Addressed in response to OS 141.26 and OS 141.35.	Reject submission.
OS 141.47	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to change the landscape capacity rating for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities from 'very limited' to 'moderate'. Also to include capacity for the replacement, or existing curtilage areas.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Regarding the submitted use of the term 'Moderate': Section 3 of the PA Schedules Methodology Report explains the capacity rating scale (and noting that this explanatory detail is incorporated into the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to assist plan users). The Methodology Report goes on to explain that 'moderate' is deliberately not a term used in the rating scale.</p> <p>Visitor accommodation is rated as having <b>very limited</b> landscape capacity for development limited to being within existing buildings or building platforms. Relying on my knowledge of the area and careful review of aerial mapping (with building platforms) I consider this suggests a very small tolerance for such development which I consider to be appropriate within the PA.</p> <p>Further, I consider that the '<b>no</b>' capacity for tourism-related activities (resorts) is appropriate in order to protect the very high physical and associative values and high perceptual values of the PA, as summarised in the schedule.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 141.48	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to change the capacity for urban expansions to be 'moderate' capacity for such rural living expansions on the lower northern flanks which reads as a lifestyle transition area between urban areas and the more natural upper slopes of the ONF'.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Urban expansion within the PA would, in my view fail to protect landscape values, and in particular, perceptual and associative values.</p> <p>Submission point is also addressed in response to OS141.1 regarding a transition area.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 141.49	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to change the capacity for earthworks to 'moderate' within the lower northern flanks of the priority area, while maintaining a limited capacity for the rest of the landscape schedule.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The use of 'Moderate' is addressed in response to OS 141.47.</p> <p>I also consider that the notified capacity for earthworks is appropriately rated as '<b>very limited</b>' for the 21.22.11 PA ONF given the relatively unmodified nature across the area.</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 141.50	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to change the capacity for utilities and regionally significant infrastructure as moderate for utilities given that existing water supply and storage is already established and will likely need maintenance, upgrade, and development in the future.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The use of 'Moderate' is addressed in response to OS 141.47.</p> <p>I also consider that the notified capacity for utilities and regionally significant infrastructure is appropriately rated as '<b>very limited</b>' for the 21.22.11 PA ONF given the relatively unmodified nature across the area. 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</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				resource consent applications that may identify varying landscape (values and) capacities.	
OS 141.51	Rosie Hill on behalf of Allenby Farms Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron is amended to change the capacity of rural living from 'no capacity' to 'moderate' for rural living in the lower northern flanks as a transition between urban development and the more natural upper slopes of the Outstanding Natural Feature.	Addressed in response to OS 141.1, OS 141.47 and OS 141.48.	Reject submission.
OS 188.31	Elisha Young-Ebert (Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 paragraph 3 be amended to correct the spelling of Mata-au.	Addressed in response to OS 77.31.	Accept submission.