

21.22.4 PA ONF Morven Hill: Schedule of Landscape Values

General Description of the Area

Morven Hill PA ONF comprises the summits and slopes of the large roche moutonnée between Te Whaka-ata (Lake Hayes) and the Kawarau River in the Whakatipu Basin. The PA excludes the semi-circular area of the north-western slopes, which has been developed for rural living, and the ice-eroded plateau extending from the eastern slopes.

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. Prominent large roche moutonnée landform that is the highest and most extensive of the roches moutonnées protruding from the Whakatipu Basin floor (Morven Hill, Slope Hill, Ferry Hill and Feehlys Hill). The landform extends south-west to north-east, with the lower western summit (559 m) separated from the main eastern summit (750 m) by a shallow saddle. This landform is recognised in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory having national importance. The underlying schist bedrock is exposed in places on the hill slopes, particularly on the north-eastern and eastern faces.

Important ecological features and vegetation types:

2. Predominantly rough pasture with scattered matagouri, sweet briar, hawthorn, elderberry and other exotic weeds in places. Dense cover of weeds (the previously mentioned species as well as buddleia, gorse and broom), with some matagouri and mānuka, on the shadier southern slopes leading down to the river. Conifer shelterbelts and woodlots in the saddle area and one larger radiata pine plantation adjacent to the river.
3. Natural spring on the southern side of the saddle, with associated farm ponds and an ephemeral watercourse running down to the Kawarau River.
4. The denser patches of matagouri towards the river provide suitable habitat for grey warbler, fantail and silvereye. The rocky terrain on the higher sunnier faces in combination with the rough pasture and pockets of matagouri provides suitable habitat for skinks and geckos.
5. Potential for enhancement of ecological values on the southern faces through weed control and indigenous regeneration. Some indigenous plantings have been established along the cycle trail.
6. Animal pest species include rabbits, possums, stoats, rats, and mice.

Important land use patterns and features:

7. Predominantly used for extensive pastoral farming (sheep or deer), baleage or hobby farming. Limited farming infrastructure, including farm tracks, fencing, stock yards, water tanks and four farm sheds.
8. A farm quarry on the upper southern slopes of the main hill.
9. ~~Several dwellings are located on Morven Hill including consented, unbuilt platforms concentrated largely on the lower part of the ONF accessed off Alec Robins Road / SH6. Two dwellings on the toe slopes adjacent to the Alec Robins Road and SH6, respectively, with associated gardens and domestic curtilage.~~

Commented [JH1]: OS 70.14 Transpower NZ Ltd

Commented [JH2]: OS 76.11 McLintock Topp Family Trust.
OS 76.12 McLintock Topp Family Trust
OS 78.12 TPI 1 Limited

10. Radio and telecommunications infrastructure on the summit and the Cromwell - Frankton A 110kV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid Transpower high-voltage Transpower high-voltage transmission corridor on the toe of the southern slopes.

Commented [JH3]: OS 70.15 Transpower NZ Ltd

11. Neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, nature and proximity include: the wedge of rural residential and lifestyle living development extending up the north-western northern slopes of Morven Hill and Little Morven Hill respectively and the hill, the working farmland including the occasional rural dwelling and farm building on the ice-eroded plateau extending from the eastern slopes, which provides a relatively unmodified rural buffer and foreground to the ONF.

Commented [JH4]: OS 76.13 McLintock Topp Family Trust

Commented [JH5]: OS 76.13 McLintock Topp Family Trust

Commented [JH6]: OS 76.13 McLintock Topp Family Trust
OS 78.13 TPI 1 Limited

Commented [JH7]: OS 76.13 McLintock Topp Family Trust
OS 78.14 TPI 1 Limited

Important archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

12. Stone chimney breast and house site belonging to 19th century orchardist Henry Steele at the south-western side of the PA, close to Hayes Creek.

13. Mature trees (walnut, chestnut and other species) associated with early European settlement and farming.

Mana whenua features and their locations:

14. 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.

15. At its southern extent, the ONF overlaps the mapped wāhi tūpuna Kawarau River.

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:

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

17. The Kawarau River was a traditional travel route that provided direct access between Whakatipu-Waimāori Whakatipu wai māori (Lake Whakatipu) and Mata-au (the Clutha River).

Commented [JH8]: OS 77.37 Kai Tahu ki Otago
OS 188.37 Te Rūnunga o Ngāi Tahu

18. The Kawarau is a significant kāika mahika kai where weka, kākāpō, kea and tuna (eel) were gathered.

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

Important historic attributes and values:

20. Historical significance of early primary industry around Morven Hill (pastoral farming, fruit growing, fishing at Te Whaka-ata (Lake Hayes).

21. Contextual significance as a landscape feature that has defined communication routes in the Whakatipu Basin, with early tracks and roading around its base.

Important shared and recognised values:

22. Important values as a widely visible and relatively open landmark that contributes strongly to the identity and sense of place of the Whakatipu Basin.

Important recreation attributes and values:

- 23. No public access to the PA, but the popular Twin Rivers cycle and walking trail is adjacent to the southern toe of the hill and allows users to view and experience the ONF.

Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

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

Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

- 24. Very prominent distinctive landform. The pastoral openness means that undulating ice-eroded slopes and rocky outcrops are displayed and the formative glacial processes are clearly legible.

Particularly important views to and from the area include:

- 25. A prominent and distinctive component of views from surrounding areas of the Whakatipu Basin and in particular from SH6 to the east, from Lake Hayes and surrounds, from Lake Hayes Estate, from the Crown Escarpment zig-zag and lookout and from the Remarkables skifield road. The bulky muscular and barren form of the hill dominates views from SH6 as it skirts the hill and from the Twin Rivers Trail. From the basin to the north, the hill forms a significant foreground feature in views towards the Remarkables.
- 26. Expansive and spectacular views from the slopes and summit of the hill (no public access) across the Whakatipu Basin floor to the enclosing mountains and lakes, enhanced by transient changes in light conditions, vegetation colours and seasonal snow and ice patterns.

Naturalness attributes and values:

- 27. Moderate-high level of naturalness due to the distinctive largely unmodified landform (within the PA) including a mosaic of pasture and native scrub cover and the low level of built modification and domestication. Rural living development outside the PA on the north-western hill slopes has degraded the naturalness and coherence of the landform to some extent but this area of modification is subservient to the overall scale, bulk and visual integrity of the hill.

Commented [JH9]: OS 76.16 McLintock Topp Family Trust
OS 78.7 TPI 1 Limited
OS 78.16 TPI 1 Limited

Memorability attributes and values:

- 28. Highly memorable landform due to its height and bulk, isolation within the basin, open barrenness and elongated form.

Transient attributes and values:

- 29. Varying colours of pasture across the seasons and effects of light and shade on the open hummocky or craggy topography.

Aesthetic attributes and values:

- 30. High aesthetic attributes due to the visual prominence, openness and legibility of the landform, its memorability and visual coherence, and its role as the largest of the roches moutonnées within the Whakatipu Basin floor.

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 Morven Hill can be summarised as follows:

- (a) **High** physical values relating to the prominent and largely unmodified roche moutonnée landform and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
- (b) **Moderate** associative values relating to the mana whenua associations of the area, the historical associations with early European settlement and strong shared and recognised values as part of the local sense of place and identity.
- (c) **High** perceptual values relating to the visual prominence, coherence and memorability of the hill, its openness, legibility and naturalness, and its role as the largest of the roches moutonnées within the Whakatipu Basin floor.

Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – limited** landscape capacity to absorb small scale and low key activities that 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 (where appropriate); and protect the area's ONE values.
- 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** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with 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 – very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that are integrated by landform and/or existing vegetation and are reasonably difficult to see from external viewpoints.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – very limited** landscape capacity to absorb additional quarrying within the area of historic quarry activity, with remediation to enhance the naturalness of the landform.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – no** landscape capacity.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of the National Grid and utilities such as overhead lines, cell phone towers, navigational aids and meteorological instruments where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks co-located with existing utilities and is designed and located so that it is not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid there is limited landscape capacity for the upgrade of existing infrastructure within the same corridor.

Commented [JH10]: OS 77.5 Kai Tahu ki Otago

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

Commented [JH12]: OS 70.16 Transpower New Zealand Limited

Commented [JH13]: OS 86.8 Queenstown Airport Corporation

Commented [JH14]: OS 70.16 Transpower New Zealand Limited

- 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 public places.
- xi. **Production Forestry** – no landscape capacity.
- xii. **Rural living** – no landscape capacity, except within existing approved residential building platforms.

Commented [JH15]: Typographical correction.

21.22.4 Morven Hill ONF Schedule

11 AUGUST 2023 FINAL

Blue highlighted text: captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.22.4 Morven Hill ONF Schedule". New text to be underlined with black line, deleted text to be strike through.

Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH Comments	JH Recommendation
OS 6.1	Michael & Bridget Davies	Oppose	That further information or clarification is provided on the circumstances in which the landscape schedules are to be used.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 6.2	Michael & Bridget Davies	Oppose	That the extent of the capacity rating scale be confirmed within the landscape schedules.	Addressed in the recommended amendments to the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22. The extent of the capacity rating scale is also addressed in more detail by Ms Gilbert in her EiC and the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 6.3	Michael & Bridget Davies	Oppose	That the ratings scale make clear how the wording used relates to the provisions in Chapter 3 Strategic Directions of the Proposed District Plan.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 6.4	Michael & Bridget Davies	Oppose	That any additional activities referred to in the landscape schedules, particularly in the landscape capacity assessment, use defined terms.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 6.5	Michael & Bridget Davies	Oppose	That the landscape capacity in xii. rural living be amended as follows "no landscape capacity, except existing approved development or where exceptional circumstances and design are presented."	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that this rating is appropriate from a landscape perspective. In particular, I note that the PA is a prominent landform and landmark with few obvious built forms and very little landform modification. The schedule summarises the physical values of the PA as 'high' due to the prominence of the landform and its lack of obvious modification. Further the schedule describes the perceptual values of the PA also as 'high' due to the landform's visual prominence, openness, legibility, naturalness, coherence and memorability. For these reasons I consider the rating of 'no' landscape capacity for further rural living development beyond what has already been consented is appropriate. However, 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.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH Comments	JH Recommendation
OS 21.1	Ben Gresson (Todd & Walker Law) on behalf of Mee Holdings Limited	Oppose	That further information or clarification is provided on the circumstances in which the landscape schedules are to be used.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report.	N/A
OS 21.2	Ben Gresson (Todd & Walker Law) on behalf of Mee Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the extent of the capacity rating scale be confirmed within the landscape schedules.	Addressed in the recommended amendments to the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22. The extent of the capacity rating scale is also addressed in more detail by Ms Gilbert in her EiC and the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 21.3	Ben Gresson (Todd & Walker Law) on behalf of Mee Holdings Limited	Oppose	That the ratings scale make clear how the wording used relates to the provisions in Chapter 3 Strategic Directions of the Proposed District Plan.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 22.1	Ben Gresson (Todd & Walker Law) on behalf of Scope Resources Limited	Oppose	That further information or clarification is provided on the circumstances in which the landscape schedules are to be used.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 22.2	Ben Gresson (Todd & Walker Law) on behalf of Scope Resources Limited	Oppose	That the extent of the capacity rating scale be confirmed within the landscape schedules.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 22.3	Ben Gresson (Todd & Walker Law) on behalf of Scope Resources Limited	Oppose	That the ratings scale make clear how the wording used relates to the provisions in Chapter 3 Strategic Directions of the Proposed District Plan.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 70.14	Ainsley McLeod on behalf of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill is amended at point 10 to include the word 'Important'.	This is a typographical error. All PAs will be amended to read 'Important Land use patterns and features:'	Accept submission.
OS 70.15	Ainsley McLeod on behalf of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill is amended at point 10 to replace the words 'Transpower high voltage transmission corridor' with 'Cromwell-Frankton A 110kV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid'.	The submitter has requested that the description for the National Grid here be more specific/use correct terminology. I recommend the following wording change to the schedule: [10] Radio and telecommunications infrastructure on the summit and the Cromwell - Frankton A 110kV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid Transpower high-voltage Transpower high-voltage transmission corridor on the toe of the southern slopes.	Accept submission.
OS 70.16	Ainsley McLeod on behalf of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill is amended in its landscape capacity assessment point ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure to include, 'In the case of the National Grid there is landscape capacity for the upgrade of existing infrastructure within the same corridor and limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for the particular location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks'.	I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.4 Capacity are appropriate: (ix) utilities and regionally significant infrastructure - limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is <u>buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of the National Grid and utilities such as overhead lines, cell phone towers, navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks. In the case of the National Grid there is limited landscape capacity for the upgrade of existing infrastructure within the same corridor.</u>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH Comments	JH Recommendation
OS 76.7	Blair Devlin on behalf of McLintock Topp Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that it fails to recognise that Morven Hill is a highly modified landscape that has been extensively farmed and therefore has very low naturalness, highly influenced by human activities.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>Case law supports the identification of areas that are dominated by pastoral uses (and other agriculture / horticulture related uses) as having naturalness values that allow the land to qualify for consideration as an RMA s6(b) landscape (e.g., <i>Man O'War Station</i>).</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) in my opinion the Morven Hill PA/ONF and its landscape character, attributes and values have been adequately and accurately described in the schedule wording [7-11], [24] and [27], including appropriately addressing levels of modification.</p> <p>As such the intent of the submission is not supported.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 76.8	Blair Devlin on behalf of McLintock Topp Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that it fails to recognise that the western end of Morven Hill outstanding natural landscape and the lower northern slopes of Morven Hill are more modified than the upper and southern slopes of Morven Hill and has a much greater capacity to absorb development.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The submission point is partly addressed in response to OS 76.7. 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 agree that the western end and northern, lower slopes of Morven Hill are more modified than other parts of the PA.</p> <p>While there may be specific locations within the PA where activities might be appropriate, I consider that would need to be determined through a site specific landscape assessment, as contemplated by the Preamble to Schedule 21.22.</p> <p>The Preamble to Schedule 21.22 explains that the capacity identified in the schedule is assessed at the PA level (rather than a site level). I acknowledge that there may be specific locations within the PA where carefully located rural living activity might be successfully absorbed from a landscape perspective. I consider that the wording of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 allows for such opportunities, activities and development to be evaluated as part of resource consent and plan change applications.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 76.9	Blair Devlin on behalf of McLintock Topp Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that it incorrectly states at [2] that there are 'important ecological feature and vegetation types', and lists features that do not have ecological importance such as rough pasture and exotic weeds. The landscape schedule fails to reflect the fact that Morven Hill has been extensively farmed and it is misleading to suggest it has noteworthy indigenous vegetation.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The value of pastoral landcover and its contribution to the ONF's associative and perceptual values are addressed in the response to OS 76.7.</p> <p>Animal and plant pests are deliberately referenced in the PA Schedules as they have the potential to (negatively) influence landscape values. The identification of negative landscape aspects such as pest plants and animals, along with the reference to landscape restoration and enhancement in the discussion of landscape capacity for a range of land uses, signals the types of enhancement and remediation as part of development change that are likely to be appropriate within the PA ONF (noting that this is at a PA level, rather than a site-specific level).</p> <p>However, it is agreed that as currently drafted the Schedules are potentially confusing in this regard as these aspects of the</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH Comments	JH Recommendation
				<p>landscape are negative rather than positive. A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.22 to address this matter.</p> <p>I also note that Schedule 21.22.4 has been reviewed by an expert ecologist with that expert supporting the notified text.</p>	
OS 76.10	Blair Devlin on behalf of McLintock Topp Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified or amended so that under the heading 'Important ecological features and vegetation types' the schedule no longer lists animal pest species.	Addressed in response to OS 76.9.	Reject submission.
OS 76.11	Blair Devlin on behalf of McLintock Topp Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address the specifics that there are two dwellings on the toe slopes adjacent to the Alec Robins Road and State Highway 6 with associated gardens and domestic curtilage. The schedule fails to identify consented building platforms where no built form has occurred yet.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The PA schedules account for existing land use activity, permitted activity, and consented but unbuilt development.</p> <p>Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork), careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, aerial imagery and resource consent history for the PA), including several consented but as yet undeveloped building platforms/sites. The resource consent documents show most of these building platforms to be located on the toe slopes of Morven Hill, near the edge of the ONF and near other residential development and roading.</p> <p>However, I recommend the schedule is less specific about numbers of dwellings and amends the text as follows:</p> <p>[9] Several dwellings are located on Morven Hill including consented unbuilt platforms concentrated largely on the lower part of the PA accessed off Alec Robins Road / SH6 Two dwellings on the toe slopes adjacent to the Alec Robins Road and SH6, respectively with associated gardens and domestic curtilage.</p>	Accept submission.
OS 76.12	Blair Devlin on behalf of McLintock Topp Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that there is an approved residential dwelling (RM191216) on the upper north-eastern slopes of Morven Hill not accounted for in [9]. RM191216 is an example of a residential dwelling located within an outstanding natural feature priority area of 'no capacity'. The submission point supports the previous submission points relating to 'no landscape capacity' and that there are site specific situations where the landscape does have capacity to absorb development through placement and recessive design.	Addressed in response to OS 76.11.	Accept submission.
OS 76.13	Blair Devlin on behalf of McLintock Topp Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [11] the description fails to acknowledge the significant rural living use on the lower reaches of Morven Hill and Little Morven Hill outside of the outstanding natural landscape boundary.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>However, relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork), careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, aerial imagery and resource consent history for the ONF), and having observed the ONF from near and afar I recommend the following amendments to the schedule wording:</p> <p>[11] Neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, nature and proximity include: the wedge of rural residential and lifestyle living development extending up the north-western northern</p>	Accept submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH Comments	JH Recommendation
				slopes of <u>Morven Hill and Little Morven Hill respectively and the hill</u> the working farmland <u>including the occasional rural dwelling and farm building</u> on the ice-eroded plateau extending from the eastern slopes, which provides a relatively unmodified rural buffer and foreground to the ONF.	
OS 76.14	Blair Devlin on behalf of McLintock Topp Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [11] the description fails to acknowledge the other farm buildings which exist but have not been identified.	Addressed in response to OS 76.13.	<u>Accept submission.</u>
OS 76.15	Blair Devlin on behalf of McLintock Topp Family Trust	Oppose	That the relationship between mana whenua associations, Wāhi Tūpuna Chapter and consultation with mana whenua for applications be clarified in the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A
OS 76.16	Blair Devlin on behalf of McLintock Topp Family Trust	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [27] where 'Naturalness attributes and values are described' the schedule incorrectly states Morven Hill as a 'distinctive largely unmodified landform' when it has been completely modified for agriculture/farming and contains built modification and domestication on the lower reaches of Morven Hill.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. In my opinion, a 'completely modified' landform as stated by the submitter would be a landscape that has been changed so much that little of its original physical, associative and perceptual values remain. The Morven Hill ONF is not modified to that degree. The value of a pastoral landscape is addressed at OS 76.7. Further, while built development is present on the the Morven Hill landform, it is outside the PA/ONF boundary. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork), careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, aerial imagery and resource consent history for the ONF), and having observed the ONF from close up and further away I recommend the following amendments to the schedule wording to better reflect the condition of the PA: [27] Moderate-high level of naturalness due to the distinctive largely unmodified landform <u>(within the PA), including a mosaic of pasture and native scrub cover</u> and the low level of built modification and domestication. Rural living development outside the PA on the north-western hill slopes has degraded the naturalness and coherence of the landform to some extent but this area of modification is subservient to the overall scale, bulk and visual integrity of the hill.	<u>Accept submission in part.</u>
OS 77.37	Michael Bathgate on behalf of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill paragraph 17 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Amend spelling.	<u>Accept submission.</u>
OS 78.7	Blair Devlin on behalf of TPI 1 Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified as it fails to recognise that Morven Hill is a highly modified landscape that has been extensively farmed and therefore has very low naturalness, highly influenced by human activities.	Addressed in response to OS 76.16.	<u>Accept submission in part.</u>

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH Comments	JH Recommendation
OS 78.8	Blair Devlin on behalf of TPI 1 Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that it fails to recognise that the western end of Morven Hill outstanding natural landscape and the lower northern slopes of Morven Hill are more modified than the upper and southern slopes of Morven Hill and has a much greater capacity to absorb development.	Addressed in response to OS 76.8.	Reject submission.
OS 78.9	Blair Devlin on behalf of TPI 1 Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified as it incorrectly states at [2] that there are 'important ecological feature and vegetation types', and lists features that do not have ecological importance such as rough pasture and exotic weeds. The landscape schedule fails to reflect the fact that Morven Hill has been extensively farmed and it is misleading to suggest it has noteworthy indigenous vegetation.	Addressed in response to OS 76.9.	Reject submission.
OS 78.10	Blair Devlin on behalf of TPI 1 Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified as under the heading 'Important ecological features and vegetation types' the schedule lists animal pest species.	Addressed in response to OS 76.9.	Reject submission.
OS 78.11	Blair Devlin on behalf of TPI 1 Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that it specifies that there are two dwellings on the toe slopes adjacent to the Alec Robins Road and State Highway 6 with associated gardens and domestic curtilage. The schedule fails to identify consented building platforms where no built form has occurred yet.	Addressed in response to OS 76.11.	Accept submission.
OS 78.12	Blair Devlin on behalf of TPI 1 Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that there is an approved residential dwelling (RM191216) on the upper north-eastern slopes of Morven Hill not accounted for in [9]. RM191216 is an example of a residential dwelling located within an outstanding natural feature priority area of 'no capacity'. The submission point supports the previous submission points relating to 'no landscape capacity' and that there are site specific situations where the landscape does have capacity to absorb development through placement and recessive design.	Addressed in response to OS 76.12.	Accept submission.
OS 78.13	Blair Devlin on behalf of TPI 1 Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [11] the description fails to acknowledge the significant rural living use on the lower reaches of Morven Hill and Little Morven Hill outside of the outstanding natural landscape boundary.	Addressed in response to OS 76.13.	Accept submission.
OS 78.14	Blair Devlin on behalf of TPI 1 Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified as at [11] the description fails to acknowledge the other farm buildings which exist but have not been identified.	Addressed in response to OS 76.13.	Accept submission.
OS 78.15	Blair Devlin on behalf of TPI 1 Limited	Oppose	That the relationship between mana whenua associations, Wahi Tupuna Chapter and consultation with mana whenua for applications be clarified in the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH Comments	JH Recommendation
OS 78.16	Blair Devlin on behalf of TPI 1 Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill be rejected as notified as at [27] where 'Naturalness attributes and values are described' the schedule incorrectly states Morven Hill as a 'distinctive largely unmodified landform' when it has been completely modified for agriculture/farming and contains built modification and domestication on the lower reaches of Morven Hill.	Addressed in response to OS 76.16.	Accept submission in part.
OS 86.8	Melissa Brook (Queenstown Airport Corporation)	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.4.ix utilities and regionally significant infrastructure be amended to: limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as an overhead lines or cell phone towers, or navigational aids and meteorological instruments which cannot be screened, these should be co-located with existing infrastructure or designed and located to reduce their visual prominence to the extent practicable, recognising the operational and functional requirements of regionally significant infrastructure means this may not be practicable in all instances.	I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.22.4 Capacity are appropriate: (ix) utilities and regionally significant infrastructure - limited landscape capacity for infrastructure that is <u>buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of the National Grid and utilities such as overhead lines, cell phone towers, navigational aids and meteorological instruments, where there is a functional or operational need for its location, structures are to be designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks co-located with existing utilities and is designed and located so that it is not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid there is limited landscape capacity for the upgrade of existing infrastructure within the same corridor.</u>	Accept submission.
OS 110.7	Jenny Carter on behalf of Kincardine Angus Limited or Nominee	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.4 Morven Hills be amended to recognise sub areas such as the lower slopes of Morven Hill as having capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including fieldwork and careful review of the GIS mapping resources, including contours and aerial imagery), it is my view that the general similarity in the landform attributes and values associated with the roche moutonnée landform means that it 'reads' as one 'landscape area'. 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. 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 a smaller scale (such as at a site-specific level) would form part of landscape assessments for resource consent and plan change applications.	Reject submission.
OS 111.7	Jenny Carter on behalf of S & L Hunt Family Trust	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.22.4 Morven Hills be amended to recognise sub areas such as the lower slopes of Morven Hill as having capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 110.7.	Reject submission.
OS 147.3	Ben Gresson on behalf of SYZ Investments Limited	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill is deleted or amended to address concerns raised throughout the submission. Concerns raised in the submission relate to how the schedules will be used by Council when assessing resource consent applications, landscape absorption capacity and an inadequate Section 32 Report.	Addressed by reporting planner in the s42A Report	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH Comments	JH Recommendation
OS 188.37	Elisha Young-Ebert (Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.22.4 Morven Hill paragraph 17 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Addressed in response to OS 77.37.	Accept submission.