

## 21.22.22 PA ONL Dublin Bay: Schedule of Landscape Values

---

### General Description of the Area

The Dublin Bay PA encompasses the Dublin Bay foreshore and flats on Lake Wānaka and extends to the crests of the landforms enclosing the bay and the Clutha Mata-au outlet – Mount Brown, the glacial moraine behind the bay, the headland on the northern side of the outlet, and the landforms enclosing the southern side of the outlet. The PA is a landscape unit within the wider Lake Wānaka ONL and its boundaries form the visual catchment of the lake when viewed from the lake surface.

There are four sub areas within the PA:

- The area of rural living on the flats and undulating gentle slopes of Dublin Bay;
- The south-west slopes of Mount Brown and the remaining pastoral or conservation areas on the moraine and headland;
- The land on the southern side of the Clutha Mata-au outlet from Penrith Point to the Outlet Motor Camp;
- The waters of the bay and river outlet.

### 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. Mount Brown: an elongated roche moutonnée landform that has been overridden by valley glaciers and smoothed by glacial till deposits from successive glaciations. The steep relatively even south-eastern faces of the hill have been eroded by glacial scraping of the schist bedrock.
2. Ice-front scarpland from the Hāwea glacial advance, framing Dublin Bay, with the inland boundary of the scarp forming the skyline to the lake above the bay. A series of terraces, ledges and benches stepping down within the bay, formed during glacial retreat.
3. Glacial till and outwash gravels on the headland between Dublin Bay and the Clutha River Mata-au, and south of the river outlet, eroded on the edges by lake and river action.
4. Lake beach deposits on the flatter parts of Dublin Bay.

### Important hydrological features:

5. Lake Wānaka, including the Clutha River Mata-au outlet. Important attributes include the clarity, quality and significant extent of the water body, its character as a deep glacial lake surrounded by ice-eroded landforms and terminal moraines, and the distinctive feature of Stevensons Arm, divided from the main lake by The Peninsula.
6. Lake Wānaka is a nationally significant fishery.
7. A small unnamed creek on the flank of Mt Brown.

### Important ecological features and vegetation types:

8. Particularly noteworthy vegetation types include:
  - a. Regenerating kānuka and kōhūhū dominant shrubland and bracken on the south-western flanks of Mount Brown;
  - b. Regenerating kānuka, with kōwhai, kōhūhū, matagouri, mingimingi and tī kōuka (cabbage tree) and other indigenous shrubs, on the lake edges, in the DOC-managed Dublin Bay-Outlet-Albert Town Recreation Reserve, and around the Outlet Motor Camp.
9. Other characteristic vegetation types are:
  - a. Lombardy poplars and willows around the lake edges, particularly at Dublin Bay;
  - b. Domestic garden vegetation on rural living properties;
  - c. Wilding radiata pine and Douglas fir, particularly on the headland within the reserve.
  - d. Plantation conifer forest at Sticky Forest.
10. Potential for enhancement of ecological attributes through control of wilding conifers and other exotic weeds and/or through ongoing indigenous regeneration.
11. Regenerating kānuka shrubland and broadleaf shrubland provide important feeding and nesting habitat for small insectivorous native birds such as South Island tomtit, grey warbler, fantail and silvereye.
12. Animal pests include rabbits, stoats, possums, rats and mice.

**Commented [JH1]:** OS 57.4 Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager

### Important land use patterns and features:

13. Predominantly farmland and reserve/conservation land, but diverse land uses, including:
  - a. Rural living/hobby farming on large lots of between 4ha and 38ha around Dublin Bay, with four small lots clustered in the centre of the bay. Associated visitor accommodation and events;
  - b. Pastoral farming on the slopes of Mount Brown and on the headland;
  - c. Conservation land and recreation reserve along the lake and outlet foreshore, with a larger area of conservation land in southern Dublin Bay. Used for walking, running and cycling, picnicking, horse trekking, swimming and boating;
  - d. Plantation forestry and informal use of mountain bike trails on private land at Sticky Forest; and
  - e. The Outlet Motor Camp, which is partly on private land and partly on recreation reserve.

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

**Commented [JH3]:** OS 57.6 Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager. OS 188.2 Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu.

### Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

14. Māori use or occupation of the land around the lake foreshore and outlet (archaeological site F40/11).
15. Mature exotic trees within the bay and along the lakeshore relate to the history of pastoral farming.

### Mana whenua features and their locations:

16. 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.
17. The ONL overlaps with mapped within wāhi tūpuna 34 and 41: Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) and Lake Wānaka (Dublin Bay) (Nohoanga).

18. Lake Wānaka is highly significant to Kāi Tahu and is a Statutory Acknowledgement under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.
19. Within the ONL is a contemporary nohoaka - Lake Wānaka (Dublin Bay) - provided as redress under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.
20. Sticky Forest is land being held by the Crown under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 for successors to SILNA<sup>1</sup> beneficiaries to be identified by the Māori Land Court. The Sticky Forest land is in substitution for SILNA land at 'The Neck' which their tūpuna were allocated but did not receive for future Kāi Tahu owners under a Treaty of Waitangi settlement, as compensation to whānau left landless in the 1800s. While currently in plantation forest and used informally for recreation purposes, future Kāi Tahu owners may seek different uses for this whenua.

**Commented [JH4]:** OS 57.2 Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager

**Commented [JH5]:** OS 57.2 Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager

### 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:

21. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
22. Wānaka is one of the lakes referred to in the tradition of "Ngā Puna Wai Karikari o Rākaihautū" which tells how the principal lakes of Te Wai Pounamu were dug by the rangatira (chief) Rākaihautū. Through these pūrakau (stories), this area holds a deep spiritual significance both traditionally and for Kāi Tahu today.
23. Identified Kāi Tahu values in this area may include, but are not limited to, wāhi taoka, mahika kai, ara tawhito, nohoaka.
24. The mamae (pain) generally felt by Kāi Tahu associated with land dispossession and alienation from traditional resources is represented by the Sticky Forest substitute land and the difficulty in accessing and using this whenua. Allowing for future uses of the land to realise whānau aspirations is viewed by Kāi Tahu as being in accordance with the principles of Te Tiriti o Waitangi.

### Important historic attributes and values:

25. History of high-country farming as part of the East Wanaka Run (Forks Run), then amalgamated into Wanaka Station, and later part of Mount Burke Station.

### Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

26. Strong shared and recognised attributes as a recreational destination and as part of the landform framing and enclosing Lake Wānaka.

### Important recreation attributes and values:

27. Highly valued as locations for swimming (safe shallow beach at Dublin Bay), picnicking, boating, water skiing, walking and mountain biking along the lake shore, and camping at The Outlet. Lake Wānaka is classified as a Nationally Significant Fishery due to both its physical and recreational significance. Tracks along the lakeshore and river outlet, including the Outlet Track and Dublin Bay Track (linked by the Deans Bank Track outside PA), and the East Dublin Bay Track. Sticky Forest is valued as a single-track mountain biking destination, with tracks both inside and outside of the PA. This is the only publicly accessible

**Commented [JH6]:** OS 115.10 Otago Fish and Game Council

<sup>1</sup> South Island Landless Natives Act 1906, repealed in 1909.

mountain bike trail network currently located in Wānaka although as discussed in paragraph 20 above, public access to this area may change in the future. Future planned connections in the tracks network include a bridge across the Clutha Mata-au at the Outlet and an extension of East Dublin Bay Track through to Maungawera Road.

28. The Clutha Mata-au Outlet is a reasonably popular start/ finish point for jetboating activities on the Clutha River.
29. Te Araroa (New Zealand's Trail) and Ngā Haerenga (New Zealand Cycle Trails) passing along the outlet and lakefront from Albert Town to Beacon Point.

**Commented [JH7]:** OS 57.7 Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager.  
OS 77.2 Kai Tahu ki Otago.  
OS 188.2 Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu

### 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:

30. Legibility and expressiveness of Mount Brown as an ice-eroded landform enclosing Dublin Bay, and of the landforms around the lake outlet, where the erosive action of the Clutha Mata-au has carved through the terminal moraine at the distal end of Lake Wānaka.

#### Particularly important views to and from the area include:

31. Highly attractive views from Dublin Bay and the conservation reserve/headland across the waters of Lake Wānaka to The Peninsula and the more distant mountains to the west. Reflections on the water and changes in weather conditions and vegetation colours add to the amenity of these views.
32. Highly attractive views from the walking/cycling tracks and recreation areas on the southern side of the Outlet across the lake waters to the northern foreshore of the Outlet, Mount Brown, Stevenson Arm, The Peninsula and more distant mountains to the north. Reflections on the water and changes in weather conditions and vegetation colours add to the amenity of these views.
33. Views from the lake waters and lake shore to the landforms enclosing the lake, including Mount Brown and the terminal moraines. The relative naturalness, indigenous vegetation patterns and, in places, openness of these landforms add to the aesthetic qualities of the PA, as does the contrast between the lake waters and the mountains and moraine features surrounding them.

**Commented [JH8]:** OS 67.16 Upper Clutha Environment Society although not submitted wording per se.

#### Naturalness attributes and values:

34. Overall a moderate-high level of perceived naturalness, despite plantation forestry, rural living and wilding conifer spread. Perceptions of naturalness are higher on the lake waters and foreshore, where natural elements and processes of indigenous regeneration are dominant. Inconsistent land use and vegetation patterns across the southern face of Mount Brown detract from the naturalness and coherence of this part of the PA.

#### Memorability attributes and values:

35. Memorable as an accessible area of the lake and lakeshore that is strongly enclosed by relatively unmodified natural landforms.

#### Transient attributes and values:

36. The influence of wind and cloud on the lake surface colour and texture, autumn colours of willows and Lombardy poplars along the lakeshore, changing colours of pasture areas, which are green in some seasons and tawny brown in others.

**Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

37. Due to its proximity to urban Wānaka, the popularity of the camping ground and tracks, and the rural living land uses, the majority of the PA does not have a strong sense of remoteness. However, people in boats on the lake or using less frequented tracks can experience a sense of relative remoteness.

**Aesthetic attributes and values:**

38. The experience of the attributes outlined above by people living within the landscape or using the popular reserves, campground, track network and lake waters.

39. More specifically, this includes:

- a. The highly attractive views available from within the PA across the lake to surrounding hills and mountains.
- b. The legibility, expressiveness, openness and relative naturalness of Mount Brown.
- c. The regenerating indigenous vegetation on Mount Brown, along the foreshore areas and within the recreation reserves.
- d. The contrast between the lake waters and the enclosing landforms, including the changing colours and textures of these elements across different seasons and weather conditions.
- e. The high degree of naturalness of the lake and the foreshore areas.
- f. The low-density rural living character of Dublin Bay, with widely spaced and largely screened dwellings, and mature integrating vegetation.
- g. The autumn colours of willows and poplars along the lake edge, and the contrast of these yellows with the blue of the lake and the tawny brown or green of the enclosing land.

**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 PA ONL Dublin Bay come together and can be summarised as follows:

- (a) **Moderate-high physical values** due to the clarity, quality and enclosed nature of the lake waters, the largely unmodified roche moutonnée and moraines surrounding the lake, and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
- (b) **Moderate-high associative values** relating to the mana whenua associations of the area, the strong recreational attributes of the landscape, and the shared and recognised values as part of the natural landform framing and enclosing Lake Wānaka.
- (c) **Moderate-high perceptual values** relating to:
  - i. The expressiveness values of Mount Brown and the moraines and terraces enclosing the lake and outlet;

- ii. The aesthetic and memorability values due to the accessibility of the PA for residents of and visitors to Wānaka, the highly attractive views available across the lake waters to the enclosing landforms, the extent of regenerating indigenous vegetation or open pasture, and the naturalness of the lake and lake foreshore.

## Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – some landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that do not require permanent built infrastructure or are co-located with existing development; complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of 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** – no landscape capacity for visitor accommodation on Mount Brown's southern flanks, the headland north of the Outlet and the land south of the Outlet (apart from at the motor camp). Some landscape capacity within the rural living area at Dublin Bay for visitor accommodation activities that are co-located with existing consented facilities, are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of 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. No landscape capacity for tourism related activities.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – no landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – limited landscape capacity in the rural living area within Dublin Bay (excluding the flanks of Mount Brown).
- v. **Earthworks** – limited landscape capacity for earthworks and some capacity for public trails (walking and cycling) subject to that protecting naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and those activities being are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character and maintain the openness and legibility attributes and values of mountain slopes and moraines.
- vii. **Mineral extraction** – very limited landscape capacity for small scale extraction, that protects the area's ONL values.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure** – very limited landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low key 'rural' roading in the rural living area of Dublin Bay that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is co-located with existing facilities, 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. Very limited landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation that is barely discernible from the lake or public places.

Commented [JH9]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago.

Commented [JH10]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [JH11]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [JH12]: OS 99.5 Upper Clutha Tracks Trust

Commented [JH13]: OS 99.5 Upper Clutha Tracks Trust

Commented [JH14]: OS 99.5 Upper Clutha Tracks Trust

Commented [JH15]: OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

Commented [JH16]: OS 70.40 Transpower NZ Ltd

- xi. **Production Forestry** – very limited landscape capacity for small scale production forestry. ~~that protects the area's ONL values.~~
- xii. **Rural living** – very limited landscape capacity for additional development in the rural living area of Dublin Bay – with the location, scale and design of any proposal ensuring that it is generally ~~not discernible difficult to see~~ from external viewpoints. Developments should be of a modest-scale; have a low key 'rural' character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement and enhance public access; ~~and protect the area's ONL values.~~

**Commented [JH17]:** Typographical correction.

**Commented [JH18]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

**Commented [JH19]:** OS 126.11 Northlake Investments Ltd.

**Commented [JH20]:** OS 74.2. John May and Longview Environmental Trust.

# 21.22.22 Dublin Bay ONL Schedule

## 11 AUGUST 2023 FINAL

**Blue highlighted text:** captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.22 Dublin Bay 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) 21.22.22 Dublin Bay ONL Schedule". This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **Three 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 32.1	Ben Wilson on behalf of Wilson family	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay recognise the protection of non-indigenous trees in and around the Dublin Bay reserve area. This should exclude any wilding <i>Pinus radiata</i> and Douglas Fir trees which are not of any significant heritage value.	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 aerial imagery) I consider that all of the vegetation features (including trees and vegetation protected under the District Plan) that make a noteworthy contribution to landscape values, have been appropriately referenced in the PA Schedules. Of note, paragraph [9] of the schedule addresses non-indigenous trees at Dublin Bay (which includes the reserve area) as 'other characteristic vegetation types'. Wilding <i>Pinus radiata</i> and Douglas Fir are also included at [9c] as they are characteristic but can pose a weed threat.	Reject submission.
OS 42.1	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay is removed or revised so that there are no additional constraints on the future use of the submitters properties (Lot 3 DP 27742, Lot 1 DP 426178, and Section 45 Block 5 Lower Wānaka SD).	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 42.3	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule plan change be rejected in its entirety.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 42.4	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That the category 'no landscape capacity' is removed and any areas or activities that are identified as having no landscape capacity be reclassified as having 'very limited landscape capacity'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. A 'no' capacity rating is applied to (ii) tourism related activities (defined as resorts) (iii) urban expansions and (x) (commercial scale) renewable energy generation in the schedule. 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) and my broader knowledge of the area I consider that these 'no' capacity ratings are appropriate from a landscape perspective within the PA. Urban expansion, resorts and commercial scale renewable energy activities within the PA would, in my view fail to protect landscape values, and in particular, perceptual and associative values. There may be locations within the PA where activities might be appropriate at varying levels of capacity, but that would need to be determined through a site specific landscape assessment (as	Reject submission.



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				signalled in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22).	
OS 42.5	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedules be made more concise.	Addressed in the EiC of Ms Gilbert.	N/A
OS 42.6	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That a definition is added to clarify what is meant by intensive agriculture.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 42.7	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That 'tourism related activities' are considered in the landscape capacity assessments as part of Visitor Accommodation (the accommodation component and directly associated activities or services and facilities as defined by the Proposed District Plan) or Commercial Recreation (if the visitor attraction). Or alternative relief that a definition for Tourism Related Activities be included within the Proposed District Plan.	Tourism related activities are defined in the schedules as 'resorts' and as such are kept separate. Definitions are addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report. Small-scale tourism related activities (not resorts) such as farm-based tourism would fall under (i) 'Commercial recreational activities' where there is 'some' landscape capacity or (ii) 'Visitor accommodation' where there is 'some' or 'no' landscape capacity depending on location within the PA.	Reject submission.
OS 42.8	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That terms used in the Proposed District Plan are used wherever possible in the landscape schedules.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 42.10	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Support	That the format used for the Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscapes is retained as notified.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 42.12	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That the words no landscape capacity for tourism activities is removed from landscape capacity 21.22.22.ii. visitor accommodation and tourism related activities.	Addressed in response to OS42.4.	Reject submission.
OS 42.13	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.22.iv. intensive agriculture be amended to: intensive agriculture - limited landscape capacity in the rural living area within Dublin Bay (excluding the flanks of Mount Brown and areas where there is existing agricultural use of the land).	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Intensive agriculture has the same meaning as 'Factory Farming' as defined in Chapter 2 of the PDP. Factory Farming provides for substantial landscape change including large scale buildings which typically have a high risk of detracting from landscape values. 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 consider it appropriate to signal that there is capacity for intensive agriculture across the flanks of Mount Brown. I consider this sort of development to be quite different to the character and scale of farming activity evident in this part of the PA.	Reject submission.
OS 42.14	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That the flanks of Mount Brown, as referred to in 21.22.22.iv. intensive agriculture, are spatially shown on the District Plan Web Mapping application.	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	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				ONF/L mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	
OS 42.15	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.22.x. renewable energy refers to small and community scale renewable energy and is amended to: very limited landscape capacity for discreetly located small and community scale renewable energy generation that is barely discernible from the lake or public places.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Renewable energy is either 'commercial scale' or 'small scale' in ONLs. 'Community scale' renewable energy generation, would fall under 'commercial scale'. Renewable energy generation at a community scale may be large, which would be inappropriate in an ONL as such development in my view, would fail to protect landscape values, in particular, perceptual, and associative values within the PA.	Reject submission.
OS 42.16	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.22.x. renewable energy is amended to provide for energy generation on buildings, for example, roof mounted solar panels.	In agreement, roof-mounted solar panels would fall within 'small scale', therefore no change required.	Accept submission.
OS 42.17	Jared Halligan (Sunnyheights Limited) on behalf of Sunnyheights Limited	Oppose	That landscape capacity xi. production forestry is amended so that it identifies that parts of the area are already covered in mature conifers, and these will have to be harvested at some stage.	Existing production forestry / mature conifers within the PA is addressed in the body of the schedule wording and is not considered necessary to also include at (xi). The capacity ratings address future development activity.	Reject submission.
OS 57.1	Monique King (Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager	Oppose	That Sticky Forest (Section 2 of 5, Block 14 Lower Wānaka Survey District - Record of Title OT18C/473) be removed from landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay, or alternatively that landscape schedule 21.22.22 be amended to demonstrate that Sticky Forest is distinct in nature from the wider Dublin Bay Outstanding Natural Landscape priority area.	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. 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), and viewing the area from across the lake, it is my view that the general similarity in the landform attributes and values associated with the Sticky Forest part of the PA, along with its spatial and visual connectivity to the balance of the PA ONL means that it reads as an integral part of the ONL which displays similar landscape values or in other words 'reads' as one 'landscape area'.	Reject submission.
OS 57.2	Monique King (Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay paragraph 20 be amended to include: Sticky Forest is land held by the Crown under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 for successors to SILNA [insert footnote: South Island Landless Natives Act 1906, repealed in 1909] beneficiaries to be identified by the Māori Land Court. The Sticky Forest land is in substitution for SILNA land at 'The Neck' which their tūpuna were allocated but did not receive. While currently in plantation forest and used informally for community recreation purposes, the future owners may seek different uses for this whenua.	I recommend the following changes to the schedule wording: [20] Sticky Forest comprises land held by the Crown under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 for successors to SILNA beneficiaries to be identified by the Māori Land Court. The Sticky Forest land is in substitution for SILNA land at 'The Neck' which their tūpuna were allocated but did not receive for future Kai Tahu owners under a Treaty of Waitangi settlement, as compensation to whānau left landless in the 1800s. While currently in plantation forest and used informally for recreation purposes, future Kai Tahu owners may seek different uses for this whenua.	Accept submission.
OS 57.3	Monique King (Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay paragraph 9. Other characteristic vegetation types be amended to remove 9.c. Wilding radiata pine and Douglas fir, particularly on the headland within the reserve; and also remove 9.d. Plantation conifer forest at Sticky Forest.	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) and viewing the area from across the lake, in my view the plantation forest cover at Sticky Forest is an obvious enough landscape	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				element in terms of its colour, texture and uniformity to warrant inclusion as a characteristic of the ONL. Also see response to OS 32.1.	
OS 57.4	Monique King (Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.22 paragraph 10 be amended to include the word 'or', so that it reads: Potential for enhancement of ecological attributes through control of wilding conifers and other exotic weeds and/or ongoing indigenous regeneration.	I recommend the following change to the schedule wording: [10] Potential for enhancement of ecological attributes through control of wilding conifers and other exotic weeds and/or through ongoing indigenous regeneration.	Accept submission.
OS 57.5	Monique King (Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended to remove the land use and features header.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Land use is an important factor to consider in any landscape assessment and is included as one of the 'typical factors' in TTatM [4.29] in Chapter 4: 'What is Landscape? Further [1.9] of the PA Methodology Statement identifies 'land use' as one of several accepted factors to be considered when seeking to understand landscape values. Note: heading has been changed to 'Important land use patterns and features': Please refer to 'Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble (July 2023)'.	Reject submission.
OS 57.6	Monique King (Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended to remove paragraph 13, or in the alternative that 13.d. Plantation forestry and mountain bike trails on private land at Sticky Forest be deleted and a new paragraph be added after paragraph 13 to note that land use patterns and features of Sticky Forest may change over time.	I recommend the following changes to the schedule wording: [13d] Plantation forestry and informal use of mountain bike trails on private land at Sticky Forest;	Accept submission in part.
OS 57.7	Monique King (Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager	Oppose	That the sentences 'Sticky Forest is value as a single-track mountain biking destination, with tracks both inside and outside of the PA. This is the only publicly accessible mountain biking trail network currently located in Wānaka' be deleted from landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay paragraph 27.	I recommend the following change to the schedule wording: [27] Highly valued as locations for swimming (safe shallow beach at Dublin Bay), picnicking, boating, water skiing, walking and mountain biking along the lake shore, and camping at The Outlet. Tracks along the lakeshore and river outlet, including the Outlet Track and Dublin Bay Track (linked by the Deans Bank Track outside PA), and the East Dublin Bay Track. Sticky Forest is valued as a single-track mountain biking destination, with tracks both inside and outside of the PA. This is the only publicly accessible mountain bike trail network currently located in Wānaka although, as discussed in paragraph 20 above, public access to this area may change in the future. Future planned connections in the tracks network include a bridge across the Clutha Mata-au at the Outlet and an extension of East Dublin Bay Track through to Maungawera Road.	Accept submission in part.
OS 57.8	Monique King (Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended to include a note that paragraphs 31-33 'particularly important views to and from the area' do not apply to Sticky Forest.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. I note that Sticky Forest is not specifically referenced in the description of the particularly important views to and from the area. However, I consider it to be inappropriate to specifically reference that views do not include Sticky Forest in a Schedule of Landscape Values, as the elevated nature of the land is such that it is inevitably visible, and even prominent, in some views. As such, the submitted changes to the schedule wording are not supported.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 57.9	Monique King (Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay paragraph 34 be amended to include: There are no naturalness attributes or values at 'Sticky Forest'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. [34] acknowledges plantation forestry and wilding spread. Such landscape features include Sticky Forest, and the high number of exotic coniferous tree species around the PA. Of note, the rating of naturalness applies to the PA as a whole and is noted in [34] as being perceived as higher in some areas than in others within the PA. Further, in my experience, plantation forestry is not a factor that would lead to a rating of 'no' naturalness attributes and values. While there may be locations within the PA where landscape values may differ, that would need to be determined through a site specific landscape assessment (as signalled in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22).	Reject submission.
OS 57.10	Monique King (Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager	Oppose	That the summary of landscape values 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended to: the physical, associative and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA ONL Dublin Bay (excluding 'Sticky Forest') come together and can be summarised as follows:... d. the physical values and perceptual values of 'Sticky Forest' are very low. The associative value of 'Sticky Forest' is its Treaty settlement purpose through the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998 by which it is committed to SILNA successors.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. In my experience, plantation forestry has physical values greater than 'very low' other than immediately after harvesting. Further, the spatial extent of the Priority Area ONF/L mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions). Mana whenua associative values are addressed at (b). As such, the submitted changes to the schedule wording are not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 57.11	Monique King (Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager	Oppose	That the Outstanding Natural Landscape line at Sticky Forest follows the line from the Stage 1 Decision on Sticky Forest or reflect the position as amended via the ENV-2018-CHC-69 Bunker & Rouse v QLDC appeal.	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 57.12	Monique King (Office for Maori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti) on behalf of Phil Green, Manager	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section in landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay not apply to Sticky Forest.	Addressed in response to OS 57.1 above.	Reject submission.
OS 67.16	Julian Haworth (Upper Clutha Environmental Society)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay is amended to recognise other aesthetic attributes not included within the landscape schedule.	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 recommend the following changes in the schedule wording are appropriate: [33] Views from the lake waters and lake shore to the landforms enclosing the lake, including Mount Brown and the terminal moraines. The relative naturalness, <b>indigenous vegetation patterns</b> and, in places, openness of these landforms add to the aesthetic qualities of the PA, as does the contrast between the lake waters and the mountains and moraine features surrounding them.	<b>Accept submission.</b>
OS 67.17	Julian Haworth (Upper Clutha Environmental Society)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay is generally supported but needs to be amended to change the rural living capacity to 'extremely limited' given the existing development and likely cumulative effects.	'Extremely Limited' is not a rating value used in the schedules. However, the 'qualifiers' under 'very limited' capacity set out in Schedule 21.22.22 capacity (xii) also play an important role in this regard, as they serve to 'curb' the inappropriate proliferation of rural living development and potential cumulative effects within the PA.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 70.40	Ainsley McLeod on behalf of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay 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 21.22.22 Capacity are appropriate:  ix. <b>Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited</b> landscape capacity for infrastructure that is co-located with existing facilities, 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 77.2	Michael Bathgate on behalf of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended to delete the words: Sticky Forest is valued as a single track mountain biking destination, with tracks both inside and outside of the PA. This is the only publicly accessible mountain bike trail network currently located in Wānaka.	Addressed in response to OS 57.7.	Accept submission in part.
OS 77.4	Michael Bathgate on behalf of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.22.iii. urban expansion be amended to read: iii. urban expansions - some landscape capacity for urban development within the Sticky Forest block only (Hāwea/Wānaka Substitute Land under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act).	Addressed in response to OS 42.4.  Urban expansion within the PA would, in my view fail to protect landscape values, and in particular, perceptual, and associative values.  As such, the submitted changes to the capacity schedule is not supported.	Reject submission.
OS 99.5	John Wellington (Upper Clutha Tracks Trust)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.	In the Landscape capacity section at (v), trails are included within the broader earthworks category which has a 'limited' capacity and is considered to be appropriate. However, it is my opinion that walking and cycling trails include relatively low levels of earthworks and therefore would be appropriate to have a greater level of capacity. I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.22 Capacity are appropriate:  (v) <b>earthworks – limited</b> landscape capacity for earthworks <b>and some capacity for public trails (walking and cycling) subject to protecting</b> naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values <b>and those activities being sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.</b>	Accept submission.
OS 115.10	Khaylm Marshall (Otago Fish and Game Council)	Oppose	That the associative attributes and values section (important recreational attributes and values subsection) of landscape schedule 21.22.22 be amended to recognise that Lake Wānaka is a nationally significant fishery.	I recommend the following change to the schedule wording: [27] Highly valued as locations for swimming (safe shallow beach at Dublin Bay), picnicking, boating, water skiing, walking and mountain biking along the lake shore, and camping at The Outlet. <b>Lake Wānaka is classified as a Nationally Significant Fishery due to both its physical and recreational significance.</b> Tracks along the lakeshore and river outlet, including the Outlet Track and Dublin Bay Track (linked by the Deans Bank Track outside PA), and the East Dublin Bay Track. Sticky Forest is valued as a single-track mountain biking destination, with tracks both inside and outside of the PA. This is the only publicly accessible mountain bike trail network currently located in Wānaka. Future planned connections in the tracks network include a bridge across the Clutha Mata-au at the Outlet and an extension of East Dublin Bay Track through to Maungawera Road.	Accept submission.



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 115.11	Khaylm Marshall (Otago Fish and Game Council)	Oppose	That both the physical values (a) and associative values (b) of landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be increased from moderate-high to 'very high'.	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 do not consider it appropriate to attribute a 'Very High' rating to physical and associative values. The PA includes vegetation clearance, pastoral farming, recreational facilities, roads, built forms and tracking earthworks, introduced vegetation including weed species and other human-induced modifications. This is supported by the various descriptions in the schedule.	Reject submission.
OS 126.1	Maddy Familton on behalf of Northlake Investments Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay is opposed and be amended to remove land within the Northlake Special Zone so that the Dublin Bay priority area aligns with the outstanding natural landscape boundary.	From carefully looking at the GIS mapping, the Dublin Bay PA does not overlap/is outside of the Northlake Special Zone.	Reject submission.
OS 126.2	Maddy Familton on behalf of Northlake Investments Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended to clarify the circumstances in which applicants, decision makers and other involved in Resource Management Act processes will utilise the information in the landscape schedules.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 126.3	Maddy Familton on behalf of Northlake Investments Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended to clarify in what instances plan users processing resource consents will refer back to the Chapter 3 provisions and utilise the landscape schedules as a result.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 126.4	Maddy Familton on behalf of Northlake Investments Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended to clarify whether an application seeking consent under a District Wide rule only will be required to address the matters in the landscape schedules.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 126.5	Maddy Familton on behalf of Northlake Investments Limited	Oppose	3.8 iii That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended to remove new features as being protected. Features and associations of importance should be identified and addressed in the provisions of other chapters such as Chapter 26 Historic Heritage and Chapter 39 Wahi Tupuna.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 126.6	Maddy Familton on behalf of Northlake Investments Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended to remove the capacity rating of 'no capacity' unless all potential individual sites within the priority area have been examined in detail. This assessment has not been carried out within the Dublin Bay landscape schedule so the lowest rating of 'no capacity' should be amended to reflect 'very limited capacity'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PA assessment has been carried out at a PA wide scale. The methodology underpinning this is explained further in the EiC of Ms Gilbert. 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 relevant 'no' capacity ratings are appropriate from a landscape perspective within the PA. The Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble explains that the landscape attributes and values identified, relate to the priority area as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing the attributes and values of specific sites. A finer grained location-specific assessment of landscape attributes and values would be required for any plan change or resource consent. Other landscape values may be identified through these finer grained assessment processes. As such, no changes to the capacity rankings are supported.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 126.10	Maddy Familton on behalf of Northlake Investments Limited	Oppose	3.8 ix That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended as the landscape schedules should identify a landscape capacity for those activities that fall outside of the specified criteria.	The PA schedules do not seek to identify capacity ratings for every activity in every part of a PA. That would amount to a structure planning exercise which is beyond the scope of the Variation. This is addressed in more detail in the EIC of Ms Gilbert.	Reject submission.
OS 126.11	Maddy Familton on behalf of Northlake Investments Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended at point xii to remove the words 'in the rural living area of Dublin Bay', replace the words 'generally not discernible' with 'reasonably difficult to see', and to remove the words 'be of a modest scale'.	I consider that the following amendment to Schedule 21.22.22 Capacity are appropriate. (xii) <b>Rural living – very limited</b> landscape capacity for additional development in the rural living area of Dublin Bay – with the location, scale and design of any proposal ensuring that it is generally <del>not discernible</del> <b>difficult to see</b> from external viewpoints. Developments should be of a small scale; have a low key 'rural' character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protect the area's ONL values. Regarding removing reference to the Dublin Bay rural living area, No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. It is encouraged that the submitter produces evidence so that any proposed modifications to the PA schedules can be robustly considered and where appropriate, acknowledged.	Accept submission in part.
OS 126.13	Maddy Familton on behalf of Northlake Investments Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay is amended to remove the priority area from land zoned as Northlake Special Zone under the Operative District Plan.	Addressed in response to OS 126.1.	Reject submission.
OS 126.13 A	Maddy Familton on behalf of Northlake Investments Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay is amended at 3.8 (xi) Acknowledging that some activity terms (such as intensive agriculture) are a direct response to the Chapter 3 provisions that also use these terms, any additional activities referred to in the Landscape Schedules, particularly those in the landscape capacity assessment, should utilise defined terms. NIL seeks that, wherever possible, defined terms are used.	The Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble address this matter and it is discussed in more detail in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 126.14	Maddy Familton on behalf of Northlake Investments Limited	Oppose	That alternatively to the relief sought additional or consequential relief necessary or appropriate to address the matters raised in this submission and/or the relief requested in this submission, including modifications to the landscape schedule or 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 126.15	Maddy Familton on behalf of Northlake Investments Limited	Oppose	That alternatively if the relief sought in this submission is not granted that the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay is withdrawn.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 170.2	Dan Curley on behalf of Arne Gawn, Don and Joy Paterson, Angus Wilson & Barry Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay is amended to give effect to the submitters' relief broadly outlined in this submission.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 170.4	Dan Curley on behalf of Arne Gawn, Don and Joy Paterson, Angus Wilson & Barry Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay is amended so the assessment does not only seek to limit capacity/restrain land use based on the broad perceptual/experiential factors observed, but where it is found appropriate, capacity ratings should identify opportunities for greater capacity and consolidation.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. 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, which may	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	
OS 170.5	Dan Curley on behalf of Arne Gawn, Don and Joy Paterson, Angus Wilson & Barry Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay is amended to address that the founding methodology and assessment is broad and lacks meaningful detail.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report. Ms Gilbert's EIC addresses the suitability of the founding assessment methodology in more detail.	N/A
OS 170.6	Dan Curley on behalf of Arne Gawn, Don and Joy Paterson, Angus Wilson & Barry Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay is amended to address that the conclusions reached in the schedule to describe the related capacity of potential land uses are too conclusive and lack sufficient contemplation of potentially suitable future land uses.	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, which may go some way to addressing the submitter's concerns in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS 170.7	Dan Curley on behalf of Arne Gawn, Don and Joy Paterson, Angus Wilson & Barry Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay is amended to find opportunities to increase capacity and or consolidate such in locations where landscape attributes enable such.	Addressed in the response to OS 170.4	Reject submission.
OS 170.8	Dan Curley on behalf of Arne Gawn, Don and Joy Paterson, Angus Wilson & Barry Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay 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 170.9	Dan Curley on behalf of Arne Gawn, Don and Joy Paterson, Angus Wilson & Barry Clarke	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay is amended to address that it re-assesses the importance and protection of landscapes related to the Wāhi Tūpuna chapter of the Proposed District Plan.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 188.1	Elisha Young-Ebert (Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu)	Oppose	That the Hāwea/Wānaka Block (Section 2 of 5, Block 14 Lower Wānaka Survey District - Record of Title OT18C/473) be removed from landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay in recognition of it being Treaty Settlement land.	ONF/L mapping amendments are beyond the scope of the Variation. Also addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report. Addressed in response to OS 57.1.	N/A
OS 188.2	Elisha Young-Ebert (Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay be amended to delete the words: Sticky Forest is valued as a single track mountain biking destination, with tracks both inside and outside of the PA. This is the only publicly accessible mountain bike trail network currently located in Wānaka.	Addressed in response to OS 57.6 and OS 57.7.	Reject submission.
OS 188.3	Elisha Young-Ebert (Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay paragraph 9. Other characteristic vegetation types be amended to remove 9.c. Wilding radiata pine and Douglas fir, particularly on the headland within the reserve; and also remove 9.d. Plantation conifer forest at Sticky Forest.	Addressed in response to OS 32.1 and OS 57.3.	Reject submission.



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 188.5	Elisha Young-Ebert (Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu)	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.22.iii. urban expansion be amended to read: iii. urban expansions - some landscape capacity for urban development within the Sticky Forest block only (Hāwea/Wānaka Substitute Land under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act).	Addressed in response to OS 77.4.	Reject submission.