

## 21.23.1 PA RCL Cardrona River/Mount Barker Road: Schedule of Landscape Values

---

### General Description of the Area

The Cardrona River/Mount Barker PA is a triangle of rural land to the east of urban Wānaka. It is bounded by the Ōrau (Cardrona River) to the west, Wānaka Luggate Highway to the north and generally by the toe of the Criffel Range to the south. The Mount Barker ONF is within the PA, adjacent to its southern boundary.

### 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. The geology of the area includes glacial outwash gravels and glacial till from the glaciers that formed the Upper Clutha Basin and Lake Wānaka.
2. The sequence of landforms:
  - a. the alluvial bed of the Ōrau (Cardrona River);
  - b. the legible series of degradational terraces stepping down to the river, where fluvial erosion has cut into the glacial outwash gravels;
  - c. a clearly defined scarp at the eastern edge of the terraces, with gently rolling glacial moraine downlands extending eastwards;
  - d. an outwash plain in the eastern triangle between Wānaka Luggate Highway and Mount Barker Road, extending to the foothills of the Criffel Range.
3. The relatively free-draining brown and pallic soils with reasonable fertility, making the area suitable for pastoral farming and more intensive farming under irrigation.
4. The semi-arid climate with hot dry summers and cold dry winters, leading to dry brown grasslands where there is no irrigation and summer dust clouds from the Cardrona riverbed and exposed gravel roads or soils.

### Important hydrological features:

5. The Ōrau (Cardrona River), a habitat for longfin eels, kōaro, upland bullies and Clutha flathead galaxias (nationally critical) and brown and rainbow trout. The section of river adjacent to the PA is seasonally ephemeral due to natural losses to groundwater and extraction for irrigation. There is relatively poor water quality (nitrogen, E coli, ammonium) in this reach.
6. Irrigation water races leading from the Ōrau (Cardrona River).
7. The Wānaka Basin Cardrona gravel aquifer, which underlies the PA and Wānaka township. Water take from the aquifer is currently over-allocated.

### Important ecological features and vegetation types:

8. Conifer, eucalypt and Lombardy poplar shelter belts throughout the PA and scattered eucalypt or conifer woodlots generally around 1-3ha in size. Many of the shelter and woodlot trees have wilding potential.

9. Vegetation associated with rural living, including roadside hedges, driveway avenues, shelter trees around dwellings and large gardens.
10. Small areas of indigenous revegetation, with potential for further enhancement.
11. Extensive areas of improved pasture and areas used for cropping that are favourable seasonal feeding grounds for Paradise shelduck, South Island oystercatcher and Spur-winged plover.
12. Rank exotic grassland along road margins may be utilised by skinks.
13. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, hawthorn, crack willow, broom and lupin.
14. Animal pest species include rabbits, stoats, possums, rats and mice.

#### **Important land use patterns and features:**

15. Pastoral farming or cropping, with irrigation from the Cardrona River water races and bores to the Wanaka Basin Cardrona gravel aquifer. The PA includes vineyards, a lavender farm, an equine facility and a firewood supply operation.
16. Rural living and hobby farming is common, mainly on lots of between 4 and 10 hectares in size. Areas of this type of land use are present around Black Peak Road, as well as south of Ballantyne Road east of the river, at the intersection of Morris and Ballantyne Roads, at the intersection of Ballantyne Road and the Wānaka Luggate Highway, and at the southern end of Mount Barker Road. Larger rural living properties of about 20ha are in the eastern part of the PA. There are also several small lots of one to two hectares in size that were subdivided from larger farms in the late 1990s. Additional residential building platforms have been consented, with potential for additional domestication and further dissection of open pastoral land.
17. Rural living dwellings are generally well set back from roads and screened and integrated by planting. Dwellings include substantial homes or visitor accommodation lodges with large gardens and curving tree-lined driveways.
18. The land use context of the PA includes:
  - a. Rural Lifestyle zoning and the Wānaka Urban Growth Boundary across the Ōrau (Cardrona River) to the west.
  - b. PA RCL Halliday Road to the north across the Wānaka-Luggate Highway, which has a pattern of rural living and working farmland similar to that of PA RCL Cardrona River/Mount Barker Road in the western half and a consented but unimplemented film studio and tourism development at Corbridge in the eastern half.
  - c. Wānaka airport (with the associated node of commercial and commercial recreation development) and working farmland with an open character to the east.
  - d. Rural Lifestyle Zones, the Criffel Range ONL and working farmland on terraces at the base of the Criffel Range to the south.
  - e. The PA forms a transitional area of pastoral farming and rural living between Wānaka township and more open rural land to the east.

**Commented [JH1]:** Typographical correction to align with standard Schedule format.

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

19. Two PDP Category 3 historic buildings within the PA - the cob house and stone shed at 107 Maxwell Road (QLDC Ref. 526), and the Pearce clay stone hut at 590 Mt Barker Road (QLDC Ref. 525).
20. Remains of the Hudson cottage (archaeological site F40/126) south-west of the intersection of Ballantyne and Morris Roads - a small timber cottage constructed about 1900 and later demolished.

### Mana whenua features and their locations:

20. 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.
21. The western part of the RCL overlaps the mapped wāhi tūpuna Ōrau (Cardrona 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:

22. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
23. The Ōrau is a traditional ara tawhito (travel route) linking Whakatipu-Waimāori Whakatipu-wai-Māori with Lakes Wānaka and Hāwea. It also provided access to the natural bridge on the Kawarau River.
24. Ōrau is also recorded as a kāika mahika kai where tuna (eels), pora ('Māori turnip'), āruhe (fernroot) and weka were gathered.
25. The mana whenua values associated with the RCL include, but may not be limited to, mahika kai, ara tawhito, nohoaka.

**Commented [JH2]:** OS 77.46 Kai Tahu ki Otago.  
OS 188.46 Te Rūnunga o Ngāi Tahu

### Important historic attributes and values:

26. The associations of the area with early European settlement and farming, where land was initially held as part of the larger Wānaka pastoral lease and gradually broken down into smaller grazing runs from the 1880s, evidenced by the remaining historic buildings and some place names.

### Important shared and recognised attributes and values:

27. Valued as the scenic rural enclosure of Wānaka township to the east. The Ōrau (Cardrona River) is a natural boundary to urban and rural residential or rural lifestyle development on the southern and eastern sides of Wānaka and District planning documents indicate that the local community values the maintenance of rural character outside this boundary. These include the 2002 Wānaka 2020 community plan, the 2007 QLDC Growth Management Strategy and the PDP.
28. Valued as a pleasant rural living location close to Wānaka, with spacious pastoral surrounds and a high level of visual and rural amenity.

### Important recreation attributes and values:

29. Recreational use of the Ōrau (Cardrona) riverbed and its margins for fishing, swimming, walking and cycling. A walkway/cycleway is planned for the true left bank of the river.

## 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:

30. The series of degradational terraces and fluviially-eroded scarps leading down to the Ōrau (Cardrona River), which express the fluvial processes of river erosion.
31. The gently rolling landform of the glacial moraine appreciated from public roads, particularly from Ballantyne, Morris, Boundary and Faulks Roads.
32. The outwash plain in the eastern part of the PA, which extends further north-east across Wānaka airport to the Clutha ~~Mata-Au~~ ~~Mata-au~~ escarpments and is notable for its flatness, openness and physical extent.

**Commented [JH3]:** OS 77.33 Kai Tahu ki Otago.  
OS 188.33 Te Rūnunga o Ngāi Tahu

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

33. The key public routes through or around the PA are the Wānaka Luggate Highway and Ballantyne Road, a local shortcut between Wānaka and Luggate. From these key viewing locations, long views across terraces, moraine and outwash plains are often prevented by either rolling terrain or roadside shelterbelts (particularly from the highway). Moving through the landscape provides intermittent vistas across open pastoral land to the mountainous ONL that surround the Upper Clutha Basin and to Mount Iron and Mount Barker. Views are important to the sense of scale of the landscape and to its amenity and visual coherence. The patterns of open pasture alternating with lines or stands of vegetation and scattered rural dwellings are moderately complex, but highly coherent across the PA. Rural living development is largely set back from roads to maintain views to open pasture and many rural lifestyle dwellings are screened from public roads by topography or planting.
34. Highly appealing intermittent views from Faulks Road and Mount Barker Road across the foreground of pastoral rural land to Mount Barker, the Criffel Range and more distant mountains in the north. The subservient nature of built development within the views contributes to the quality of the outlook.
35. Views from the summit of Mount Iron, where the panoramic vistas available to the south-east take in the Cardrona River and the rolling pastoral expanse of the PA in the mid-ground, contrasting with Mount Barker and the Criffel/Pisa Range in the background. The balance between rural living development and open pastoral land within the PA is important to the amenity and perceived naturalness of the views.

### Naturalness attributes and values:

36. Perceptions of naturalness and of pastoral and working farm rural character are largely maintained for people visiting the landscape, although this is undermined to some extent by the high number of road crossings, letterboxes, tree-lined driveways, entry features and partially visible houses. There is a moderate level of naturalness, with a predominance of natural rather than built elements. Human intervention as managed farmland and rural living is evident.

### Transient attributes and values:

37. Transient elements of the landscape include seasonal foliage and pasture colours, the changing shadow patterns from shelter belts, the varying water flow characteristics of the Cardrona and the presence of stock and wildlife such as hawks.

### Remoteness/wildness attributes and values:

38. Rural tranquillity and quietness are experienced in those parts of the PA away from Ballantyne Road and Wānaka Luggate Highway, where there are low traffic volumes and the levels of activity are consistent

with ~~working farmland~~, ~~working farmland~~ hobby farming and low-density rural living (on lots of 4ha and greater).

Commented [JH4]: OS 19.19 Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd

### Aesthetic attributes and values

39. The experience of the values identified above from public and private viewpoints.
40. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. the highly attractive views, often framed by trees, across pastoral land to Mount Barker, Mount Iron and the mountain ranges surrounding the Upper Clutha Basin<sup>1</sup>;
  - b. Juxtaposition and contrast between the smooth pastoral 'tamed' appearance of the PA and the rougher browner and more visually complex rangelands of Mount Barker and the Criffel Range slopes;
  - c. Strong rural character, with large areas of open space – either pastoral or cropping – retained adjacent to main roads, a sense of spaciousness and rural living development integrated by topography and/or vegetation;
  - d. Aesthetic appeal of the gently rolling moraine landforms.

### Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Perceptual (Sensory) • Associative

Rating scale: seven-point scale ranging from **Very Low** to **Very High**.

very low	low	low-mod	moderate	mod-high	high	very high
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

The combined physical, associative and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA RCL Cardrona River/Mount Barker Road can be summarised as follows:

- (a) **Moderate physical values** relating to the productive soils (with irrigation) and associated agricultural and horticultural land uses, the natural attributes of the Ōrau (Cardrona River), the sequence of landforms extending eastward from the river, the patterns of rural shelterbelts, hedgerows and mature exotic trees framing open areas of pastoral land, and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
- (b) **Moderate associative values** relating to mahika kai, ara tawhito, nohoaka, the historic heritage of European pastoral farming, the recreational use of the Cardrona River and the shared and recognised values of the area as a rural edge to Wānaka township and a pleasant rural living location.
- (c) **Moderate-high perceptual values** relating to the expressiveness of the downland landforms, the coherence of vegetation and land use patterns, the strong rural character, the framed scenic views across open pasture, the low-key rural tranquillity and quietness, and the moderate level of naturalness, with rural living remaining subordinate to pasture/cropping and vegetation.

### Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the PA RCL Cardrona River/Mount Barker Road for a range of activities is set out below.

<sup>1</sup> Mount Iron and the mountain ranges surrounding the Upper Clutha Basin are outside of the PA.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities based on the rural land resource that are: visually recessive; of a modest scale and have a low key 'rural' character; and that maintain or enhance the PA's landscape values.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – some** landscape capacity for rural farmstay/visitor accommodation within existing or consented buildings/building platforms. **Very limited** capacity for small scale and low-key tourism related activities that are: visually recessive; of a modest scale and have a low key 'rural' character; and that maintain or enhance the PA's landscape values.
- iii. **Urban expansions – no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – some** landscape capacity where soils and available water allocation support the activity, and where expressiveness and aesthetic attributes and values are maintained or enhanced.
- v. **Earthworks – limited** landscape capacity to absorb earthworks associated with farming and rural living / visitor accommodation / commercial recreation activities and **some** landscape capacity for trails (walking and cycling) that maintain naturalness and expressiveness and aesthetic attributes and values and integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings – some** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce the existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – limited** landscape capacity for ongoing gravel extraction from the Ōrau (Cardrona) riverbed in accordance with Otago Regional Council river management strategy. **No landscape capacity** for additional gravel extraction from the Ōrau (Cardrona) riverbed. **Very limited** landscape capacity for farm-scale quarries elsewhere within the PA that protect the naturalness and aesthetic attributes and values of the PA.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure –** outside the State Highway corridor, **some** landscape capacity to absorb additional infrastructure that is of a modest scale and low-key rural character.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for additional district scale infrastructure that is co-located with existing distribution lines or roads and has an appearance consistent with the rural character of the PA. **Very limited** landscape capacity for larger scale regionally significant infrastructure. 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 – some** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy regeneration. **Limited** landscape capacity for larger scale commercial renewable energy generation.
- xi. ~~Production Forestry~~ – **limited** landscape capacity for scattered woodlots of up to 2 hectares in area.
- xii. **Rural living – very limited** capacity to absorb additional rural living without cumulative adverse effects on naturalness, aesthetic, rural character and shared and recognised attributes and values. The rural character of the PA is vulnerable to further fragmentation and domestication through rural living development, and its value as a rural edge to Wānaka would be undermined by increased densities of rural living. Any additional rural living should be set well back from roads; integrated by landform and/or existing vegetation; designed to be of a modest scale; have a 'low-key' rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); enhance public access (where appropriate); and should maintain public views across open land to surrounding landforms.

**Commented [JH5]:** OS 73.16 Bike Wanaka Inc

**Commented [JH6]:** OS 73.16 Bike Wanaka Inc

**Commented [JH7]:** Grammatical amendment by JHLA.

**Commented [JH8]:** OS 73.16 Bike Wanaka Inc

**Commented [JH9]:** OS 77.16 Kai Tahu ki Otago

**Commented [JH10]:** OS 70.43 Transpower NZ Ltd

**Commented [JH11]:** Typographical correction.

## 21.23.1 Cardrona River/Mount Barker Road RCL Schedule

11 AUGUST 2023 FINAL

**Blue highlighted text:** captured in "Response to Submissions (version of) 21.23.1 Cardrona River/Mount Barker Road RCL 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) 21.23.1 Cardrona River/Mount Barker Road RCL Schedule". This is typically because the submission point is general rather than confined to specific text amendments. **Four examples identified.**

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

### Submissions Summary: Landscape Comments

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 2.1	John Robert Binney	Support	That landscape schedule 21.23.1 is supported.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 2.4	John Robert Binney	Oppose	That the Mount Barker Rural Character Landscape be extended southward to incorporate the houses on the south side of Mount Barker Road.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The spatial extent of the RCL Priority Area mapping has been confirmed by the Environment Court (Topic 2 Decisions) and RCL mapping amendments (of the nature requested by the submitter) are beyond the scope of the Variation.	Reject submission.
OS 19.3	Ian Percy (Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd)	Oppose	That landscape schedules 21.23 are amended to provide explicit definitions for terms 'limited', 'very limited', 'some' in regard to landscape capacity.	Section 3 of the PA Schedules Methodology Report explains the capacity rating scale (and noting that this explanatory detail is incorporated into the Response to Submissions Version of the Schedule 21.22 Preamble to assist plan users).	Reject submission.
OS 19.16	Ian Percy (Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road be rejected as notified.	Addressed by reporting planner in S42A Report.	N/A
OS 19.17	Ian Percy (Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road is amended to remove vague terms such as 'dramatic', 'sublime', and 'tranquil' as they are purely subjective.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. Ms Gilbert's evidence in chief (EIC) addresses such wording where she notes that: <i>"...the PA Schedules are intended to provide a guidance resource that incorporates technical landscape vocabulary to describe the landscape values and landscape capacity (at a PA level)... the terminology used within the PA Schedules is generally well understood by the landscape profession and is acknowledged and referenced in landscape related case law. So, while such terminology may not be evident in the District Plan or may be perceived as subjective, it has an established and accepted use within the lexicon of the landscape profession."</i> In my opinion, while some terms are considered by the submitter to be subjective, they are used in the schedule to help describe the landscape in a way that most people understand.	Reject submission.
OS 19.18	Ian Percy (Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road is amended to provide explicit definitions for terms 'limited', 'very limited', 'some' in regard to landscape capacity.	Addressed in response to OS 19.3.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 19.19	Ian Percy (Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road is amended to remove quotation marks on the terms 'working farm', and 'rural'.	Quotation marks are only used once around 'working farm' at [38]. I recommend they be removed.  However, the quotation marks around 'rural' is used twice - in the capacity section where 'rural' (inside quotation marks) is used to help describe the desired <u>character</u> of built activities that aren't strictly a rural activity (in this case commercial recreational and tourism related activities).	Accept submission in part.
OS 19.20	Ian Percy (Aitkens Folly Vineyard Ltd)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road is amended to determine explain who arbitrates the definitions of the terms 'expressiveness', and 'aesthetics'.	The PA Schedules have been prepared in accordance with best practice landscape assessment as explained in the EiC of Ms Gilbert.	Reject submission.
OS 51.1	Alison Devlin (Mt Barker Family Trust)	Oppose	That farm buildings and earthworks are not limited or restricted through landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road.	In agreement.  The schedules provide 'some' landscape capacity for farm buildings. Earthworks have a broad 'limited' capacity rating and a 'some' capacity rating for public walking and cycling trails. All capacity ratings used in the schedules are for activities that are not permitted. As such, the purpose of the schedules is to provide guidance, not increase the reasonably restrictive planning regime further.  This is addressed in more detail in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 and in Ms Gilbert's evidence in chief.	Accept submission.
OS 67.27	Julian Haworth (Upper Clutha Environmental Society)	Support	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is generally supported, especially the 'very limited capacity' for rural living.	In agreement, no comment required.	Accept submission.
OS 67.28	Julian Haworth (Upper Clutha Environmental Society)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended " <i>Due to the disruption by blocks of exotic conifers in screening the landform nuances of this rural character landscape, and of blocking vistas...</i> " so if there is any capacity for production forestry that it is limited to deciduous or native species.	In my opinion, any permitted planting will cover nuances in the underlying topography on which it is planted, as well as block vistas. This includes deciduous and native species.	Reject submission.
OS 70.43	Ainsley McLeod on behalf of Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road 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 21.23.1 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. <u>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.</u>	Accept submission.
OS 73.6	Ian Greaves on behalf of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road be amended to remove reference to limited or very limited capacity for new trails.	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), and viewing the wider area from various locations, I do not consider it appropriate to remove the capacity reference for trails, as inappropriately located and/or designed trails have the potential to detract from RCL landscape values.	Reject submission.



Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 73.16	Ian Greaves on behalf of Bike Wanaka Inc	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road 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.	In the Landscape capacity section at (v), trails are not included within the broader earthworks category. It is of my opinion that walking and cycling trails include relatively low levels of earthworks and therefore would be appropriate to have a 'some' level of capacity. I consider that the following amendments to Schedule 21.23.1 Capacity are appropriate:  (v) <b>earthworks – limited</b> landscape capacity to absorb earthworks associated with farming and rural living / <b>visitor accommodation / commercial recreation</b> activities <b>and some landscape capacity for trails (walking and cycling)</b> that maintain naturalness <b>and</b> expressiveness <b>and aesthetic</b> attributes and values and integrate with existing natural landform patterns.	Accept submission.
OS 77.16	Michael Bathgate on behalf of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.1.vii. mineral extraction be amended to no landscape capacity for mineral extraction.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Mineral extraction from the Ōrau (Cardrona) riverbed is currently permitted in accordance with Otago Regional Council and QLDC river management strategy consents.  I consider that the following amendment to the wording in Schedule 21.23.1 Capacity are appropriate:  (vii) <b>mineral extraction – limited</b> landscape capacity for ongoing gravel extraction from the Ōrau (Cardrona) riverbed in accordance with Otago Regional Council river management strategy. <b>No landscape capacity for additional gravel extraction from the Ōrau (Cardrona) riverbed. Very limited</b> landscape capacity for farm-scale quarries elsewhere within the PA that protect the naturalness and aesthetic attributes and values of the PA.	Accept submission in part.
OS 77.33	Michael Bathgate on behalf of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.1 paragraph 32 be amended to correct the spelling of Mata-au.	Spelling amended.	Accept submission.
OS 77.46	Michael Bathgate on behalf of Kai Tahu ki Otago	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road paragraph 23 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Spelling amended.	Accept submission.
OS 79.7	Blair Devlin on behalf of Ian Ferguson Farrant and the Estate of MC Farrant	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road be rejected as notified or amended to address paragraph [13] and [14] under 'important ecological features and vegetation types' where animal pest species and plant pest species which are not important ecological features or vegetation types are listed.	Ms Gilbert's evidence in chief (EiC) addresses animal and plant pest species. A number of amendments are recommended in the Response to Submissions Version of the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 to address this matter.	Reject submission.
OS 79.8	Blair Devlin on behalf of Ian Ferguson Farrant and the Estate of MC Farrant	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road be rejected as notified or amended to address that at paragraph [15] a generic statement is made that 'the descriptions and photographs of the area in tourist publications' while not providing evidence as to what publications or photographs are referred to.	The submission point is not relevant. There is no reference to photographs or tourist publications in Schedule 21.23.1.	Reject submission.
OS 79.9	Blair Devlin on behalf of Ian Ferguson Farrant and the Estate of MC Farrant	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road be rejected as notified or amended to address that at [36] 'naturalness attributes and values' incorrectly states the Cardrona River Mount Barker Road rural character landscape is 'with a predominance of natural rather than built environments' when a majority of areas have been modified for agriculture and farming purposes.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my knowledge of the area (including field work) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I agree that the PA has been largely modified for agriculture and farming purposes.  However, these land uses retain a predominance of natural characteristics (e.g., the amount of green / open space compared with built forms). In my opinion [36] adequately recognises the levels	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				of modification in the area. Levels of naturalness are considered 'moderate' (not high) which in my opinion is an appropriate conclusion.	
OS 79.10	Blair Devlin on behalf of Ian Ferguson Farrant and the Estate of MC Farrant	Oppose	That the relationship between mana whenua associations, Wāhi Tūpuna Chapter and consultation with mana whenua for applications be clarified in the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 79.11	Blair Devlin on behalf of Ian Ferguson Farrant and the Estate of MC Farrant	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road is amended to make clear that the landscape capacity schedules are at a landscape character unit level rather than a site specific level.	The Preamble to Schedule 21.23 explains that landscape capacity is evaluated at a PA level within the Schedule. A determination of capacity levels at scales smaller than this (such as at a landscape character, or site-specific level) would form part of landscape assessments for resource consent and plan change applications.  Landscape capacity may change over time; and across each priority area there are likely to be variations in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment.  This means that there is an acknowledgement that a finer grained assessment as part of a site-specific proposal may determine a higher capacity for a land use which may give the submitter some comfort in this regard.	Reject submission.
OS 99.8	John Wellington (Upper Clutha Tracks Trust)	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.	Addressed in response to OS 73.16.	Accept submission.
OS 121.1	Maddy Familton on behalf of Andrew Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities (ii) within the Cardrona River Mt Barker rural character landscape is amended to the following: ii. visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - some landscape capacity for rural farmstyle visitor accommodation within existing or consented buildings/building platforms. Some capacity for small scale and low-key tourism related activities that are: visually recessive; of a modesty scale; have a low key 'rural character'; and that maintain or enhance the PA's landscape values.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  At (ii) tourism related activities is rated as having a 'very limited' landscape capacity.  Relying on my knowledge of the area (including field work) 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. At capacity levels greater than 'very limited', the landscape values identified in the PA would be materially compromised.	Reject submission.
OS 121.2	Maddy Familton on behalf of Andrew Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for intensive agriculture activities (iv) within the Cardrona River Mt Barker rural character landscape is amended to the following: iv. intensive agriculture - some landscape capacity where soils and available water allocation support the activity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Relying on my knowledge of the area (including field work) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), the maintenance or enhancement of the expressiveness and aesthetic attributes and values of the PA (wording which the submission seeks be deleted) contribute to rural character. Of note these values derived from the area's glacial and fluvial origins are described at [30 – 32] in the schedule. Some of these landforms are subtle requiring careful development.	Reject submission.
OS 121.3	Maddy Familton on behalf of Andrew Donaldson	Oppose	That the landscape capacity for rural living activities (xii) within the Cardrona River Mt Barker rural character landscape is revised from 'very limited' to 'limited'.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.  Rural living is rated as having 'very limited' landscape capacity. At capacities greater than this cumulative effects would adversely affect naturalness, aesthetic, rural character and shared and recognised attributes and values, discussed at (xii).  Relying on my knowledge of the area (including field work) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that due to existing patterns of rural living development, cumulative	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
				effects are a relevant matter to consider and that the "very limited" rating is appropriate from a landscape perspective.	
OS 144.1	Scott Edgar on behalf of Jonathan Wallis, Andrew Haseldine and Alice Wallis as trustees of the Blackcurry Trust	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.1vii. rural living be amended from very limited to some landscape for well-considered rural living development within the wider priority area.	Addressed in response to OS 121.3.	Reject submission.
OS 153.3	Dan Curley on behalf of Cardrona Valley Farms Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona Valley Mt Barker Road is amended as outlined in this submission before being adopted.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 158.2	Dan Curley on behalf of PK Ventures Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended to give effect to the submitter's relief outlined in this submission.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 158.4	Dan Curley on behalf of PK Ventures Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended so the schedule is required to include a more robust disclaimer/ statement that reinforces the very broad brush approach that has been applied to the landscape assessment within priority areas.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 158.5	Dan Curley on behalf of PK Ventures Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended to more appropriately identify various landscapes that are nested within each priority area, identify their landscape attributes and values and related capacity.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>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), in my opinion, the general similarity of landform, landcover and land use across the PA, and at a PA scale, is sufficient for it be addressed in the schedule as one 'landscape area'.</p> <p>I acknowledge that there are variations in topography, landcover and land use across the PA which give rise to variations in terms of landscape character and visual amenity attributes and values, but consider that these are appropriately acknowledged in the schedule wording.</p> <p>Further, the Preamble to Schedule 21.23 explains that landscape capacity is evaluated at a PA level within the Schedule. A determination of capacity levels at scales smaller than this (such as at a site-specific level) would form part of landscape assessments for resource consent and plan change applications.</p> <p>In other words, the capacity descriptions should not be taken as prescribing the capacity of specific sites.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 158.6	Dan Curley on behalf of PK Ventures Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is rejected as notified or amended to address that the conclusions reached to describe the related capacity of potential land uses are too conclusive.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>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 landscape capacity ratings advised in the Response to Submissions Version of 21.23.1 are appropriate from a landscape perspective.</p> <p>Ms Gilbert's EiC also addresses this matter in more detail.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 158.7	Dan Curley on behalf of PK Ventures Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is rejected as notified or amended to address that the schedules do not properly reflect the landscape capacity of each priority area, nor in founding assessment, the environment anticipated by the District Plan.	<p>Addressed in response to OS 158.6.</p> <p>Further, in my review of submissions, I have carefully considered the rating of capacity in terms of the environment anticipated by the District Plan.</p>	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 158.8	Dan Curley on behalf of PK Ventures Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is rejected as notified or amended to address that the stated capacity is too conclusive and lacks sufficient contemplation of potentially suitable land uses within each priority area. As such wording requires to be carefully chosen to provide contemplation for suitable cases approved by resource consent.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PA schedules identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected while providing an indication of the landscape capacity of the PA for a range of land use activities. The Landscape Capacity section of the schedule includes a range of 'development characteristics' that are likely to be associated with appropriate development (for each land use type), within the PA. As such, the PA schedules acknowledge the dynamics of landscape change and anticipate the broad parameters or characteristics that are likely to make such change appropriate in terms of landscape values including visual amenity values. Also addressed in response to OS 158.6. This matter is also addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A report.	Reject submission.
OS 158.9	Dan Curley on behalf of PK Ventures Ltd	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended so the assessment does not only seek to limit capacity/ restrain land use based on the broad perceptual / experiential factors observed across the extent of the priority areas but, where it is found appropriate, capacity ratings should identify opportunities for greater capacity for such activities as visitor accommodation, tourism related activities and rural living development.	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 the landscape capacity ratings advised in the Response to Submissions Version of 21.23.1 are appropriate from a landscape perspective. Ms Gilbert's EiC also addresses this matter in more detail.	Reject submission.
OS 160.2	Dan Curley on behalf of Fiona and Ross Howie	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona Valley Mt Barker Road is amended to give effect to the submitters relief outline in this submission.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 160.4	Dan Curley on behalf of Fiona and Ross Howie	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended so each schedule includes a more robust disclaimer / statement that reinforces the very broad brush approach that has been applied to landscape assessment in the priority area.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 160.5	Dan Curley on behalf of Fiona and Ross Howie	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is rejected as notified or amended to address that the conclusions reached in the schedule to describe the related capacity of potential land uses are too conclusive.	Addressed in response to OS 158.6.	Reject submission.
OS160.7	Dan Curley on behalf of Fiona and Ross Howie	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is rejected as notified or amended to address that the stated capacity is too conclusive and lacks sufficient contemplation of potentially suitable future land uses within parts of the priority area.	Addressed in response to OS 158.8.	Reject submission.
OS 160.8	Dan Curley on behalf of Fiona and Ross Howie	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended so that the assessment does not only seek to limit/restrain land use based on the broad perceptual/experiential factors observed across the extent of the priority area, but where it is appropriate, capacity ratings should identify opportunities for greater capacity for such activities as visitor accommodation, tourism related activities and rural living development.	Addressed in response to OS 158.9.	Reject submission.
OS 161.2	Dan Curley on behalf of Duncan Callum Fraser	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona Valley Mt Barker Road is amended to give effect to the submitters relief outline in this submission.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 161.4	Dan Curley on behalf of Duncan Callum Fraser	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended so each schedule includes a more robust disclaimer/statement that reinforces the very broad brush approach that has been applied to landscape assessment in the priority area.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 161.5	Dan Curley on behalf of Duncan Callum Fraser	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is rejected as notified or amended to address that the conclusions reached in the schedule to describe the related capacity of potential land uses are too conclusive.	Addressed in response to OS 158.6.	Reject submission.
OS 161.7	Dan Curley on behalf of Duncan Callum Fraser	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is rejected as notified or amended to address that the stated capacity is too conclusive and lacks sufficient contemplation of potentially suitable future land uses within parts of the priority area.	Addressed in response to OS 158.8.	Reject submission.
OS 161.8	Dan Curley on behalf of Duncan Callum Fraser	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended so that the assessment does not only seek to limit/restrain land use based on the broad perceptual / experiential factors observed across the extent of the priority area, but where it is appropriate, capacity ratings should identify opportunities for greater capacity for such activities as visitor accommodation, tourism related activities and rural living development.	Addressed in response to OS 158.9.	Reject submission.
OS 180.3	Daniel Thorne on behalf of Graeme and Leah Causer (Ballantyne Rd)	Oppose	That 21.23.1 be rejected	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 180.4	Daniel Thorne on behalf of Graeme and Leah Causer (Ballantyne Rd)	Oppose	That the Priority Areas (PAs) are further distinguished by identifying the various landscape areas or units within the PA.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>The Topic 2.2 Decision (December 2019) directs at [171], that the assessment of the ONF/L Priority Areas be undertaken for the feature or landscape as a whole (rather than at a landscape character unit scale).</p> <p>The PA Schedules have been drafted to acknowledge, in Schedule 21.23, that the landscape attributes, values and capacity relate to the PA as a whole and should not be taken as prescribing the attributes, values and capacity of specific sites; and a finer grained site-specific assessment of a plan change or resource consent process may identify different attributes, values and capacity to that identified in the PA Schedule.</p> <p>Ms Gilbert's EIC also addresses this matter in more detail.</p>	Reject submission.
OS 180.5	Daniel Thorne on behalf of Graeme and Leah Causer (Ballantyne Rd)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule identifies the key attributes and distinguishing features within each landscape area or unit of the PA.	<p>No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point.</p> <p>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), in my opinion, the key attributes and distinguishing features (at a PA wide scale) have been captured in the notified schedule.</p> <p>Also addressed in response to OS 180.4.</p>	Accept submission.
OS 180.6	Daniel Thorne on behalf of Graeme and Leah Causer (Ballantyne Rd)	Oppose	That the landscape schedule is accompanied by a map of each PA identifying the distinguishable landscape units within it, and the related landscape capacity of each of those areas.	Addressed in response to OS 180.4.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS180.7	Daniel Thorne on behalf of Graeme and Leah Causer (Ballantyne Rd)	Oppose	That for the Upper Clutha Rural Character Landscape (RCL) Priority Areas (PAs), within each landscape unit there are identified measurable spatial limits of rural living, subdivision and development.	Addressed in response to OS 180.4.	Reject submission.
OS 180.8	Daniel Thorne on behalf of Graeme and Leah Causer (Ballantyne Rd)	Oppose	That appropriate terminology is used to describe the relative landscape capacity of the landscape unit/areas within the PA, and the appropriateness of finer grained assessments to determine landscape capacity within specific landscape units or sites.	Addressed in response to OS 180.4.	Reject submission.
OS 188.17	Elisha Young-Ebert (Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu)	Oppose	That landscape capacity 21.23.1.vii. mineral extraction be amended to no landscape capacity for mineral extraction.	Addressed in response to OS 77.16.	Accept submission in part.
OS 188.33	Elisha Young-Ebert (Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.1 paragraph 32 be amended to correct the spelling of Mata-au.	Addressed in response to OS 77.33.	Accept submission.
OS 188.46	Elisha Young-Ebert (Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu)	Oppose	That landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mount Barker Road paragraph 23 be amended to correct the spelling from Lake Wakatipu to Whakatipu Waimāori.	Addressed in response to OS 77.46.	Accept submission.
OS 191.1	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended to clarify the circumstances in which applicants, Council planners and landscape architects, decision-makers and others 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 191.2	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended to clarify in what instances plan users processing resource consents will refer back to Chapter 3 provisions and utilise the landscape schedules.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 191.3	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended to clarify whether an application seeking consent under a district wide rule only will be required to address matters in the landscape schedules.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 191.4	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended to remove the capacity rating of no capacity as individual sites within the priority area have not been examined in detail.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. A 'no' capacity rating is applied to (iii) urban expansions. 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 'no' capacity rating for urban expansion is appropriate from a landscape perspective within the PA. Urban development is inappropriate within RCLs as urban development would in my opinion fail to protect the identified rural landscape values. As such, removing the 'no' capacity rating from the schedule is not supported. Ms Gilbert's EIC also addresses the requirement for a 'no' capacity rating in more detail.	Reject submission.
OS 191.5	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended to confirm the extent of the capacity rating scale in the landscape schedules themselves.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 191.6	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That the plan change be rejected or amended to address that the Section 32 report for the landscape schedules is deficient in that it does not adequately evaluate the costs, benefits, efficiency, and effectiveness of the options or of the landscape schedules provisions.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 191.7	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That the plan change be rejected or amended to address that the consultation for the landscape schedules was deficient and did not seek meaningful input in relation to, for example, rating of landscapes' capacities for change and should be undertaken again.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 191.8	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road be rejected or amended to address that it does not provide flexibility for changes in farming practices and technologies and should be modified to recognise this. The schedule should allow sufficiently for flexibility and the future opportunities for proactive change and technology improvements.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. The PA schedules identify the existing landscape values that need to be protected while providing a high-level indication of the landscape capacity of the PA for a range of land use activities. The Landscape Capacity section of the schedule includes a range of 'development characteristics' that are likely to be associated with appropriate development (for each land use type), within the PA. As such, the PA schedules acknowledge the dynamics of landscape change and anticipate the broad parameters or characteristics that are likely to make such change appropriate in terms of landscape values including visual amenity values (including for farming). This matter is also addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A report.	Reject submission.
OS 191.9	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended so non-farming activities are not overly constrained by the landscape schedules for the diversification of farm economies.	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 the landscape capacity ratings in the Response to Submissions Version of the PA Schedules are appropriate. This matter is also addressed by the reporting planner in the s42A report.	Reject submission.
OS 191.10	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended to remove the words 'within existing or consented buildings/building platforms' from the capacity assessment for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities and to change the capacity rating for small scale low-key tourism related activities from 'very limited' to 'some' capacity.	No technical evidence is provided in support of this submission point. At (ii) visitor accommodation is rated as having 'some' landscape capacity for development that is within existing or consented buildings / building platforms. This is to avoid cumulative effects of additional built forms which would adversely affect rural character and visual amenity values. Relying on my knowledge of the area (including field work) and careful review of GIS mapping resources (including contours, building platforms, resource consents and aerial imagery), I consider that the 'very limited' capacity rating for tourism related activities (resorts) is appropriate from a landscape perspective. At capacity levels greater than 'very limited', the landscape values identified in the PA would be materially compromised.	Reject submission.
OS 191.11	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended to remove the words 'and where expressiveness and aesthetic attributes and values are maintained or enhanced' from the capacity assessment for intensive agriculture.	Addressed in response to OS 121.2.	Reject submission.

Original Submission No	Submitter	Position	Submission Summary	JH comments	JH recommendation
OS 191.12	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended to change the capacity assessment for rural living from 'very limited' to 'limited'.	Addressed in response to OS 121.3.	Reject submission.
OS 191.13	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That the landscape schedule 21.23.1 Cardrona River Mt Barker Road is amended to acknowledge 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.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A
OS 191.14	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That alternatively to the relief sought in this submission additional or consequential relief necessary or appropriate to address the matters raised in this submission and/or the relief requested in this submission, including 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 191.15	Maddy Familton on behalf of Bell Group Limited	Oppose	That if the relief sought in this submission is not granted that the landscape schedules are rejected and withdrawn.	Addressed by the reporting planner in the S42A Report.	N/A