

Landscape Schedules - Submission points to be re-notified (22 June 2023)

The following table list the affected submission points from the notified SODR that have been revised or have had additional points added.

Submitter	Point Number	Position	Summary of Decision Requested
#9: Susan Gathercole (Maungawera Hill Group) <i>On behalf of:</i> Anderson, Mactaggert, Hinds and Gathercole families	9.1	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River RCL be rejected.
#13: Jennie Semple	New 13.12	Oppose	That the notified landscape map contains an error which shows an extended Urban Growth Boundary over Atley Road which the Environment Court and Appeals Court ordered to be reversed. This error should be rectified and include a further period of time for people to respond once rectified.
#32: Ben Wilson <i>On behalf of:</i> Wilson Family	32.1	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay recognise the protection of the heritage non-indigenous trees in and around the Dublin Bay reserve area. This should exclude any wilding Pinus radiata and Douglas Fir trees which are not of any significant heritage value"
#33: Phil Hunt <i>On behalf of:</i> Fork Family Trust	33.9	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are co-located with existing development be amended from no landscape capacity to limited landscape capacity; and be amended to some landscape capacity for tourism related activities, including farm related tourism.

	New 33.19	Oppose	'That the landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be amended to remove reference to the historic importance of the submitters' family home and garden.
#39: John Palmer	39.2	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.
#44: Brendon Fraher	44.1	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.'
	New 44.5	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.
#47 Paterson Pitts Group <i>On behalf of:</i> Glen Dene Limited	47.2	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'
#48 Jo Fyfe <i>On behalf of:</i> Second Star Limited	48.1	Oppose	That the landscape schedules be reassessed to include a further layer of capacity mapping that identifies areas within specific ONLs that have the capability to absorb some development, with specific reference to schedules 21.22.19 and 21.22.21.
	48.2	Oppose	That the landscape schedules be reassessed to include a further layer of capacity mapping that identifies areas within specific ONLs that have the capability to absorb some development, with specific reference to schedules 21.22.19 and 21.22.21

	48.3	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.19 apply at a priority area level to guide future development but not preclude it.
	New 48.8	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 apply a priority area level to guide future development but not preclude it.
	48.4	Oppose	That it is clear that that the capacity for landscape schedule 21.22.19 is not to be applied or interpreted at a site-specific scale.
	New 48.9	Oppose	That is clear that the capacity for landscape schedule 21.22.21 is not to be applied or interpreted at a site-specific scale.
	48.5	Oppose	That with regard to landscape schedule 21.22.19, that the benefits of visitor accommodation are recognised and appropriately anticipated, subject to appropriate design and comprehensive landscape assessment.
	48.6	Oppose	That with regard to landscape schedule 21.22.21, that the benefits of visitor accommodation are recognised and appropriately anticipated, subject to appropriate design and comprehensive landscape assessment.
	48.7	Oppose	That with regard to landscape schedule 21.22.19, any other consequential or alternative changes be made that are necessary to achieve the relief sought in the submission.
	New 48.10	Oppose	That with regard to landscape schedule 21.22.21, any other consequential or alternative changes be made that are necessary to achieve the relief sought in the submission.
#49 Patterson Pitts Group <i>On behalf of:</i> Richard Burdon	49.2	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'.

#56 Megan Davies <i>On behalf of:</i> Hidden Hills Residents Association	56.1	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.'
#59 Werner Murray (The Property Group) <i>On behalf of:</i> Anna Hutchison Family Trust	New 59.12	Oppose	That paragraph 18 of landscape schedule 21.22.3 be amended to more accurately describe and look at the factual elements that are present, rather than having a planning outcome influence a landscape opinion. The Urban Growth Boundary is a planning construct rather than a land use pattern.
	New 59.13	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 be amended to acknowledge that the Queenstown Wastewater Plant has a significant influence both visually and practically on the landscape character of the river corridor, being located directly adjacent to the ONF.
	New 59.14	Oppose	That paragraph 20 of landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River be amended to be more inclusive of landuse patterns and features, as excluding those that could be perceived as undesirable could lead to false expectations from members of the public and users of the District Plan around what the ONF as a regulatory tool is designed to do, and can do.
	New 59.15	Oppose	That paragraph 46 of landscape schedule 21.22.3 Shotover River is amended to include reference to the cluster of buildings at the old Ferry Hotel on Spence Road adjacent to the PA ONF.
	New 59.16	Oppose	That paragraph 47-51 of landscape schedule 21.22.3 are amended to recognise the attributes and values that extend beyond Arthurs Point, Tucker Beach and Quail Rise which include important settlement patterns dating back to the 1800s and the elements of large infrastructure important to Queenstown as a whole.

	New 59.17	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.3 be amended so that it is clear that the landscape capacity rating 'no capacity for urban expansion' relates to expansion within the ONF and not adjacent to the ONF.
	New 59.18	Oppose	That paragraph 7 of landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended as it currently overstates the status of indigenous vegetation within or adjacent to the ONF as set out in the Ladies Mile Master Plan.
	New 59.19	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill be amended to recognise the extensive body of historic photographs that are available for the area, which depict high levels of human activity often celebrating European settlement.
	New 59.20	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 is amended to acknowledge and adequately address the tension that exists between the ONF, rural and urban land uses.
	New 59.21	Oppose	That the landscape schedules be considered with regard to Part 2 of the RMA as there is a high possibility for unintended consequences whereby the landscape schedules will be used to refer to adjoining areas and make inferences around the appropriateness of development that adjoins the ONF.
	New 59.22	Oppose	That the variation is rejected, refused or otherwise declined.
	New 59.23	Oppose	That if the variation is adopted, that it be amended, varied or otherwise modified (including schedules 21.22.3 and 21.22.6) to address the concerns, issues, and other matters raised in this submission including any necessary additional or consequential relief.
#67 Julian Haworth <i>On behalf of:</i> Upper Clutha Environment Society	New 67.35	Oppose	That the landscape capacity rating for large scale energy generation in Landscape Schedule 21.23.2 Halliday Road/Corbridge RCL is questioned and requires review once the schedule is revised.

#73 Ian Greaves <i>On behalf of:</i> Bike Wanaka Inc	New 73.22	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.
	New 73.23	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley be amended to remove reference to limited or very limited capacity for new cycling and walking trails.
	New 73.24	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.
	New 73.25	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley be amended to include the following Walking and Cycling trails: some landscape capacity for additional trails that are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
#96 Scott Freeman <i>On behalf of:</i> Treespace No1 Limited Partnership.	96.10	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.15ii Central Whakatipu Basin landscape capacity assessment is amended in the following way: Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – <u>Limited</u> landscape capacity for tourism related activities and Very Limited landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are: co-located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale and have a ‘low key’ rural alpine character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protects the area’s ONL values.
#99 John Wellington <i>On behalf of:</i> Upper Clutha Tracks Trust	99.1	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.
	99.2	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.19 Mount Alpha be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.

	99.3	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.20 Roys Bay be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.
	99.4	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.21 West Wanaka be amended to state that there is development capacity for public future walking and cycling trails.
	99.5	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.
	99.6	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.
	99.7	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.24 Lake McKay and environs be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.
	99.8	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.
	99.9	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.2 Halliday Road Corbridge be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.
	99.10	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.3 West of Hawea River be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.
	99.11	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.4 Church Road Shortcut Road be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.
	99.12	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley be amended to state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling trails.
	132.22	Oppose	That 21.22.17 Aesthetic attributes and values:

#132 Rosie Hill – Rock Supplies NZ Limited			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Be amended at paragraph 40 to include the words ‘although largely influenced by State Highway Landscaping’; - Be amended at paragraph 41(b) so that it reads ‘The sense of relative commercialization and industrial nature of the flats and the contrast with the more tamed and inhabited Gibbston Valley’; and - Be amended at paragraph 41(c) so that it reads ‘The relatively low level of naturalness perceived from the highway, with the most development effectively screened by mounding and/or planting, and modified patterns of vegetation (largely exotic weeds) apparent.
	132.43	Oppose	That the landscape capacity section for schedule 21.22.17 Victoria Flats and 21.22.9 Kawarau be deleted.
#134 Maree Baker-Galloway- Criffel Deer Ltd, Ballantyne Barker Holdings Ltd, Mt Acernus Holdings Ltd.	134.1	Oppose	<p>The deletion of the landscape schedules in 21.22 and 21.23.</p> <p>Or</p> <p>Amendments to the Landscape Schedules 21.22.24 Lake McKay Station and & Environs and 21.23.1 Cardrona River/Mount Barker Road; and</p> <p>Removal of the Criffel Deer Limited property from the Lake McKay Station PA.</p>
#139 Rosie Hill – Grant Stalker Family Trust	139.3	Oppose	That the boundary of the Slope Hill ONF and Priority Area be amended to shift higher up the landform. This would alter the classification of the land that was formerly within the ONF / PA.
	139.59	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended at point 34(c) to include reference to the lower slopes of the priority area as being a lifestyle transition area between Ladies Mile and the upper slopes of the priority area, and remove reference to the natural landscape backdrop and the western and central portion of Wakatipu Basin.
	New 139.69	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill is amended to remove references to private views, such as from Lakes Hayes houses from identification as particularly important views.

#140 Rosie Hill – Maryhill Limited	140.1	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.6 Slope Hill, PA overlay and ONF boundary is amended to recognise and provide for future development and change within the foothills of the Slope Hill ONF.
#176 Rosie Hill – Glendhu Bay Trustees Limited	176.80	Oppose	That 81d of 21.22.21 be deleted.
#177 Rosie Hill – Glencoe Station Limited and Glencoe Land Development Company Limited	New 177.67	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin is amended at the general description section to include the works ‘more modified’.
#183 Rosie Hill – Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited	183.6	Oppose	That the boundaries of the landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill, including the ONL and ONF boundaries, are amended.
	New 183.77	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill is amended to change the capacity rating for urban expansions from ‘no’ capacity to ‘limited’.
#194 Sue Bradley (Southern Lakes Windriders)	New 194.2	Support	That landscape schedule 21.22.13 is classified as an ONF within an ONL.
	New 194.3	Support	That Homestead Bay Environs be retained in its natural state.
#206 Jo Fyfe – Sally and Braden Currie	206.7	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.23 Hawea South North Grandview is amended to ensure that the benefits of rural living and other appropriate activities are recognized and appropriately anticipated, subject to appropriate design, location, and comprehensive landscape assessment.

	New 206.9	Oppose	That within landscape schedule 21.22.23, rural living, visitor accommodation and rural tourism are not limited provided they are appropriately located and subject to comprehensive, site-specific landscape assessment.
--	--------------	--------	--

Incorrectly assigned SODR

The following submission points were incorrectly attributed to the submitters below and have been withdrawn.

Submitter	Point Number	Summary of Decision Requested
#44: Brendon Fraher	44.4	That all priority areas are retained as notified.
#47 Glen Dene Limited	47.2	That landscape schedule 21.22.11 Mount Iron landscape capacity include no landscape capacity for erection of shelters, huts, cabins and lodges.
#54.3 Janet Bartholomew	54.3	That the landscape schedules are considered in regard to Part 2 of the RMA.
#55 Brent Will	55.1	That in landscape schedule 21.22.23 it be noted that the lake is manmade in relation to the legibility of the natural processes.