

# **Queenstown Lakes District Council**

**Variation to Chapter 21 (Rural Zone) of the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan**

**Introduction of Priority Area Landscape Schedules: 21.22 (Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes) and 21.23 (Rural Character Landscapes)**

**Report and Recommendations of Hearing Commissioners  
9 May 2024**

**Commissioners**  
**D Jane Taylor (Chair)**  
**Peter Kensington**  
**Quentin Smith**

## Contents Page

Terminology and abbreviations	1
Attendances	2
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>How do the landscape schedules relate to the PDP and what is their role and purpose?</b>	<b>3</b>
Background Environment Court considerations	3
Structure and requirements of the PDP to prepare landscape schedules	5
Role and purpose of the schedules	10
<b>Preliminary matters</b>	<b>12</b>
Alleged Conflict of Interest – Commissioner Smith	12
Adequacy of Consultation	13
Scope to include proposed Mapping Amendments to PA, and ONFL and RCL, boundaries	14
The Adequacy of the section 32 Report	22
Partially Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019 (POORPS) and the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 (PORPS)	23
Relevance of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD)	24
Expert Conferencing	24
<b>Summary of our role in making a recommendation to the Council</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Has preparation of the schedules followed an appropriate methodology?</b>	<b>28</b>
The methodology followed by Council	28
Landscape attributes / values	29
At an appropriate landscape scale	30
Landscape capacity	32
<b>Is the structure of the proposed schedules appropriate?</b>	<b>34</b>
Reference to identified attributes and values as “important”	35
“Summary of landscape values” or “key landscape values”	35
<b>Is the content of the proposed preambles helpful and appropriate?</b>	<b>37</b>
Application – reference to Exception Zones	37
Landscape capacity descriptions	39
Other Areas of Disagreement between the Experts with regard to the wording of the Preambles	41
Activities and Definitions	42
<b>Are the contents of each specific schedule appropriate or are further changes required?</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Will the schedules be ‘fit for purpose’ and meet the PDP and Court’s intended purpose?</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	

## Terminology and abbreviations

The following terminology and abbreviations are used throughout this report:

Queenstown Lakes District Council	Council
Queenstown Lakes District	District
Hearing Commissioners	Panel
Priority Area Landscape Schedules Variation	Variation
Partially Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019	POORPS
Operative District Plan	ODP
Proposed District Plan	PDP
Outstanding Natural Feature	ONF
Outstanding Natural Landscape	ONL
Outstanding Nature Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape	ONFL
Rural Character Landscape	RCL
Priority Area(s)	PA(s)

## **Attendances**

### For the Queenstown Lakes District Council:

Mr Mike Wakefield, Counsel  
Ms Shanae Richardson, Counsel  
Ms Ruth Evans, Planning  
Ms Bridget Gilbert, Landscape Architecture  
Mr Jeremy Head, Landscape Architecture

### For the Submitters:

Please refer to the Hearing Timetable located under General Hearing Information section on the QLDC website:

<https://www.qldc.govt.nz/your-council/district-plan/proposed-district-plan/hearings/landscape-schedules>

## Introduction

1. This report sets out the recommendations of the Panel to the Council, following the hearing of submissions and evidence with regard to the Variation, which proposes additions to Chapter 21 (Rural Zone) of the PDP. The Variation seeks to introduce proposed Schedules 21.22 and 21.23, with associated preambles, relating to twenty-nine (29) identified Priority Areas (PA) within the District.
2. Proposed Schedule 21.22 seeks to document identified landscape values and related landscape capacity for PAs that relate to existing ONF and ONL landscapes within the PDP; whereas proposed Schedule 21.23 seeks to document identified landscape character and visual amenity values and related landscape capacity for those PAs that relate to existing RCL landscapes within the PDP.

## How do the landscape schedules relate to the PDP and what is their role and purpose?

### Background Environment Court considerations

3. By way of background context, the policy framework set out in Chapter 3 (Strategic Direction) of the PDP that has given rise to the Variation was confirmed by the Environment Court through a complex *de novo* Stage 1 appeal process (Topic 2 – Rural Landscapes) comprising a number of separate but related interim decisions.<sup>1</sup> We understand that the relevant Chapter 3 PDP provisions are now settled, as there are no outstanding appeals.<sup>2</sup>
4. Briefly, the Decisions Version of the PDP (following Stage 1 of the PDP process) did not include any landscape schedules or other text to describe the attributes and values of the District's ONFs, ONLs or RCLs. Rather, the Decisions Version methodology relied on other processes, primarily through applications for resource consent, to provide for the identification of the relevant landscape values to be protected. The Council has noted that there was significant opposition to the initial regime throughout the Stage 1 hearings, and on appeal, with the relief sought challenging both the location of the mapped ONF, ONL and RCL boundaries and whether the regime would adequately protect the District's rural landscapes from inappropriate levels of development, due (in part) to the absence of clearly identified landscape values.
5. The Environment Court subsequently held that, due to the absence of schedules or other descriptions of landscape values, the Decisions Version regime did not provide sufficient certainty to ensure the intended policy direction for ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes was achieved. In Decision 2.1,<sup>3</sup> the Court held that: *"Mapping only assists in identifying the geographic extent of what is sought to be protected. Listing those landscape values that inform why a feature or landscape is an ONF or ONL is an important further element of setting out what is sought to be*

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court's findings have been summarised in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.8 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report dated 30 June 2022; paragraphs 2.1 to 2.13 of the opening Submissions/Representations for Queenstown Lakes District Council, dated 13 October 2023; and also in paragraphs 2.2 to 2.9 of the Reply Legal Submissions for Queenstown Lakes District Council, dated 15 December 2023.

<sup>2</sup> This was not disputed by any of the parties.

<sup>3</sup> *Hawthenden Limited et Ors v Queenstown Lakes District Council* [2019] NZEnvC 160 (Decision 2.1) at [30].

*protected*". At paragraph [31] the Court went on to explain that: "*Objectives, policies, assessment matters and other rules are relatively limited in their capacity to enunciate particular ONF or ONL values because they are designed to apply generically. The listing of relevant values, provided it is properly informed and expressed, helps plug that gap. As such, scheduling values would assist the ODP to fulfil its protective purposes*".

6. At paragraph [57] of Decision 2.1 the Court found: "*Queenstown District stands somewhat apart in being well endowed with landscapes and features of special quality. While comparison is appropriately undertaken at a district level, for a district plan, it is not unsound conceptually for QLDC to have adjudged that 97% of its entire District land area is either ONL or ONF. However, as we discuss at [27] and following, mapping ONFs and ONLs is just one necessary part of ensuring the ODP properly responds to s 6(b), RMA*".
7. Subsequently, in Decision 2.2,<sup>4</sup> the Court held that: "*[L]andscape capacity cannot be known unless there has been an identification of the landscape character values and their importance (i.e. knowing what the landscape is valued for and why). Evaluating a landscape is inherently an exercise where different landscape experts have different opinions. That is why it is important that a district plan identifies both landscape values and landscape capacity in that both of these are part of the plan's intended statutory authority in regard to ss 6(b) and 7(c)*".
8. As set out in the Council's s 32 Report,<sup>5</sup> the Variation:

*"...addresses an issue identified by the Environment Court that it is difficult to protect the landscape values of ONFLs, and maintain the landscape character, and maintain or enhance visual amenity values of RCLs, without first identifying these values. Further, that it is more efficient and effective to identify these values at the district plan level, than to leave the identification to a case-by-case situation via individual resource consent applications."*
9. Through a series of subsequent interim decisions, commencing with Decision 2.2, the Court made a number of directions to give effect to the scheduling of landscape values. These included joint witness conferencing to produce draft *Values Identification Framework* strategic policies, together with associated maps depicting the geographic extent, at "*proper landscape scale*", of the PAs to which those strategic policies would apply.<sup>6</sup> The Court also directed that the *Values Identification Framework* should be targeted to PAs, and that scheduling should not extend beyond specified PAs, nor provide an avenue to revisit ONF, ONL or RCL overlays on the planning maps.<sup>7</sup> The PAs were subsequently endorsed in Decision 2.5, subject to some mapping adjustments and reservation of determination of the proposed Clutha River ONF PA.<sup>8</sup>
10. In summary, through lengthy evidence exchange, expert conferencing and the exchange of various legal submissions and memoranda, the series of interim decisions issued by the Environment Court in Topic 2 resulted in the current set of PDP Chapter 3 (Strategic Direction)

---

<sup>4</sup> At [127] and [128].

<sup>5</sup> Section 32 Report, paragraph 7.1.

<sup>6</sup> Decision 2.2 at [525].

<sup>7</sup> Decision 2.2 at [162] to [164].

<sup>8</sup> Decision 2.5 at [67] – [71] and [83].

and 6 (Landscapes – Rural Character) provisions. We note that these provisions have been significantly amended from the Stage 1 Decisions Version of the PDP. Of most relevance to this Variation, the Chapter 3 amendments added policies that: (i) direct how plan changes are to be pursued for the inclusion of PA schedules; and (ii) provide policy direction that identifies specific mapped PAs. The additional policies also further direct how schedules of landscape values and landscape capacity are to be prepared for inclusion in Chapter 21 (Rural Zone) of the PDP.

11. In Decision 2.9, the Court confirmed, by way of Strategic Policy 3.3.42, that a plan change (or Variation in this instance) be notified by 30 June 2022 to implement the strategic policies that provide for the PA schedules, including the content that has been specified in the associated strategic policies. The relevant strategic policies, which have informed our approach to the Variation, are further described below.
12. We are cognisant that although the process leading to the Variation has been long and complex, the relevant objectives and policies within Chapters 3 and 6 of the PDP are now settled and uncontested. Accordingly, it is plain that we do not have any jurisdiction to make any recommendations that purport to amend any of the PDP Chapter 3 strategic policies, for example. Rather, our role is limited to an assessment (through the Variation) of the requirements of the applicable strategic policies within the PDP, in order to give effect to the Values Identification Framework which underpins the content of proposed Schedules 21.22 and 21.23.
13. We are also mindful of the submission on behalf of the Upper Clutha Environmental Society Incorporated that the overarching objective of the relevant Chapter 3 strategic policies and the associated Values Identification Framework is to *protect* rural landscape values from inappropriate levels of development.<sup>9</sup> To this end, we are cognisant that this Variation, which seeks to give greater clarity as to the landscape attributes and values sought to be protected in areas of ONF, ONL and RCL that are subject to development pressure, is vitally important in terms of “*deciding the fate of rural landscapes for generations to come*”. We concur that the schedules, and in particular the high level assessment of landscape capacity, should, if appropriately constructed, be instrumental in establishing a metaphorical “*line in the sand*” for appropriate levels of development in the ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes.<sup>10</sup>

#### Structure and requirements of the PDP to prepare landscape schedules

14. The Variation to the PDP responds and gives effect to the wider strategic direction provided by Chapter 3 of the PDP relating to the management of landscapes in the Rural Zone. As outlined in the evidence of Ms Evans,<sup>11</sup> at its core the purpose of the Variation is to give effect to and implement the requirements of strategic policy 3.3.42 of the PDP, which requires the Council to notify a plan change (or variation in this instance), to achieve the following prescriptive direction:

---

<sup>9</sup> Submission on behalf of UCESI dated 13 October 2023 at 6 and 19.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Evans, Section 42A evidence at para 4.3; and with reference to the Section 32 Report at paragraphs 1.2 to 1.4, and 3.1 to 3.4.

*“The Council shall notify a proposed plan change to the District Plan by 30 June 2022 to implement SPs 3.3.36, 3.3.37, 3.3.39 and 3.3.40.”*

15. We have also had regard to the other strategic objectives and policies that are relevant to our consideration of the *application* of proposed PA Schedules 21.22 and 21.23 and hence, in particular, the preambles to each of these schedules.<sup>12</sup>
16. Strategic policy 3.3.42 is located within Chapter 3 (Strategic Direction) under Part Two (Strategy) of the PDP, which sets out the over-arching strategic direction for the management of growth, land use and development within the District, in a manner that ensures sustainable management of the District’s special qualities, which includes (at 3.1(a)) *“distinctive lakes, rivers, alpine and high country landscapes free of inappropriate development”*.
17. Ms Lucas provided us with a succinct summary of the District’s landscapes:<sup>13</sup>

*“As identified in the PDP, some 97% of QLD qualifies as an outstanding natural feature or landscape (ONFL) at the District scale, and is thus of national importance. The ONFL are almost all bedrock country – large mountain ranges above and isolated mountains within the deposition lands below. The small areas not included as ONFL are primarily the gentle lowlands of deposition country of the valley floors and lake basins where built development and occupation has been concentrated.*

*The type of land is a major contributor to the valued natural landscape and rural character of this district. The legibility of the land-forming processes, with the mountain slopes shorn off by substantial former glacial flows, and the gouged-out lakes, moraine dumps and outwash terraces left below. The naturalness of land cover and lack of built clutter is important in allowing for the legibility. It is the natural landscape legibility that is the essence to the district’s landscapes in total. Addressed at the national scale, the district’s rural landscapes are in total outstanding for their dramatic natural landscape attributes based on geomorphic character complemented by vegetated naturalness. Their qualities are vulnerable to cumulative degradation through dispersed development.”*
18. In order to achieve strategic objective 3.2.5, being *“the retention of the District’s distinctive landscapes”*, the PDP requires (under objective 3.2.5.1) the identification of landscape values and related landscape capacity for the District’s ONFs and ONLs.<sup>14</sup> Objectives 3.2.5.2 to 3.2.5.4 provide further direction on how these identified landscape values are to be protected for ONFs and ONLs. A similar strategic objective at 3.2.5.7(b) requires the identification of landscape character and visual amenity values and related landscape capacity for RCLs; while objective 3.2.5.5 focuses on the maintenance of landscape character and the maintenance or enhancement of visual amenity values within RCLs.
19. Where applicable to our consideration of the PA schedules, we have also had regard to the key strategic objectives and policies provided in: 3.1B.5, 3.1B.6, 3.2.1.7 and 3.2.1.8; 3.2.4 (protection

---

<sup>12</sup> We discuss the composition of the Schedules more fully later in this report.

<sup>13</sup> Lucas summary statement, dated 6 November 2023, page 1.

<sup>14</sup> Noting that the term ‘landscape capacity’ is as defined in Strategic Policy 3.1B.5 b.



of the distinctive natural environments and ecosystems of the District); 3.3.21 to 3.3.23 (rural activities); 3.3.28 to 3.3.35 (ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes); 3.3.45 to 3.3.46 (landscape assessment methodology); and 3.3.47 to 3.3.48 (rural zone landscape monitoring).

20. Strategic objectives 3.2.5.2(a) (for ONFs and ONLs) and 3.2.5.7(b) (for RCLs) focus attention toward identified PAs, which we understand are geographically/spatially defined areas within the District that include areas of land classified as either ONF, ONL and/or RCL where there is higher development pressure than in other areas.<sup>15</sup>
21. It is important to highlight and recognise that PAs are not necessarily landscape units or landscape character areas in their own right – they are areas of wider ONF, ONL and/or RCL that have been identified (through the Environment Court processes) as anticipated to be *under significant development pressure* during the life of the PDP.<sup>16</sup> Accordingly, in a technical sense, they may comprise one or more discrete landscapes, or be part landscapes (that is, the remaining area of what is considered the relevant landscape is not included in the PA). Hence it is necessary to be cognisant of the other Chapter 3 strategic policies that apply to the ‘non-Priority Area’ ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes, which may form part of a development proposal or the receiving environment.<sup>17</sup> For completeness, the Court noted that the identification of an area as a PA is not intended to connote any higher relative ONF, ONL or RCL quality rating.<sup>18</sup> This was subsequently codified in strategic policy 3.3.44, which clarifies that any, or any part of an ONF, ONL or RCL not identified as a PA in Schedule 21.22 or 21.23 does not imply that the relevant area is more or less important than the identified PA in terms of: the identified landscape attributes and values (ONFs and ONLs) or the identified landscape character and visual amenity values (RCLs); or is more or less vulnerable to subdivision, use and development.
22. A PA is defined at clause 3.1B5 e. of the PDP as:
  - i. *in relation to an Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape, means an area listed in SP 3.3.36 and shown on the maps [held on [QLDC reference file]];*
  - ii. *in relation to the Upper Clutha Rural Character Landscape, means an area listed in SP 3.3.39 and shown on the maps in Schedule 21 [held on [QLDC reference file]].”*
23. Strategic policy 3.3.36 lists the Rural Zone PAs for ONF and ONL, which were identified and mapped through the Court processes, as noted above, being:
  - a. *parts of the Outstanding Natural Features of Peninsula Hill, Ferry Hill, Shotover River, Morven Hill, Lake Hayes, Slope Hill, Feehly Hill, Arrow River, Kawarau River, Mt Barker, and Mt Iron.*
  - b. *parts of the Outstanding Natural Landscapes of West Wakatipu Basin, Queenstown Bay and environs, Northern Remarkables, Central Wakatipu Basin Coronet Area, East Wakatipu Basin and Crown Terrace Area, Victoria Flats, Cardrona Valley,*

---

<sup>15</sup> Refer Decision 2.2 discussion at [7] - [14].

<sup>16</sup> [2019] NZEnvC 205 at [166] – [167].

<sup>17</sup> Including strategic policy 3.2.5.4, which seeks to ensure that any application for subdivision, use or development not provided for within an Exception Zone protects the landscape values of the relevant ONF or ONL; and strategic policy 3.2.5.6, which seeks to ensure that any subdivision, use or development in an RCL in proximity to an ONF or ONL does not compromise the landscape values of that ONF or ONL.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid at [167].

*Mount Alpha, Roys Bay, West Wanaka, Dublin Bay, Hāwea South and North Grandview, and Lake McKay Station and environs.”*

Importantly, both clauses (a) and (b) under strategic policy 3.3.36 refer to “parts of” ONF or ONL, rather than the geographic extents of the PAs following the full ONF or ONL mapped areas.

24. Strategic policy 3.3.39 lists the Rural Zone PAs within the Upper Clutha RCL, being:

- a. Cardrona River/Mt Barker Road RCL PA;*
- b. Halliday Road/Corbridge RCL PA;*
- c. West of Hāwea River RCL PA;*
- d. Church Road/Shortcut Road RCL PA;*
- e. Maungawera Valley RCL PA.”*

While strategic policy 3.3.39 does not have a similar reference to “parts of” the RCL for each PA, we have approached the geographic extents of the RCL PAs in a similar way to the ONFs and ONLs.

25. Strategic policy 3.3.29(a) further directs the identification of landscape values and landscape capacity (of related ONFs and ONLs) for the PAs which have been identified for inclusion in Schedule 21.22 of the PDP; while strategic policy 3.3.33(a) directs the identification of landscape character and visual amenity values and related landscape capacity (of related RCLs) for the PAs in the Upper Clutha Basin which have been identified for inclusion in Schedule 21.23 of the PDP.

26. Populating the content of both Schedule 21.2 and Schedule 21.3 of the PDP, with associated preambles, is the subject of this Variation. The PDP provides guidance as to what the schedules are to include, as discussed below, with further guidance provided through the various Environment Court decisions that have shaped the content of the PDP to date.<sup>19</sup> In short, the Court anticipated that the schedules would identify the landscape values of ONFs and ONLs and the landscape character and visual amenity values of RCLs, to assist in providing enough certainty to ensure that the relevant PDP policy direction can be achieved.<sup>20</sup>

27. As outlined in the Council’s s 32 Report for the Variation,<sup>21</sup> the Court found that it would be more efficient and effective to identify the landscape values at the district plan level, rather than leaving the identification to a case-by-case situation via individual applications for resource consent(s). Mr Farrell also stressed, in his written and verbal evidence at the hearing,<sup>22</sup> that confirmation of the schedules will assist with the Council’s obligations in responding to policies 3.2.4 and 3.2.6 of the POORPS 2019, which require the identification and maintenance of the values that contribute to a natural feature or natural landscape being outstanding.

---

<sup>19</sup> The first stage of the PDP was notified in August 2015 with subsequent appeals being made to the Court on the Council’s decisions version. As previously discussed, the Court has issued a number of interim decisions on Topic 2 (Landscapes and Rural Character) of the PDP Appeals, including decisions which have shaped the current PDP provisions of relevance.

<sup>20</sup> Requiring: the protection of the landscape values of ONL and ONF; and the maintenance of the landscape character, or the maintenance and enhancement of the visual amenity values of RCL.

<sup>21</sup> Section 32 Report, paragraph 7.1.

<sup>22</sup> Farrell, 17 October 2023 summary statement.

28. Strategic policy 3.3.37, under the heading *Values Identification Framework*, further refines the ‘task at hand’<sup>23</sup> and requires, in addition to a description of landscape values and related landscape capacity, a description of the landscape attributes (physical, sensory and associative) for listed PAs, “*at an appropriate scale*” (a phrase that we discuss further in this recommendation in relation to methodology). A similar requirement for RCLs is mandated in strategic policy 3.3.40.
29. Strategic policy 3.3.38 further specifies how to achieve the directive of strategic policy 3.3.37 for the PAs applicable to ONFs and ONLs through a requirement to:
- a. identify the key physical, sensory and associative attributes that contribute to the values of the Feature or Landscape that are to be protected;*
  - b. describe in accordance with SP 3.3.43, and then rate, those attributes; and*
  - c. assess and record the related landscape capacity for subdivision, use and development activities including but not limited to:*
    - i. commercial recreational activities;*
    - ii. visitor accommodation and tourism related activities;*
    - iii. urban expansions;*
    - iv. intensive agriculture;*
    - v. earthworks;*
    - vi. farm buildings;*
    - vii. mineral extraction;*
    - viii. transport infrastructure;*
    - ix. utilities and regionally significant infrastructure;*
    - x. renewable energy generation;*
    - xi. forestry;*
    - xii. rural living.”*
30. Similarly, for PAs applicable to RCLs, under strategic policy 3.4.41 the following requirements are specified:
- a. identify and describe key public routes and viewpoints both within and in proximity to the Priority Areas (including waterbodies, roads, walkways and cycleways);*
  - b. identify the key physical, sensory and associative attributes that contribute to the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Priority Area;*
  - c. describe in accordance with SP 3.3.43, and then rate, those attributes;*
  - d. assess and record the relationship between the Priority Area and the wider Rural Character Landscape context;*
  - e. assess and record the relationship between the Priority Area and the Outstanding Natural Features within the Upper Clutha Basin;*
  - f. assess and record the relationship between the Priority Area and the Outstanding Natural Landscapes that frame the Upper Clutha Basin; and*
  - g. assess and record the related landscape capacity for subdivision, use and development activities including but not limited to:*
    - i. commercial recreational activities;*

---

<sup>23</sup> This policy was referenced by Mr Krüger as “setting the brief for this work”.

- ii. *visitor accommodation and tourism related activities;*
- iii. *urban expansions;*
- iv. *intensive agriculture;*
- v. *earthworks;*
- vi. *farm buildings;*
- vii. *mineral extraction;*
- viii. *transport infrastructure;*
- ix. *utilities and regionally significant infrastructure;*
- x. *renewable energy generation;*
- xi. *forestry;*
- xii. *rural living.”*

31. In achieving the above outcomes, strategic policy 3.3.43 requires regard to be had to “*physical, sensory (or experiential) and associated attributes*”, as listed in the PDP at 3.3.43(a) to (c).
32. Ms Gilbert confirmed that the structure of the proposed PA schedules has been derived from, and is organised to follow, the strategic policy direction of the PDP outlined above.<sup>24</sup> That is, the proposed PA schedules “...describe the landscape attributes, landscape values (ONFs and ONLs) or landscape character and visual amenity values (RCLs) and the related landscape capacity of each PA...” to assist with the “...protection of identified landscape values of ONF and ONL PAs; and the maintenance and enhancement of identified landscape character and visual amenity values of RCL PAs.”

#### Role and purpose of the schedules

33. Once confirmed, the content of Schedules 21.22 and 21.23, alongside the associated preambles, will assist with administration of the PDP and provide ‘high level’ guidance in relation to the assessment of applications for resource consent(s) when relevant objectives and policies<sup>25</sup> are engaged. Importantly, as Mr Ferguson informed us,<sup>26</sup> it is not the role of the PA schedules to be directive or to set out management aspirations (that is, they do not set policy direction) in relation to landscape capacity for ONFs and ONLs, rather their content simply identifies, describes, assesses and records what is to be protected; while the existing PDP objectives and policies, which remain unchanged through the Variation, provide the necessary strategic direction. Ms Hill also submitted that it was important for the schedules to be descriptive, rather than setting new policy.<sup>27</sup>
34. As noted by Ms Evans in her s 42A Report,<sup>28</sup> the PA Schedules are not linked to specific rules in the PDP, and do not introduce any new resource consent requirements. Rather, the content of the schedules is intended to assist with the assessment of land use and subdivision proposals

<sup>24</sup> Gilbert EIC, para 3.11.

<sup>25</sup> Including, for example: Strategic Objectives 3.2.5.2 (for ONF and ONL) and 3.3.34 (for RCL) of Chapter 3 (Strategic Direction) under Part Two (Strategy); Policies 6.3.3.6 and 6.3.4.6 (relating to the upgrading or development of the National Grid and Regionally Significant Infrastructure) of Chapter 6 (Landscapes – Rural Character) under Part Two (Strategy); and the relevant Assessment Matters (Landscape) 21.21.1-21.21.3 and 21.21.2 of Chapter 21 (Rural Zone) under Part Four (Rural Environment) of the PDP.

<sup>26</sup> Ferguson evidence summary, dated 8 November 2023, para 25.

<sup>27</sup> Anderson Lloyd submissions dated 7 November 2023, at para 5.

<sup>28</sup> Section 42A Report at 4.2.

within the Rural Zone when an application for resource consent is being considered by the Council. However, as Ms Evans also explains, the schedules do provide an element of direction through the *'qualifying comments'* associated with the landscape capacity descriptions.<sup>29</sup> We agree with Ms Evans that these comments should remain in the schedules because they provide useful context and guidance for understanding the capacity ratings.

35. Mr Krüger reminded us that the schedules should achieve what the Environment Court had intended, including:<sup>30</sup>
- *"Overall: improvements in the implementation of s6(b) RMA – "The protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development"*
  - *To afford the identified PA (being those areas that are perceived to be subject to higher development pressure) the necessary attention and protection.*
  - *Instantaneous information on landscape-related content in resource management application processes for experts and lay-people.*
  - *"Simplification" or streamlining of landscape assessment processes.*
  - *More uniform outcomes in expert opinions."*
36. We were informed by various landscape experts, as confirmed in their Joint Witness Statement, that the attributes and values outlined within each proposed schedule are at a necessarily *'high level'* given the wide geographic extent/scale of each PA. As such, site-specific landscape assessments, which accompany applications for proposals requiring resource consent(s),<sup>31</sup> will generally be required to provide more localised and *'in depth'* identification and evaluation of specific relevant attributes and values, informed by the overarching content of the PA schedules. Landscape capacity considerations within the proposed schedules, we were told, have also been undertaken at a *'high level'* and will need to be re-evaluated in the context of each specific application. It was generally agreed by the experts that attended expert conferencing that the PA schedules, and in particular the landscape capacity ratings, are not a substitute for a site-specific landscape assessment at the consenting stage.
37. Importantly, strategic policies 3.3.47 to 3.3.48 of the PDP require the Council to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of Rural Zone provisions (at intervals of not more than two and a half years), in order to check whether Strategic Objective 3.2.5 is being achieved. The content of Schedules 21.22 and 21.23 will assist with this *'Rural Zone Landscape Monitoring'* process.
38. As the assessed landscape values and landscape capacity descriptions in the Schedules represent a *'snapshot'* of the landscape at a particular point in time, we consider it essential that Council plans and conducts regular monitoring in accordance with strategic policies 3.3.47 and 3.3.48, to ensure that the schedules, and in particular the capacity ratings, are updated to take account of the potential cumulative effects of subdivision, use and development over time, together with permitted or consented changes in land use. In this regard, we acknowledge the submission from Federated Farmers of NZ, which stressed the importance of recognising that

---

<sup>29</sup> Evans reply statement at paras 4.1-4.6.

<sup>30</sup> Krüger evidence summary, dated 29 October 2023, at para 14.

<sup>31</sup> As required under strategic policies 3.3.45 and 3.3.46, for example.

the landscape is constantly changing, particularly through *permitted* rural activities that have previously shaped and will continue to shape the landscape.

39. In summary, the Variation proposes the introduction of twenty-nine (29) Priority Area 'landscape' schedules to Chapter 21 (Rural) of the PDP, as Schedules 21.22 and 21.23. Twenty-four (24) Priority Areas relating to ONFs and ONLs are to be included, as listed under strategic policy 3.3.36; and five (5) Priority Areas that relate to RCLs, as listed under strategic policy 3.3.39. The Variation does not propose to change any objectives and policies in the PDP, or seek to introduce new provisions (other than the PA schedules themselves, with associated preambles).<sup>32</sup>

### **Preliminary matters**

40. A number of preliminary matters were considered and decided prior to and during the Hearing, summarised as follows:
- (i) Alleged potential bias and conflict of interest in relation to Commissioner Smith;
  - (ii) The adequacy of Council's consultation with respect to the Variation;
  - (iii) The Panel's scope to consider and recommend changes to the PA boundaries and/or the ONF, ONL and RCL boundaries (collectively referred to as the "mapping amendments");
  - (iv) The adequacy of the s 32 Report;
  - (v) The Partially Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019 (POORPS) and the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 (PORPS);
  - (vi) The relevance of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD); and
  - (vii) Expert Conferencing outcomes.
41. For completeness, the appropriateness of the landscape methodology employed by the Council was also raised prior to the hearing in a number of submissions and memoranda. Our response to this matter is set out in our Minute dated 11 October 2023 (attached as **Appendix 3**) and addressed further in the main body of findings below.<sup>33</sup>
42. We discuss and record our findings on the preliminary matters as follows.

### Alleged Conflict of Interest – Commissioner Smith

43. By way of a memorandum dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 2023, Dr John Cossens challenged the appointment of Councillor and Deputy Mayor Smith to the Panel on the grounds of alleged "*potential bias and conflict of interest*". The grounds giving rise to the allegations related to Commissioner Smith's involvement as a member of the Queenstown Lakes District Council Planning and Strategy committee and, in particular, his participation and voting record in relation to various motions concerning the process surrounding the landscape variations schedules.

---

<sup>32</sup> Evans, section 42 evidence at para 4.4.

<sup>33</sup> Refer to the Minute of the Hearing Panel dated 11 October 2023.

44. Our preliminary views on the allegations were set out in a Minute dated 30 August 2023, which is attached as **Appendix 1** to this Report, at the conclusion of which we invited further memoranda from any other parties that wished to be heard on the matter of Commissioner Smith's alleged bias or conflict of interest. This Minute also noted Commissioner Smith's role as a trustee of the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust (the Trust), and our determination that Commissioner Smith would, as a consequence, not be involved in deliberations or any subsequent recommendations in relation to the Trust's submission.
45. In response to our invitation, a further memorandum on behalf of the Cardrona Cattle Company Limited (CCCL) dated 6 September 2023 was subsequently received. The CCCL memorandum discussed the relevant principles of law in relation to allegations of bias and conflict of interest, and supported the general concerns raised in Dr Cossens' memorandum.
46. Our response to the CCCL memorandum was set out in a Minute dated 14 September 2023, which is attached as **Appendix 2** to this Report.
47. Our findings on the matter of the alleged bias and conflict of interest of Commissioner Smith are summarised as follows:<sup>34</sup>
- (a) Having had regard to the applicable legal principles and authoritative guidance, we concluded that a fair-minded observer would not reasonably think Councillor Smith might not bring an impartial mind to the recommendations, and that no question of predetermination, bias or conflict of interest arises, except as specifically noted in relation to the Trust (as per our Minute dated 30 August 2023) and the particular concerns of CCCL as outlined in its memorandum of 6 September 2023.
  - (b) We determined, applying an abundance of caution, that in addition to not taking part in deliberations and recommendations in relation to the Trust's submission, Councillor Smith would not take part in any deliberations or any subsequent recommendations in relation to CCCL's submission or further submission and, to the extent that it concerns CCCL's submission or further submission, the Councils submission (which CCCL further submitted on).
48. We confirm that Commissioner Smith has not taken part in the deliberations or the formulation of recommendations in relation to the matters raised in the submissions and further submissions of both the Trust and CCCL as they apply to those entities. Commissioner Smith also elected to recuse himself from the hearing during the oral representations and submissions on behalf of CCCL, and in relation to the Gibbston Character Zone generally.

#### Adequacy of Consultation

49. In a second memorandum dated 12 September 2023, Dr Cossens requested that the Panel:
- “(a) Consider the matter of whether the landscape schedule methodology, in particular the community consultation, was fair, reliable, robust and representative.*

---

<sup>34</sup> Minute of the Panel dated 14 September 2023 at 22 to 23.

- (b) Initiate an expert peer review of the consultative method and landscape methodology employed by [Council]; and*
- (c) Allow for submissions to be received on the methodology employed by [Council]"*

50. At paragraph 30 of his memorandum, Dr Cossens outlines the relief sought as follows:
- “(a) To find there is a case to be heard in regard the consultative and landscape schedules methodology employed by the QLDC.*
  - (b) To call for submissions on the matter of the landscape and consultation method employed by the QLDC, and*
  - (c) Once having had the evidence and submissions, determine whether the landscape and consultative methodology was fair, reasonable and provided sufficient information for respondents to make an informed submission on landscape values.*
  - (d) If the Commission finds the consultative process was not fair, then it is submitted the Commission would have no choice in calling for the consultative process to be redone in a more reliable, fair and representative manner.”*
51. For the reasons set out in our Minute dated 11 October 2023, attached as **Appendix 3** to this Report, we declined the relief sought by Dr Cossens with respect to the alleged deficiencies in the Council’s *public consultation* on landscape methodology. We noted, however, that the hearing would consider submissions and expert evidence from all parties on the landscape methodology employed by the Council in formulating the schedules, as part of the statutory process.

Scope to include proposed Mapping Amendments to PA, and ONFL and RCL, boundaries

52. Whether or not the Panel has scope to recommend mapping changes to PAs, which in some cases also extended to corresponding changes to ONF, ONL and RCL boundaries, was a significant issue in relation to this Variation. Ms Baker-Galloway submitted that *“it was a common public/submitter perception and understanding that the mapping of PA boundaries and ONL boundaries are indeed the subject of submissions and the Variation”*.<sup>35</sup> At the hearing she advised that approximately 55, equating to 25% of total submissions received by the Council (excluding further submissions) had requested changes to the PA and/or ONF and ONL boundaries, or alternatively had sought retention of the boundaries,<sup>36</sup> and that this provided strong evidence that the scope of the notified Schedule 1 process was widely understood to include proposed mapping amendments.
53. The relief sought in relation to changes to the PA boundaries included both significant and relatively minor changes to the PA boundaries, in some cases with corresponding changes to the ONF, ONL or RCL boundaries; together with the exclusion of land within non-Rural Zones and Operative Zones from PAs, including Exception Zones and parts of the Gibbston Valley Resort Zone and the Northlake Special Zone.

---

<sup>35</sup> Legal submissions of Anderson Lloyd dated 16 October 2023 at 12.

<sup>36</sup> Refer also to Anderson Lloyd Legal Submissions dated 24 October 2023 at 25.



54. Council's position is that any requested mapping amendments to the PAs, together with the separate PDP ONF, ONL and RCL landscape classification lines, are not within the scope of the Variation.
55. It was not in contention that the Panel, together with the Council in its decision-making role, can only operate within its jurisdiction (scope). Scope is a matter of interpretation by reference to the applicable case law and the notified proposal.<sup>37</sup>
56. The leading authority on scope is *Clearwater Resort Limited v Christchurch City Council*.<sup>38</sup> The High Court's approach was subsequently endorsed in *Palmerston North City Council v Motor Machinists Ltd*,<sup>39</sup> which summed up the required test as follows:

*[80] For a submission to be on a plan change, therefore, it must address the proposed plan change itself. That is, to the alteration of the status quo brought about by that change. The first limb in Clearwater serves as a filter, based on direct connection between the submission and the degree of notified change proposed to the extant plan. It is the dominant consideration. It involves itself two aspects: the breadth of alteration to the status quo entailed in the proposed plan change, and whether the submission then addresses that alteration.*

....

*[91] To sum up:*

*(a) .... [The] approach requires analysis as to whether, first the submission addresses the plan change to the status quo advanced by the proposed plan change and, secondly, there is a real risk that persons potentially affected by such a change have been denied an effective opportunity to participate in the plan change process.*

...

*(d) The first limb of the Clearwater test requires that the submission address the alteration to the status quo entailed in the proposed plan change. The submission must reasonably be said to fall within the ambit of that plan change. One way of analysing that is to ask whether the submission raises matters that should have been addressed in the s 32 evaluation and report. If so, the submission is unlikely to fall within the ambit of the plan change. Another is to ask whether the management regime and a district plan for a particular resource is altered by the plan change. If it is not, then a submission seeking a new management regime for that resource is unlikely to be 'on' the plan change, unless the change is merely incidental or consequential.*

*(e) The second limb of the Clearwater test asks whether there is a real risk that persons directly or potentially directly affected by the additional changes proposed in the*

---

<sup>37</sup> We record here that the Panel did not request "expert evidence" on this jurisdictional matter, as has been assumed by Mr Wakefield and recorded at paragraph 3.4 of the Reply Legal Submissions for Council dated 15 December 2023. Plainly the issue of scope is not a matter of expert evidence, as the Panel is fully aware. Rather, had we determined that the scope of the Variation extended to mapping amendments, the Panel was minded to afford Council's experts the opportunity to respond to the submitter evidence that had been filed and presented prior to and during the Hearing.

<sup>38</sup> HC, Christchurch, AP34/02, 14 March 2003 ("*Clearwater*").

<sup>39</sup> [2013] NZHC 1290 ("*Motor Machinists*").

submission have been denied an effective opportunity to respond to those additional changes in the plan change process.

57. Applying the *Clearwater* test, the Council submitted that:

- (i) Mapping amendments to the PAs, ONFL and RCL proposed by various submitters are not “on” the Variation, and could not have reasonably been contemplated to be within the scope of the Variation, as:
- Any recommended changes to the respective PA, ONFL or RCL boundaries, or the potential for them to be made, were not addressed in the s 32 evaluation and report. On the contrary, the s 32 Report made it clear that the Variation was limited to the *content* of the PA schedules.
  - The public was not notified of any changes to the PA areas, or the potential for such changes, in the Public Notice that accompanied the Variation.<sup>40</sup> The Public Notice expressly references the introduction of PA Schedules 21.22 and 21.23 but makes no mention of the potential for any related mapping amendments.
  - The link to the mapping of the PAs was only referenced (by way of a weblink) under the topic heading “*Landscape Schedules Variation*” to ensure that submitters were aware of the spatial area that the proposed PA schedules would apply to. This does not amount to notification of the PA boundaries, either expressly or by inference. The information on the dedicated webpage for the Variation, which includes the Information Sheet and the s 32 Report, also makes it clear the PA mapping was not part of the Variation.
  - The Variation is not seeking to change the management regime for any ONFs, ONLs or RCLs, or the Rural Zone, other than by introducing PA schedules to guide the operation and implementation of the relevant policy regime for ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes (as the Court determined to be appropriate through Topic 2).
  - The exclusion of the potential for mapping amendments was a deliberate decision of Council, and one that it was plainly within its discretion.
- (ii) No notice of the potential for mapping amendments was given to those who may have otherwise taken part in the proceeding. Accordingly, were the Panel to make recommendations in favour of amendments to the PA mapping and/or ONFL and/or RCL boundaries, this would raise clear procedural fairness concerns. The Council submitted that there exists the real potential that parties that would have, had they known, taken part in the process (including by way of further submissions) could be prejudiced by the making of such recommendations.<sup>41</sup>

58. Counsel for various submitters, together with their advisors and expert witnesses, maintain that a correct interpretation and application of the *Clearwater* tests provides scope for mapping

---

<sup>40</sup> The Public Notice dated 30 June 2022 advising of the proposed variation to the QLDC PDP.

<sup>41</sup> In support of this submission, Council notes in its Reply Legal submissions at 4.11 that a number of submitters have expressed their understanding that PA mapping is not within the scope of the Variation, including the Upper Clutha Environmental Society Inc (submitter #67).

adjustments, at a minimum with respect to the PA boundaries. Their arguments are summarised as follows:

- (i) The decision of the Environment Court to decline to exercise its powers under s 293 to notify the PA mapping and schedules through the Topic 2 process,<sup>42</sup> raised a legitimate expectation that there would be the potential for affected parties to be able to participate at a later date.<sup>43</sup>
- (ii) The values and attributes assessment, which is the focus of the s 32 assessment, is the “*first time*” the values, attributes, character and related capacity of a number of already identified ONLs and ONFs have been considered in detail. Because capacity ratings change over time, it follows that a more detailed assessment undertaken as part of the Variation may also lead to better and “*more defensible*” boundaries, informed by best practice landscape assessment methodology. Accordingly, assessment of the values and attributes of the identified landscapes, and “*consequent mapping of boundaries supported by the values and attributes identification*”, which is an iterative process, is squarely within the ambit of the s 32 report, as envisaged in the *Clearwater* tests.<sup>44</sup>
- (iii) Failure to include mapping amendments, as supported by a more fine-grained analysis, within the scope of the Variation will necessitate the need for any deficiencies to be corrected through another Schedule 1 process, which is neither efficient nor effective.<sup>45</sup>
- (iv) The Variation is not a ‘*narrow*’ or ‘*minor*’ change to the PDP. The PAs are subject to an additional and new “*step*” of planning assessment, against identified values and capacity. Consequently, submissions on this “*new management regime*” must be able to critique the associated spatial areas.<sup>46</sup>
- (v) That the PA overlays were notified or incorporated is supported by Ms Gilbert's references to the “*notified PA mapping*” throughout her evidence, including Appendix 3.<sup>47</sup>
- (vi) Changes subsequently made to the PA mapping after the Topic 2 Court decision by the Council, which is indicated by the differently coloured spatial layers on the Council's website, supports the submitters' position that the PA mapping was notified through the Variation. Importantly, where those mapped areas differ from the Court-ordered boundaries in Topic 2, landowners have had no opportunity for involvement in the “*regulatory change*” to their land.<sup>48</sup> Having had regard to the consequential amendments and in particular the use of Clause 16 amendments,<sup>49</sup> for the Council to

---

<sup>42</sup> *Upper Clutha Environmental Society the Queenstown Lakes District Council* [2020] NZEnvC 158 at [33] and [68]. Interim Decision 2.5.

<sup>43</sup> Anderson Lloyd Legal Submissions on behalf of Passion Developments Limited dated 16 October 2023 at 28 and 29.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid* at 21 to 22. This submission was also supported in the Representations on behalf of CCCL and Milstead Trust dated 13 October 2023 at 10 to 15.

<sup>45</sup> Representations on behalf of CCCL and Milstead Trust dated 13 October 2023 at 13.

<sup>46</sup> Anderson Lloyd, *ibid* at 19, with reference to the decision in *High Country Rosehip Orchards Ltd v MacKenzie District Council* [2011] NZEnvC 387 at [27].

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid* at 25.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid* at 24 to 27.

<sup>49</sup> Anderson Lloyd Submissions dated 24 October 2023 at 25 to 31.

maintain its position that the mapping was not notified would result in a “*flawed and misleading*” process.

- (vii) With respect to the ONF, ONL and/or RCL boundaries, any consequential change to these boundaries as a result of the amended PA boundaries is a matter that is reasonably anticipated to be the subject of submissions (applying the *Clearwater* tests).<sup>50</sup>
- (viii) There is no risk that persons directly or potentially directly affected by the additional changes proposed will have been denied an effective opportunity to respond. Many submitters understood the PA boundaries to be the subject of the Variation and did not seek amendments to those boundaries. Anyone specifically interested in the ONL or PA boundaries could have lodged a submission or further submission, as part of the process.<sup>51</sup>

59. Other submissions raised the issue of natural justice in relation to those submitters that were not involved in the PDP Topic 2 appeals, and consequently were not able to have input into the identification of PAs and schedules. It was submitted that the Variation does change the policy framework or direction, contrary to the s 32 Report and analysis; accordingly the inability to “*look behind*” the Environment Court direction and question the appropriateness or effectiveness of the PAs and accompanying schedules, as a method, unfairly prejudices affected landowners.<sup>52</sup>

#### *Discussion*

60. In explaining our findings on scope, it is important to first set out the background context surrounding the introduction and mapping of the PAs.
61. The appropriateness of the priority area scheduling approach was determined by the Environment Court in Decision 2.2.<sup>53</sup> The Court’s approach envisaged the identification and scheduling of areas of ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes subject to significant development pressure, and the preparation of associated landscape schedules for these areas. It was made very clear by the Court that this approach was not intended to differentiate between the protection afforded to ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes (by the PDP) as between ‘priority’ or ‘non-priority’ areas.
62. Further, the Court was not prepared to allow the Council to decide on the Priority Areas, instead finding that “*these are matters more properly directed by our decision on the evidence such that the priority areas are specified in the relevant Chapter 3 policies for Schedule 1 plan changes*”.<sup>54</sup> In making this determination, the Court held that it would not direct the Council “*to undertake a District-wide landscape assessment, or to progress ONFL values scheduling beyond specified*

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid at 27.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid at 23.

<sup>52</sup> Submission #109 by Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Ltd dated 26 August 2022 at 3.1.

<sup>53</sup> [2019] NZEnvC 205 at [162].

<sup>54</sup> Ibid at [163].

*priority areas, or to revisit the ONFL or RCL overlays on the planning maps*".<sup>55</sup> The Court then set in train a process to identify the Priority Areas, as has been described in the evidence in chief of Ms Gilbert.<sup>56</sup> Ultimately, the PA mapping that accompanied the associated Joint Witness Statement was confirmed in Decision 2.7.<sup>57</sup> The Court recognised that greater clarity was needed as to the geographic boundaries of each listed PA, finding that the balance weighed in favour of having mapping accompany the listing of PAs. In its determination, the Court provided for the Council to elect whether it wished to include the mapping directly in the PDP, or to have it incorporated by reference to a suitable Council file.<sup>58</sup> The Council chose the latter option by way of a Memorandum dated 16 June 2021. We were advised by the Council that it is currently in the process of including the link to the mapping reference file in Chapter 3, as part of a wider workstream to update the PDP provisions to reflect recent Court decisions and consent orders.<sup>59</sup>

63. Under clause 30 of Schedule 1 of the RMA, the Council is of the view that its powers under Clause 16(2) to amend a proposed plan where an alteration is of minor effect, or to correct any minor errors, extends to material incorporated by reference. For any non-minor amendments to material incorporated by reference, that is, changes that are not neutral in effect, clause 31 would be triggered, which requires a variation or plan change for that purpose.<sup>60</sup> We note that the lawfulness of this approach, and the Council's subsequent application of clause 16 to the PA mapping determined through the Court processes, is not a matter that we are required to turn our minds to, as it does not impact on our findings below with regard the scope of the Variation. We comment on this aspect further below.

### *Findings*

64. Applying the first limb of the *Clearwater* test, we find that the mapping amendments proposed by submitters are not 'on' the Variation for the following reasons:
- (i) The Public Notice, together with the s 32 Report and associated material that informed the notification of the Variation, make it unambiguously clear that the scope of the proposal is limited to the content of the Schedules. The s 32 report in particular explicitly states that the Variation does not change any aspect of the identification or mapping of the PAs, nor does it seek to introduce new PAs or delete identified PAs: "*Identification and mapping of the Priority Areas has already occurred and is already set out in Chapter 3 of the PDP and the web mapping application*".<sup>61</sup> We therefore accept the Council's submission that these statements plainly confine the Variation to the *content* of the PA schedules to be included in Chapter 21 of the PDP.
  - (ii) We further consider the submission that Ms Gilbert's references to "*notified PA mapping*" in her Evidence in Chief, which was filed after the submission period closed, to be somewhat disingenuous. It seems plain to us, on a purposive interpretation, that Ms

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid at [164].

<sup>56</sup> EIC Ms Gilbert dated 11 August 2023 at [3.9].

<sup>57</sup> [2017] NZEnvC60 at [26].

<sup>58</sup> Ibid at [13] to [15].

<sup>59</sup> Opening Legal Submissions for Council dated 13 October 2023 at 2.13.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid at 4.2 to 4.3.

<sup>61</sup> Refer s 32 Report at 1.5 and 1.6.

Gilbert was simply referring to the PA maps that accompanied the Variation (by way of a weblink) as a point of reference for submitters. This is supported by the observation that Ms Gilbert's evidence did not directly address the various submissions that had been made with respect to PA (or ONF, ONL and/or RCL) mapping, which would otherwise necessarily have been the case. We observe that had access to the PA mapping not been made readily available by the Council, the ability of submitters to meaningfully participate in the Variation process would have been significantly impeded.

- (iii) While a more detailed assessment of values, attributes and capacity (as informed by best practice landscape methodology) may or may not result in "*more defensible [PA] boundaries*", this was not the purpose of the Variation and, with respect, appears to misinterpret the basis on which the PAs were determined by the Court. The PAs comprise areas that are subject to *substantial development pressure*, which may not necessarily comprise landscapes or part landscapes in their own right. The '*iterative*' landscape process advanced by the submitters does not necessarily, therefore, bear any relationship to the identified PA boundaries, which are for a different purpose (as explained by the Court). We are not aware of any arguments that addressed the absence of significant development pressure within a mapped PA; on the contrary, most if not all submissions, either directly or by implication, sought intensification of subdivision, use and development.
  
- (iv) In any event, the Court has made it plain, supported by the inclusion of Chapter 3 Strategic Policy 3.3.44, that the protection to be afforded to 'Non-PA' ONFL and RCL areas is no less important than an identified PA in terms of the landscape attributes and values (ONFs and ONLs) or landscape character and amenity values (RCLs), or is less vulnerable to subdivision, use and development than a PA. Accordingly, unless we had scope to also change the corresponding ONF, ONL or RCL boundaries, any recommendations that we might purport to make with respect to PA mapping may have little practical effect given the role and purpose of the schedules (which we discuss further in the substantive section of this report below) and in particular the need for a site-specific assessment with respect to any proposed development. The ONF, ONL and RCL boundaries have been determined through robust Court processes, as set out in Decision 2.2,<sup>62</sup> which specifically addressed the Council's ability to re-visit the ONF, ONL or RCL overlays on the planning maps. We do not consider that we have authority to relitigate the Court's decision by adopting what would amount to a very strained approach to the scope of this Variation. Any substantial change to these boundaries will therefore require a Schedule 1 process to be initiated or, in the case of 'minor' changes to the PA boundaries, an appeal to the Council for exercise of its powers under clause 16. We note that as a result of the mapping submissions filed in response to this Variation, the Council has prepared a schedule of proposed minor clause 16 changes to the PAs.<sup>63</sup> While this appears to be an appropriate response by the Council in the circumstances, as set out above, it is not necessary for us to express a view on the *vires* of this method.

---

<sup>62</sup> Decision 2.2 at [164].

<sup>63</sup> Refer Reply Submissions for Council at Appendix 3.

- (v) We also note that, in some instances, substantive relief with respect to mapping amendments has already been sought through (unrelated) Court processes.<sup>64</sup> Council notes that the boundaries at issue in these proceedings have not been re-notified as part of this Variation. For us to purport to make recommendations with respect to PA, or ONF, ONL and/or RCL boundaries on a matter that is currently before the Court would serve no useful purpose, and we agree with the Council that these submissions are tantamount to an opportunistic attempt to relitigate the concerns of those submitters.
- (vi) We have considered whether the Court, in declining to exercise its powers under s 293 to notify the PA mapping and schedules through the Topic 2 process, anticipated the potential for affected parties to be able to ‘participate’ at a later date. While on its face this is a possible interpretation of Judge Hassan’s observations (although in our view there are equally valid interpretations that would confine participation to the content of the schedules), it is also very clear that the Court ultimately left such matters to the Council in its discretionary judgement as the planning authority.<sup>65</sup> As we have found above, the Council chose not to notify the PA maps as part of this Variation on the basis that the PA mapping had been endorsed for incorporation in the PDP by the Court;<sup>66</sup> accordingly, the submitters’ argument falls moot on this point.
- (vii) Finally, we find that nothing turns on the submissions concerning a range of changes to the PA mapping incorporated by reference (as evidenced on the Council’s website) following the Court’s decision on the boundaries of the PAs, together with any confusion arising from the green and yellow spatial overlay mapping layers or the Council’s subsequent clause 16 amendments. While we are cognisant of the potential misperception that may have been raised, in our view any alleged deficiencies in this process do not have any bearing on the matter of jurisdiction under the first limb of the *Clearwater* test, for the reasons outlined above. To find otherwise would be at odds with the express wording used in the s 32 Report and the Public Notice.

65. With regard to the second limb of the *Clearwater* test, we accept the Council's submission that recommendations on the requested PA mapping changes, or any of the separate PDP landscape boundaries, would create significant procedural fairness issues that are unable to be rectified through this process. We concur that any attempt to relocate the PDP landscape lines would amount to a re-litigation of matters progressed and determined through the Topic 2 Court decisions referenced above, which was plainly regarded by some submitters to now be settled and, as such, not a matter that was open for review through this Variation.

66. We note here that a number of the more substantial mapping submissions concerned the ‘carve-out’ of non-Rural zoned land, including Exception Zones and Operative Zones, from the PA

---

<sup>64</sup> Opening Submissions for Council dated 13 October 2023 at 6.30 to 6.34, including Hawthenden [ref]; Cardrona Cattle Company Limited; Sticky Forest; the landscape classification of the Rural Zone outside the mapped extent of the Kimiākau Shotover River ONF with respect to properties located at 111 and 163 Atley Road– refer to Council’s Memorandum regarding Priority Area mapping dated 20 October 2023 at 9 to 11.

<sup>65</sup> Decision 2.2 at [164].

<sup>66</sup> Reply Legal Submissions for Council at 4.23.

Schedules.<sup>67</sup> During the course of the hearing it was generally agreed by all parties that the PA schedules do not apply to non-Rural zoned land. Accordingly, while we do not have jurisdiction to make any changes to the PA boundaries, we concur with the Council that as the schedules plainly do not apply to non-Rural Zoned land located within PAs, including Exception Zones and Operative Zones, there is no specific need to ‘carve out’ the mapping.<sup>68</sup> The application of the PAs (to Rural zoned land only) has been clarified in the preambles for the avoidance of any doubt in this respect.

67. Other submissions of note were concerned with the extension of the PA boundaries into Resort and Urban zoned land; specifically parts of the Gibbston Valley Resort Zone and the Northlake Special Zone. The Council has acknowledged that these minor boundary ‘overlaps’ are anomalous, and that the PA boundaries should logically follow the respective Resort and Special Zone boundaries in these locations. Corrections to the respective PA boundaries through a clause 16 adjustment has been proposed by the Council.<sup>69</sup>
68. Overall, we find that we have no jurisdiction to consider or make recommendations on the PA, ONF, ONL and RCL mapping amendments proposed in submissions and further submissions. As set out above, our scope is limited to the *content* of proposed Schedules 21.22 and 21.23, including the proposed preambles. Although it is possible that some submitters may have harboured a misperception that mapping amendments were ‘on’ the Variation and prepared submissions accordingly, this does not, in our view, impact on our consideration of and recommendations with respect to the schedules and the preambles. We observe, however, that as noted above, a number of the mapping submissions have very helpfully assisted us with clarification of the *application* of the PA Schedules to non-Rural zoned land and, in some cases, will lead to minor adjustments through the Council’s proposed clause 16 process.

#### The Adequacy of the section 32 Report

69. Several submissions allege that the s 32 analysis is inadequate, as it relies solely on the Environment Court’s direction as the reason for the Variation and provides no assessment of options or considered cost benefit analysis. Further, the methodology adopted states that the starting point is the collective decisions of the Environment Court, rather than a zero-based approach. The submitters invited us to consider whether the Variation is the most appropriate method to achieve the Chapter 3 strategic objectives and policies, the costs and benefits, efficiency and effectiveness and risks of implementation; in particular, the use of the proposed schedules against the option of the status quo.
70. As set out above, the purpose of the Variation is to give effect to the Environment Court’s directions as recorded in strategic policy 3.3.42. The scope of the proposal is therefore limited to the content of the schedules, including the way the schedules describe the landscape attributes and landscape values (ONFs and ONLs) or the landscape character and visual amenity

---

<sup>67</sup> These included in relation to Mt Cardrona Station, Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited, Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings 1 LP, Cardrona Cattle Company Limited; RealNZ Limited; Rock Supplies NZ Limited and The Station at Waitiri Limited.

<sup>68</sup> Refer opening submissions of Council at 6.19, which we adopt.

<sup>69</sup> Reply Legal Submissions for Council dated 15 December 2023 at Appendix 3.



values (RCLs), and the related capacity of the landscape within each of the 29 PAs. The Variation does not change any objectives or policies in the PDP or seek to introduce new objectives or policies.

71. We note that in paragraphs 9 to 11 of the s 32 Report, the Council examined the extent to which the proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, noting that the Variation does not propose any new objectives or changes to the existing objectives. The s 32 Report concluded that because the Variation is a direct result of the processes directed by the Court, which was required to adhere to the requirements of s 32, the Variation is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. We are satisfied that this is an appropriate conclusion, and that a “zero-based approach” is neither practicable nor would it necessarily give effect to the Court’s directions, as now codified in Chapter 3.
72. The Council also carried out an assessment of whether the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the objective or purpose of the proposal, noting that this assessment must identify other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives, assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving objectives, including consideration of the benefits and costs anticipated from the implementation of the provisions, and the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions. The required analysis was included in section 11 of the s 32 Report. The Council concluded that there are no other reasonably practicable options to achieve the purpose of the variation or the objectives of Chapter 3 of the PDP, noting that Chapter 3 sets out a clear and direct approach by identifying the PAs, specifying the methodology to be used to identify and describe the values, and setting the date by which notification was required. As such, the Council considered there are no other reasonable options to achieve such a specific direction.
73. Having had regard to the s 32 Report, we are satisfied that the Council’s analysis was adequate, meets the statutory requirements and that no further analysis is required. We further note that the adequacy of the s 32 report was not raised in oral submissions at the hearing.

Partially Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019 (POORPS) and the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 (PORPS)

74. As noted by Ms Evans in her evidence before us, the PORPS is a matter that we must have regard to under section 74(2)(a) of the RMA. The POORPS is the operative planning instrument for the purpose of section 75(3)(c) of the RMA, and must be given effect to. We are satisfied that the proposed schedules are consistent with the applicable PORPS and POORPS policies, where relevant. In this regard, as mentioned earlier in this Report, Mr Farrell helpfully drew our attention to PORPS policy 3.2.4, which requires the identification and maintenance of the values that contribute to the natural feature or natural landscape being outstanding, and policy 3.2.6, which is concerned with managing highly valued natural features, landscapes, and seascapes.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Farrell, 17 October 2023 summary statement.

75. Given the relevant Chapter 3 provisions, and the purpose of this Variation, we agree with the submission of counsel for the Council that it is difficult to see how future decisions on the PORPS would materially impact on our consideration of the content of the PA schedules. Should the PORPS make any significant policy shifts, which would ultimately be reflected in the PDP through a subsequent process, the starting position would necessarily be with the relevant objectives and policies, rather than the content of the PA schedules.

#### Relevance of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD)

76. In his planning evidence for Passion Developments Limited, Mr Richard Kemp considered the NPS-UD to be relevant to the Variation, on the basis that section 1.3 references “*planning decisions ... that affect an urban environment*”, which provides the necessary link between the NPS-UD and the Variation. Mr Kemp also identified a number of objectives and policies of the NPS-UD that he considered relevant to matters addressed by the Variation.<sup>71</sup>
77. Ms Evans comprehensively responded to this issue and her rebuttal evidence, concluding that as the focus of the variation is on section 6 and 7 landscapes (Part 2 of the RMA), and implementing the strategic direction set in Chapter 3 of the PDP, the NPS-UD direction is not material to the Variation. She stated:<sup>72</sup>
- “... urban environment is described in the NPSUD as land that is or is intended to be predominantly urban in character. The Rural Zone (to which the PA schedules directly apply) is not part of the urban environment. In addition, the relevant landscapes are - other than limited exceptions - entirely outside the existing urban environment in the District, which is defined by the mapped Urban Growth Boundary. For these reasons, I consider that the NPSUD has very limited relevance to the proposed variation.”*
78. In his Reply legal submissions for the Council,<sup>73</sup> Mr Wakefield submitted that Ms Evans’s evidence is correct. He noted that the NPS-UD does not, as a policy document, engage with the Rural Zone, or any non-rural environment, unless there is a relevant proposal to rezone land so that it comes within the urban environment. Accordingly, as the Variation addresses the content of new schedules for inclusion in Chapter 21, Rural Zone of the PDP, the NPS-UD is of no relevance.
79. We accept the evidence of Ms Evans and, concurring with Mr Wakefield, find the NPS-UD is not relevant to our consideration of this Variation.

#### Expert Conferencing

80. Expert conferencing of landscape experts and planners, facilitated by Independent Commissioner Ken Fletcher, took place during the week of 2 to 6 October 2023 and resulted in two Joint Witness Statements dated 4 October 2023 (landscape architects only) and 6 to 10 October 2023 (landscape architects and planners). Although not all experts were able to attend conferencing, or only able to attend in part, significant agreement was reached between those

---

<sup>71</sup> Statement of Evidence of Mr Richard Kemp dated 11 September 2023 at 5.1 – 5.6.

<sup>72</sup> Rebuttal evidence of Ms Evans at 4.5 – 4.6.

<sup>73</sup> Reply Legal Submissions of Council at 13.4 – 13.5.

present (which included the Council's experts) with respect to the content of the PA schedules and the preambles.

81. We wish to acknowledge the benefit of the expert conferencing that occurred following the exchange of evidence in chief and before the hearing commenced. This process significantly narrowed areas of disagreement and made the hearing process more efficient than it might otherwise have been had conferencing not occurred. In that regard, we thank the mediator, Commissioner Fletcher and all parties and participants for their role in this process, and in particular for the professional manner in which the conferencing was approached and the clear outcomes that were communicated via the Joint Witness Statements.
82. We note the Joint Witness Statements helpfully recorded agreement amongst experts that:
  - (a) Each PA Schedule has been written to be read in its entirety and selected excerpts should not be read in isolation or taken out of the context of the entire schedule; and
  - (b) Each PA Schedule should be read in conjunction with the associated preamble and not in isolation, particularly because:
    - (i) As the schedules are written at the broad PA level, they are a high-level description and assessment, and any proposed project will be set at a smaller scale within the PA; and
    - (ii) Each proposed project will require a specific landscape assessment that identifies how the project sits within the PA, which attributes and values of the PA are relevant to the project, and an assessment against those values and related capacity.

We acknowledge Mr Farrell's contribution to the Joint Witness Statement, in which it was recorded that: *"...landscape assessments for some proposals may need to assess landscape values beyond those identified in the PA Schedule (e.g. where an identified PA forms only part of a larger ONF/L). This is because ONF/L policy directives tend to apply across the full extent of a ONF/L, not just the extent of a PA."*

83. One of the most significant issues raised in submissions concerned the landscape capacity rating scale adopted by the Council, and in particular the *"no landscape capacity"* rating. This issue was very helpfully largely resolved during expert conferencing (albeit that not all experts were in attendance), and a modified rating scale agreed by those present. In making their recommendation with respect to the rating scale, the experts agreed that within the PAs, the starting position is that, in general, landscape capacity is limited and that the rating scales represent small downward increments from some extremely limited to no landscape capacity.
84. The resulting scale proposed by the Council in Ms Gilbert's rebuttal evidence softened the *"No"* landscape capacity rating so that it reads *"Extremely limited or no"*. In the Council's view, this modification recognises the underlying landscape context of the PAs, and appropriately reflects

the PDP policy direction, within the context of ss 6(b) and 7(c) of the RMA, that regulates land use within the ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes.

85. The two Joint Witness Statements have been of considerable assistance in narrowing the *unresolved* issues between the experts involved in conferencing, which are broadly summarised as:
- (i) Where the ratings of landscape values in the specific PA schedules should be located, and how those ratings should be described; that is, as “*key*” or “*summary*”;
  - (ii) Whether there should be greater articulation of the key physical landscape values, as opposed to the summary approach preferred in the Council’s rebuttal vision of the individual PA schedules;
  - (iii) Whether the phrase “*estimates in unknown future*” should be included in the preambles, when describing the concept of “*landscape capacity*”; and
  - (iv) The approach to defining certain activities described in the schedules.
86. It should be noted that not all issues raised in submissions were able to be addressed through expert conferencing, and we discuss any further significant residual matters later in this Report.

### **Summary of our role in making a recommendation to the Council**

87. Fundamentally, subject to the matter of scope discussed above, we accept the submission of counsel for the Council that our role is to make recommendations on:<sup>74</sup>
- (a) The content of the twenty-four (24) schedules for the PAs located within ONFs and ONLs, being those identified in strategic policy 3.3.36 (forming proposed Schedule 21.22);
  - (b) The content of the five (5) schedules for the PAs within the Upper Clutha RCLs, being those identified in strategic policy 3.3.39 (forming proposed Schedule 21.23); and
  - (c) The proposed preambles to Schedules 21.22 and 21.23.
88. We note here that the word ‘*preamble*’ does not feature in any of the relevant strategic policies, nor, strictly speaking, is there any requirement in the PDP to include a preamble to the schedules. The purpose, scope and content of the preambles was the subject of a large number of submissions and expert evidence, together with discussion at the hearing. Opinions on content ranged from a narrow view of the purpose and content of the preambles, essentially limited to explaining the terms used in the PA schedules, to a wider, more interpretative view that includes comment on the *application* of the schedules to both the Rural Zone and non-Rural zones. We note that the latter approach, if taken to its extreme, may require an

---

<sup>74</sup> Reply Legal Submissions on behalf of Council at 3.1.

interpretation of a number of other strategic objectives and policies in Chapter 3, and potentially other sections of the PDP.

89. An important consideration that was instrumental in informing our approach to the preamble content was the potential audience for the landscape schedules – who are the relevant Plan users, and are the schedules pitched at a level that will be helpful? The Council's view, summarised by Ms Evans,<sup>75</sup> is that the PA schedules are intended to be used to inform landscape assessments. As a result, they will primarily be used by landscape architects to assist plan users and decision makers in relation to plan implementation and, where required, plan development. Ms Evans acknowledged, however, that the schedules will also be read and used by a wide range of other plan users, including landowners and the community more generally, developers, planners, lawyers, and decision makers.
90. In their Reply submissions and evidence, the Council experts addressed our concern that the schedules may be drafted in too technical a manner for users other than landscape experts. Following this review, a number of amendments to the preambles were recommended, as discussed in paragraph 3.5 of Ms Evans's Reply evidence, although no material changes were recommended.
91. Having considered all of the evidence and views expressed by the parties, we are comfortable that the amendments to the schedules strike an appropriate balance between technical content and readability. We are mindful of Ms Evans's caution that any attempts to further simplify the content may run the risk of reducing the utility and intended role of the schedules in informing landscape assessments. We note that the schedules have been developed to meet the requirements of the policy framework in Chapter 3 of the PDP, which requires the PA schedules to identify and describe certain matters, as discussed above. Although the schedules will be of interest to a wide section of the community, we accept that the primary users of the schedules are likely to be landscape architects, as most, if not all, resource consents in PA Rural Zones will require a site-specific landscape assessment that will be informed by the relevant landscape attributes and values described in the PA schedules.
92. We also queried the integration of the PA schedules with the PDP, in particular the strategic objectives and policies in Chapter 3, and whether the preambles were sufficiently clear in this respect. Ms Evans comprehensively addressed this issue in her Reply evidence,<sup>76</sup> and as a result, references to the relevant Chapter 3 strategic objectives and policies have been made throughout the preambles, to provide a clearer link. We are satisfied that the amendments are appropriate and that, on balance, the more interpretive view adopted by the preambles will assist users of the Plan without compromising the integrity of the PDP when read as a whole.
93. Finally, we note that the content of the preambles and the schedules was generally agreed by the landscape architects involved in the expert conferencing, subject to the issues identified above. As such, we have confidence that the schedules are prima facie fit for purpose, subject to our recommendations that follow.

---

<sup>75</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 3.9 to 3.17.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid at 3.6 to 3.8.

94. For the purposes of this Report, we have adopted the Council’s Reply preambles and schedules as our starting point. We note that, as a result of the expert conferencing and discussion during the hearing, many of the material issues have been resolved, as reflected in the updated documents. The discussion that follows is, accordingly, focused on the remaining outstanding issues.

### **Has preparation of the schedules followed an appropriate methodology?**

95. For the purpose of understanding the requirements of Chapter 3 of the PDP, Clause 3.1B.5 f. defines “*Best practice landscape methodology in relation to the identification of landscape values or related landscape capacity...*” as including “*...a methodology produced or recommended by a reputable professional body for landscape architects.*”

#### The methodology followed by the Council

96. Ms Gilbert informed us that the preparation of the proposed PA schedules, including the methodology undertaken and their structure and content, was consistent with the Tuia Pito Ora, New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects, *Te Tangi a te Manu: Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines*, dated July 2022.<sup>77</sup>
97. Ms Gilbert described the methodology that had been followed by the Council in preparing the proposed schedules.<sup>78</sup> While some submitters criticised the methodology that has been undertaken, primarily because it was suggested that the ‘*community voice was not engaged*’, Ms Gilbert was firmly of the opinion that the methodology employed by the Council had been ‘*fit for purpose*’.
98. The process that was used to complete the proposed schedules (as notified) included:<sup>79</sup>
- i. a description of **other expert inputs** into the preparation of the PA Schedules;
  - ii. an explanation of how **associative values** have been addressed;
  - iii. an explanation of how **perceptual values** have been addressed;
  - iv. **other information sources** relied on;
  - v. the PA **Schedule templates**;
  - vi. a description of the **field survey**;
  - vii. a summary of the **peer review process**;
  - viii. the **delineation of ‘landscape character units’** within PAs;
  - ix. the **data sources** that have been relied on;
  - x. any **assumptions** that have underpinned the preparation of the PA Schedules; and
  - xi. the **step-by-step process** that has been used to complete the work.”
99. Following questioning by the Panel as to whether we could view other examples of similar ‘best practice’ landscape assessment methodology where landscape values had been identified, Dr

---

<sup>77</sup> Te Tangi a te Manu.

<sup>78</sup> Gilbert EIC, 11 August 2023, section 4, with reference to the section 32 report (attached as appendix to EIC).

<sup>79</sup> Ibid, paragraph 4.1(d).

Cossens provided us with an example from Banks Peninsula<sup>80</sup> where, in his opinion, effective community engagement had been undertaken. While this information was of interest, it did not convince us that the Council's approach to this particular process was inappropriate or in any way fatally flawed, as he has alleged. In reaching this view we are cognisant of the scale of the exercise before the Council to give effect to strategic policy 3.3.42 in this District, and the resulting limitations of the schedules, which are necessarily at a high level, and which are not a substitute for a site-specific assessment. At the hearing, Ms Gilbert emphasised that an exercise of the scope and magnitude required to give effect to the PDP Chapter 3 requirements has not been attempted in any other region of the country, to the best of her knowledge. Accordingly, while the approach taken has essentially been a pragmatic one, given the time and resources available, the output is nonetheless robust, detailed and of a high quality, and in accordance with best practice. No other examples of similar exercises were brought to our attention that would assist us in this respect.

100. Expert conferencing and the resulting Joint Witness Statements have confirmed general agreement with Ms Gilbert that the process adopted has indeed been 'fit for purpose', noting that not all landscape and planning experts attending the expert conferencing – notably, Ms Lucas and Mr Krüger. We acknowledge where differences remain in the discussion below.
101. We find, accordingly, that the methodology employed by the Council, subject to our findings below, was appropriate given the scale and magnitude of the exercise required, and that the resulting output achieves the purpose of the relevant strategic policies. In reaching this conclusion we are mindful that there may well have been other approaches available to the Council at varying degrees of cost and complexity, that may or may not have resulted in a different or more nuanced outcome.

#### Landscape attributes / values

102. Ms Gilbert identified a potential disconnect in the wording of the PDP when considering landscape attributes and values; acknowledging that some submitters had suggested that relevant attributes should be distinguished separately from values. Ms Gilbert stated that:<sup>81</sup>

*"Best practice landscape assessment acknowledges that landscape attributes and landscape values are inextricably linked, and to understand (and protect) landscape values requires consideration of both landscape attributes and landscape values. Therefore, focussing on identifying and rating landscape attributes only (as suggested by 3.3.38), would amount to 'part of the picture' only and does not align well with best practice landscape assessment."*

103. We also note that the s 32 reporting (methodology statement) refers (at para 2.8) to the explanation within *Te Tangi a te Manu* (at 5.06) quoted below:

*"Landscape values are the various reasons a landscape is valued—the aspects that are important or special or meaningful. Values may relate to each of a landscape's*

---

<sup>80</sup> Banks Peninsula Landscape Study, Final Report, May 2007 (Boffa Miskell for Christchurch City Council (attached to memo from Dr Cossens dated 12 November 2023).

<sup>81</sup> Gilbert EIC, para 6.15.

*dimensions—or, more typically, the interaction between the dimensions. Values can relate to the landscape’s physical condition, meanings associated with certain landscape attributes, and a landscape’s aesthetic or perceptual qualities. Importantly, landscape values depend on certain physical attributes. Values are not attributes but are embodied in attributes.”*

104. Again, we have been guided by the Joint Witness Statements following expert conferencing which does not take this issue further and, as such, we accept Ms Gilbert’s advice to us.

#### *Understanding the values of tangata whenua*

105. The s 32 Report (at para 6.3) references two relevant iwi management plans applicable to the District, a review of which has informed the content of the schedules:

- Kāi Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan 2005
- Te Tangi a Tauria – The Cry of the People.

106. We also note from the peer review undertaken by Mr Coombes for the Council that:<sup>82</sup>

*“Mana whenua input was also provided specifically for the Physical and Associative attributes and values sections of each of the schedules. The Mana whenua attributes and values have been incorporated into the schedules as provided by Kāi Tahu.*

*The Mana whenua values have not been specifically ‘rated’ as requested by Kāi Tahu, but have formed part of the consideration of the overall physical and associative values for each of the schedules.”*

107. The s 32 Report also confirms (at para 5.4) that Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku have contributed to the schedules through collaboration with Kāi Tahu Ki Otago.

#### At an appropriate landscape scale

108. We acknowledge that the scale and spatial extents of the identified PAs have already been defined through the Court process – these being necessarily broad in scale, noting that a site specific case-by-case assessment will still be required, with the schedules providing guidance for these application specific assessments. We also acknowledge that there is a tension between these two extremes of scale, particularly when determining landscape capacity.

109. Mr Krüger raises criticism that the methodology followed by the Council does not conform with the PDP,<sup>83</sup> which states that assessment be at “*an appropriate landscape scale*”, rather than following the ‘*pre-defined*’ PA scale. He suggested to us that the Council’s approach is “*dangerous*” because these areas (Priority Areas) are not necessarily a defined landscape and that “*...the PAs are rather arbitrarily delineated geographic areas . . . they have little to no relation with the landscapes they were designed to serve.*” In his opinion, it was open to the Council to adopt a ‘landscape scale’ approach, which he considered would provide more

---

<sup>82</sup> Appendix E to the Council’s s 32 Report.

<sup>83</sup> At strategic policy 3.3.40.



appropriate information that is “*useful for the purpose*”. In this respect, he noted that PAs could comprise a number of discrete landscapes.

110. Ms Gilbert acknowledges that the PAs, which contain predominantly ONLs, are not necessarily the whole extent of a related ONL, as they are focused on areas where there is significant development pressure. Messrs Espie and Vivien also acknowledged that the PAs applicable to an ONL may be subsets of the landscape and not landscapes in themselves. These findings are shared by the experts that participated in conferencing, as recorded in the Joint Witness Statements.
111. On a related note, helpfully the legal submissions from Mr Ashton (on behalf of Queenstown Park Limited)<sup>84</sup> emphasise that “*[w]hile landscape scale is an important consideration, particularly when addressing expansive PAs that have discrete landscape units within them, it is unavoidable that descriptions of Landscape Values and Capacity will reference relatively specific parts of ONL and ONF.*”
112. While we have some sympathy with Mr Krüger’s views, we have found that the scale of PAs that has been utilised to inform the schedules is appropriate, primarily because it is clear to us that the identification of values for each PA has been informed by detailed analysis at a variety of landscape scales (some being detailed and some being wider than the PA extents). While it may have been possible to ‘re-frame’ the scale of each PA, particularly those that relate to ONLs, we have concluded that the Council has undertaken the required analysis and prepared the values and capacity identification for each PA at an appropriate landscape scale.
113. During our deliberations on this matter, we concluded that the proposed names for each of the PA schedules is potentially misleading. As proposed, each of the schedule titles includes either a reference to ONL, ONF or RCL. In our minds, this ‘labelling’ potentially misleads readers of the schedules into thinking that the PAs are in themselves complete ONLs, ONFs or RCLs. In reality, as was explained to us during the hearing, while some PAs might comprehensively relate to a single landscape unit (most commonly those related to ONFs), the majority of the PAs relate spatially to wider ONL, ONF and/or RCL landscape units. We therefore recommend, as set out in the attached tracked-change versions of the schedules, that the names of each PA schedule be amended to remove any references to ONL, ONF or RCL. We have also made minor changes to the introductory section of relevant schedules to reflect the changes to the titles, and to reinforce that the schedules relate to the defined PA as a part of a wider ONF, ONL or RCL.
114. At paragraph 7.2 of her Reply evidence, Ms Evans helpfully noted that the PA mapping is different to the landscape classification line (LCL) mapping in the PDP that identifies ONL boundaries, and some ONF boundaries. Rather, the PA mapping is intended to show the spatial extent of the PAs that each schedule applies to. Ms Evans noted that in most cases for ONL PAs, the PA mapping aligns with the LCL. However, there are PAs that comprise a smaller part of a much larger ONL, where the boundary of the PA may not necessarily coincide with the LCL

---

<sup>84</sup> Dated 18 October 2023, at para 1.8(a).

mapping. She also observed that it is not uncommon for an ONF to be nested within a wider LCL, such as the Kimiākau Shotover River ONF.

115. Ms Evans pointed out that *“whether a PA is an ONF or ONL”* is described in strategic policy 3.3.36. In her view, the schedule that matches the name of the mapped PA (as set out in the policy) should be used, to assist with clarity and certainty. While we respect Ms Evans’s view, we do not believe that removing the references to ONF, ONL or RCL in the headings will cause any confusion with the strategic policies, given the taxonomy, description and structure of the schedules that has been adopted by the Council, together with the amendments that we have suggested to the opening paragraphs. On balance, we consider that our preferred approach will avoid any confusion where PAs include areas of both ONF and ONL, and better assist users to interpret the content of the schedules.

### Landscape capacity

116. Ms Gilbert informed us that a consideration of landscape capacity was not usually a consideration when undertaking ONL, ONF and/or RCL values assessments. However, in this instance, it is a requirement of the PDP, stemming from a Court directive, that landscape capacity be assessed for each of the PAs.
117. Ms Gilbert advised us verbally at the hearing that assessments as to whether there is capacity in a landscape to accommodate change through further development are usually undertaken in the context of the consideration of a specific application for resource consent(s). As such, the landscape capacity determination associated with this proposed Variation is somewhat of a new process for a landscape assessment task.
118. The Upper Clutha Environmental Society Incorporated submission supported the inclusion of *“development capacity ratings”* in the schedules, noting that these represent the key mechanism required by the Court to ensure protection and maintenance of landscape values. The Society observed that *“the schedules proposed in the variation have been carefully prepared for the Council by expert landscape architects in a disinterested manner”*, whereas *“the vast majority of submissions opposing the development capacity limits in the schedules are from landowners who will gain financially from more permissive development capacity provisions”*.<sup>85</sup>
119. Mr Krüger, on the contrary, recommended removing the landscape capacity section from the schedules altogether, as in his opinion the concept can only be assessed when a specific development proposal is being considered. Given that a site specific assessment will always be required, in his view there was no need to *“consult ‘high level’ assumptions”*. He also suggested that the proposed landscape capacity assessment ‘goes against’ the guidelines of *Te Tangi a te Manu*.<sup>86</sup>
120. In a similar vein, Mr Farrell was of the initial opinion that *“the framework is going to be of less assistance than it could have been”*, as no proposals for resource consent will be at the PA scale,

---

<sup>85</sup> Submission of UCESI at 11 to 13.

<sup>86</sup> Krüger evidence summary, dated 29 October 2023, at paras 17-21.

and that accordingly, the capacity ratings will not offer any meaningful assistance.<sup>87</sup> He considered the utility of the landscape capacity ratings to be questionable unless they can be relied on – “*and if they cannot be relied on, they do not achieve the intent of the strategic policies*”. Mr Farrell was also concerned that the failure of the landscape capacity ratings to provide “meaningful assistance” would create unreasonable and unnecessarily high financial costs and uncertainties on parties wanting to understand or debate what landscape capacity actually means for a property. We note, however, that in his summary evidence presented at the hearing, Mr Farrell generally supported the preambles agreed by the experts. Although he remained of the view that the landscape capacity ratings do not implement strategic objective 3.2.5.1, and strategic policies 3.3.29 and 3.3.38(c), he advanced what we consider to be a pragmatic view, stating: “*but the combination of the high-level approach followed by separate site-specific assessment is probably the most appropriate option given the extent of work actually required to determine landscape capacity at localised or site-specific scale*”.

121. On a related note, Mr Farrell recorded in the Joint Witness Statement that “*Schedule 24.8 Whakatipu Basin Landscape Character Units*” includes the term “*Capability to absorb additional development*”, which he suggests has “*effectively the same meaning as “Landscape Capacity”*”. While this is an interesting point, we do not have the benefit of evidence to test this observation; accordingly, we prefer to concentrate on the task at hand, as directed by the strategic policies, of confirming ‘Landscape Capacity’.
122. We return to our earlier observation, helpfully highlighted to us by Ms Evans, that the term ‘Landscape Capacity’, as this relates to ONFs, ONLs and RCLs, is as defined in strategic policy 3.1B.5 b, which states the following:<sup>88</sup>
- “*Landscape capacity*’:
- i. *in relation to an Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape, means the capacity of a landscape or feature to accommodate subdivision and development without compromising its identified landscape values;*
  - ii. *in relation to a landscape character area in a Rural Character Landscape, means the capacity of the landscape character area to accommodate subdivision and development without compromising its identified landscape character and while maintaining its identified visual amenity values;”*
123. Paragraph 9a of the Joint Witness Statement of the planning and landscape experts noted the starting position of the PAs is that, in general, landscape capacity in ONFs, ONLs and/or RCLs will be limited. This was further highlighted by Mr Bentley when he summarised his evidence to us in person, describing the reality that landscape capacity ratings for development within each PA is currently at the lesser end of the spectrum; with even “*some landscape capacity*” (the highest description in the schedules) meaning ‘*some landscape capacity within the context of an already limited capacity*’.

---

<sup>87</sup> Brief of Evidence of Mr Farrell at 16.

<sup>88</sup> PDP clause 3.1B.5(b).

124. The legal submissions from Mr Ashton (on behalf of Queenstown Park Limited)<sup>89</sup> emphasised that “*[f]ine grained assessment will be required to identify the particular Landscape Values engaged by a proposal and the same is true of the related Landscape Capacity. The schedule is therefore a relevant consideration but not the end point for proposal specific assessments.*” Mr Ashton suggested to us that the landscape capacity statements should be somewhat directive in order to ensure the outcomes sought (such as landscape restoration) could be achieved.
125. Legal submissions from Ms Hill, Counsel for the Office for Māori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti (provided by way of memorandum dated 16 November 2023), pointed us to the Bay of Plenty Regional Coastal Environment Plan, which contains an example of landscape capacity of an ONL in Schedule 3 relating to the Matakana Island ONL (noting that this has only a fleeting reference to landscape capacity and the concept is to be applied quite differently to that in the PDP context).
126. While we appreciate the professional opinion of Mr Krüger, ultimately the PDP directs a consideration of landscape capacity within the schedules and, accordingly, the Council is required to include such a consideration as an integral component of the schedules.<sup>90</sup>

### **Is the structure of the proposed schedules appropriate?**

127. Expert conferencing and the resulting Joint Witness Statements have confirmed that the overall structure of the proposed schedule documents is appropriate; however, there remained two significant areas of expert disagreement over terminology – that is: whether the use of the word “*important*” is required as a heading for the identified values; and whether the section that is titled “*summary of landscape values*” should be titled “*key landscape values*”.
128. In addition to these two issues, there was some disagreement amongst experts regarding the recording of landscape values due to the confusion between negative and neutral attributes, and key values.<sup>91</sup> Ms Lucas was strongly of the view that the inclusion of selected neutral and negative attributes is unhelpful.<sup>92</sup> She cited the example of “*identified pests*” as an example of a negative attribute, expressing concern that this may invite applicants to offer ways to address pest problems to gain development consent. As a solution, she proposed a “*traffic light*” rating to clarify but not “*clutter*” the PA schedules.
129. In her Reply evidence, Ms Gilbert addressed the references to neutral and negative landscape attributes and values, and suggested a number of refinements to the PA structure and the preambles to assist Plan users,<sup>93</sup> which we respectfully adopt. We are satisfied that the proposed amendments adequately address the issues raised by Ms Lucas, in that the additional text to be inserted into the preambles will avoid any confusion that the positive attributes and values are landscape elements deserving of protection, and will also avoid the impression that

---

<sup>89</sup> Dated 18 October 2023, at para 1.8(d).

<sup>90</sup> Refer strategic policies 3.3.37-3.3.38 and 3.3.40-3.3.41.

<sup>91</sup> As noted in the Joint Witness Statement of the landscape experts.

<sup>92</sup> Evidence of Ms Lucas dated 6 November 2023 at 4.

<sup>93</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Gilbert at 3.3.

the PA schedules have locked in existing land uses, or promote the retention of negative landscape attributes and values.

#### Reference to identified attributes and values as “Important”

130. Ms Lucas, who was not part of the expert conferencing discussion, did not support inclusion of the word “*important*” being used in the titles for each identified value under each schedule, which she considered was “*inappropriate and unnecessary*”.<sup>94</sup> Ms Smetham agreed with the views of Ms Lucas in this respect.
131. Ms Gilbert<sup>95</sup>, supported by Mr Head, did not agree with Ms Lucas and Ms Smetham about the suggestion to remove the word “*important*” from the structure of each schedule document.
132. We also note that PDP strategic policy 3.3.38(a) uses the word “*key*” when requiring the identification of “*...physical, sensory and associative attributes that contribute to the values of the Feature or Landscape that are to be protected*” for PAs with ONF and ONL considerations; and PDP strategic policy 3.3.41(b) also uses the word “*key*” when requiring the identification of “*physical, sensory and associative attributes that contribute to the landscape character and visual amenity val[u]es*” for PAs with RCL considerations.

#### *Findings*

133. While we acknowledge that the schedules do provide a synthesis of a wider body of information relating to landscape attributes and values, we do not agree with Ms Gilbert that it is necessary to include the word “*important*” in the topic headings of the schedules. There is also a current anomaly in the schedules where the mana whenua values are not predicated on such a title, which we understand followed a request from Auhaka prior to notification of the Variation.
134. As such, we recommend that each schedule be amended to remove the “*important*” references from each of the value headings. We have also suggested additional text within the preambles which highlights the fact that there could well be additional values beyond those stated, with these comprising the “*key*” attributes and values of each identified PA.

#### “Summary of landscape values” or “key landscape values”?

135. Messrs Espie and Vivien and Ms Smetham prefer the use of the term “*key*” landscape values rather than the term “*summary*” within each schedule in the provision of an overview synopsis of all identified attributes and values. During expert conferencing an ‘exemplar’ alternative for one of the schedules (21.22.12 PA ONL Western Whakatipu Basin) was prepared by Mr Espie and Ms Smetham to test their thinking. In addition, under the “*key landscape values*” section of the schedules, the ‘exemplar’ alternative provided a greater description of physical values than was outlined in the notified version of the schedule being tested.

---

<sup>94</sup> Evidence of Ms Lucas dated 6 November 2023 at 7.

<sup>95</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Gilbert at 3.6 to 3.8.

136. Mr Brown, Ms Gilbert and Mr Head disagreed with this approach, recommending that “summary” is a more appropriate term than “key”.
137. Ms Gilbert prefers to keep the structure of the schedules as proposed,<sup>96</sup> noting that all physical values recorded in the schedules are important (i.e. these can’t be summarised because they are the foundation of the landscape values recorded under each schedule). Ms Gilbert clearly set out her reasoning for this preference in evidence stating:<sup>97</sup>

*“The PA Schedules also deliberately state in the ‘start’ of the Summary of Landscape Values that the summary draws from the “combined physical, associative and perceptual attributes and values” described in the preceding part of the PA Schedules (i.e. the more detailed explanation of Physical, Associative and Perceptual attributes and values in the main body of each PA Schedule).*

*In my opinion, these two aspects are critical to the correct interpretation of the PA Schedules by plan users. They signal the interrelationship between attributes and values and the importance of reading the PA Schedules as a whole, rather than simply focussing on the relatively brief Summary of Landscape Values which have been distilled down from the more complex description of landscape attributes and landscape values in the main body of the schedule.”*

The above position is reiterated in Ms Gilbert’s Reply evidence.

### *Findings*

138. While we understand and can appreciate the suggestions and evidence provided to us by Messrs Espie and Vivien and Ms Smetham, we have concluded that the current use of the word “summary” in this section of the schedules is preferable to the word “key”. We observe that the main body of the schedules contains the most relevant account of each PA’s important, or ‘key’, landscape attributes and values and that the summary is somewhat of a repeat of some of those ‘key’ attributes and values, albeit possibly an incomplete account. In relation to physical attributes and values, for example, this component of the landscape is unlikely to change over time and does not need to be summarised; rather, the main body of the schedule will provide the most assistance to plan users when considering the physical attributes and values of a landscape within the extent of a particular PA. We observe that, in many instances, it is the physical geographic attributes and values of a landscape that provide an important base from which to derive perceptual and associative values.
139. For completeness, we also deliberated as to whether the provision of a summary was necessary at all. On balance, we consider that the summaries, as proposed in each of the PA schedules, is helpful to plan users, noting also that there was no expert evidence that called for it to be excluded from the PA schedules entirely.
140. We therefore do not envisage any issues adopting the structure of the schedules proposed by the Council, and as has been agreed by most landscape experts during conferencing.

---

<sup>96</sup> Gilbert 13 October 2023 summary of evidence, paragraph 14.

<sup>97</sup> Gilbert EIC, 11 August 2023, paragraphs 6.17-6.18.

## Is the content of the proposed preambles helpful and appropriate?

### Application - reference to Exception Zones

141. The version of the proposed preambles text that accompanied the Council's Reply submissions and evidence included the following explanatory text as to how the schedules will apply:

#### **2. Application**

2.1 *The PA schedules have been prepared to reflect that the PA mapping extends beyond the Rural Zone. The application of the PA Schedules to resource consents is as follows:*

2.1.1 *The PA Schedules apply to any proposal requiring resource consent for a restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity [Refer to Strategic Policy 3.3.46] in the Rural Zone, including the Rural Industrial Sub Zone, but not the Ski Area Sub Zone (see 2.1.2 below).*

2.1.2 *The PA Schedules do not apply to proposals requiring resource consent in any other zone, including Exception Zones [Refer to Chapter 3 part 3.1B.5(a)]. They may inform landscape assessments for proposals involving any land within a PA but are not required to be considered.*

2.2 *The PA Schedules will be used where relevant for any plan development proposal.*

142. We note that there was some disagreement in the Joint Witness Statements (by Messrs Devlin and Espie) over the applicability of the schedules to land within a PA that is not zoned Rural. Ms Gilbert and Mr Head responded to these issues in their evidence as part of the Council's Reply, as did Ms Evans. For example, we note that with regard to land within a PA that is zoned 'Open Space', Ms Evans confirmed that while this land is not an Exception Zone, as it is not listed in 3.1B.5 a. of the PDP, it nonetheless follows:<sup>98</sup>

*"... that the PA Schedules are not directly relevant to proposals in the Open Space Zone (see section 2 of the Preamble), but like other non-Rural Zones, the PA Schedules may be referred to for proposals within the Open Space Zone (however this is not mandatory)."*

143. Ms Evans's approach above, which is consistent with the relevant strategic objectives and policies of Chapter 3 of the PDP that direct the preparation of landscape schedules for land within the Rural Zone only, also logically extends to other non-Rural zoned land that falls within a PA (but is not listed as an Exception Zone in 3.1B.5 a), including other PDP Special Zones (Chapter 45, Gibbston Valley Resort Zone and Chapter 46, Rural Visitor Zone) and Operative Plan Special Zones, including Mount Cardrona Station and Northlake.

144. In response to questions that we raised regarding the Rural Visitor Zone (RVZ) (which includes land that is part of the rural environment and part of the same landscape within the relevant PA) around how the schedules would apply to development proposals in that zone, on Day 2 of the hearing Mr Wakefield provided us with a very helpful explanation of how the RVZ provisions have been developed. Essentially, as we understand it, the RVZ Chapter 46 provisions, which

---

<sup>98</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 3.29.

apply to very small parcels of land, are quite different by design to those of the Rural Zone, in that they provide for a closely defined set of activities and the requirement to identify landscape sensitivity areas with limits on the bulk and scale of buildings. As such, the RVZ provisions ‘self-regulate’ and capture and give effect to the strategic direction of Chapter 3, including fundamental protection of landscape values, such that the RVZ does not need to be listed as an Exception Zone in in 3.1B.5 a). Having said this, Mr Wakefield acknowledged that the schedules could still helpfully be referenced to assist with the preparation of assessments of landscape effects for proposals requiring resource consent.

145. In our view the wording in the preambles, and in particular 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, is now sufficiently clear. We agree with Ms Evans that attempting to list all of the zones that the PA schedules *do not* apply to is neither efficient nor necessary, and may lead to unintended consequences.
146. We note that Ms Lucas challenged the inclusion of the wording of 2.1.2 of the preambles and suggested the deletion of the words “*but are not required to be considered*”. While we agree that these words are prima facie superfluous, we do not accept that they are confusing. We are mindful that this wording was agreed by those experts that attended the expert conferencing, as recorded in the Planning Joint Witness Statement and, accordingly, are comfortable with the weight of evidence in this respect.
147. Mr Giddens considered it desirable to make it absolutely clear in the preamble text as to how the Exception Zones are to be administered. Mr Ferguson also suggested further changes to strengthen an understanding for plan users as to how the “*landscape capacity*” ratings within each schedule were to be administered,<sup>99</sup> having a clear reference back to strategic policy 3.3.46,<sup>100</sup> and with reference to the Exception Zones listed in 3.1B.5 a.<sup>101</sup>
148. Mr Gardner-Hopkins suggested to us that the Exception Zones should be removed from the PA mapped areas in their entirety; however, for the reasons set out earlier in this decision around scope, we do not consider this to be a course of action that is open to us, instead preferring to utilise the preamble text to explain how the schedules are to be administered for Exception Zones.
149. In her Reply evidence, Ms Evans provided a well-considered response to the remaining matters raised by submitters,<sup>102</sup> and suggested further changes to the preambles (as reflected in the above extract), to assist in making it clear as to how the schedules are to be applied to the Exception Zones. We are grateful for the time and effort by the Council team in reviewing and, where appropriate, adjusting the wording of the preambles in response to submitter concerns, which has improved the clarity of the preambles and PA schedules.<sup>103</sup>
150. Having had regard to the issues raised by submitters and the Council’s subsequent detailed and considered responses, we record that we are generally comfortable with the wording of the

---

<sup>99</sup> Ferguson summary evidence, para 20.

<sup>100</sup> Ferguson summary evidence, para 15.

<sup>101</sup> Ferguson summary evidence, paras 17-20.

<sup>102</sup> Evans reply evidence from para 3.2.

<sup>103</sup> As set out in Ms Evans’s Reply evidence at 3.30 to 3.31.



preambles included within the Council’s Reply submissions and evidence (subject to our further discussion below). Our recommendation, therefore, is that the content of the preambles is now very clear, noting that the wording has been considerably strengthened through various inputs during expert conferencing and through changes that have been made throughout the hearing process in response to evidence and submissions.

### Landscape capacity descriptions

151. At the hearing, Mr Ferguson expressed a view that the landscape capacity descriptions may be straying into policy, for example by touching on landscape outcomes, or requirements for enhancement.<sup>104</sup> He cited the landscape capacity description for rural living in the West Wānaka schedule as an example.
152. Ms Evans addressed this issue in her reply evidence.<sup>105</sup> She explained her understanding that the qualifying comments in the landscape capacity descriptions are intended to provide the *context* in which each activity may be appropriate, at a PA scale, to provide helpful guidance to plan users. The descriptions are based on a review of the characteristics of the existing environment, including consents for development within each PA. Were these comments to be removed, in her opinion the landscape capacity ratings would lose this context, and the PA schedules would effectively provide a rating only. Ms Evans considered that the latter approach could lead to potential risks, including that of being more determinative, which is inconsistent with the role of the PA schedules and the landscape capacity descriptions to provide high level guidance. Further, if the qualifying comments were not included, the landscape capacity ratings may need to become more restrictive to reduce the risk of inappropriate activities being established.
153. Having considered the evidence, we agree with Ms Evans that it is important to find a balance between providing useful context for the landscape capacity ratings, so that the schedules guide the type of activity that may be appropriate, and providing a more “*blunt*” rating. We accept her advice that assessing landscape capacity naturally includes consideration of the context in which an activity may be appropriate.
154. We are cognisant that there is no express direction in Chapter 3 to provide qualifying comments when providing “*the record of the related landscape capacity*” required by strategic policies 3.3.38 and 3.3.41. We accept Ms Evans’s evidence that when considered against the definition of landscape capacity in 3.1B.5 b., a record of landscape capacity should provide some guidance as to when the ‘threshold’ is reached such that identified landscape values could be compromised. We note that the recommended qualifying comments are intended to work in a similar way, although they describe potentially appropriate activities that would not compromise landscape values.

---

<sup>104</sup> Summary Statement of Mr Ferguson presented at the hearing, at 21 to 28.

<sup>105</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 4.1 to 4.6.

155. For the reasons set out above, we are comfortable that the landscape capacity ratings in the Reply version of the preambles, subject to our further amendments below, strike an appropriate balance without straying into policy.
156. The majority of issues concerning the structure of the proposed landscape capacity terms and associated descriptions was agreed during expert conferencing, including the significant change to amend an earlier “no capacity” rating, which we note Mr Gardner-Hopkins likened to an “avoid type directive”, to “extremely limited to no capacity”. There were, however, a few continuing concerns expressed by submitters over the wording of the rating scale descriptions, primarily associated with the “extremely limited to no capacity” rating.
157. In their legal submissions, Anderson Lloyd (representing a number of submitters),<sup>106</sup> as well as Messrs Bentley and Farrell who provided similar sentiments in their respective evidence, suggested to us that:
- “... there may be 'exceptions where occasional, unique, or discrete development protects identified landscape values' is contrary to the intended nature of the schedules as a 'starting point' which does not preclude future site-specific assessment of case-by case proposals” and that changes since expert conferencing may have “the effect of undermining or unravelling other agreements reached through schedule-specific joint witness statements, in particular where those were agreed to...”*
158. Having considered the evidence in relation to the proposed wording of the preambles, we prefer the Reply evidence of Ms Gilbert,<sup>107</sup> as set out at paragraphs 4.8 to 4.11, supported by the submissions and evidence on behalf of the Upper Clutha Environmental Society, which we respectfully adopt. That said, and without taking away the thrust of the descriptions or making any wholesale amendments,<sup>108</sup> which we are generally comfortable with, we recommend making the following ‘wordsmithing’ changes in relation to how landscape capacity is described at paragraphs 4.5 of each of Schedule 21.22 and 21.23:

4.5 For the purposes of the PA Schedules, landscape capacity is described using the following five terms:

**Some landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which a careful or measured amount of some sensitively located and designed development of this type is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is near its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values and where only a small-limited amount of sensitively located and designed development is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Very limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is very close to its capacity to accommodate

<sup>106</sup> Anderson Lloyd legal submissions, dated 7 November 2023, at para 4(c)-(d).

<sup>107</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Gilbert dated 15 December 2023 at 4.4 – 4.11.

<sup>108</sup> Mr Wakefield for the Council cautioned us against this temptation primarily because there might be unintended consequences that could run counter to the agreements reached during expert conferencing.

development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only a very ~~small~~limited amount of sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

**Extremely limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is extremely close to its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only an extremely ~~small~~limited amount of very sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

**Extremely limited or no capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is extremely close to, or already at, capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where ~~only either no, or~~ an extremely ~~small~~limited amount of ~~extremely~~very sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

159. In our view, these suggested minor changes are more consistent with the structure of the rating scale, and will aid in providing clarity to the users of the PA schedules, particularly as between the very slight differences of scale in the capacity ratings.

#### Other Areas of Disagreement between the Experts with regard to the wording of the Preambles

##### *“Estimates an Unknown Future”*

160. The Upper Clutha Environmental Society disagreed with inclusion of the phrase “*estimates and unknown future*” in the preambles (which followed expert conferencing), noting that the Council landscape experts also view these words as superfluous, as outlined at paragraph 17 of the planning and landscape experts joint witness statement. Ms Lucas considered that inclusion of the wording may potentially weaken the landscape schedules, and that it should be excluded. Ms Gilbert referenced *Te Tangi a te Manu*, which highlights landscape assessment as being an inexact science. Her preference was to rely on the definition of landscape capacity under Chapter 3 of the PDP, which she considered to be sufficient without the addition of the wording. Mr Bentley also discussed this matter at paragraphs 47 to 50 of his evidence, quoting *Te Tangi a te Manu* (at paragraph 5.49) that an evaluation of (landscape) capacity is ‘*necessarily imprecise because they estimate a future.*’
161. We acknowledge that the majority of planning and landscape witnesses were in agreement that the wording should remain, and that the Council landscape experts noted in the joint witness statement that the inclusion of the wording does not detract from their overall level of comfort with the preambles. However, we have determined that the wording is superfluous and unnecessary, particularly given the monitoring requirements of the Plan in relation to cumulative effects of development over time on the landscape and the specific definition of ‘Landscape Capacity’ at 3.1B.5 of the PDP, which is very clear and could potentially be weakened by the inclusion of these words in the preambles. We have therefore recommended that these words be deleted from paragraphs 4.4 of each schedule.

*“Reasonably difficult to see”*

162. In her Reply submissions,<sup>109</sup> Ms Gilbert advised that having reflected on the issue, she considered the proposed terminology in Schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka PA ONL of *“barely discernible”* could lead to some confusion for Plan users and that it should be amended to *“reasonably difficult to see”*. She noted that the *“reasonably difficult to see”* terminology is used in the PDP in policy 6.3.3.1(b) for ONFs and ONLs, and it also appears in the ODP District wide issues 3(a)(iii) and 5(a)(iii). As such, the long-established use of this terminology means that it is generally well understood by plan users. Mr Head also supported amending the wording contained in Schedule 21.22.21 to *“reasonably difficult to see”*.
163. Mr Krüger expressed a preference for the term *“extremely difficult to see”*, which he considered to be the established test. However, we can find no supporting evidence for this opinion. Accordingly, we prefer Ms Gilbert’s evidence and accept her proposed amendment to Schedule 21.22.21.

#### Activities and Definitions

164. The Joint Witness Statement records the acknowledgement of the experts in attendance that the list of activities in the Preambles is as specified in strategic policies 3.3.38 and 3.3.41, that this list is not exclusive, and that there may be other activities proposed within the PAs that fall outside the listed activities. It was noted that: *“We understand that such proposals will be assessed within the context of the relevant PA, and that a landscape capacity assessment will need to be undertaken against the site-specific landscape that the proposal may sit in.”*
165. Ms Evans comprehensively discussed the listed activities and definitions that remained in issue in her Reply evidence.
166. With regard to the list of activities, we accept Ms Evans’s advice,<sup>110</sup> and do not propose to add any further activities to the list of activities specified in the relevant policies. We agree that it is not efficient to list every similarly consented activity with the PAs, such as distilleries, and that a landscape capacity assessment is not necessary for all potential activities, particularly as non-listed activities will almost certainly require a site-specific assessment during the consenting stage.
167. We comment on specific matters as follows:

#### *Earthworks*

168. In response to suggestions in evidence from Mr Greaves, the *“earthworks”* activity descriptions in various schedules have been amended in the Council’s Reply version to be more explicit when differentiating between different types of earthworks activities, including in relation to tracks and trails for mountain biking (as discussed further below). We note that Ms Evans acknowledged that earthworks for tracks and trails would be a consenting trigger that highlights

---

<sup>109</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Gilbert dated 15 December 2023 at 3.14 to 3.17.

<sup>110</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 5.19 and 5.20.

the need for landscape consideration. We also acknowledge that the submissions from the Queenstown Mountain Bike Club, Bike Wānaka and the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust highlighted this issue as potentially lacking the necessary clarity without further refinement. We recommend a slight further change to these references (as suggested by Mr Greaves) by amending any references to “downhill” mountain bike trails, to “downhill/gravity” mountain bike trails.

### *Tracks and Trails*

169. The Council acknowledged in their Reply legal submissions that there was a degree of inconsistency with the approach to tracks and trails the schedules.<sup>111</sup> To provide clarity, Ms Gilbert and Mr Head recommended amendments to the PA schedules so that:<sup>112</sup>

- (a) Tracks and trails are referenced under the ‘earthworks’ capacity subheading only, and not under ‘transport infrastructure’; and
- (b) the terminology used refers to tracks and trails for recreational use throughout all PA schedules.

Ms Gilbert and Mr Head suggested that these changes would assist to provide greater clarity for plan users and avoid confusion.

170. We agree with Council that including tracks and trails under the “earthworks” subheading is appropriate, given that resource consent for tracks and trails will more often be required in the Rural Zone where earthworks standards are infringed. We also accept Council’s advice that the creation of a new definition for recreational tracks and trails was not necessary, given that the PA schedules are intended to provide high level guidance. We also accept the updated wording of the schedules in relation the landscape capacity of ‘earthworks’ for tracks and trails, as suggested by Ms Gilbert (at paragraph 3.22 of her evidence in reply).

### *Rural living, Farm dwellings and Workers Accommodation*

171. We note that “*Rural Living*” has the same meaning as ‘Rural Living’ in Chapter 3 section 3.1B.5 d, which is cross-referenced in the preambles. Importantly, the definition *excludes* residential development for farming or other rural production activities, which correspondingly falls to be assessed on a case-by case basis in order to determine the relevant values/character of the landscape, and the related landscape capacity.

172. Mr Devlin raised concern with what he termed a potential gap, in that the PA schedules do not list capacity for farmhouses. In Ms Evans’s view, farm dwellings were not included in the list of activities in strategic policy 3.3.38 as they were not known to be creating particular development pressure at the time the list of PAs was developed. She further noted that there is no change to the consenting pathway for farmhouses (or any other non-listed activity) and that landscape capacity for this type of activity will continue to be assessed on a case-by-case basis, which she considered to be an appropriate pathway.

---

<sup>111</sup> Reply Legal Submissions of Council at 11.2.

<sup>112</sup> Reply Legal Submissions of Council at 11.2 – 11.5.

173. While we acknowledge Ms Evans’s evidence in this respect,<sup>113</sup> we consider the exclusion of farm dwellings (which are often difficult to practically distinguish from residential development in the rural zones generally) from both the definition of Rural Living and/or the landscape capacity analysis to be problematic. We are mindful that at the hearing, Mr Haworth considered rural living, which he described as “*the real problem*”, to be the main contributor to inappropriate development pressure in ONFs, ONLs and RCLs. His views were indirectly supported by several submitters concerned that no provision had been made in the schedules for farm dwellings associated with family succession.<sup>114</sup> It seems plain to us that this will continue to be an area of ongoing tension (and development pressure) that should be addressed comprehensively in the PDP and in the schedules. Accordingly, we suggest that the exclusion of residential development for farming or other rural production activities from the definition of Rural Living in Chapter 3, and potentially from the PA schedule of listed activities, be subject to review at the first available opportunity under the Chapter 3 monitoring provisions.
174. The challenge of providing accommodation for farm workers was also raised as an issue by several submitters. Ms Evans advised that workers’ accommodation is not defined in the PDP and is generally treated as a residential activity in the PDP for consenting purposes. She was of the view that a proposal specific assessment will be required regardless of whether or not the activity is listed (as it triggers a discretionary activity consent status), and that including landscape capacity for this type of activity is therefore not required. In her view, a proposal specific assessment is appropriate, as the form and scale of this type of accommodation could vary from a standard dwelling to a scale of building that houses a number of individual workers, with potential landscape effects varying accordingly. We accept Ms Evans’s evidence on this point.<sup>115</sup>

#### *Tourism related activities*

175. As recorded in the planning and landscape joint witness statement that was produced following expert conferencing, Ms Shepherd and Mr Farrell retained a degree of uncomfortableness with the term “*tourism related activities*” being listed in the schedules (as part of the wider description of “*visitor accommodation and tourism related activities*”) as an activity for which landscape capacity was to be determined. Both these planning witnesses were of the opinion that the term “*resort*” would be more appropriate because this term is defined within Chapter 2 of the PDP whereas “*tourism related activities*” is not. We were informed by the Council planning and landscape witnesses that, in preparing the schedules when considering this matter, they had in their minds that this activity was indeed akin to the “*resort*” definition. However, strategic policies 3.3.38 and 3.3.41 specifically refer to “*visitor accommodation and tourism related activities*” and the Council has chosen not to amend this reference. Mr Farrell suggested that this option would be open to the Council and that there was no reason, in his mind, as to why this change could not occur.

---

<sup>113</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 5.7 – 5.12.

<sup>114</sup> In particular, various landowners in the 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley RCL PA.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid.

176. In response to this issue, the Council have included a clarification within the preambles of the schedules, under the heading “*Meaning of activities for the purpose of the PA Schedules*”, to specify that “*tourism related activities: has the same meaning as Resort in Chapter 2.*” We understand that Ms Shepherd and Mr Farrell were comfortable with this pragmatic approach and that no areas of disagreement remain for us to make any determination over. As such, we confirm our agreement with the way in which the preambles and schedules address this issue.

#### *Intensive agriculture*

177. An issue arose in response to a matter highlighted in the planning and landscape Joint Witness Statement following expert conferencing (at paragraph 18 of that statement), which recorded a discussion around the definition of activities listed in the preambles where there is an indirect definition elsewhere in the PDP (for example, within Chapter 2).

178. The Panel questioned whether the term “*Intensive agriculture*” in the schedules, which has the same meaning as Factory Farming in Chapter 2 of the PDP, required further clarification. This definition did not appear to correlate comfortably with our understanding of an intensive agricultural activity, which may, for example, utilise pivot irrigators (being a permitted activity in the Rural Zone). We were not assisted greatly in resolving this issue by the Council’s Reply evidence, which suggested that the term “*factory farming*” could be added to the landscape capacity descriptions under the “*intensive agriculture*” heading.<sup>116</sup> The Joint Witness Statement did not assist us either, recording that “*we accept that, while not ideal, these are the best available [definitions], given the activities prescribed in Policy 3.3.38 and Policy 3.3.41.*”

179. We are therefore unable to resolve this issue, as we have no submissions or evidence before us that gives us scope to do so, and we simply record in this recommendation our remaining discomfort with this definition. We suggest that the definition of “*intensive agriculture*” be reviewed in conjunction with the monitoring review required by strategic policies 3.3.47 and 3.3.48.

#### *Renewable energy*

180. The issue of how renewable energy as an activity was to be addressed in the schedules was highlighted during the hearing with representatives of Submitter #96 (Treespace No.1 Limited), as we were told that they may have plans for a small scale renewable energy (solar) generation activity on their property, which is within the Central Wakatipu Basin PA. Messrs Freeman (planning) and Skelton (landscape) suggested that the description of “*renewable energy generation*” within the preambles to the schedules should include reference to “*small-scale community scale*” schemes, which they considered to comprise a scheme that supplies 100 or less residential dwellings.

181. In reply, Ms Gilbert<sup>117</sup> cautioned against including such specificity in the schedules because that would suggest a level of certainty around a defined scale of renewable energy activity (which

---

<sup>116</sup> Evans Reply evidence, para 3.35.

<sup>117</sup> Gilbert Reply evidence at para 3.19.

may include wind turbines, hydro, or solar panel installation). Ms Gilbert also noted that there is a tension between such infrastructure and landscape values, such that the Council would be unwise to signal a comfort with renewable energy generation activity at a particular scale, when the appropriateness of such an activity would need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis through the resource consenting process.

182. In short, we share Ms Gilbert’s concerns and do not accept the submitter’s evidence that the schedules should be amended as suggested by Mr Freeman. We note that the schedules appropriately reference the definition of Renewable Energy Generation under Chapter 2 of the PDP. The National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011 includes direction (at Policy F) for provision for small and community-scale renewable electricity generation activities to be incorporated into regional policy statements and regional and district plans. Were we to agree with the suggestion of Mr Freeman, that would be akin to *‘putting the cart before the horse’* when the PDP has not comprehensively addressed this issue at this point in time. If the Council were to do so, that would be the time to debate the appropriateness of such activities for inclusion within the Plan, including whether specific provisions were required to mitigate adverse effects on identified landscape values, for example.

### *Forestry*

183. The term *“Forestry”* in the list of activities for the purpose of the PA schedules has the same definition as *“Forestry Activity”* in Chapter 2 of the PDP:

*“Means the use of land primarily for the purpose of planting, tending, managing and harvesting of trees for timber or wood production in excess of 0.5ha in area.*

*Plantation Forestry is as defined by the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017.”*

184. Several submitters, and the Panel members, expressed concern that the definition adopted in schedules may inadvertently constrain other forms of ‘forestry’, such as indigenous forest cover for carbon farming. This matter was comprehensively addressed by Ms Evans in her Reply evidence.<sup>118</sup> She noted that the schedules do not seek to change the PDP approach, including the activity status for forestry or indigenous forest cover, or carbon farming. While the presence of existing production forestry is acknowledged as an attribute in several schedules (such as 21.22.22 Dublin Bay ONL), in general the capacity descriptions focus on exotic forestry and remain silent on other forestry activities, including carbon farming. While she did not consider the PA schedules to be constraining on indigenous forestry, Ms Evans noted that the PDP does not seek to specifically manage carbon/native forests in Chapter 21 or Chapter 23. As a result, this activity could potentially default to non-complying status in the Rural zone.

185. Miss Evans also reviewed the implications for the Variation arising from the new National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry, which replaces the previous National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry. She noted that the key difference is that the NES-CF also manages effects from carbon forestry, whether the NES-PF did not. In her opinion,

---

<sup>118</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 5.15 to 5.18.



there is nothing in the NES-CF that presents any inconsistency issues for the PA schedules, noting that the schedules are a “descriptive” tool rather than a management regime.

186. Although we are prepared to accept Ms Evans's advice in relation to the definition of forestry for the purposes of the schedules at this juncture, we suggest that this definition be reviewed at the first available monitoring opportunity, in order that emerging forms of ‘forestry’ land use, such as both exotic and indigenous carbon farming (as addressed in the NES-CF), are accommodated within the PA schedules, and indeed the PDP, as appropriate.
187. Within the above context we have considered the submission of Te Arawhiti in relation to Schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay ONL. Te Arawhiti sought to amend the capacity rating for forestry to add the words “*establishing new*” in relation to exotic forestry. We consider this amendment to be appropriate within the context of the existing land use pattern and as an aid to clarity, and have amended the landscape capacity rating accordingly.

### **Are the contents of each specific schedule appropriate or are further changes required?**

188. We note that the content of each specific schedule was mostly resolved through expert conferencing. However, as noted above, not all experts attended conferencing and, as such, any remaining matters of disagreement over the content of the schedules was addressed via evidence and summary statements.
189. As signalled in the above discussions, we recommend making the following amendments to each of the schedules:
  - (a) Amending the titles of each schedule to remove the ONL, ONF or RCL terms and including, where relevant, reference to these terms within the introductory “*General Description of the Area*” text for each schedule and throughout each schedule generally.
  - (b) Deleting the word “important” from the titles for each attribute and value under each schedule and various consequential amendments, including deletion of the footnote explaining why the word “important” was not included for mana whenua related attributes and values.
  - (c) Amending the spelling of “discrete” to “discreet” where this term was used.
  - (d) Amending references to “downhill”, to “downhill / gravity” mountain bike trails within the Central Whakatipu Basin PA (21.22.15).
  - (e) Updating the schedules to correct minor errors noted in the Council’s memorandum dated 15 February 2024, accompanying receipt of Council’s Reply version of the accept/reject recommendations spreadsheet, which stated:  
“...upon updating spreadsheet, we came across several errors in the s42A version ... and additionally please note the below formatting clarifications:

- *In the tracked reply version of 21.23.2 Haliday Road / Corbridge, there should be underline at Landscape Capacity section i. to show the amendment made in response to OS77.5.*
- *In the clean reply version of 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill, there is a residual struck through 'or' at Landscape Capacity section ix. that should have been removed."*

190. In addition, for specific schedules, we suggest the following recommended changes:

- (a) Removal of the reference to *"a distillery"* from the Victoria Flats PA (21.22.17) schedule because we understand that the relevant consent for that activity has now lapsed (as agreed in the joint witness statement discussion in relation to this schedule); and adding in reference to the *"Queenstown Trail"* at paragraph 28 of this schedule.
- (b) Addition of the words *"...establishing new..."* before the words *"...exotic forestry"* under the *"Forestry"* landscape capacity activity for the Dublin Bay PA (21.22.22), at the suggestion of Ms Pull for Ngāi Tahu and for the reasons set out earlier in our Report under the Forestry heading.
- (c) Amendments to the descriptions (paragraphs 11, 31, 33, 34 and 44) and capacity rating for rural industrial activity (from very limited to extremely limited) for the Church Road – Shortcut Road PA (21.23.4), alongside the addition of the words *"...and includes appropriately scaled buildings"* to the landscape capacity description for rural industrial activity. We have recommended these changes as a result of our review of the resource consent decisions for the existing building developments on the eastern side of Church Road, which appear not to have addressed landscape values to the degree or with a level of rigor that might be expected in a RCL.

191. We have not made changes to the Kawarau River PA (21.22.9) schedule or the Northern Remarkables PA (21.22.14) landscape capacity descriptions and ratings, as recommended by Mr Brown for Queenstown Park Limited. While we received no evidence in reply from the Council on these suggested amendments, we have determined that these relatively wholesale changes would bring a degree of unnecessary specificity to the schedules. The detailed descriptions may well be helpful; however, these are likely better suited for inclusion within an assessment of landscape effects that might accompany an application for resource consent.

192. We have also not made changes to the Cardrona Valley PA (21.22.18) schedule to include specific reference to the Cardrona Distillery as a rural industrial activity (at the suggestion of Mr Espie) because we agree with the evidence in reply by Mr Head and Ms Evans that should a specific assessment of any future expansion of the distillery activity be sought, the appropriate avenue to address potential effects on landscape values is through the resource consent process.

193. We record that we have also considered the submissions of several other parties in relation to changes requested to the landscape capacity ratings for particular schedules;<sup>119</sup> however, in all

---

<sup>119</sup> Including the Morven Hill PA and the Ferry Hill PA.

such instances we have concluded that there is insufficient expert evidence on which to base a very fine-grained finding that goes against the recommendations of the Council's experts.

### **Will the schedules be 'fit for purpose' and meet the PDP and Court's intended purpose?**

194. As discussed in detail above, and set out in the preambles at 1.2, the purpose of the PA schedules is to assist with the identification of the landscape values and related landscape capacity to provide guidance with respect to landscape-related policy outcomes in the PDP.<sup>120</sup> The schedules contain both factual information and evaluative content designed to inform plan development and plan implementation processes, and to assist with technical landscape assessment.
195. One of the most significant areas of contention, addressed in evidence and during the hearing, was whether the PA schedules, which have been prepared at a 'high level', will achieve the purpose envisaged by the Court as subsequently codified in the relevant Chapter 3 strategic objectives and policies. The majority of landscape architects agreed at expert conferencing, as recorded in the Landscape Joint Witness Statement, that as the schedules have been prepared at a broad scale PA level, they represent a high-level description and assessment and that any proposed project will be "set at a smaller scale" within the PA. Accordingly, each proposed project will require a specific landscape assessment that identifies how the project sits within the PA, which attributes and values of the PA are relevant to the project, and an assessment against those values. While this approach to preparation of the schedules has been criticised by some submitters and a minority of landscape architects and planners, we are satisfied for the reasons given previously that it is both a reasonable and pragmatic approach to fulfilling the directions contained in strategic policy 3.3.42, and that the resulting content will achieve the intended purpose.
196. Although the *primary* users of the PA schedules are anticipated to be landscape architects and planners assisting applicants and decision makers in relation to plan implementation, as discussed previously the schedules will be read and used by a much wider range of plan users, including lawyers, landowners and the public more generally, including developers and community organisations such as the Upper Clutha Environmental Society.
197. We note that the two preambles, which describe the role, purpose in general approach of the PA schedules, are instrumental in assisting plan users to apply the schedules. As the preambles are intended to provide guidance, the key concern has been to ensure that they are as certain and as easily understandable (by all users) as possible. In terms of process, the preambles were subject to expert conferencing, as a result of which they were generally agreed to be appropriate. However, throughout the course of the evidence exchange and hearing, amendments have been made by Council to assist with clarity as follows:
- (a) Due to the PA scale of the landscape assessment underpinning the schedules, acknowledgement that a finer-grain, location-specific assessment of landscape attributes

---

<sup>120</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Gilbert at 3.1.

and values will typically be required for plan development or plan implementation purposes, including resource consent applications.

- (b) To clarify that as a result of more fine-grained site-specific assessments, other proposal or location-specific landscape values may be identified that do not exist, or have not been identified, at PA scale.
  - (c) An explanation that the capacity ratings and associated descriptions are based on an assessment of each PA as a whole, and are not intended to describe the relevant capacity of specific sites within a PA.
  - (d) As the PA schedules represent a point in time, they are not intended to provide a complete, or fixed description, of values or landscape capacity.
198. For the reasons explained above, we are comfortable that the PA schedules strike an appropriate balance between the necessary technical concepts and content, and ease of readability. The hearing process has assisted enormously with achieving this outcome, and we are very grateful for the participation of all parties in this respect.
199. One final matter related to ‘fitness for purpose’ that came to our attention during hearing was whether there is a risk that the schedules, as drafted, might have the effect of “locking in” present activities (those specified in Chapter 3), based on what is relevant at the present point in time. We questioned how the schedules could be “future-proofed” to provide for activities that are not currently specifically listed or provided for (such as carbon farming; alternative proteins, which may have infrastructure requirements that require consent; and renewable energy generation) but that potentially should, at some future date, be appropriately included. From the evidence and submissions, it appears highly likely that there will be development pressure in some PAs (particularly RCLs) for these kinds of activities in the future, to varying degrees.
200. Miss Evans helpfully addressed this issue in her Reply evidence.<sup>121</sup> She observed that the PA schedules are drafted “at a point in time” and that they are not intended to be “fixed” in any way. This has been made clear in the preambles, and strengthened through an amendment in the Reply version that notes that the references to existing attributes are not intended to lock in existing land uses (section 3.4). She also noted that the plan contains several strategic policies (3.2.1.8 and 3.3.21) that enable existing farming activities and evolving forms of agricultural land use, and which provide for diversification of land use beyond traditional activities, including farming, provided that the policy direction to protect (for ONF/ONLs) or maintain/enhance (RCLs) is met.
201. In Ms Evans’s view, the collective effect of Chapter 3 is that it does anticipate some appropriate change, and sets out policy guidance on how that change should occur in terms of outcomes. Importantly, the monitoring requirements set out in strategic policies 3.3.47 and 3.3.48 also anticipate change, and have been included as a means to assess whether the provisions of

---

<sup>121</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 5.3 to 5.6.

Chapters 3, 4, 6 and 21 are being implemented successfully for a non-specific range of activities. Finally, Ms Evans observed that it is not the role of the PA schedules to constrain or regulate development, as they are intended to be a tool to assist with processing applications.

202. In general, we accept Ms Evans’s evidence on this issue. That said, we are of the view that for the schedules to remain an effective and efficient tool in the longer term, the Council will need to implement a regular monitoring programme to ensure that any material changes that might be required, particularly in response to cumulative development, or to include future relevant activities that may create development pressure, are given effect to. Otherwise there is a risk that the schedules, and in particular the landscape capacity assessments, will become irrelevant over time.
203. In terms of s 32AA of the RMA, we accept Ms Evans’s advice that the additional changes recommended in the Council's reply improve effectiveness with respect to implementation of the PA schedules, efficiency in terms of how they apply within the wider PDP context and, overall, ensure the PA schedules better achieve the strategic objectives and policies of Chapter 3 of the PDP.<sup>122</sup>

## Conclusions and recommendations

204. We have reached a similar finding to that of the Council’s reporting officers and legal counsel, which is set out succinctly by Ms Evans’ reply evidence and which states that the Variation, as amended through this hearing process:<sup>123</sup>
- “ . . . will achieve the relevant strategic objectives and policies of the PDP, and are the most appropriate to achieve the objective of the Variation and purpose of the RMA.”*
205. While we have made additional minor changes to the content of the proposed preambles and schedules, as set out in the above discussion, these changes have not fundamentally altered the scheme and intention of the schedules proposed in the Council’s Reply evidence.
206. We note from Ms Evans’ Reply evidence that an administrative task will still need to be undertaken to amend the labels for the PA mapping to ensure that these match the PA titles listed in strategic policies 3.3.36 and 3.3.39, and to match the schedule titles.<sup>124</sup>
- 207. We recommend that the Council adopt the version of the preambles and schedules attached to this report at Appendix 4, to be included in the PDP as Schedules 21.22 and 21.23.**
- 208. We recommend that Council implements a formal monitoring process as required by strategic policies 3.3.47 and 3.3.48, noting our specific immediate suggestions as set out above, to ensure that Schedules 21.22 and 21.23 remain efficient and effective in future years.** In this respect, it was acknowledged by all expert witnesses that landscape capacity will change over time as a result of the cumulative effects of subdivision, use and development. We have

---

<sup>122</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 9.1.

<sup>123</sup> Evans, reply evidence, para 10.4.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid, para 7.4.

highlighted, in particular, the more immediate issues associated with the exclusion of residential development for farming or other rural production activities from the definition of Rural Living in Chapter 3, and the definitions of “forestry” and “intensive agriculture” for the purposes of the landscape capacity assessment.

209. We further recommend that the submission points on the Variation be accepted or rejected as set out within the spreadsheet attached as **Appendix 5** to this report.
210. Finally, we wish to express our thanks to the Council’s legal counsel and team of experts, and all submitters, their legal counsel and expert witnesses, particularly those that participated in the hearing, for your collaborative and constructive assistance, which has been greatly appreciated.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Jane Taylor', written in a cursive style.

Jane Taylor  
For the Commission

## **Appendix 1**

**Minute of Commissioners dated 30 August 2023**

## **Appendix 2**

**Minute of Commissioners dated 14 September 2023**



## **Appendix 3**

**Minute of Commissioners dated 11 October 2023**

## **Appendix 4**

### **Landscape Schedules 21.22 and 21.23**

## **Appendix 5**

### **Table of Accept/Reject Submissions**

**QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN: PRIORITY AREA LANDSCAPE  
SCHEDULES**

**MINUTE OF COMMISSIONERS**

**30 August 2023**

1. The Queenstown Lakes District Council (Council) has appointed a Hearing Panel, which comprises Commissioners Jane Taylor, Peter Kensington and Quentin Smith (the Commission), to hear all submissions and, after it has heard the submissions, to make recommendations on the Variation to the Proposed District Plan: Priority Area Landscape Schedules as to whether to accept or reject the submissions received and any amendments to the provisions of the Schedules.
2. The Council is then required to decide whether to accept or reject the Hearing Panel's recommendations.

Memorandum on behalf of Dr John Cossens dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 2023

3. A Memorandum on behalf of Dr John Cossens dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 2023 (the Memorandum) has been received by the Hearing Panel. The Memorandum challenges the appointment of Councillor and Deputy Mayor Smith ("Councillor Smith") to the Hearing Panel on the grounds of alleged "potential bias and conflict of interest". The grounds giving rise to the allegations of potential bias and conflict of interest, set out in paragraphs 4 to 11 of the Memorandum, relate to Councillor Smith's involvement as a member of the Queenstown Lakes District Council Planning and Strategy Committee and, in particular, his participation and voting record in relation to various motions concerning the process surrounding the landscape variation schedules.
4. At paragraph 27, the Memorandum seeks that Councillor Smith recuse himself from the role of commissioner, or alternatively that the Chair of the Hearing Panel, having considered the alleged facts as set out in the Memorandum, asks Councillor Smith to resign from his role.

Discussion

5. The Hearing Panel has carefully considered the allegations raised in the Memorandum by adopting the following approach:
  - (a) Consideration of the applicable legal principles and rules that apply to issues of bias or conflict of interest;
  - (b) The application of the principles to the alleged facts, as informed by our understanding following discussions with Councillor Smith and Council officers; and
  - (c) Any other relevant matters that have come to our attention as a result of our internal investigations.
6. The rules and expectations in relation to potential bias and conflict of interest, which includes predetermination, are governed by legislation, the common law, and general standards and expectations as applicable.

*Legislative Framework*

7. The Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968 ("the Act") applies to elected councillors and regulates *financial* interests. The Act essentially codifies the common law position that a councillor with

a financial interest is presumed to be biased as a result of that interest. Councillors are prohibited from discussing or voting on any matter in which they have a financial interest unless that interest is “in common with the public”. Whether an interest can be said to be “in common with the public” will depend on the nature of the interest; the size of the group affected and whether the group is large enough to comprise “the public”; and whether the interests of the councillor and the public are affected in a similar way. A councillor may apply to the Auditor General for an exemption from the financial interest rule, or alternatively a declaration that the rule does not apply in a specific circumstance.<sup>1</sup>

8. It is also relevant that in the Resource Management Act 1991 context, the prohibition contained in the Act in relation to financial interests does not apply to the approval or review of a district plan; however, it does apply to a plan change or variation, and to the consideration of a resource consent application.<sup>2</sup>
9. As there have been no allegations, or indeed evidence, that Councillor Smith has any *financial interest* in the landscape variation schedules, or *any interest that is any greater than that of the public*, the provisions of the Act do not, prima facie, apply in this situation.

#### *Applicable Principles of Common Law and General Standards and Expectations*

10. The common law requires that all public decision making must be procedurally fair, including being free from the taint of bias and predetermination. Known as “the rule against bias”, the common law rule has two main objectives: first, to ensure that the best decision is made based on relevant information and arguments, not ulterior motives or prejudices; and secondly, to ensure that people affected by, or interested in, a decision have trust and confidence in the process.<sup>3</sup>
11. The rule against bias operates both to avoid actual bias and the *perception* of bias. The overriding principle is that justice should not only be done but should be seen to be done.<sup>4</sup>
12. The courts generally approach questions of bias by asking the following:<sup>5</sup>

*“Would a fair-minded observer reasonably think that the decision-maker or member of the decision-making body might not bring an impartial mind to the decision, in the sense that they might unfairly treat someone’s case with favour or disfavour?”*
13. We note that the Auditor-General has proposed a very similar test for determining whether a common law (or non-financial) interest exists:<sup>6</sup> *“The test for whether a non-financial conflict of interest exists is whether an objective observer who knows the relevant facts would perceive the person to be biased because of that interest”*.
14. In addition to the common law tests set out above, there is a general expectation that public business should be conducted in the spirit of integrity, impartiality, accountability, trustworthiness, respect, and responsiveness. All decisions about conflicts of interest must be guided by ethical principles.
15. There is no single source of rules or expectations specifying what constitutes ethical behaviour for all situations or all public organisations. However, in this particular situation the Council's code of conduct or relevant internal policies and procedures are likely to be relevant, together with general guidance or

---

<sup>1</sup> Managing Conflicts of Interest in Regional Councils 2020: [Part 5: Managing conflicts of interest in regional councils — Office of the Auditor-General New Zealand \(oag.parliament.nz\)](https://www.oag.parliament.nz/publications/2020/06/managing-conflicts-of-interest-in-regional-councils)

<sup>2</sup> *Making Good Decisions: A resource for RMA Decision-makers (5<sup>th</sup> ed)*, Ministry for the Environment, at page 26.

<sup>3</sup> *“Managing conflicts of interest: A guide for the public sector”*, Office of the Auditor General, June 2020 at 6.8 – 6.9.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid* at 6.10.

<sup>5</sup> *Saxmere Company Ltd v Wool Board Disestablishment Company Ltd* [2010] 1 NZLR 35; [2010] 1 NZLR 76.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*, footnote 1, at 5.10.

good practice guides, customary practice and behaviour in the public sector or a particular part of it, and analogies drawn from legal rules that apply to similar situations.

16. There are a number of good practice guides that are applicable to this situation, including the guidance issued by the Auditor General,<sup>7</sup> the Quality Planning Resource online website,<sup>8</sup> together with the guidance contained in Making Good Decisions: A resource for RMA decision-makers (5<sup>th</sup> edition).<sup>9</sup>
17. We have found the following paragraphs from the Auditor-General's guidance, which concern issues of predetermination (as has been broadly alleged in the Memorandum), to be particularly apposite:<sup>10</sup>
- 3.32 *Predetermination is any situation where you are making a decision about something and there is a risk that people will think you have made-up your mind before you have considered all of the evidence. Suggestions of predetermination usually arise because of something you have previously said or done.*
- 3.32 *Technically, predetermination is not a form of conflict of interest. However, the concept of predetermination is derived from the common law on bias, so we have covered it in this guide. The underlying risk with predetermination is the same as for conflicts of interest - that is, the risk that you will "taint" a decision you are involved in making because you are biased or appear to be biased.*
- ....
- 3.36 *The seriousness of the risk will depend on the context, such as what your role is and what sort of decision you are being asked to make.*
- 3.37 *For quasi-judicial decisions, decision makers are held to an exacting standard of impartiality and objectivity. Quasi-judicial decisions are those that directly affect the legal rights, interests, and obligations of an individual or small group of individuals. Quasi-judicial decisions can be, for example, a decision to grant a permit, confer a specific benefit, or impose a punishment.*
- 3.38 *In other situations, it might nevertheless be acceptable for employees or officeholders to bring personal or previously formed views to decision making - for example, when:*
- *discussing issues and exchanging ideas with members of the public;*
  - *developing a preliminary position, especially where a proposal is being consulted on or where the public organisation is expected to perform an advocacy role;*
  - *already holding - and perhaps having expressed - strong personal views about the matter, for decisions that are made by an elected or representative body and are political in nature or involve high level policy-making;*
  - *promoting a particular view during debate in public hearings on a matter; and*
  - *drawing on your own knowledge or experience, especially for discussions that are entrusted to particular people because of their special expertise in the subject.*

*Is there any substance to the allegations at common law?*

18. We make the following observations based on our understanding of the relevant law and general standards and expectations (with reference to the applicable guidance):
- (a) The hearing panel has been convened to make *recommendations* to Council in relation to the proposed landscape variation schedules, a component of the Proposed District Plan. Accordingly the panel is not acting in a quasi-judicial capacity that will impact on the legal rights, interests and obligations of an individual or small group of individuals; on the contrary, the

---

<sup>7</sup> Refer to the material at footnotes 1 and 3, *ibid*, together with the *Local Authorities (Members Interests) Act 1968: A Guide for members of local authorities on managing financial conflicts of interest* (oag.parliament.nz).

<sup>8</sup> [Welcome to the Quality Planning Website | Quality Planning](#)

<sup>9</sup> Available to commissioners that have completed the Making Good Decisions certification, published by the Ministry for the Environment, 2023 ed.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid*, footnote 3, at 3.32 to 3.40.

landscape schedules are in the nature of broad policy that will apply to the public generally, as an integral component of the Proposed District Plan.

- (b) It is open to Councils to appoint elected members to be commissioners of hearings panels that are tasked with making recommendations on matters of policy, such as plan changes or, as in this case, landscape schedules that will comprise part of a proposed plan, provided that the commissioners meet the relevant training and experience requirements, and have no actual or perceived conflict of interest under the Act or at common law. In these situations, it is accepted that such appointees will almost certainly have been involved in the relevant Council processes, and that they may hold personal views on the matters that will be the subject of the recommendations.
19. Having considered the allegations based on the facts outlined in the Memorandum, it is our preliminary view that no relevant issue of predetermination or conflict of interest arises for the following reasons:
- (a) Councillor Smith's membership of the Council's Planning and Strategy Committee (the Committee) does not, prima facie, preclude his appointment as a commissioner in relation to this particular hearing panel, which is not acting in a quasi-judicial capacity. On the contrary, it is entirely appropriate for elected members to be appointed to hearing panels concerned with policy matters in situations where their knowledge and expertise will enhance the quality of the hearing and the panel's subsequent recommendations.
- (b) The allegations refer to Councillor Smith's voting record on *matters of process*. Notwithstanding that the allegations in relation to the motion of the Committee concerning consultation appear to have been misconstrued,<sup>11</sup> we do not consider that the discharge by Councillor Smith of his lawful responsibilities as a member of the Committee in relation to process matters raises any issue of predetermination or perceived bias apropos the substantive issues that will be the subject of the hearing panel's recommendations.
- (c) The allegation that Councillor Smith voiced his willingness to be part of the hearing panel does not raise any issue of predetermination. On the contrary, his knowledge, interest and experience in relation to the subject matter of the hearing is considered to be an asset to the hearing panel.
- (d) The standard of independence and objectivity required of an elected member of Council appointed to a non quasi-judicial hearing panel should not be compared to that of an expert witness, or for that matter, an independent commissioner. It is anticipated that elected members such as Councillor Smith will have been involved in the Council processes leading up to the hearing, that they may have prior knowledge and, potentially, thoughts on the issues. What it required is that they keep an open mind, and be prepared to adjust their views if the evidence warrants it.
20. We have discussed the matters raised in the Memorandum with Councillor Smith, including his obligations as a member of the hearing panel. We are satisfied that Councillor Smith is fully apprised of his responsibilities, including that of maintaining an open mind throughout the hearing and, ultimately, the overriding obligation of the hearing panel to make a recommendation to Council based on the evidence before us (as tested throughout the hearing process).

---

<sup>11</sup> For clarification purposes only, it is our understanding from discussions with Councillor Smith and Council staff that Councillor Smith voted against the resolution outlined at paragraph 4 of the Memorandum because he did not agree with the *question that was to be consulted on*, not against consultation per se.

21. It should also be noted that the hearing panel comprises a majority of independent commissioners (including the Chair), which accords with good practice guidelines. As such, any elected member of Council is in the minority, and we are confident that were any conflicts of interest to arise with respect to Councillor Smith, these can be appropriately managed.
22. In summary, having regard to the applicable legal principles, we have concluded that a fair-minded observer would not reasonably think that Councillor Smith might not bring an impartial mind to the recommendations, and that no question of predetermination, bias or conflict of interest arises.

#### *Other Relevant Matters*

23. During the course of our discussions, Councillor Smith alerted us to his role as a trustee of the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust (“the Trust”). The Upper Clutha Tracks Trust is a charitable organisation that advocates for, funds and builds walking and cycling tracks for the public, and advocates for public access in general. The Trust has lodged a submission on the proposed landscape variation schedules (Submission #99), seeking: *“That all of the VIF landscape schedules are amended such that they state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling tracks”*. Councillor Smith has advised us that he was not involved in the development of the Trust’s submission, in relation to which the Trust sought third party planning advice.
24. Given the nature of the Trust, which is a charitable organisation that is acting in the public interest only, together with the nature of the relief sought, we are of the view that there is no relevant or actionable conflict of interest in all of the circumstances, and certainly not one that would preclude Councillor Smith’s involvement on the hearing panel.
25. In accordance with best practice, the hearing panel has agreed that Councillor Smith will not be involved in deliberations or any subsequent recommendations in relation to the Trust’s submission.
26. That said, it is entirely appropriate to draw this matter to the attention of the parties in the interests of full disclosure, and to seek any objections that parties may have.

#### Next Steps

27. We are grateful to Dr Cossens for raising this matter at the earliest opportunity, so that the issues of Councillor Smith’s alleged bias and conflict of interest can be considered, and a determination reached, well in advance of the commencement of the hearing.
28. Having set out our preliminary position, we now invite memoranda from any other parties that wish to be heard on the matter of Councillor Smith’s alleged bias or conflict of interest, including in relation to his role as a trustee of the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust. Memoranda should clearly set out the reasons for the views expressed, with reference to the law and to any relevant case law as may be applicable.
29. Following consideration of any memoranda received, we will issue a final Minute summarising our views, and making any recommendations or directions that we determine appropriate. Given our preliminary views as outlined above, we have not received advice from Council’s legal team on the panel’s delegated authority in this matter at this stage; however, we will do so should this become necessary.
30. Any parties wishing to lodge a memorandum in relation to this matter should do so prior to **12 noon, 6 September 2023**.
31. Should any party have any queries in relation to this Minute or require any clarification in relation to the process for this hearing, please contact the Hearings Administrator at [dp.hearings@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:dp.hearings@qldc.govt.nz).



A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Jane Taylor'.

Jane Taylor

For the Commission

30 August 2023

**QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN: PRIORITY AREA LANDSCAPE  
SCHEDULES**

**MINUTE OF COMMISSIONERS**

**14 September 2023**

1. The Queenstown Lakes District Council (Council) has appointed a Hearing Panel, which comprises Commissioners Jane Taylor, Peter Kensington and Quentin Smith (the Commission), to hear all submissions and, after it has heard the submissions, to make recommendations on the Variation to the Proposed District Plan: Priority Area Landscape Schedules as to whether to accept or reject the submissions received and any amendments to the provisions of the Schedules.
2. The Council is then required to decide whether to accept or reject the Hearing Panel's recommendations.

Background - Memorandum on behalf of Dr John Cossens dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 2023

3. A memorandum was received on behalf of Dr John Cossens dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 2023 (the Cossens Memorandum), in which the appointment of Councillor and Deputy Mayor Smith ("Councillor Smith") to the Hearing Panel was challenged on the grounds of alleged "potential bias and conflict of interest". The grounds giving rise to the allegations of potential bias and conflict of interest, set out in paragraphs 4 to 11 of the Cossens Memorandum, related to Councillor Smith's involvement as a member of the Queenstown Lakes District Council ("the Council") Planning and Strategy Committee and, in particular, his participation and voting record in relation to various motions concerning the process surrounding the landscape variation schedules.
4. The relief sought in the Cossens Memorandum was that Councillor Smith recuse himself from the role of commissioner, or alternatively that the Chair of the Hearing Panel, having considered the alleged facts as set out in the Memorandum, asks Councillor Smith to resign from his role.
5. A Minute setting out our draft position in relation to the issues raised in the Cossens Memorandum was issued on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2023 (the August Minute). In summary, having had regard to the applicable legal principles and relevant authoritative guidance, we concluded that a fair-minded observer would not reasonably think that Councillor Smith might not bring an impartial mind to the recommendations, and that no question of predetermination, bias or conflict of interest arises.
6. We also discussed Councillor Smith's role as a trustee of the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust, which submitted on the landscape variation schedules. In accordance with best practice, the hearing panel agreed that Councillor Smith would not be involved in deliberations or any subsequent recommendations in relation to the Trust's submission.
7. Having set out our preliminary position in the August Minute, we invited memoranda from any other parties that wish to be heard on the matter of Councillor Smith's alleged bias or conflict of interest, including in relation to his role as a trustee of the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust, prior to issuing a final determination on the matters.

Memorandum on behalf of the Cardrona Cattle Company Limited dated 6 September 2023

8. A memorandum on behalf of the Cardrona Cattle Company Limited (CCCL) dated 6 September 2023 (the CCCL Memorandum) was received in response to our August minute. The CCCL Memorandum discussed

the relevant principles of law at paragraphs 6 to 14 and, at paragraph 15, supported the “general concerns” raised in the Cossens Memorandum.

9. The CCCL Memorandum further outlined some specific additional concerns that it considered must preclude Councillor Smith from taking any part in the Panel's consideration, hearing, or deliberations on its recommendations in respect of CCCL's submission and further submission, as well as Queenstown Lakes District Council's own (late) submission, which see CCCL further submitted on.<sup>1</sup>
10. We discuss the two areas of concern raised in the CCCL Memorandum as follows.

#### *The Legal Principles and General Concerns raised in the Cossens Memorandum*

11. In short, we largely agree with the brief summary of principles of law as set out in paragraphs 6 to 12 of the CCCL Memorandum, which is not materially dissimilar to the discussion of relevant legal principles set out in our August Minute. It may also be helpful, as an aid to understanding the test to be applied, to set out the Court's description of a “fair-minded, impartial and properly informed observer” as found in *Saxmere v New Zealand Wool Board Disestablishment Co Ltd (No 1)*.<sup>2</sup> The Court stated:<sup>3</sup>

[5] *The fair-minded lay observer is presumed to be intelligent and to view matters objectively. He or she is neither unduly sensitive or suspicious nor complacent about what may influence the judge's decision. He or she must be taken to be a non-lawyer but reasonably informed about the workings of our judicial system, as well as about the nature of the issues in the case and about the facts pertaining to the situation which is said to give rise to an appearance or apprehension of bias. Lord Hope of Craighead commented in Helow v Secretary of State for the Home Department that:*

11 *before she takes a balanced approach to any information she is given, she will take the trouble to inform herself on all matters that are relevant. She is the sort of person who takes the trouble to read the text of an article as well as the headlines. She is able to put whatever she has read or seen into its overall social, political or geographical context. She is fair-minded, so she will appreciate that the context forms an important part of the material which she must consider before passing judgment.*  
[Our emphasis]

[6] *The elaboration of the features of the objective observer is, as Kirby J remarked in Smits v Roach, a reminder to judges, the parties and the community reading their reasons that the standard that is applied is not simply the reaction of the judges to a particular complaint:*

13 *It is, as far as it can be, an objective standard: one aimed at emphasising the undesirability of idiosyncratic and personal assessments of such matters. As the cases show, in such decisions different judges can reflect different assessments and reach different conclusions. The fact that this is so should make contemporary judges aware that, ultimately, they themselves have to shoulder the responsibility of reaching conclusions on the point and giving effect to them. They cannot ultimately hide behind a fiction and pretend that it provides an entirely objective standard by which to measure the individual case.*

12. In applying the principles to the facts as alleged in the Cossens Memorandum, we remain satisfied that a properly informed, impartial and fair minded observer, as described by the Court in *Saxmere*, would not hold a perception that Councillor Smith was biased,<sup>4</sup> noting in particular that there has been no allegation that Councillor Smith has stated a view or opinion in relation to the substantive issues that will form the basis of the recommendations to Council.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 15 of the CCCL Memorandum.

<sup>2</sup> [2009] NZSC 72, [2010] 1 NZLR 35 (*Saxmere*).

<sup>3</sup> Ibid at [5].

<sup>4</sup> Paragraph 10 of the CCCL Memorandum.

<sup>5</sup> As per paragraph 11 of the CCCL Memorandum.

13. We further note that the CCCL Memorandum, in voicing support for the “general concerns” of Dr Cossens, did not set out any further evidence of actual or perceived bias in relation to Councillor Smith’s appointment to the hearing panel.
14. We do not agree with the statements set out at paragraphs 13 and 14 of the CCCL Memorandum, which discuss the nature of the panel’s role and function, recognising that our use of the term “quasi-judicial” is perhaps too broad a brush in this context without further explanation. Our conclusions in this regard were in part based on the Auditor-General’s guidance, which was set out at paragraph 17 of the August Minute and repeated here:<sup>6</sup>
- 3.37 *For quasi-judicial decisions, decision makers are held to an exacting standard of impartiality and objectivity. Quasi-judicial decisions are those that directly affect the legal rights, interests, and obligations of an individual or small group of individuals. Quasi-judicial decisions can be, for example, a decision to grant a permit, confer a specific benefit, or impose a punishment.*
- 3.38 *In other situations, it might nevertheless be acceptable for employees or officeholders to bring personal or previously formed views to decision making - for example, when:*
- *discussing issues and exchanging ideas with members of the public;*
  - *developing a preliminary position, especially where a proposal is being consulted on or where the public organisation is expected to perform an advocacy role;*
  - *already holding - and perhaps having expressed - strong personal views about the matter, for decisions that are made by an elected or representative body and are political in nature or involve high level policy-making;*
  - *promoting a particular view during debate in public hearings on a matter; and*
  - *drawing on your own knowledge or experience, especially for discussions that are entrusted to particular people because of their special expertise in the subject.*
15. Essentially, as we understand it, the panel is tasked with making recommendations as to what is *in the public interest* with respect to the landscape variation schedules. A decision as to what is in the public interest can be contrasted with determination of the legal rights, interests and obligations of an individual or small group of individuals, such as in relation to an application for resource consent(s). A recommendation as to the public interest, which is essentially a policy decision, is quite different from the determination of a right. Although the panel does have the ability to exercise discretion, taking multiple factors into account, the resulting recommendations will not give any person affected by the recommendations the right to any particular outcome. It is, of course, acknowledged that the panel does have a duty, in accordance with the rule of law, to behave fairly in the decision or recommendation-making procedure. But the decision or recommendation itself is not a judicial or quasi-judicial act, as alleged at paragraph 14(a) of the CCCL Memorandum. It does not involve deciding between the rights or interests of particular persons; rather, it is the exercise of a power delegated by the Council, representing the community, to decide what the public interest requires. This approach corresponds with the Auditor General’s guidance, as previously mentioned.
16. That said, it is plain that the administrative functions of the panel must uphold the principles of fair process and natural justice, including the avoidance of actual or perceived bias or conflict of interest. In a *procedural* sense the panel, once convened, could therefore be considered to be functioning in a ‘quasi-judicial’ manner, notwithstanding that the decision or recommendations are not a judicial or quasi-judicial act. However, for the reasons set out above and in our August Minute, we do not accept that the common law test, as set out in *Saxmere*, has been met generally in the case of Councillor Smith, other than in relation to the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust. We now turn to the specific concerns with respect to CCCL.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Managing Conflicts of Interest: A Guide for the Public Sector*, Office of the Auditor-General, June 2020 at 3.37-3.38.

### *The specific concerns in relation to CCHL*

17. THE CCCL Memorandum sets out its specific concerns at paragraphs 17 to 22. It concludes, at paragraph 22, that *“it is untenable for Councillor Smith to take any part in the panel’s consideration, hearing or deliberations on its recommendation in respect of CCCL’s submission and further submission, as well as the Council’s own (late) submission, which CCCL further submitted on”*. This conclusion was reached by CCCL after applying the principles in the *Muir v Commissioner of Inland Revenue*<sup>7</sup> and *Saxmere v New Zealand Wool Board Disestablishment Co Ltd (No 1)*<sup>8</sup> cases, together with the general guidance found in the Making Good Decisions – Chair Re-certification material.
18. Having considered the specific concerns raised with respect to CCHL, the panel is of the view that, at first glance, the correspondence described in paragraph 20 of the CCCL Memorandum between Councillor Smith and Mr Henderson may give rise to a perception of bias in an impartial, fair-minded observer. We record, however, that the alleged “significant falling out” to which the correspondence related arose in a previous matter and, in Councillor Smith’s view, appears to be one-sided on the part of Mr Henderson.
19. We do not accept that it follows (as set out at paragraph 24 of the CCCL Memorandum) that because of the concerns raised by CCCL in relation to the relationship between Councillor Smith and Mr Henderson, there is a risk of actual or perceived bias or conflict of interest with respect to other submitters who own land in the Gibbston Valley Character Zone, noting that no other memoranda have been received in relation to this issue. There is no relevant basis or evidence to support such a finding, which the CCCL Memorandum refers to as “an observation” only.
20. Given the above findings, the panel has determined, applying an abundance of caution, that Councillor Smith will not be involved in deliberations or any subsequent recommendations in relation to CCCL’s submission or further submission and, to the extent that it concerns CCCL’s submission or further submission, the Council’s submission (which CCCL further submitted on).
21. We reiterate our previous observation that the hearing panel comprises a majority of independent commissioners (including the Chair), which accords with good practice guidelines. As such, any elected member of Council is in the minority, and we are confident that were any conflicts of interest to arise with respect to Councillor Smith, these can be appropriately managed.

### Summary of Findings

22. In summary, having regard to the applicable legal principles and authoritative guidance, we have concluded that a fair-minded observer would not reasonably think Councillor Smith might not bring an impartial mind to the recommendations, and that no question of predetermination, bias or conflict of interest arises, except as noted in relation to the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust (as per our August Minute) and the specific concerns of CCCL as set out above.
23. We have determined that in addition to not taking part in deliberations and recommendations in relation to the Upper Clutha tracks trust submission, Councillor Smith will not take part in any deliberations or any subsequent recommendations in relation to CCCL’s submission or further submission and, to the extent that it concerns CCCL’s submission or further submission, the Council’s submission (which CCCL further submitted on).

---

<sup>7</sup> [2007] 3 NZLR 495 (CA) at [64].

<sup>8</sup> [2009] NZSC 72, [2010] 1 NZLR 35 at [37].

24. Should any party have any queries in relation to this Minute or require any clarification in relation to the process for this hearing, please contact the Hearings Administrator at [dp.hearings@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:dp.hearings@qldc.govt.nz).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jane Taylor', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jane Taylor

For the Commission

14 September 2023

**QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN: PRIORITY AREA LANDSCAPE  
SCHEDULES**

**MINUTE OF COMMISSIONERS**

**11 October 2023**

1. The Queenstown Lakes District Council (Council) has appointed a Hearing Panel, which comprises Commissioners Jane Taylor, Peter Kensington and Quentin Smith (the Commission), to hear all submissions and, after it has heard the submissions, to make recommendations on the Variation to the Proposed District Plan: Priority Area Landscape Schedules as to whether to accept or reject the submissions received and any amendments to the provisions of the Schedules.
2. The Council is then required to decide whether to accept or reject the Hearing Panel's recommendations.

Memorandum on behalf of Dr John Cossens (2) dated 12 September 2023

3. A second Memorandum on behalf Dr John Cossens dated 12 September 2023 has been received by the Hearing Panel (the Memorandum).
4. At paragraph 1, the Memorandum seeks that the Hearing Panel:
  - “(a) Consider the matter of whether the landscape schedule methodology, in particular the community consultation, was fair, reliable, robust and representative.*
  - “(b) Initiate an expert peer review of the consultative method and landscape methodology employed by [Council]; and*
  - “(c) Allow for submissions to be received on the methodology employed by [Council]”*
5. At paragraph 30 Dr Cossens outlines the relief sought through the Memorandum as follows:
  - a. To find there is a case to be heard in regard the consultative and landscape schedules methodology employed by the QLDC.*
  - b. To call for submissions on the matter of the landscape and consultation method employed by the QLDC, and*
  - c. Once having had the evidence and submissions, determine whether the landscape and consultative methodology was fair, reasonable and provided sufficient information for respondents to make an informed submission on landscape values.*
  - d. If the Commission finds the consultative process was not fair, then it is submitted the Commission would have no choice in calling for the consultative process to be redone in a more reliable, fair and representative manner.*
6. Dr Cossens summarised his concern as relating to whether the proposed variation to the plan with respect to the landscape variation schedules is based on reliable information and accurately portrays the views of the community and/or those most likely to be affected by the proposed variation.<sup>1</sup> After setting out the reasons for his view that the Council's consultation process was deficient, Dr Cossens submitted that:<sup>2</sup>

*“In summary, it is respectfully submitted that it is a logical and fair approach for the Commission to first consider the matter of ‘methodology’ before it hears submissions on the landscape*

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 8 of the Memorandum.

<sup>2</sup> Paragraph 29 of the Memorandum.

*schedules and that submitters, their experts and counsel should be able to make submissions on the matter. It would seem ill founded to hear the substantive submissions on landscape schedule matters when the Commission may find the landscape methodology unfair, biased, and has not allowed the community at the heart of these hearings to have been misled and that ultimately, impinges on their rights to natural justice and to be fairly heard. In a nutshell, has the community being given a fair go?"*

7. Although it was not drawn to our attention in the Memorandum, we note that this same issue was substantially the subject of an application to the Environment Court by Dr Cossens for a Declaration and Enforcement action against the Council in 2022, which was subsequently decided by the Environment Court on 11 October 2022.<sup>3</sup> The Court struck out the relief sought in paragraphs 48.a, c, d and e of the Declaration and Enforcement Application, and declined the remaining relief.<sup>4</sup> Hassan J stated:<sup>5</sup>

*[23] Effective community consultation is plainly integral to sound practice particularly for the proper identification of landscape values. Mr. Ferguson's opinions as an experienced planner give force to that proposition. Effective consultation is an important underpinning for the sound identification of landscape values. That is in the sense that it can help inform appreciation of predominant community values. It can also assist fact checking. For example, NZILA's recently published guidelines, Te Tangi a te Manu, comments that a landscape assessor should remain aware of the range of options and perceptions of landscape matters in the community and draw on available sources of information.*

*[24] However, the RMA does not require such consultation to be undertaken (except to the narrow extent that cl 3(1) Sch 1 prescribes that consultation with certain named parties to be undertaken). Nor is this prescribed in any direction in any of the court's Topic 2 decisions (including in the prescribed values identification framework policies).*

...

*[26] What QLDC has elected to do in regard to consultation and other input into its Proposed Variation falls within the legitimate scope of its planning authority discretion. In terms of s310, nothing undertaken or not undertaken constitutes any identifiable misuse of any RMA function or power or breach of duty or denial of any identifiable RMA right. Nor do the circumstances call for any declaration as to how QLDC has interpreted its planning authority functions, powers or duties.*

*[27] Insofar as Dr Cossens or Darby Planning have concerns about such matters, their proper recourse is to make a submission under Sch 1 RMA and, if not satisfied with the outcome, to appeal.*

*[28] It follows that I find these aspects of the Declaration and Enforcement Application misconceived and disclosing no reasonable or relevant case. Therefore, I strike out the declaration and enforcement relief sought in paragraphs 48.a, c, d, and e of the Declaration and Enforcement Application.*

8. We have considered the matters raised in the Memorandum and set out our findings as follows. In doing so, we have necessarily focused on the process that is required under the RMA with respect to the plan changes and subsequent variation(s). We have also considered our powers as a delegated hearing panel under the RMA with respect to the relief sought by Dr Cossens.

#### Discussion

9. Schedule 1 of the RMA sets out the plan making process, which includes the process required for proposed variation to district plans. In doing so, Schedule 1 creates statutory rights for various persons

---

<sup>3</sup> *JJ Cossens v Queenstown Lakes District Council* [2022] NZEnvC 206, 11 October 2022, Hassan J.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid* at [31].

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid* at [23] to [28].



to participate in the process. The manner by which a local authority must conduct its hearings is prescribed by ss 39 to 42A RMA.<sup>6</sup>

10. Clause 3 of Schedule 1 sets out a hierarchy with respect to consultation and provides (our emphasis underlined):

**3 Consultation**

(1) *During the preparation of a proposed policy statement or plan, the local authority concerned shall consult –*

*(a) the Minister for the Environment; and*

*(b) those other Ministers of the Crown who may be affected by the policy statement or plan; and*

*(c) local authorities who may be so affected; and*

*(d) the tangata whenua of the area who may be affected, through iwi authorities; and*

*(e) any customary marine title group in the area.*

(2) *A local authority may consult anyone else during the preparation of a proposed policy statement or plan*

...

(4) *In consulting persons for the purposes of subclause (2), a local authority must undertake consultation in accordance with section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002.*

11. Relevantly, Clause 3 of Schedule 1 RMA does not require a local authority to carry out pre consultation with the public as part of developing a plan change or variation. However, if a local authority chooses to consult anyone else, including the public, this must be undertaken in accordance with s 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (the LGA), which sets out principles of consultation.

12. The Court in *Cossens* made it very clear that under the Schedule 1 process, the Council was not obliged to consult the public in preparing a plan change or variation. Further, what the Council ultimately elected to do with regard to consultation and other input into the proposed variation falls within the legitimate scope of its planning authority discretion. In terms of s 310, nothing undertaken or not undertaken constitutes any identifiable misuse of any RMA function or power or breach of duty or denial of any identifiable RMA right. As a delegated hearing panel, much like the court, we have no powers under the RMA or the LGA<sup>7</sup> to review the Council's processes with respect to its consultation with the public, or to grant the relief sought at paragraph 30. a, c or d of the Memorandum with respect to consultation.

13. Even if we were wrong with respect to our powers, it is plain that any alleged defect with respect to public consultation has been remedied by the Schedule 1 process following public notification of the proposed variation.<sup>8</sup>

14. With respect to the other apparent area of concern, being the landscape schedules methodology, Dr Cossens, together with all members of the public, have had full participatory rights under Schedule 1 to make submissions on the landscape methodology employed, and have appeal rights to the Environment Court once Council's decision is received. We note that many of the submitters (as further elaborated in their expert landscape evidence) have made submissions with respect to the landscape methodology. Accordingly, there would seem to be no utility whatsoever in granting the relief sought at paragraph 30. b of the Memorandum and we see no reason to do so. Under the notification process, the public has had

---

<sup>6</sup> *Paraparaumu Airport Coalition Inc v Kapiti Coast District Council* EnvC W077/08.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

the opportunity to make submissions with respect to the landscape methodology and, indeed, in many instances has done so. Were we to grant the relief sought at 30. b, we consider it would seriously disadvantage other submitters who have legitimately participated in the process to date and have a reasonable expectation that the hearing panel will consider their submissions and subsequently make recommendations to the Council.

15. It goes without saying that part of the Hearing Panel's function under the RMA is to consider all points raised in submissions and to hear all of the evidence prior to making our recommendations, which includes those submissions concerned with landscape methodology (as opposed to public consultation on the landscape methodology). The hearing will commence on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2023 in accordance with the directions set out in our first Minute. If we consider it necessary after considering the submissions and evidence, we do have the powers to seek a peer review of the landscape methodology.

Decision

16. For the reasons given above, we decline the relief sought by Dr Cossens with respect to public consultation on the landscape methodology. We do, however, note that the hearing will consider submissions and expert evidence from all parties on the landscape methodology, as notified, as part of this statutory process.
17. Should any party have any queries in relation to this Minute or require any clarification in relation to the process for this hearing, please contact the Hearings Administrator at [dp.hearings@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:dp.hearings@qldc.govt.nz).



Jane Taylor

For the Commission

11 October 2023

# **Queenstown Lakes District Council**

**Variation to Chapter 21 (Rural Zone) of the Proposed Queenstown Lakes District Plan**

**Introduction of Priority Area Landscape Schedules: 21.22 (Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes) and 21.23 (Rural Character Landscapes)**

**Report and Recommendations of Hearing Commissioners  
9 May 2024**

**Commissioners**  
**D Jane Taylor (Chair)**  
**Peter Kensington**  
**Quentin Smith**

## Contents Page

Terminology and abbreviations	1
Attendances	2
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>How do the landscape schedules relate to the PDP and what is their role and purpose?</b>	<b>3</b>
Background Environment Court considerations	3
Structure and requirements of the PDP to prepare landscape schedules	5
Role and purpose of the schedules	10
<b>Preliminary matters</b>	<b>12</b>
Alleged Conflict of Interest – Commissioner Smith	12
Adequacy of Consultation	13
Scope to include proposed Mapping Amendments to PA, and ONFL and RCL, boundaries	14
The Adequacy of the section 32 Report	22
Partially Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019 (POORPS) and the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 (PORPS)	23
Relevance of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD)	24
Expert Conferencing	24
<b>Summary of our role in making a recommendation to the Council</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Has preparation of the schedules followed an appropriate methodology?</b>	<b>28</b>
The methodology followed by Council	28
Landscape attributes / values	29
At an appropriate landscape scale	30
Landscape capacity	32
<b>Is the structure of the proposed schedules appropriate?</b>	<b>34</b>
Reference to identified attributes and values as “important”	35
“Summary of landscape values” or “key landscape values”	35
<b>Is the content of the proposed preambles helpful and appropriate?</b>	<b>37</b>
Application – reference to Exception Zones	37
Landscape capacity descriptions	39
Other Areas of Disagreement between the Experts with regard to the wording of the Preambles	41
Activities and Definitions	42
<b>Are the contents of each specific schedule appropriate or are further changes required?</b>	<b>47</b>
<b>Will the schedules be ‘fit for purpose’ and meet the PDP and Court’s intended purpose?</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>Conclusions and recommendations</b>	<b>51</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	

## Terminology and abbreviations

The following terminology and abbreviations are used throughout this report:

Queenstown Lakes District Council	Council
Queenstown Lakes District	District
Hearing Commissioners	Panel
Priority Area Landscape Schedules Variation	Variation
Partially Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019	POORPS
Operative District Plan	ODP
Proposed District Plan	PDP
Outstanding Natural Feature	ONF
Outstanding Natural Landscape	ONL
Outstanding Nature Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape	ONFL
Rural Character Landscape	RCL
Priority Area(s)	PA(s)

## **Attendances**

### For the Queenstown Lakes District Council:

Mr Mike Wakefield, Counsel  
Ms Shanae Richardson, Counsel  
Ms Ruth Evans, Planning  
Ms Bridget Gilbert, Landscape Architecture  
Mr Jeremy Head, Landscape Architecture

### For the Submitters:

Please refer to the Hearing Timetable located under General Hearing Information section on the QLDC website:

<https://www.qldc.govt.nz/your-council/district-plan/proposed-district-plan/hearings/landscape-schedules>

## Introduction

1. This report sets out the recommendations of the Panel to the Council, following the hearing of submissions and evidence with regard to the Variation, which proposes additions to Chapter 21 (Rural Zone) of the PDP. The Variation seeks to introduce proposed Schedules 21.22 and 21.23, with associated preambles, relating to twenty-nine (29) identified Priority Areas (PA) within the District.
2. Proposed Schedule 21.22 seeks to document identified landscape values and related landscape capacity for PAs that relate to existing ONF and ONL landscapes within the PDP; whereas proposed Schedule 21.23 seeks to document identified landscape character and visual amenity values and related landscape capacity for those PAs that relate to existing RCL landscapes within the PDP.

## How do the landscape schedules relate to the PDP and what is their role and purpose?

### Background Environment Court considerations

3. By way of background context, the policy framework set out in Chapter 3 (Strategic Direction) of the PDP that has given rise to the Variation was confirmed by the Environment Court through a complex *de novo* Stage 1 appeal process (Topic 2 – Rural Landscapes) comprising a number of separate but related interim decisions.<sup>1</sup> We understand that the relevant Chapter 3 PDP provisions are now settled, as there are no outstanding appeals.<sup>2</sup>
4. Briefly, the Decisions Version of the PDP (following Stage 1 of the PDP process) did not include any landscape schedules or other text to describe the attributes and values of the District's ONFs, ONLs or RCLs. Rather, the Decisions Version methodology relied on other processes, primarily through applications for resource consent, to provide for the identification of the relevant landscape values to be protected. The Council has noted that there was significant opposition to the initial regime throughout the Stage 1 hearings, and on appeal, with the relief sought challenging both the location of the mapped ONF, ONL and RCL boundaries and whether the regime would adequately protect the District's rural landscapes from inappropriate levels of development, due (in part) to the absence of clearly identified landscape values.
5. The Environment Court subsequently held that, due to the absence of schedules or other descriptions of landscape values, the Decisions Version regime did not provide sufficient certainty to ensure the intended policy direction for ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes was achieved. In Decision 2.1,<sup>3</sup> the Court held that: *"Mapping only assists in identifying the geographic extent of what is sought to be protected. Listing those landscape values that inform why a feature or landscape is an ONF or ONL is an important further element of setting out what is sought to be*

---

<sup>1</sup> The Court's findings have been summarised in paragraphs 4.1 to 4.8 of the Section 32 Evaluation Report dated 30 June 2022; paragraphs 2.1 to 2.13 of the opening Submissions/Representations for Queenstown Lakes District Council, dated 13 October 2023; and also in paragraphs 2.2 to 2.9 of the Reply Legal Submissions for Queenstown Lakes District Council, dated 15 December 2023.

<sup>2</sup> This was not disputed by any of the parties.

<sup>3</sup> *Hawthenden Limited et Ors v Queenstown Lakes District Council* [2019] NZEnvC 160 (Decision 2.1) at [30].

*protected*". At paragraph [31] the Court went on to explain that: "*Objectives, policies, assessment matters and other rules are relatively limited in their capacity to enunciate particular ONF or ONL values because they are designed to apply generically. The listing of relevant values, provided it is properly informed and expressed, helps plug that gap. As such, scheduling values would assist the ODP to fulfil its protective purposes*".

6. At paragraph [57] of Decision 2.1 the Court found: "*Queenstown District stands somewhat apart in being well endowed with landscapes and features of special quality. While comparison is appropriately undertaken at a district level, for a district plan, it is not unsound conceptually for QLDC to have adjudged that 97% of its entire District land area is either ONL or ONF. However, as we discuss at [27] and following, mapping ONFs and ONLs is just one necessary part of ensuring the ODP properly responds to s 6(b), RMA*".
7. Subsequently, in Decision 2.2,<sup>4</sup> the Court held that: "*[L]andscape capacity cannot be known unless there has been an identification of the landscape character values and their importance (i.e. knowing what the landscape is valued for and why). Evaluating a landscape is inherently an exercise where different landscape experts have different opinions. That is why it is important that a district plan identifies both landscape values and landscape capacity in that both of these are part of the plan's intended statutory authority in regard to ss 6(b) and 7(c)*".
8. As set out in the Council's s 32 Report,<sup>5</sup> the Variation:

*"...addresses an issue identified by the Environment Court that it is difficult to protect the landscape values of ONFLs, and maintain the landscape character, and maintain or enhance visual amenity values of RCLs, without first identifying these values. Further, that it is more efficient and effective to identify these values at the district plan level, than to leave the identification to a case-by-case situation via individual resource consent applications."*
9. Through a series of subsequent interim decisions, commencing with Decision 2.2, the Court made a number of directions to give effect to the scheduling of landscape values. These included joint witness conferencing to produce draft *Values Identification Framework* strategic policies, together with associated maps depicting the geographic extent, at "*proper landscape scale*", of the PAs to which those strategic policies would apply.<sup>6</sup> The Court also directed that the *Values Identification Framework* should be targeted to PAs, and that scheduling should not extend beyond specified PAs, nor provide an avenue to revisit ONF, ONL or RCL overlays on the planning maps.<sup>7</sup> The PAs were subsequently endorsed in Decision 2.5, subject to some mapping adjustments and reservation of determination of the proposed Clutha River ONF PA.<sup>8</sup>
10. In summary, through lengthy evidence exchange, expert conferencing and the exchange of various legal submissions and memoranda, the series of interim decisions issued by the Environment Court in Topic 2 resulted in the current set of PDP Chapter 3 (Strategic Direction)

---

<sup>4</sup> At [127] and [128].

<sup>5</sup> Section 32 Report, paragraph 7.1.

<sup>6</sup> Decision 2.2 at [525].

<sup>7</sup> Decision 2.2 at [162] to [164].

<sup>8</sup> Decision 2.5 at [67] – [71] and [83].



and 6 (Landscapes – Rural Character) provisions. We note that these provisions have been significantly amended from the Stage 1 Decisions Version of the PDP. Of most relevance to this Variation, the Chapter 3 amendments added policies that: (i) direct how plan changes are to be pursued for the inclusion of PA schedules; and (ii) provide policy direction that identifies specific mapped PAs. The additional policies also further direct how schedules of landscape values and landscape capacity are to be prepared for inclusion in Chapter 21 (Rural Zone) of the PDP.

11. In Decision 2.9, the Court confirmed, by way of Strategic Policy 3.3.42, that a plan change (or Variation in this instance) be notified by 30 June 2022 to implement the strategic policies that provide for the PA schedules, including the content that has been specified in the associated strategic policies. The relevant strategic policies, which have informed our approach to the Variation, are further described below.
12. We are cognisant that although the process leading to the Variation has been long and complex, the relevant objectives and policies within Chapters 3 and 6 of the PDP are now settled and uncontested. Accordingly, it is plain that we do not have any jurisdiction to make any recommendations that purport to amend any of the PDP Chapter 3 strategic policies, for example. Rather, our role is limited to an assessment (through the Variation) of the requirements of the applicable strategic policies within the PDP, in order to give effect to the Values Identification Framework which underpins the content of proposed Schedules 21.22 and 21.23.
13. We are also mindful of the submission on behalf of the Upper Clutha Environmental Society Incorporated that the overarching objective of the relevant Chapter 3 strategic policies and the associated Values Identification Framework is to *protect* rural landscape values from inappropriate levels of development.<sup>9</sup> To this end, we are cognisant that this Variation, which seeks to give greater clarity as to the landscape attributes and values sought to be protected in areas of ONF, ONL and RCL that are subject to development pressure, is vitally important in terms of “*deciding the fate of rural landscapes for generations to come*”. We concur that the schedules, and in particular the high level assessment of landscape capacity, should, if appropriately constructed, be instrumental in establishing a metaphorical “*line in the sand*” for appropriate levels of development in the ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes.<sup>10</sup>

#### Structure and requirements of the PDP to prepare landscape schedules

14. The Variation to the PDP responds and gives effect to the wider strategic direction provided by Chapter 3 of the PDP relating to the management of landscapes in the Rural Zone. As outlined in the evidence of Ms Evans,<sup>11</sup> at its core the purpose of the Variation is to give effect to and implement the requirements of strategic policy 3.3.42 of the PDP, which requires the Council to notify a plan change (or variation in this instance), to achieve the following prescriptive direction:

---

<sup>9</sup> Submission on behalf of UCESI dated 13 October 2023 at 6 and 19.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid.

<sup>11</sup> Evans, Section 42A evidence at para 4.3; and with reference to the Section 32 Report at paragraphs 1.2 to 1.4, and 3.1 to 3.4.

*“The Council shall notify a proposed plan change to the District Plan by 30 June 2022 to implement SPs 3.3.36, 3.3.37, 3.3.39 and 3.3.40.”*

15. We have also had regard to the other strategic objectives and policies that are relevant to our consideration of the *application* of proposed PA Schedules 21.22 and 21.23 and hence, in particular, the preambles to each of these schedules.<sup>12</sup>
16. Strategic policy 3.3.42 is located within Chapter 3 (Strategic Direction) under Part Two (Strategy) of the PDP, which sets out the over-arching strategic direction for the management of growth, land use and development within the District, in a manner that ensures sustainable management of the District’s special qualities, which includes (at 3.1(a)) *“distinctive lakes, rivers, alpine and high country landscapes free of inappropriate development”*.
17. Ms Lucas provided us with a succinct summary of the District’s landscapes:<sup>13</sup>

*“As identified in the PDP, some 97% of QLD qualifies as an outstanding natural feature or landscape (ONFL) at the District scale, and is thus of national importance. The ONFL are almost all bedrock country – large mountain ranges above and isolated mountains within the deposition lands below. The small areas not included as ONFL are primarily the gentle lowlands of deposition country of the valley floors and lake basins where built development and occupation has been concentrated.*

*The type of land is a major contributor to the valued natural landscape and rural character of this district. The legibility of the land-forming processes, with the mountain slopes shorn off by substantial former glacial flows, and the gouged-out lakes, moraine dumps and outwash terraces left below. The naturalness of land cover and lack of built clutter is important in allowing for the legibility. It is the natural landscape legibility that is the essence to the district’s landscapes in total. Addressed at the national scale, the district’s rural landscapes are in total outstanding for their dramatic natural landscape attributes based on geomorphic character complemented by vegetated naturalness. Their qualities are vulnerable to cumulative degradation through dispersed development.”*
18. In order to achieve strategic objective 3.2.5, being *“the retention of the District’s distinctive landscapes”*, the PDP requires (under objective 3.2.5.1) the identification of landscape values and related landscape capacity for the District’s ONFs and ONLs.<sup>14</sup> Objectives 3.2.5.2 to 3.2.5.4 provide further direction on how these identified landscape values are to be protected for ONFs and ONLs. A similar strategic objective at 3.2.5.7(b) requires the identification of landscape character and visual amenity values and related landscape capacity for RCLs; while objective 3.2.5.5 focuses on the maintenance of landscape character and the maintenance or enhancement of visual amenity values within RCLs.
19. Where applicable to our consideration of the PA schedules, we have also had regard to the key strategic objectives and policies provided in: 3.1B.5, 3.1B.6, 3.2.1.7 and 3.2.1.8; 3.2.4 (protection

---

<sup>12</sup> We discuss the composition of the Schedules more fully later in this report.

<sup>13</sup> Lucas summary statement, dated 6 November 2023, page 1.

<sup>14</sup> Noting that the term ‘landscape capacity’ is as defined in Strategic Policy 3.1B.5 b.

of the distinctive natural environments and ecosystems of the District); 3.3.21 to 3.3.23 (rural activities); 3.3.28 to 3.3.35 (ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes); 3.3.45 to 3.3.46 (landscape assessment methodology); and 3.3.47 to 3.3.48 (rural zone landscape monitoring).

20. Strategic objectives 3.2.5.2(a) (for ONFs and ONLs) and 3.2.5.7(b) (for RCLs) focus attention toward identified PAs, which we understand are geographically/spatially defined areas within the District that include areas of land classified as either ONF, ONL and/or RCL where there is higher development pressure than in other areas.<sup>15</sup>
21. It is important to highlight and recognise that PAs are not necessarily landscape units or landscape character areas in their own right – they are areas of wider ONF, ONL and/or RCL that have been identified (through the Environment Court processes) as anticipated to be *under significant development pressure* during the life of the PDP.<sup>16</sup> Accordingly, in a technical sense, they may comprise one or more discrete landscapes, or be part landscapes (that is, the remaining area of what is considered the relevant landscape is not included in the PA). Hence it is necessary to be cognisant of the other Chapter 3 strategic policies that apply to the ‘non-Priority Area’ ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes, which may form part of a development proposal or the receiving environment.<sup>17</sup> For completeness, the Court noted that the identification of an area as a PA is not intended to connote any higher relative ONF, ONL or RCL quality rating.<sup>18</sup> This was subsequently codified in strategic policy 3.3.44, which clarifies that any, or any part of an ONF, ONL or RCL not identified as a PA in Schedule 21.22 or 21.23 does not imply that the relevant area is more or less important than the identified PA in terms of: the identified landscape attributes and values (ONFs and ONLs) or the identified landscape character and visual amenity values (RCLs); or is more or less vulnerable to subdivision, use and development.
22. A PA is defined at clause 3.1B5 e. of the PDP as:
  - i. *in relation to an Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape, means an area listed in SP 3.3.36 and shown on the maps [held on [QLDC reference file]];*
  - ii. *in relation to the Upper Clutha Rural Character Landscape, means an area listed in SP 3.3.39 and shown on the maps in Schedule 21 [held on [QLDC reference file]].”*
23. Strategic policy 3.3.36 lists the Rural Zone PAs for ONF and ONL, which were identified and mapped through the Court processes, as noted above, being:
  - a. *parts of the Outstanding Natural Features of Peninsula Hill, Ferry Hill, Shotover River, Morven Hill, Lake Hayes, Slope Hill, Feehly Hill, Arrow River, Kawarau River, Mt Barker, and Mt Iron.*
  - b. *parts of the Outstanding Natural Landscapes of West Wakatipu Basin, Queenstown Bay and environs, Northern Remarkables, Central Wakatipu Basin Coronet Area, East Wakatipu Basin and Crown Terrace Area, Victoria Flats, Cardrona Valley,*

<sup>15</sup> Refer Decision 2.2 discussion at [7] - [14].

<sup>16</sup> [2019] NZEnvC 205 at [166] – [167].

<sup>17</sup> Including strategic policy 3.2.5.4, which seeks to ensure that any application for subdivision, use or development not provided for within an Exception Zone protects the landscape values of the relevant ONF or ONL; and strategic policy 3.2.5.6, which seeks to ensure that any subdivision, use or development in an RCL in proximity to an ONF or ONL does not compromise the landscape values of that ONF or ONL.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid at [167].

*Mount Alpha, Roys Bay, West Wanaka, Dublin Bay, Hāwea South and North Grandview, and Lake McKay Station and environs.”*

Importantly, both clauses (a) and (b) under strategic policy 3.3.36 refer to “parts of” ONF or ONL, rather than the geographic extents of the PAs following the full ONF or ONL mapped areas.

24. Strategic policy 3.3.39 lists the Rural Zone PAs within the Upper Clutha RCL, being:

- a. Cardrona River/Mt Barker Road RCL PA;*
- b. Halliday Road/Corbridge RCL PA;*
- c. West of Hāwea River RCL PA;*
- d. Church Road/Shortcut Road RCL PA;*
- e. Maungawera Valley RCL PA.”*

While strategic policy 3.3.39 does not have a similar reference to “parts of” the RCL for each PA, we have approached the geographic extents of the RCL PAs in a similar way to the ONFs and ONLs.

25. Strategic policy 3.3.29(a) further directs the identification of landscape values and landscape capacity (of related ONFs and ONLs) for the PAs which have been identified for inclusion in Schedule 21.22 of the PDP; while strategic policy 3.3.33(a) directs the identification of landscape character and visual amenity values and related landscape capacity (of related RCLs) for the PAs in the Upper Clutha Basin which have been identified for inclusion in Schedule 21.23 of the PDP.

26. Populating the content of both Schedule 21.2 and Schedule 21.3 of the PDP, with associated preambles, is the subject of this Variation. The PDP provides guidance as to what the schedules are to include, as discussed below, with further guidance provided through the various Environment Court decisions that have shaped the content of the PDP to date.<sup>19</sup> In short, the Court anticipated that the schedules would identify the landscape values of ONFs and ONLs and the landscape character and visual amenity values of RCLs, to assist in providing enough certainty to ensure that the relevant PDP policy direction can be achieved.<sup>20</sup>

27. As outlined in the Council’s s 32 Report for the Variation,<sup>21</sup> the Court found that it would be more efficient and effective to identify the landscape values at the district plan level, rather than leaving the identification to a case-by-case situation via individual applications for resource consent(s). Mr Farrell also stressed, in his written and verbal evidence at the hearing,<sup>22</sup> that confirmation of the schedules will assist with the Council’s obligations in responding to policies 3.2.4 and 3.2.6 of the POORPS 2019, which require the identification and maintenance of the values that contribute to a natural feature or natural landscape being outstanding.

---

<sup>19</sup> The first stage of the PDP was notified in August 2015 with subsequent appeals being made to the Court on the Council’s decisions version. As previously discussed, the Court has issued a number of interim decisions on Topic 2 (Landscapes and Rural Character) of the PDP Appeals, including decisions which have shaped the current PDP provisions of relevance.

<sup>20</sup> Requiring: the protection of the landscape values of ONL and ONF; and the maintenance of the landscape character, or the maintenance and enhancement of the visual amenity values of RCL.

<sup>21</sup> Section 32 Report, paragraph 7.1.

<sup>22</sup> Farrell, 17 October 2023 summary statement.

28. Strategic policy 3.3.37, under the heading *Values Identification Framework*, further refines the ‘task at hand’<sup>23</sup> and requires, in addition to a description of landscape values and related landscape capacity, a description of the landscape attributes (physical, sensory and associative) for listed PAs, “*at an appropriate scale*” (a phrase that we discuss further in this recommendation in relation to methodology). A similar requirement for RCLs is mandated in strategic policy 3.3.40.
29. Strategic policy 3.3.38 further specifies how to achieve the directive of strategic policy 3.3.37 for the PAs applicable to ONFs and ONLs through a requirement to:
- a. identify the key physical, sensory and associative attributes that contribute to the values of the Feature or Landscape that are to be protected;*
  - b. describe in accordance with SP 3.3.43, and then rate, those attributes; and*
  - c. assess and record the related landscape capacity for subdivision, use and development activities including but not limited to:*
    - i. commercial recreational activities;*
    - ii. visitor accommodation and tourism related activities;*
    - iii. urban expansions;*
    - iv. intensive agriculture;*
    - v. earthworks;*
    - vi. farm buildings;*
    - vii. mineral extraction;*
    - viii. transport infrastructure;*
    - ix. utilities and regionally significant infrastructure;*
    - x. renewable energy generation;*
    - xi. forestry;*
    - xii. rural living.”*
30. Similarly, for PAs applicable to RCLs, under strategic policy 3.4.41 the following requirements are specified:
- a. identify and describe key public routes and viewpoints both within and in proximity to the Priority Areas (including waterbodies, roads, walkways and cycleways);*
  - b. identify the key physical, sensory and associative attributes that contribute to the landscape character and visual amenity values of the Priority Area;*
  - c. describe in accordance with SP 3.3.43, and then rate, those attributes;*
  - d. assess and record the relationship between the Priority Area and the wider Rural Character Landscape context;*
  - e. assess and record the relationship between the Priority Area and the Outstanding Natural Features within the Upper Clutha Basin;*
  - f. assess and record the relationship between the Priority Area and the Outstanding Natural Landscapes that frame the Upper Clutha Basin; and*
  - g. assess and record the related landscape capacity for subdivision, use and development activities including but not limited to:*
    - i. commercial recreational activities;*

---

<sup>23</sup> This policy was referenced by Mr Krüger as “setting the brief for this work”.

- ii. *visitor accommodation and tourism related activities;*
- iii. *urban expansions;*
- iv. *intensive agriculture;*
- v. *earthworks;*
- vi. *farm buildings;*
- vii. *mineral extraction;*
- viii. *transport infrastructure;*
- ix. *utilities and regionally significant infrastructure;*
- x. *renewable energy generation;*
- xi. *forestry;*
- xii. *rural living.”*

31. In achieving the above outcomes, strategic policy 3.3.43 requires regard to be had to “*physical, sensory (or experiential) and associated attributes*”, as listed in the PDP at 3.3.43(a) to (c).
32. Ms Gilbert confirmed that the structure of the proposed PA schedules has been derived from, and is organised to follow, the strategic policy direction of the PDP outlined above.<sup>24</sup> That is, the proposed PA schedules “...describe the landscape attributes, landscape values (ONFs and ONLs) or landscape character and visual amenity values (RCLs) and the related landscape capacity of each PA...” to assist with the “...protection of identified landscape values of ONF and ONL PAs; and the maintenance and enhancement of identified landscape character and visual amenity values of RCL PAs.”

#### Role and purpose of the schedules

33. Once confirmed, the content of Schedules 21.22 and 21.23, alongside the associated preambles, will assist with administration of the PDP and provide ‘high level’ guidance in relation to the assessment of applications for resource consent(s) when relevant objectives and policies<sup>25</sup> are engaged. Importantly, as Mr Ferguson informed us,<sup>26</sup> it is not the role of the PA schedules to be directive or to set out management aspirations (that is, they do not set policy direction) in relation to landscape capacity for ONFs and ONLs, rather their content simply identifies, describes, assesses and records what is to be protected; while the existing PDP objectives and policies, which remain unchanged through the Variation, provide the necessary strategic direction. Ms Hill also submitted that it was important for the schedules to be descriptive, rather than setting new policy.<sup>27</sup>
34. As noted by Ms Evans in her s 42A Report,<sup>28</sup> the PA Schedules are not linked to specific rules in the PDP, and do not introduce any new resource consent requirements. Rather, the content of the schedules is intended to assist with the assessment of land use and subdivision proposals

<sup>24</sup> Gilbert EIC, para 3.11.

<sup>25</sup> Including, for example: Strategic Objectives 3.2.5.2 (for ONF and ONL) and 3.3.34 (for RCL) of Chapter 3 (Strategic Direction) under Part Two (Strategy); Policies 6.3.3.6 and 6.3.4.6 (relating to the upgrading or development of the National Grid and Regionally Significant Infrastructure) of Chapter 6 (Landscapes – Rural Character) under Part Two (Strategy); and the relevant Assessment Matters (Landscape) 21.21.1-21.21.3 and 21.21.2 of Chapter 21 (Rural Zone) under Part Four (Rural Environment) of the PDP.

<sup>26</sup> Ferguson evidence summary, dated 8 November 2023, para 25.

<sup>27</sup> Anderson Lloyd submissions dated 7 November 2023, at para 5.

<sup>28</sup> Section 42A Report at 4.2.

within the Rural Zone when an application for resource consent is being considered by the Council. However, as Ms Evans also explains, the schedules do provide an element of direction through the *'qualifying comments'* associated with the landscape capacity descriptions.<sup>29</sup> We agree with Ms Evans that these comments should remain in the schedules because they provide useful context and guidance for understanding the capacity ratings.

35. Mr Krüger reminded us that the schedules should achieve what the Environment Court had intended, including:<sup>30</sup>

- *"Overall: improvements in the implementation of s6(b) RMA – "The protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development"*
- *To afford the identified PA (being those areas that are perceived to be subject to higher development pressure) the necessary attention and protection.*
- *Instantaneous information on landscape-related content in resource management application processes for experts and lay-people.*
- *"Simplification" or streamlining of landscape assessment processes.*
- *More uniform outcomes in expert opinions."*

36. We were informed by various landscape experts, as confirmed in their Joint Witness Statement, that the attributes and values outlined within each proposed schedule are at a necessarily *'high level'* given the wide geographic extent/scale of each PA. As such, site-specific landscape assessments, which accompany applications for proposals requiring resource consent(s),<sup>31</sup> will generally be required to provide more localised and *'in depth'* identification and evaluation of specific relevant attributes and values, informed by the overarching content of the PA schedules. Landscape capacity considerations within the proposed schedules, we were told, have also been undertaken at a *'high level'* and will need to be re-evaluated in the context of each specific application. It was generally agreed by the experts that attended expert conferencing that the PA schedules, and in particular the landscape capacity ratings, are not a substitute for a site-specific landscape assessment at the consenting stage.

37. Importantly, strategic policies 3.3.47 to 3.3.48 of the PDP require the Council to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of Rural Zone provisions (at intervals of not more than two and a half years), in order to check whether Strategic Objective 3.2.5 is being achieved. The content of Schedules 21.22 and 21.23 will assist with this *'Rural Zone Landscape Monitoring'* process.

38. As the assessed landscape values and landscape capacity descriptions in the Schedules represent a *'snapshot'* of the landscape at a particular point in time, we consider it essential that Council plans and conducts regular monitoring in accordance with strategic policies 3.3.47 and 3.3.48, to ensure that the schedules, and in particular the capacity ratings, are updated to take account of the potential cumulative effects of subdivision, use and development over time, together with permitted or consented changes in land use. In this regard, we acknowledge the submission from Federated Farmers of NZ, which stressed the importance of recognising that

---

<sup>29</sup> Evans reply statement at paras 4.1-4.6.

<sup>30</sup> Krüger evidence summary, dated 29 October 2023, at para 14.

<sup>31</sup> As required under strategic policies 3.3.45 and 3.3.46, for example.

the landscape is constantly changing, particularly through *'permitted'* rural activities that have previously shaped and will continue to shape the landscape.

39. In summary, the Variation proposes the introduction of twenty-nine (29) Priority Area 'landscape' schedules to Chapter 21 (Rural) of the PDP, as Schedules 21.22 and 21.23. Twenty-four (24) Priority Areas relating to ONFs and ONLs are to be included, as listed under strategic policy 3.3.36; and five (5) Priority Areas that relate to RCLs, as listed under strategic policy 3.3.39. The Variation does not propose to change any objectives and policies in the PDP, or seek to introduce new provisions (other than the PA schedules themselves, with associated preambles).<sup>32</sup>

### **Preliminary matters**

40. A number of preliminary matters were considered and decided prior to and during the Hearing, summarised as follows:
- (i) Alleged potential bias and conflict of interest in relation to Commissioner Smith;
  - (ii) The adequacy of Council's consultation with respect to the Variation;
  - (iii) The Panel's scope to consider and recommend changes to the PA boundaries and/or the ONF, ONL and RCL boundaries (collectively referred to as the "mapping amendments");
  - (iv) The adequacy of the s 32 Report;
  - (v) The Partially Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019 (POORPS) and the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 (PORPS);
  - (vi) The relevance of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD); and
  - (vii) Expert Conferencing outcomes.
41. For completeness, the appropriateness of the landscape methodology employed by the Council was also raised prior to the hearing in a number of submissions and memoranda. Our response to this matter is set out in our Minute dated 11 October 2023 (attached as **Appendix 3**) and addressed further in the main body of findings below.<sup>33</sup>
42. We discuss and record our findings on the preliminary matters as follows.

### Alleged Conflict of Interest – Commissioner Smith

43. By way of a memorandum dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 2023, Dr John Cossens challenged the appointment of Councillor and Deputy Mayor Smith to the Panel on the grounds of alleged "*potential bias and conflict of interest*". The grounds giving rise to the allegations related to Commissioner Smith's involvement as a member of the Queenstown Lakes District Council Planning and Strategy committee and, in particular, his participation and voting record in relation to various motions concerning the process surrounding the landscape variations schedules.

---

<sup>32</sup> Evans, section 42 evidence at para 4.4.

<sup>33</sup> Refer to the Minute of the Hearing Panel dated 11 October 2023.



44. Our preliminary views on the allegations were set out in a Minute dated 30 August 2023, which is attached as **Appendix 1** to this Report, at the conclusion of which we invited further memoranda from any other parties that wished to be heard on the matter of Commissioner Smith's alleged bias or conflict of interest. This Minute also noted Commissioner Smith's role as a trustee of the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust (the Trust), and our determination that Commissioner Smith would, as a consequence, not be involved in deliberations or any subsequent recommendations in relation to the Trust's submission.
45. In response to our invitation, a further memorandum on behalf of the Cardrona Cattle Company Limited (CCCL) dated 6 September 2023 was subsequently received. The CCCL memorandum discussed the relevant principles of law in relation to allegations of bias and conflict of interest, and supported the general concerns raised in Dr Cossens' memorandum.
46. Our response to the CCCL memorandum was set out in a Minute dated 14 September 2023, which is attached as **Appendix 2** to this Report.
47. Our findings on the matter of the alleged bias and conflict of interest of Commissioner Smith are summarised as follows:<sup>34</sup>
- (a) Having had regard to the applicable legal principles and authoritative guidance, we concluded that a fair-minded observer would not reasonably think Councillor Smith might not bring an impartial mind to the recommendations, and that no question of predetermination, bias or conflict of interest arises, except as specifically noted in relation to the Trust (as per our Minute dated 30 August 2023) and the particular concerns of CCCL as outlined in its memorandum of 6 September 2023.
  - (b) We determined, applying an abundance of caution, that in addition to not taking part in deliberations and recommendations in relation to the Trust's submission, Councillor Smith would not take part in any deliberations or any subsequent recommendations in relation to CCCL's submission or further submission and, to the extent that it concerns CCCL's submission or further submission, the Councils submission (which CCCL further submitted on).
48. We confirm that Commissioner Smith has not taken part in the deliberations or the formulation of recommendations in relation to the matters raised in the submissions and further submissions of both the Trust and CCCL as they apply to those entities. Commissioner Smith also elected to recuse himself from the hearing during the oral representations and submissions on behalf of CCCL, and in relation to the Gibbston Character Zone generally.

#### Adequacy of Consultation

49. In a second memorandum dated 12 September 2023, Dr Cossens requested that the Panel:
- “(a) Consider the matter of whether the landscape schedule methodology, in particular the community consultation, was fair, reliable, robust and representative.*

---

<sup>34</sup> Minute of the Panel dated 14 September 2023 at 22 to 23.

- (b) Initiate an expert peer review of the consultative method and landscape methodology employed by [Council]; and*
- (c) Allow for submissions to be received on the methodology employed by [Council]”*

50. At paragraph 30 of his memorandum, Dr Cossens outlines the relief sought as follows:
- “(a) To find there is a case to be heard in regard the consultative and landscape schedules methodology employed by the QLDC.*
  - (b) To call for submissions on the matter of the landscape and consultation method employed by the QLDC, and*
  - (c) Once having had the evidence and submissions, determine whether the landscape and consultative methodology was fair, reasonable and provided sufficient information for respondents to make an informed submission on landscape values.*
  - (d) If the Commission finds the consultative process was not fair, then it is submitted the Commission would have no choice in calling for the consultative process to be redone in a more reliable, fair and representative manner.”*
51. For the reasons set out in our Minute dated 11 October 2023, attached as **Appendix 3** to this Report, we declined the relief sought by Dr Cossens with respect to the alleged deficiencies in the Council’s *public consultation* on landscape methodology. We noted, however, that the hearing would consider submissions and expert evidence from all parties on the landscape methodology employed by the Council in formulating the schedules, as part of the statutory process.

Scope to include proposed Mapping Amendments to PA, and ONFL and RCL, boundaries

52. Whether or not the Panel has scope to recommend mapping changes to PAs, which in some cases also extended to corresponding changes to ONF, ONL and RCL boundaries, was a significant issue in relation to this Variation. Ms Baker-Galloway submitted that *“it was a common public/submitter perception and understanding that the mapping of PA boundaries and ONL boundaries are indeed the subject of submissions and the Variation”*.<sup>35</sup> At the hearing she advised that approximately 55, equating to 25% of total submissions received by the Council (excluding further submissions) had requested changes to the PA and/or ONF and ONL boundaries, or alternatively had sought retention of the boundaries,<sup>36</sup> and that this provided strong evidence that the scope of the notified Schedule 1 process was widely understood to include proposed mapping amendments.
53. The relief sought in relation to changes to the PA boundaries included both significant and relatively minor changes to the PA boundaries, in some cases with corresponding changes to the ONF, ONL or RCL boundaries; together with the exclusion of land within non-Rural Zones and Operative Zones from PAs, including Exception Zones and parts of the Gibbston Valley Resort Zone and the Northlake Special Zone.

---

<sup>35</sup> Legal submissions of Anderson Lloyd dated 16 October 2023 at 12.

<sup>36</sup> Refer also to Anderson Lloyd Legal Submissions dated 24 October 2023 at 25.

54. Council's position is that any requested mapping amendments to the PAs, together with the separate PDP ONF, ONL and RCL landscape classification lines, are not within the scope of the Variation.
55. It was not in contention that the Panel, together with the Council in its decision-making role, can only operate within its jurisdiction (scope). Scope is a matter of interpretation by reference to the applicable case law and the notified proposal.<sup>37</sup>
56. The leading authority on scope is *Clearwater Resort Limited v Christchurch City Council*.<sup>38</sup> The High Court's approach was subsequently endorsed in *Palmerston North City Council v Motor Machinists Ltd*,<sup>39</sup> which summed up the required test as follows:

*[80] For a submission to be on a plan change, therefore, it must address the proposed plan change itself. That is, to the alteration of the status quo brought about by that change. The first limb in Clearwater serves as a filter, based on direct connection between the submission and the degree of notified change proposed to the extant plan. It is the dominant consideration. It involves itself two aspects: the breadth of alteration to the status quo entailed in the proposed plan change, and whether the submission then addresses that alteration.*

....

*[91] To sum up:*

*(a) .... [The] approach requires analysis as to whether, first the submission addresses the plan change to the status quo advanced by the proposed plan change and, secondly, there is a real risk that persons potentially affected by such a change have been denied an effective opportunity to participate in the plan change process.*

...

*(d) The first limb of the Clearwater test requires that the submission address the alteration to the status quo entailed in the proposed plan change. The submission must reasonably be said to fall within the ambit of that plan change. One way of analysing that is to ask whether the submission raises matters that should have been addressed in the s 32 evaluation and report. If so, the submission is unlikely to fall within the ambit of the plan change. Another is to ask whether the management regime and a district plan for a particular resource is altered by the plan change. If it is not, then a submission seeking a new management regime for that resource is unlikely to be 'on' the plan change, unless the change is merely incidental or consequential.*

*(e) The second limb of the Clearwater test asks whether there is a real risk that persons directly or potentially directly affected by the additional changes proposed in the*

---

<sup>37</sup> We record here that the Panel did not request "expert evidence" on this jurisdictional matter, as has been assumed by Mr Wakefield and recorded at paragraph 3.4 of the Reply Legal Submissions for Council dated 15 December 2023. Plainly the issue of scope is not a matter of expert evidence, as the Panel is fully aware. Rather, had we determined that the scope of the Variation extended to mapping amendments, the Panel was minded to afford Council's experts the opportunity to respond to the submitter evidence that had been filed and presented prior to and during the Hearing.

<sup>38</sup> HC, Christchurch, AP34/02, 14 March 2003 ("*Clearwater*").

<sup>39</sup> [2013] NZHC 1290 ("*Motor Machinists*").

submission have been denied an effective opportunity to respond to those additional changes in the plan change process.

57. Applying the *Clearwater* test, the Council submitted that:

- (i) Mapping amendments to the PAs, ONFL and RCL proposed by various submitters are not “on” the Variation, and could not have reasonably been contemplated to be within the scope of the Variation, as:
- Any recommended changes to the respective PA, ONFL or RCL boundaries, or the potential for them to be made, were not addressed in the s 32 evaluation and report. On the contrary, the s 32 Report made it clear that the Variation was limited to the *content* of the PA schedules.
  - The public was not notified of any changes to the PA areas, or the potential for such changes, in the Public Notice that accompanied the Variation.<sup>40</sup> The Public Notice expressly references the introduction of PA Schedules 21.22 and 21.23 but makes no mention of the potential for any related mapping amendments.
  - The link to the mapping of the PAs was only referenced (by way of a weblink) under the topic heading “*Landscape Schedules Variation*” to ensure that submitters were aware of the spatial area that the proposed PA schedules would apply to. This does not amount to notification of the PA boundaries, either expressly or by inference. The information on the dedicated webpage for the Variation, which includes the Information Sheet and the s 32 Report, also makes it clear the PA mapping was not part of the Variation.
  - The Variation is not seeking to change the management regime for any ONFs, ONLs or RCLs, or the Rural Zone, other than by introducing PA schedules to guide the operation and implementation of the relevant policy regime for ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes (as the Court determined to be appropriate through Topic 2).
  - The exclusion of the potential for mapping amendments was a deliberate decision of Council, and one that it was plainly within its discretion.
- (ii) No notice of the potential for mapping amendments was given to those who may have otherwise taken part in the proceeding. Accordingly, were the Panel to make recommendations in favour of amendments to the PA mapping and/or ONFL and/or RCL boundaries, this would raise clear procedural fairness concerns. The Council submitted that there exists the real potential that parties that would have, had they known, taken part in the process (including by way of further submissions) could be prejudiced by the making of such recommendations.<sup>41</sup>

58. Counsel for various submitters, together with their advisors and expert witnesses, maintain that a correct interpretation and application of the *Clearwater* tests provides scope for mapping

---

<sup>40</sup> The Public Notice dated 30 June 2022 advising of the proposed variation to the QLDC PDP.

<sup>41</sup> In support of this submission, Council notes in its Reply Legal submissions at 4.11 that a number of submitters have expressed their understanding that PA mapping is not within the scope of the Variation, including the Upper Clutha Environmental Society Inc (submitter #67).

adjustments, at a minimum with respect to the PA boundaries. Their arguments are summarised as follows:

- (i) The decision of the Environment Court to decline to exercise its powers under s 293 to notify the PA mapping and schedules through the Topic 2 process,<sup>42</sup> raised a legitimate expectation that there would be the potential for affected parties to be able to participate at a later date.<sup>43</sup>
- (ii) The values and attributes assessment, which is the focus of the s 32 assessment, is the “*first time*” the values, attributes, character and related capacity of a number of already identified ONLs and ONFs have been considered in detail. Because capacity ratings change over time, it follows that a more detailed assessment undertaken as part of the Variation may also lead to better and “*more defensible*” boundaries, informed by best practice landscape assessment methodology. Accordingly, assessment of the values and attributes of the identified landscapes, and “*consequent mapping of boundaries supported by the values and attributes identification*”, which is an iterative process, is squarely within the ambit of the s 32 report, as envisaged in the *Clearwater* tests.<sup>44</sup>
- (iii) Failure to include mapping amendments, as supported by a more fine-grained analysis, within the scope of the Variation will necessitate the need for any deficiencies to be corrected through another Schedule 1 process, which is neither efficient nor effective.<sup>45</sup>
- (iv) The Variation is not a ‘*narrow*’ or ‘*minor*’ change to the PDP. The PAs are subject to an additional and new “*step*” of planning assessment, against identified values and capacity. Consequently, submissions on this “*new management regime*” must be able to critique the associated spatial areas.<sup>46</sup>
- (v) That the PA overlays were notified or incorporated is supported by Ms Gilbert's references to the “*notified PA mapping*” throughout her evidence, including Appendix 3.<sup>47</sup>
- (vi) Changes subsequently made to the PA mapping after the Topic 2 Court decision by the Council, which is indicated by the differently coloured spatial layers on the Council's website, supports the submitters' position that the PA mapping was notified through the Variation. Importantly, where those mapped areas differ from the Court-ordered boundaries in Topic 2, landowners have had no opportunity for involvement in the “*regulatory change*” to their land.<sup>48</sup> Having had regard to the consequential amendments and in particular the use of Clause 16 amendments,<sup>49</sup> for the Council to

---

<sup>42</sup> *Upper Clutha Environmental Society the Queenstown Lakes District Council* [2020] NZEnvC 158 at [33] and [68]. Interim Decision 2.5.

<sup>43</sup> Anderson Lloyd Legal Submissions on behalf of Passion Developments Limited dated 16 October 2023 at 28 and 29.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid* at 21 to 22. This submission was also supported in the Representations on behalf of CCCL and Milstead Trust dated 13 October 2023 at 10 to 15.

<sup>45</sup> Representations on behalf of CCCL and Milstead Trust dated 13 October 2023 at 13.

<sup>46</sup> Anderson Lloyd, *ibid* at 19, with reference to the decision in *High Country Rosehip Orchards Ltd v MacKenzie District Council* [2011] NZEnvC 387 at [27].

<sup>47</sup> *Ibid* at 25.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid* at 24 to 27.

<sup>49</sup> Anderson Lloyd Submissions dated 24 October 2023 at 25 to 31.

maintain its position that the mapping was not notified would result in a “*flawed and misleading*” process.

- (vii) With respect to the ONF, ONL and/or RCL boundaries, any consequential change to these boundaries as a result of the amended PA boundaries is a matter that is reasonably anticipated to be the subject of submissions (applying the *Clearwater* tests).<sup>50</sup>
- (viii) There is no risk that persons directly or potentially directly affected by the additional changes proposed will have been denied an effective opportunity to respond. Many submitters understood the PA boundaries to be the subject of the Variation and did not seek amendments to those boundaries. Anyone specifically interested in the ONL or PA boundaries could have lodged a submission or further submission, as part of the process.<sup>51</sup>

59. Other submissions raised the issue of natural justice in relation to those submitters that were not involved in the PDP Topic 2 appeals, and consequently were not able to have input into the identification of PAs and schedules. It was submitted that the Variation does change the policy framework or direction, contrary to the s 32 Report and analysis; accordingly the inability to “*look behind*” the Environment Court direction and question the appropriateness or effectiveness of the PAs and accompanying schedules, as a method, unfairly prejudices affected landowners.<sup>52</sup>

### *Discussion*

60. In explaining our findings on scope, it is important to first set out the background context surrounding the introduction and mapping of the PAs.
61. The appropriateness of the priority area scheduling approach was determined by the Environment Court in Decision 2.2.<sup>53</sup> The Court’s approach envisaged the identification and scheduling of areas of ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes subject to significant development pressure, and the preparation of associated landscape schedules for these areas. It was made very clear by the Court that this approach was not intended to differentiate between the protection afforded to ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes (by the PDP) as between ‘priority’ or ‘non-priority’ areas.
62. Further, the Court was not prepared to allow the Council to decide on the Priority Areas, instead finding that “*these are matters more properly directed by our decision on the evidence such that the priority areas are specified in the relevant Chapter 3 policies for Schedule 1 plan changes*”.<sup>54</sup> In making this determination, the Court held that it would not direct the Council “*to undertake a District-wide landscape assessment, or to progress ONFL values scheduling beyond specified*

---

<sup>50</sup> Ibid at 27.

<sup>51</sup> Ibid at 23.

<sup>52</sup> Submission #109 by Kiwi Vineyard Holdings Ltd dated 26 August 2022 at 3.1.

<sup>53</sup> [2019] NZEnvC 205 at [162].

<sup>54</sup> Ibid at [163].

*priority areas, or to revisit the ONFL or RCL overlays on the planning maps*".<sup>55</sup> The Court then set in train a process to identify the Priority Areas, as has been described in the evidence in chief of Ms Gilbert.<sup>56</sup> Ultimately, the PA mapping that accompanied the associated Joint Witness Statement was confirmed in Decision 2.7.<sup>57</sup> The Court recognised that greater clarity was needed as to the geographic boundaries of each listed PA, finding that the balance weighed in favour of having mapping accompany the listing of PAs. In its determination, the Court provided for the Council to elect whether it wished to include the mapping directly in the PDP, or to have it incorporated by reference to a suitable Council file.<sup>58</sup> The Council chose the latter option by way of a Memorandum dated 16 June 2021. We were advised by the Council that it is currently in the process of including the link to the mapping reference file in Chapter 3, as part of a wider workstream to update the PDP provisions to reflect recent Court decisions and consent orders.<sup>59</sup>

63. Under clause 30 of Schedule 1 of the RMA, the Council is of the view that its powers under Clause 16(2) to amend a proposed plan where an alteration is of minor effect, or to correct any minor errors, extends to material incorporated by reference. For any non-minor amendments to material incorporated by reference, that is, changes that are not neutral in effect, clause 31 would be triggered, which requires a variation or plan change for that purpose.<sup>60</sup> We note that the lawfulness of this approach, and the Council's subsequent application of clause 16 to the PA mapping determined through the Court processes, is not a matter that we are required to turn our minds to, as it does not impact on our findings below with regard the scope of the Variation. We comment on this aspect further below.

### *Findings*

64. Applying the first limb of the *Clearwater* test, we find that the mapping amendments proposed by submitters are not 'on' the Variation for the following reasons:
- (i) The Public Notice, together with the s 32 Report and associated material that informed the notification of the Variation, make it unambiguously clear that the scope of the proposal is limited to the content of the Schedules. The s 32 report in particular explicitly states that the Variation does not change any aspect of the identification or mapping of the PAs, nor does it seek to introduce new PAs or delete identified PAs: "*Identification and mapping of the Priority Areas has already occurred and is already set out in Chapter 3 of the PDP and the web mapping application*".<sup>61</sup> We therefore accept the Council's submission that these statements plainly confine the Variation to the *content* of the PA schedules to be included in Chapter 21 of the PDP.
  - (ii) We further consider the submission that Ms Gilbert's references to "*notified PA mapping*" in her Evidence in Chief, which was filed after the submission period closed, to be somewhat disingenuous. It seems plain to us, on a purposive interpretation, that Ms

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid at [164].

<sup>56</sup> EIC Ms Gilbert dated 11 August 2023 at [3.9].

<sup>57</sup> [2017] NZEnvC60 at [26].

<sup>58</sup> Ibid at [13] to [15].

<sup>59</sup> Opening Legal Submissions for Council dated 13 October 2023 at 2.13.

<sup>60</sup> Ibid at 4.2 to 4.3.

<sup>61</sup> Refer s 32 Report at 1.5 and 1.6.

Gilbert was simply referring to the PA maps that accompanied the Variation (by way of a weblink) as a point of reference for submitters. This is supported by the observation that Ms Gilbert's evidence did not directly address the various submissions that had been made with respect to PA (or ONF, ONL and/or RCL) mapping, which would otherwise necessarily have been the case. We observe that had access to the PA mapping not been made readily available by the Council, the ability of submitters to meaningfully participate in the Variation process would have been significantly impeded.

- (iii) While a more detailed assessment of values, attributes and capacity (as informed by best practice landscape methodology) may or may not result in "*more defensible [PA] boundaries*", this was not the purpose of the Variation and, with respect, appears to misinterpret the basis on which the PAs were determined by the Court. The PAs comprise areas that are subject to *substantial development pressure*, which may not necessarily comprise landscapes or part landscapes in their own right. The '*iterative*' landscape process advanced by the submitters does not necessarily, therefore, bear any relationship to the identified PA boundaries, which are for a different purpose (as explained by the Court). We are not aware of any arguments that addressed the absence of significant development pressure within a mapped PA; on the contrary, most if not all submissions, either directly or by implication, sought intensification of subdivision, use and development.
  
- (iv) In any event, the Court has made it plain, supported by the inclusion of Chapter 3 Strategic Policy 3.3.44, that the protection to be afforded to 'Non-PA' ONFL and RCL areas is no less important than an identified PA in terms of the landscape attributes and values (ONFs and ONLs) or landscape character and amenity values (RCLs), or is less vulnerable to subdivision, use and development than a PA. Accordingly, unless we had scope to also change the corresponding ONF, ONL or RCL boundaries, any recommendations that we might purport to make with respect to PA mapping may have little practical effect given the role and purpose of the schedules (which we discuss further in the substantive section of this report below) and in particular the need for a site-specific assessment with respect to any proposed development. The ONF, ONL and RCL boundaries have been determined through robust Court processes, as set out in Decision 2.2,<sup>62</sup> which specifically addressed the Council's ability to re-visit the ONF, ONL or RCL overlays on the planning maps. We do not consider that we have authority to relitigate the Court's decision by adopting what would amount to a very strained approach to the scope of this Variation. Any substantial change to these boundaries will therefore require a Schedule 1 process to be initiated or, in the case of 'minor' changes to the PA boundaries, an appeal to the Council for exercise of its powers under clause 16. We note that as a result of the mapping submissions filed in response to this Variation, the Council has prepared a schedule of proposed minor clause 16 changes to the PAs.<sup>63</sup> While this appears to be an appropriate response by the Council in the circumstances, as set out above, it is not necessary for us to express a view on the *vires* of this method.

---

<sup>62</sup> Decision 2.2 at [164].

<sup>63</sup> Refer Reply Submissions for Council at Appendix 3.



- (v) We also note that, in some instances, substantive relief with respect to mapping amendments has already been sought through (unrelated) Court processes.<sup>64</sup> Council notes that the boundaries at issue in these proceedings have not been re-notified as part of this Variation. For us to purport to make recommendations with respect to PA, or ONF, ONL and/or RCL boundaries on a matter that is currently before the Court would serve no useful purpose, and we agree with the Council that these submissions are tantamount to an opportunistic attempt to relitigate the concerns of those submitters.
- (vi) We have considered whether the Court, in declining to exercise its powers under s 293 to notify the PA mapping and schedules through the Topic 2 process, anticipated the potential for affected parties to be able to ‘participate’ at a later date. While on its face this is a possible interpretation of Judge Hassan’s observations (although in our view there are equally valid interpretations that would confine participation to the content of the schedules), it is also very clear that the Court ultimately left such matters to the Council in its discretionary judgement as the planning authority.<sup>65</sup> As we have found above, the Council chose not to notify the PA maps as part of this Variation on the basis that the PA mapping had been endorsed for incorporation in the PDP by the Court;<sup>66</sup> accordingly, the submitters’ argument falls moot on this point.
- (vii) Finally, we find that nothing turns on the submissions concerning a range of changes to the PA mapping incorporated by reference (as evidenced on the Council’s website) following the Court’s decision on the boundaries of the PAs, together with any confusion arising from the green and yellow spatial overlay mapping layers or the Council’s subsequent clause 16 amendments. While we are cognisant of the potential misperception that may have been raised, in our view any alleged deficiencies in this process do not have any bearing on the matter of jurisdiction under the first limb of the *Clearwater* test, for the reasons outlined above. To find otherwise would be at odds with the express wording used in the s 32 Report and the Public Notice.

65. With regard to the second limb of the *Clearwater* test, we accept the Council's submission that recommendations on the requested PA mapping changes, or any of the separate PDP landscape boundaries, would create significant procedural fairness issues that are unable to be rectified through this process. We concur that any attempt to relocate the PDP landscape lines would amount to a re-litigation of matters progressed and determined through the Topic 2 Court decisions referenced above, which was plainly regarded by some submitters to now be settled and, as such, not a matter that was open for review through this Variation.

66. We note here that a number of the more substantial mapping submissions concerned the ‘carve-out’ of non-Rural zoned land, including Exception Zones and Operative Zones, from the PA

---

<sup>64</sup> Opening Submissions for Council dated 13 October 2023 at 6.30 to 6.34, including Hawthenden [ref]; Cardrona Cattle Company Limited; Sticky Forest; the landscape classification of the Rural Zone outside the mapped extent of the Kimiākau Shotover River ONF with respect to properties located at 111 and 163 Atley Road– refer to Council’s Memorandum regarding Priority Area mapping dated 20 October 2023 at 9 to 11.

<sup>65</sup> Decision 2.2 at [164].

<sup>66</sup> Reply Legal Submissions for Council at 4.23.

Schedules.<sup>67</sup> During the course of the hearing it was generally agreed by all parties that the PA schedules do not apply to non-Rural zoned land. Accordingly, while we do not have jurisdiction to make any changes to the PA boundaries, we concur with the Council that as the schedules plainly do not apply to non-Rural Zoned land located within PAs, including Exception Zones and Operative Zones, there is no specific need to ‘carve out’ the mapping.<sup>68</sup> The application of the PAs (to Rural zoned land only) has been clarified in the preambles for the avoidance of any doubt in this respect.

67. Other submissions of note were concerned with the extension of the PA boundaries into Resort and Urban zoned land; specifically parts of the Gibbston Valley Resort Zone and the Northlake Special Zone. The Council has acknowledged that these minor boundary ‘overlaps’ are anomalous, and that the PA boundaries should logically follow the respective Resort and Special Zone boundaries in these locations. Corrections to the respective PA boundaries through a clause 16 adjustment has been proposed by the Council.<sup>69</sup>
68. Overall, we find that we have no jurisdiction to consider or make recommendations on the PA, ONF, ONL and RCL mapping amendments proposed in submissions and further submissions. As set out above, our scope is limited to the *content* of proposed Schedules 21.22 and 21.23, including the proposed preambles. Although it is possible that some submitters may have harboured a misperception that mapping amendments were ‘on’ the Variation and prepared submissions accordingly, this does not, in our view, impact on our consideration of and recommendations with respect to the schedules and the preambles. We observe, however, that as noted above, a number of the mapping submissions have very helpfully assisted us with clarification of the *application* of the PA Schedules to non-Rural zoned land and, in some cases, will lead to minor adjustments through the Council’s proposed clause 16 process.

#### The Adequacy of the section 32 Report

69. Several submissions allege that the s 32 analysis is inadequate, as it relies solely on the Environment Court’s direction as the reason for the Variation and provides no assessment of options or considered cost benefit analysis. Further, the methodology adopted states that the starting point is the collective decisions of the Environment Court, rather than a zero-based approach. The submitters invited us to consider whether the Variation is the most appropriate method to achieve the Chapter 3 strategic objectives and policies, the costs and benefits, efficiency and effectiveness and risks of implementation; in particular, the use of the proposed schedules against the option of the status quo.
70. As set out above, the purpose of the Variation is to give effect to the Environment Court’s directions as recorded in strategic policy 3.3.42. The scope of the proposal is therefore limited to the content of the schedules, including the way the schedules describe the landscape attributes and landscape values (ONFs and ONLs) or the landscape character and visual amenity

---

<sup>67</sup> These included in relation to Mt Cardrona Station, Coneburn Preserve Holdings Limited and Henley Downs Farm Holdings Limited, Soho Ski Area Limited and Blackmans Creek Holdings 1 LP, Cardrona Cattle Company Limited; RealNZ Limited; Rock Supplies NZ Limited and The Station at Waitiri Limited.

<sup>68</sup> Refer opening submissions of Council at 6.19, which we adopt.

<sup>69</sup> Reply Legal Submissions for Council dated 15 December 2023 at Appendix 3.

values (RCLs), and the related capacity of the landscape within each of the 29 PAs. The Variation does not change any objectives or policies in the PDP or seek to introduce new objectives or policies.

71. We note that in paragraphs 9 to 11 of the s 32 Report, the Council examined the extent to which the proposed objectives are the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, noting that the Variation does not propose any new objectives or changes to the existing objectives. The s 32 Report concluded that because the Variation is a direct result of the processes directed by the Court, which was required to adhere to the requirements of s 32, the Variation is the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA. We are satisfied that this is an appropriate conclusion, and that a “zero-based approach” is neither practicable nor would it necessarily give effect to the Court’s directions, as now codified in Chapter 3.
72. The Council also carried out an assessment of whether the proposed provisions are the most appropriate way to achieve the objective or purpose of the proposal, noting that this assessment must identify other reasonably practicable options for achieving the objectives, assess the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions in achieving objectives, including consideration of the benefits and costs anticipated from the implementation of the provisions, and the risk of acting or not acting if there is uncertain or insufficient information about the subject matter of the provisions. The required analysis was included in section 11 of the s 32 Report. The Council concluded that there are no other reasonably practicable options to achieve the purpose of the variation or the objectives of Chapter 3 of the PDP, noting that Chapter 3 sets out a clear and direct approach by identifying the PAs, specifying the methodology to be used to identify and describe the values, and setting the date by which notification was required. As such, the Council considered there are no other reasonable options to achieve such a specific direction.
73. Having had regard to the s 32 Report, we are satisfied that the Council’s analysis was adequate, meets the statutory requirements and that no further analysis is required. We further note that the adequacy of the s 32 report was not raised in oral submissions at the hearing.

Partially Operative Otago Regional Policy Statement 2019 (POORPS) and the Proposed Otago Regional Policy Statement 2021 (PORPS)

74. As noted by Ms Evans in her evidence before us, the PORPS is a matter that we must have regard to under section 74(2)(a) of the RMA. The POORPS is the operative planning instrument for the purpose of section 75(3)(c) of the RMA, and must be given effect to. We are satisfied that the proposed schedules are consistent with the applicable PORPS and POORPS policies, where relevant. In this regard, as mentioned earlier in this Report, Mr Farrell helpfully drew our attention to PORPS policy 3.2.4, which requires the identification and maintenance of the values that contribute to the natural feature or natural landscape being outstanding, and policy 3.2.6, which is concerned with managing highly valued natural features, landscapes, and seascapes.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>70</sup> Farrell, 17 October 2023 summary statement.

75. Given the relevant Chapter 3 provisions, and the purpose of this Variation, we agree with the submission of counsel for the Council that it is difficult to see how future decisions on the PORPS would materially impact on our consideration of the content of the PA schedules. Should the PORPS make any significant policy shifts, which would ultimately be reflected in the PDP through a subsequent process, the starting position would necessarily be with the relevant objectives and policies, rather than the content of the PA schedules.

#### Relevance of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD)

76. In his planning evidence for Passion Developments Limited, Mr Richard Kemp considered the NPS-UD to be relevant to the Variation, on the basis that section 1.3 references “*planning decisions ... that affect an urban environment*”, which provides the necessary link between the NPS-UD and the Variation. Mr Kemp also identified a number of objectives and policies of the NPS-UD that he considered relevant to matters addressed by the Variation.<sup>71</sup>
77. Ms Evans comprehensively responded to this issue and her rebuttal evidence, concluding that as the focus of the variation is on section 6 and 7 landscapes (Part 2 of the RMA), and implementing the strategic direction set in Chapter 3 of the PDP, the NPS-UD direction is not material to the Variation. She stated:<sup>72</sup>
- “... urban environment is described in the NPSUD as land that is or is intended to be predominantly urban in character. The Rural Zone (to which the PA schedules directly apply) is not part of the urban environment. In addition, the relevant landscapes are - other than limited exceptions - entirely outside the existing urban environment in the District, which is defined by the mapped Urban Growth Boundary. For these reasons, I consider that the NPSUD has very limited relevance to the proposed variation.”*
78. In his Reply legal submissions for the Council,<sup>73</sup> Mr Wakefield submitted that Ms Evans’s evidence is correct. He noted that the NPS-UD does not, as a policy document, engage with the Rural Zone, or any non-rural environment, unless there is a relevant proposal to rezone land so that it comes within the urban environment. Accordingly, as the Variation addresses the content of new schedules for inclusion in Chapter 21, Rural Zone of the PDP, the NPS-UD is of no relevance.
79. We accept the evidence of Ms Evans and, concurring with Mr Wakefield, find the NPS-UD is not relevant to our consideration of this Variation.

#### Expert Conferencing

80. Expert conferencing of landscape experts and planners, facilitated by Independent Commissioner Ken Fletcher, took place during the week of 2 to 6 October 2023 and resulted in two Joint Witness Statements dated 4 October 2023 (landscape architects only) and 6 to 10 October 2023 (landscape architects and planners). Although not all experts were able to attend conferencing, or only able to attend in part, significant agreement was reached between those

---

<sup>71</sup> Statement of Evidence of Mr Richard Kemp dated 11 September 2023 at 5.1 – 5.6.

<sup>72</sup> Rebuttal evidence of Ms Evans at 4.5 – 4.6.

<sup>73</sup> Reply Legal Submissions of Council at 13.4 – 13.5.

present (which included the Council's experts) with respect to the content of the PA schedules and the preambles.

81. We wish to acknowledge the benefit of the expert conferencing that occurred following the exchange of evidence in chief and before the hearing commenced. This process significantly narrowed areas of disagreement and made the hearing process more efficient than it might otherwise have been had conferencing not occurred. In that regard, we thank the mediator, Commissioner Fletcher and all parties and participants for their role in this process, and in particular for the professional manner in which the conferencing was approached and the clear outcomes that were communicated via the Joint Witness Statements.
82. We note the Joint Witness Statements helpfully recorded agreement amongst experts that:
  - (a) Each PA Schedule has been written to be read in its entirety and selected excerpts should not be read in isolation or taken out of the context of the entire schedule; and
  - (b) Each PA Schedule should be read in conjunction with the associated preamble and not in isolation, particularly because:
    - (i) As the schedules are written at the broad PA level, they are a high-level description and assessment, and any proposed project will be set at a smaller scale within the PA; and
    - (ii) Each proposed project will require a specific landscape assessment that identifies how the project sits within the PA, which attributes and values of the PA are relevant to the project, and an assessment against those values and related capacity.

We acknowledge Mr Farrell's contribution to the Joint Witness Statement, in which it was recorded that: *"...landscape assessments for some proposals may need to assess landscape values beyond those identified in the PA Schedule (e.g. where an identified PA forms only part of a larger ONF/L). This is because ONF/L policy directives tend to apply across the full extent of a ONF/L, not just the extent of a PA."*

83. One of the most significant issues raised in submissions concerned the landscape capacity rating scale adopted by the Council, and in particular the *"no landscape capacity"* rating. This issue was very helpfully largely resolved during expert conferencing (albeit that not all experts were in attendance), and a modified rating scale agreed by those present. In making their recommendation with respect to the rating scale, the experts agreed that within the PAs, the starting position is that, in general, landscape capacity is limited and that the rating scales represent small downward increments from some extremely limited to no landscape capacity.
84. The resulting scale proposed by the Council in Ms Gilbert's rebuttal evidence softened the *"No"* landscape capacity rating so that it reads *"Extremely limited or no"*. In the Council's view, this modification recognises the underlying landscape context of the PAs, and appropriately reflects

the PDP policy direction, within the context of ss 6(b) and 7(c) of the RMA, that regulates land use within the ONF, ONL and RCL landscapes.

85. The two Joint Witness Statements have been of considerable assistance in narrowing the *unresolved* issues between the experts involved in conferencing, which are broadly summarised as:
- (i) Where the ratings of landscape values in the specific PA schedules should be located, and how those ratings should be described; that is, as “*key*” or “*summary*”;
  - (ii) Whether there should be greater articulation of the key physical landscape values, as opposed to the summary approach preferred in the Council’s rebuttal vision of the individual PA schedules;
  - (iii) Whether the phrase “*estimates in unknown future*” should be included in the preambles, when describing the concept of “*landscape capacity*”; and
  - (iv) The approach to defining certain activities described in the schedules.
86. It should be noted that not all issues raised in submissions were able to be addressed through expert conferencing, and we discuss any further significant residual matters later in this Report.

### **Summary of our role in making a recommendation to the Council**

87. Fundamentally, subject to the matter of scope discussed above, we accept the submission of counsel for the Council that our role is to make recommendations on:<sup>74</sup>
- (a) The content of the twenty-four (24) schedules for the PAs located within ONFs and ONLs, being those identified in strategic policy 3.3.36 (forming proposed Schedule 21.22);
  - (b) The content of the five (5) schedules for the PAs within the Upper Clutha RCLs, being those identified in strategic policy 3.3.39 (forming proposed Schedule 21.23); and
  - (c) The proposed preambles to Schedules 21.22 and 21.23.
88. We note here that the word ‘*preamble*’ does not feature in any of the relevant strategic policies, nor, strictly speaking, is there any requirement in the PDP to include a preamble to the schedules. The purpose, scope and content of the preambles was the subject of a large number of submissions and expert evidence, together with discussion at the hearing. Opinions on content ranged from a narrow view of the purpose and content of the preambles, essentially limited to explaining the terms used in the PA schedules, to a wider, more interpretative view that includes comment on the *application* of the schedules to both the Rural Zone and non-Rural zones. We note that the latter approach, if taken to its extreme, may require an

---

<sup>74</sup> Reply Legal Submissions on behalf of Council at 3.1.

interpretation of a number of other strategic objectives and policies in Chapter 3, and potentially other sections of the PDP.

89. An important consideration that was instrumental in informing our approach to the preamble content was the potential audience for the landscape schedules – who are the relevant Plan users, and are the schedules pitched at a level that will be helpful? The Council's view, summarised by Ms Evans,<sup>75</sup> is that the PA schedules are intended to be used to inform landscape assessments. As a result, they will primarily be used by landscape architects to assist plan users and decision makers in relation to plan implementation and, where required, plan development. Ms Evans acknowledged, however, that the schedules will also be read and used by a wide range of other plan users, including landowners and the community more generally, developers, planners, lawyers, and decision makers.
90. In their Reply submissions and evidence, the Council experts addressed our concern that the schedules may be drafted in too technical a manner for users other than landscape experts. Following this review, a number of amendments to the preambles were recommended, as discussed in paragraph 3.5 of Ms Evans's Reply evidence, although no material changes were recommended.
91. Having considered all of the evidence and views expressed by the parties, we are comfortable that the amendments to the schedules strike an appropriate balance between technical content and readability. We are mindful of Ms Evans's caution that any attempts to further simplify the content may run the risk of reducing the utility and intended role of the schedules in informing landscape assessments. We note that the schedules have been developed to meet the requirements of the policy framework in Chapter 3 of the PDP, which requires the PA schedules to identify and describe certain matters, as discussed above. Although the schedules will be of interest to a wide section of the community, we accept that the primary users of the schedules are likely to be landscape architects, as most, if not all, resource consents in PA Rural Zones will require a site-specific landscape assessment that will be informed by the relevant landscape attributes and values described in the PA schedules.
92. We also queried the integration of the PA schedules with the PDP, in particular the strategic objectives and policies in Chapter 3, and whether the preambles were sufficiently clear in this respect. Ms Evans comprehensively addressed this issue in her Reply evidence,<sup>76</sup> and as a result, references to the relevant Chapter 3 strategic objectives and policies have been made throughout the preambles, to provide a clearer link. We are satisfied that the amendments are appropriate and that, on balance, the more interpretive view adopted by the preambles will assist users of the Plan without compromising the integrity of the PDP when read as a whole.
93. Finally, we note that the content of the preambles and the schedules was generally agreed by the landscape architects involved in the expert conferencing, subject to the issues identified above. As such, we have confidence that the schedules are prima facie fit for purpose, subject to our recommendations that follow.

---

<sup>75</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 3.9 to 3.17.

<sup>76</sup> Ibid at 3.6 to 3.8.

94. For the purposes of this Report, we have adopted the Council’s Reply preambles and schedules as our starting point. We note that, as a result of the expert conferencing and discussion during the hearing, many of the material issues have been resolved, as reflected in the updated documents. The discussion that follows is, accordingly, focused on the remaining outstanding issues.

### **Has preparation of the schedules followed an appropriate methodology?**

95. For the purpose of understanding the requirements of Chapter 3 of the PDP, Clause 3.1B.5 f. defines “*Best practice landscape methodology in relation to the identification of landscape values or related landscape capacity...*” as including “*...a methodology produced or recommended by a reputable professional body for landscape architects.*”

#### The methodology followed by the Council

96. Ms Gilbert informed us that the preparation of the proposed PA schedules, including the methodology undertaken and their structure and content, was consistent with the Tuia Pito Ora, New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects, *Te Tangi a te Manu: Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines*, dated July 2022.<sup>77</sup>
97. Ms Gilbert described the methodology that had been followed by the Council in preparing the proposed schedules.<sup>78</sup> While some submitters criticised the methodology that has been undertaken, primarily because it was suggested that the ‘*community voice was not engaged*’, Ms Gilbert was firmly of the opinion that the methodology employed by the Council had been ‘*fit for purpose*’.
98. The process that was used to complete the proposed schedules (as notified) included:<sup>79</sup>
- i. a description of **other expert inputs** into the preparation of the PA Schedules;
  - ii. an explanation of how **associative values** have been addressed;
  - iii. an explanation of how **perceptual values** have been addressed;
  - iv. **other information sources** relied on;
  - v. the PA **Schedule templates**;
  - vi. a description of the **field survey**;
  - vii. a summary of the **peer review process**;
  - viii. the **delineation of ‘landscape character units’** within PAs;
  - ix. the **data sources** that have been relied on;
  - x. any **assumptions** that have underpinned the preparation of the PA Schedules; and
  - xi. the **step-by-step process** that has been used to complete the work.”
99. Following questioning by the Panel as to whether we could view other examples of similar ‘best practice’ landscape assessment methodology where landscape values had been identified, Dr

---

<sup>77</sup> Te Tangi a te Manu.

<sup>78</sup> Gilbert EIC, 11 August 2023, section 4, with reference to the section 32 report (attached as appendix to EIC).

<sup>79</sup> Ibid, paragraph 4.1(d).



Cossens provided us with an example from Banks Peninsula<sup>80</sup> where, in his opinion, effective community engagement had been undertaken. While this information was of interest, it did not convince us that the Council's approach to this particular process was inappropriate or in any way fatally flawed, as he has alleged. In reaching this view we are cognisant of the scale of the exercise before the Council to give effect to strategic policy 3.3.42 in this District, and the resulting limitations of the schedules, which are necessarily at a high level, and which are not a substitute for a site-specific assessment. At the hearing, Ms Gilbert emphasised that an exercise of the scope and magnitude required to give effect to the PDP Chapter 3 requirements has not been attempted in any other region of the country, to the best of her knowledge. Accordingly, while the approach taken has essentially been a pragmatic one, given the time and resources available, the output is nonetheless robust, detailed and of a high quality, and in accordance with best practice. No other examples of similar exercises were brought to our attention that would assist us in this respect.

100. Expert conferencing and the resulting Joint Witness Statements have confirmed general agreement with Ms Gilbert that the process adopted has indeed been 'fit for purpose', noting that not all landscape and planning experts attending the expert conferencing – notably, Ms Lucas and Mr Krüger. We acknowledge where differences remain in the discussion below.
101. We find, accordingly, that the methodology employed by the Council, subject to our findings below, was appropriate given the scale and magnitude of the exercise required, and that the resulting output achieves the purpose of the relevant strategic policies. In reaching this conclusion we are mindful that there may well have been other approaches available to the Council at varying degrees of cost and complexity, that may or may not have resulted in a different or more nuanced outcome.

#### Landscape attributes / values

102. Ms Gilbert identified a potential disconnect in the wording of the PDP when considering landscape attributes and values; acknowledging that some submitters had suggested that relevant attributes should be distinguished separately from values. Ms Gilbert stated that:<sup>81</sup>

*“Best practice landscape assessment acknowledges that landscape attributes and landscape values are inextricably linked, and to understand (and protect) landscape values requires consideration of both landscape attributes and landscape values. Therefore, focussing on identifying and rating landscape attributes only (as suggested by 3.3.38), would amount to ‘part of the picture’ only and does not align well with best practice landscape assessment.”*

103. We also note that the s 32 reporting (methodology statement) refers (at para 2.8) to the explanation within *Te Tangi a te Manu* (at 5.06) quoted below:

*“Landscape values are the various reasons a landscape is valued—the aspects that are important or special or meaningful. Values may relate to each of a landscape’s*

---

<sup>80</sup> Banks Peninsula Landscape Study, Final Report, May 2007 (Boffa Miskell for Christchurch City Council (attached to memo from Dr Cossens dated 12 November 2023.

<sup>81</sup> Gilbert EIC, para 6.15.

*dimensions—or, more typically, the interaction between the dimensions. Values can relate to the landscape’s physical condition, meanings associated with certain landscape attributes, and a landscape’s aesthetic or perceptual qualities. Importantly, landscape values depend on certain physical attributes. Values are not attributes but are embodied in attributes.”*

104. Again, we have been guided by the Joint Witness Statements following expert conferencing which does not take this issue further and, as such, we accept Ms Gilbert’s advice to us.

#### *Understanding the values of tangata whenua*

105. The s 32 Report (at para 6.3) references two relevant iwi management plans applicable to the District, a review of which has informed the content of the schedules:

- Kāi Tahu ki Otago Natural Resource Management Plan 2005
- Te Tangi a Tauria – The Cry of the People.

106. We also note from the peer review undertaken by Mr Coombes for the Council that:<sup>82</sup>

*“Mana whenua input was also provided specifically for the Physical and Associative attributes and values sections of each of the schedules. The Mana whenua attributes and values have been incorporated into the schedules as provided by Kāi Tahu.*

*The Mana whenua values have not been specifically ‘rated’ as requested by Kāi Tahu, but have formed part of the consideration of the overall physical and associative values for each of the schedules.”*

107. The s 32 Report also confirms (at para 5.4) that Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku have contributed to the schedules through collaboration with Kāi Tahu Ki Otago.

#### At an appropriate landscape scale

108. We acknowledge that the scale and spatial extents of the identified PAs have already been defined through the Court process – these being necessarily broad in scale, noting that a site specific case-by-case assessment will still be required, with the schedules providing guidance for these application specific assessments. We also acknowledge that there is a tension between these two extremes of scale, particularly when determining landscape capacity.

109. Mr Krüger raises criticism that the methodology followed by the Council does not conform with the PDP,<sup>83</sup> which states that assessment be at “*an appropriate landscape scale*”, rather than following the ‘*pre-defined*’ PA scale. He suggested to us that the Council’s approach is “*dangerous*” because these areas (Priority Areas) are not necessarily a defined landscape and that “*...the PAs are rather arbitrarily delineated geographic areas . . . they have little to no relation with the landscapes they were designed to serve.*” In his opinion, it was open to the Council to adopt a ‘landscape scale’ approach, which he considered would provide more

---

<sup>82</sup> Appendix E to the Council’s s 32 Report.

<sup>83</sup> At strategic policy 3.3.40.

appropriate information that is “*useful for the purpose*”. In this respect, he noted that PAs could comprise a number of discrete landscapes.

110. Ms Gilbert acknowledges that the PAs, which contain predominantly ONLs, are not necessarily the whole extent of a related ONL, as they are focused on areas where there is significant development pressure. Messrs Espie and Vivien also acknowledged that the PAs applicable to an ONL may be subsets of the landscape and not landscapes in themselves. These findings are shared by the experts that participated in conferencing, as recorded in the Joint Witness Statements.
111. On a related note, helpfully the legal submissions from Mr Ashton (on behalf of Queenstown Park Limited)<sup>84</sup> emphasise that “*[w]hile landscape scale is an important consideration, particularly when addressing expansive PAs that have discrete landscape units within them, it is unavoidable that descriptions of Landscape Values and Capacity will reference relatively specific parts of ONL and ONF.*”
112. While we have some sympathy with Mr Krüger’s views, we have found that the scale of PAs that has been utilised to inform the schedules is appropriate, primarily because it is clear to us that the identification of values for each PA has been informed by detailed analysis at a variety of landscape scales (some being detailed and some being wider than the PA extents). While it may have been possible to ‘re-frame’ the scale of each PA, particularly those that relate to ONLs, we have concluded that the Council has undertaken the required analysis and prepared the values and capacity identification for each PA at an appropriate landscape scale.
113. During our deliberations on this matter, we concluded that the proposed names for each of the PA schedules is potentially misleading. As proposed, each of the schedule titles includes either a reference to ONL, ONF or RCL. In our minds, this ‘labelling’ potentially misleads readers of the schedules into thinking that the PAs are in themselves complete ONLs, ONFs or RCLs. In reality, as was explained to us during the hearing, while some PAs might comprehensively relate to a single landscape unit (most commonly those related to ONFs), the majority of the PAs relate spatially to wider ONL, ONF and/or RCL landscape units. We therefore recommend, as set out in the attached tracked-change versions of the schedules, that the names of each PA schedule be amended to remove any references to ONL, ONF or RCL. We have also made minor changes to the introductory section of relevant schedules to reflect the changes to the titles, and to reinforce that the schedules relate to the defined PA as a part of a wider ONF, ONL or RCL.
114. At paragraph 7.2 of her Reply evidence, Ms Evans helpfully noted that the PA mapping is different to the landscape classification line (LCL) mapping in the PDP that identifies ONL boundaries, and some ONF boundaries. Rather, the PA mapping is intended to show the spatial extent of the PAs that each schedule applies to. Ms Evans noted that in most cases for ONL PAs, the PA mapping aligns with the LCL. However, there are PAs that comprise a smaller part of a much larger ONL, where the boundary of the PA may not necessarily coincide with the LCL

---

<sup>84</sup> Dated 18 October 2023, at para 1.8(a).

mapping. She also observed that it is not uncommon for an ONF to be nested within a wider LCL, such as the Kimiākau Shotover River ONF.

115. Ms Evans pointed out that *“whether a PA is an ONF or ONL”* is described in strategic policy 3.3.36. In her view, the schedule that matches the name of the mapped PA (as set out in the policy) should be used, to assist with clarity and certainty. While we respect Ms Evans’s view, we do not believe that removing the references to ONF, ONL or RCL in the headings will cause any confusion with the strategic policies, given the taxonomy, description and structure of the schedules that has been adopted by the Council, together with the amendments that we have suggested to the opening paragraphs. On balance, we consider that our preferred approach will avoid any confusion where PAs include areas of both ONF and ONL, and better assist users to interpret the content of the schedules.

### Landscape capacity

116. Ms Gilbert informed us that a consideration of landscape capacity was not usually a consideration when undertaking ONL, ONF and/or RCL values assessments. However, in this instance, it is a requirement of the PDP, stemming from a Court directive, that landscape capacity be assessed for each of the PAs.
117. Ms Gilbert advised us verbally at the hearing that assessments as to whether there is capacity in a landscape to accommodate change through further development are usually undertaken in the context of the consideration of a specific application for resource consent(s). As such, the landscape capacity determination associated with this proposed Variation is somewhat of a new process for a landscape assessment task.
118. The Upper Clutha Environmental Society Incorporated submission supported the inclusion of *“development capacity ratings”* in the schedules, noting that these represent the key mechanism required by the Court to ensure protection and maintenance of landscape values. The Society observed that *“the schedules proposed in the variation have been carefully prepared for the Council by expert landscape architects in a disinterested manner”*, whereas *“the vast majority of submissions opposing the development capacity limits in the schedules are from landowners who will gain financially from more permissive development capacity provisions”*.<sup>85</sup>
119. Mr Krüger, on the contrary, recommended removing the landscape capacity section from the schedules altogether, as in his opinion the concept can only be assessed when a specific development proposal is being considered. Given that a site specific assessment will always be required, in his view there was no need to *“consult ‘high level’ assumptions”*. He also suggested that the proposed landscape capacity assessment ‘goes against’ the guidelines of *Te Tangi a te Manu*.<sup>86</sup>
120. In a similar vein, Mr Farrell was of the initial opinion that *“the framework is going to be of less assistance than it could have been”*, as no proposals for resource consent will be at the PA scale,

---

<sup>85</sup> Submission of UCESI at 11 to 13.

<sup>86</sup> Krüger evidence summary, dated 29 October 2023, at paras 17-21.

and that accordingly, the capacity ratings will not offer any meaningful assistance.<sup>87</sup> He considered the utility of the landscape capacity ratings to be questionable unless they can be relied on – “*and if they cannot be relied on, they do not achieve the intent of the strategic policies*”. Mr Farrell was also concerned that the failure of the landscape capacity ratings to provide “meaningful assistance” would create unreasonable and unnecessarily high financial costs and uncertainties on parties wanting to understand or debate what landscape capacity actually means for a property. We note, however, that in his summary evidence presented at the hearing, Mr Farrell generally supported the preambles agreed by the experts. Although he remained of the view that the landscape capacity ratings do not implement strategic objective 3.2.5.1, and strategic policies 3.3.29 and 3.3.38(c), he advanced what we consider to be a pragmatic view, stating: “*but the combination of the high-level approach followed by separate site-specific assessment is probably the most appropriate option given the extent of work actually required to determine landscape capacity at localised or site-specific scale*”.

121. On a related note, Mr Farrell recorded in the Joint Witness Statement that “*Schedule 24.8 Whakatipu Basin Landscape Character Units*” includes the term “*Capability to absorb additional development*”, which he suggests has “*effectively the same meaning as “Landscape Capacity”*”. While this is an interesting point, we do not have the benefit of evidence to test this observation; accordingly, we prefer to concentrate on the task at hand, as directed by the strategic policies, of confirming ‘Landscape Capacity’.
122. We return to our earlier observation, helpfully highlighted to us by Ms Evans, that the term ‘Landscape Capacity’, as this relates to ONFs, ONLs and RCLs, is as defined in strategic policy 3.1B.5 b, which states the following:<sup>88</sup>
- “*Landscape capacity*’:
- i. *in relation to an Outstanding Natural Feature or Outstanding Natural Landscape, means the capacity of a landscape or feature to accommodate subdivision and development without compromising its identified landscape values;*
  - ii. *in relation to a landscape character area in a Rural Character Landscape, means the capacity of the landscape character area to accommodate subdivision and development without compromising its identified landscape character and while maintaining its identified visual amenity values;”*
123. Paragraph 9a of the Joint Witness Statement of the planning and landscape experts noted the starting position of the PAs is that, in general, landscape capacity in ONFs, ONLs and/or RCLs will be limited. This was further highlighted by Mr Bentley when he summarised his evidence to us in person, describing the reality that landscape capacity ratings for development within each PA is currently at the lesser end of the spectrum; with even “*some landscape capacity*” (the highest description in the schedules) meaning ‘*some landscape capacity within the context of an already limited capacity*’.

---

<sup>87</sup> Brief of Evidence of Mr Farrell at 16.

<sup>88</sup> PDP clause 3.1B.5(b).

124. The legal submissions from Mr Ashton (on behalf of Queenstown Park Limited)<sup>89</sup> emphasised that “*[f]ine grained assessment will be required to identify the particular Landscape Values engaged by a proposal and the same is true of the related Landscape Capacity. The schedule is therefore a relevant consideration but not the end point for proposal specific assessments.*” Mr Ashton suggested to us that the landscape capacity statements should be somewhat directive in order to ensure the outcomes sought (such as landscape restoration) could be achieved.
125. Legal submissions from Ms Hill, Counsel for the Office for Māori Crown Relations - Te Arawhiti (provided by way of memorandum dated 16 November 2023), pointed us to the Bay of Plenty Regional Coastal Environment Plan, which contains an example of landscape capacity of an ONL in Schedule 3 relating to the Matakana Island ONL (noting that this has only a fleeting reference to landscape capacity and the concept is to be applied quite differently to that in the PDP context).
126. While we appreciate the professional opinion of Mr Krüger, ultimately the PDP directs a consideration of landscape capacity within the schedules and, accordingly, the Council is required to include such a consideration as an integral component of the schedules.<sup>90</sup>

### **Is the structure of the proposed schedules appropriate?**

127. Expert conferencing and the resulting Joint Witness Statements have confirmed that the overall structure of the proposed schedule documents is appropriate; however, there remained two significant areas of expert disagreement over terminology – that is: whether the use of the word “*important*” is required as a heading for the identified values; and whether the section that is titled “*summary of landscape values*” should be titled “*key landscape values*”.
128. In addition to these two issues, there was some disagreement amongst experts regarding the recording of landscape values due to the confusion between negative and neutral attributes, and key values.<sup>91</sup> Ms Lucas was strongly of the view that the inclusion of selected neutral and negative attributes is unhelpful.<sup>92</sup> She cited the example of “*identified pests*” as an example of a negative attribute, expressing concern that this may invite applicants to offer ways to address pest problems to gain development consent. As a solution, she proposed a “*traffic light*” rating to clarify but not “*clutter*” the PA schedules.
129. In her Reply evidence, Ms Gilbert addressed the references to neutral and negative landscape attributes and values, and suggested a number of refinements to the PA structure and the preambles to assist Plan users,<sup>93</sup> which we respectfully adopt. We are satisfied that the proposed amendments adequately address the issues raised by Ms Lucas, in that the additional text to be inserted into the preambles will avoid any confusion that the positive attributes and values are landscape elements deserving of protection, and will also avoid the impression that

---

<sup>89</sup> Dated 18 October 2023, at para 1.8(d).

<sup>90</sup> Refer strategic policies 3.3.37-3.3.38 and 3.3.40-3.3.41.

<sup>91</sup> As noted in the Joint Witness Statement of the landscape experts.

<sup>92</sup> Evidence of Ms Lucas dated 6 November 2023 at 4.

<sup>93</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Gilbert at 3.3.

the PA schedules have locked in existing land uses, or promote the retention of negative landscape attributes and values.

#### Reference to identified attributes and values as “Important”

130. Ms Lucas, who was not part of the expert conferencing discussion, did not support inclusion of the word “*important*” being used in the titles for each identified value under each schedule, which she considered was “*inappropriate and unnecessary*”.<sup>94</sup> Ms Smetham agreed with the views of Ms Lucas in this respect.
131. Ms Gilbert<sup>95</sup>, supported by Mr Head, did not agree with Ms Lucas and Ms Smetham about the suggestion to remove the word “*important*” from the structure of each schedule document.
132. We also note that PDP strategic policy 3.3.38(a) uses the word “*key*” when requiring the identification of “*...physical, sensory and associative attributes that contribute to the values of the Feature or Landscape that are to be protected*” for PAs with ONF and ONL considerations; and PDP strategic policy 3.3.41(b) also uses the word “*key*” when requiring the identification of “*physical, sensory and associative attributes that contribute to the landscape character and visual amenity val[u]es*” for PAs with RCL considerations.

#### *Findings*

133. While we acknowledge that the schedules do provide a synthesis of a wider body of information relating to landscape attributes and values, we do not agree with Ms Gilbert that it is necessary to include the word “*important*” in the topic headings of the schedules. There is also a current anomaly in the schedules where the mana whenua values are not predicated on such a title, which we understand followed a request from Auhaka prior to notification of the Variation.
134. As such, we recommend that each schedule be amended to remove the “*important*” references from each of the value headings. We have also suggested additional text within the preambles which highlights the fact that there could well be additional values beyond those stated, with these comprising the “*key*” attributes and values of each identified PA.

#### “Summary of landscape values” or “key landscape values”?

135. Messrs Espie and Vivien and Ms Smetham prefer the use of the term “*key*” landscape values rather than the term “*summary*” within each schedule in the provision of an overview synopsis of all identified attributes and values. During expert conferencing an ‘exemplar’ alternative for one of the schedules (21.22.12 PA ONL Western Whakatipu Basin) was prepared by Mr Espie and Ms Smetham to test their thinking. In addition, under the “*key landscape values*” section of the schedules, the ‘exemplar’ alternative provided a greater description of physical values than was outlined in the notified version of the schedule being tested.

---

<sup>94</sup> Evidence of Ms Lucas dated 6 November 2023 at 7.

<sup>95</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Gilbert at 3.6 to 3.8.

136. Mr Brown, Ms Gilbert and Mr Head disagreed with this approach, recommending that “summary” is a more appropriate term than “key”.

137. Ms Gilbert prefers to keep the structure of the schedules as proposed,<sup>96</sup> noting that all physical values recorded in the schedules are important (i.e. these can’t be summarised because they are the foundation of the landscape values recorded under each schedule). Ms Gilbert clearly set out her reasoning for this preference in evidence stating:<sup>97</sup>

*“The PA Schedules also deliberately state in the ‘start’ of the Summary of Landscape Values that the summary draws from the “combined physical, associative and perceptual attributes and values” described in the preceding part of the PA Schedules (i.e. the more detailed explanation of Physical, Associative and Perceptual attributes and values in the main body of each PA Schedule).*

*In my opinion, these two aspects are critical to the correct interpretation of the PA Schedules by plan users. They signal the interrelationship between attributes and values and the importance of reading the PA Schedules as a whole, rather than simply focussing on the relatively brief Summary of Landscape Values which have been distilled down from the more complex description of landscape attributes and landscape values in the main body of the schedule.”*

The above position is reiterated in Ms Gilbert’s Reply evidence.

### *Findings*

138. While we understand and can appreciate the suggestions and evidence provided to us by Messrs Espie and Vivien and Ms Smetham, we have concluded that the current use of the word “summary” in this section of the schedules is preferable to the word “key”. We observe that the main body of the schedules contains the most relevant account of each PA’s important, or ‘key’, landscape attributes and values and that the summary is somewhat of a repeat of some of those ‘key’ attributes and values, albeit possibly an incomplete account. In relation to physical attributes and values, for example, this component of the landscape is unlikely to change over time and does not need to be summarised; rather, the main body of the schedule will provide the most assistance to plan users when considering the physical attributes and values of a landscape within the extent of a particular PA. We observe that, in many instances, it is the physical geographic attributes and values of a landscape that provide an important base from which to derive perceptual and associative values.

139. For completeness, we also deliberated as to whether the provision of a summary was necessary at all. On balance, we consider that the summaries, as proposed in each of the PA schedules, is helpful to plan users, noting also that there was no expert evidence that called for it to be excluded from the PA schedules entirely.

140. We therefore do not envisage any issues adopting the structure of the schedules proposed by the Council, and as has been agreed by most landscape experts during conferencing.

---

<sup>96</sup> Gilbert 13 October 2023 summary of evidence, paragraph 14.

<sup>97</sup> Gilbert EIC, 11 August 2023, paragraphs 6.17-6.18.



## Is the content of the proposed preambles helpful and appropriate?

### Application - reference to Exception Zones

141. The version of the proposed preambles text that accompanied the Council's Reply submissions and evidence included the following explanatory text as to how the schedules will apply:

#### **2. Application**

2.1 *The PA schedules have been prepared to reflect that the PA mapping extends beyond the Rural Zone. The application of the PA Schedules to resource consents is as follows:*

2.1.1 *The PA Schedules apply to any proposal requiring resource consent for a restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity [Refer to Strategic Policy 3.3.46] in the Rural Zone, including the Rural Industrial Sub Zone, but not the Ski Area Sub Zone (see 2.1.2 below).*

2.1.2 *The PA Schedules do not apply to proposals requiring resource consent in any other zone, including Exception Zones [Refer to Chapter 3 part 3.1B.5(a)]. They may inform landscape assessments for proposals involving any land within a PA but are not required to be considered.*

2.2 *The PA Schedules will be used where relevant for any plan development proposal.*

142. We note that there was some disagreement in the Joint Witness Statements (by Messrs Devlin and Espie) over the applicability of the schedules to land within a PA that is not zoned Rural. Ms Gilbert and Mr Head responded to these issues in their evidence as part of the Council's Reply, as did Ms Evans. For example, we note that with regard to land within a PA that is zoned 'Open Space', Ms Evans confirmed that while this land is not an Exception Zone, as it is not listed in 3.1B.5 a. of the PDP, it nonetheless follows:<sup>98</sup>

*"... that the PA Schedules are not directly relevant to proposals in the Open Space Zone (see section 2 of the Preamble), but like other non-Rural Zones, the PA Schedules may be referred to for proposals within the Open Space Zone (however this is not mandatory)."*

143. Ms Evans's approach above, which is consistent with the relevant strategic objectives and policies of Chapter 3 of the PDP that direct the preparation of landscape schedules for land within the Rural Zone only, also logically extends to other non-Rural zoned land that falls within a PA (but is not listed as an Exception Zone in 3.1B.5 a), including other PDP Special Zones (Chapter 45, Gibbston Valley Resort Zone and Chapter 46, Rural Visitor Zone) and Operative Plan Special Zones, including Mount Cardrona Station and Northlake.

144. In response to questions that we raised regarding the Rural Visitor Zone (RVZ) (which includes land that is part of the rural environment and part of the same landscape within the relevant PA) around how the schedules would apply to development proposals in that zone, on Day 2 of the hearing Mr Wakefield provided us with a very helpful explanation of how the RVZ provisions have been developed. Essentially, as we understand it, the RVZ Chapter 46 provisions, which

---

<sup>98</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 3.29.

apply to very small parcels of land, are quite different by design to those of the Rural Zone, in that they provide for a closely defined set of activities and the requirement to identify landscape sensitivity areas with limits on the bulk and scale of buildings. As such, the RVZ provisions ‘self-regulate’ and capture and give effect to the strategic direction of Chapter 3, including fundamental protection of landscape values, such that the RVZ does not need to be listed as an Exception Zone in in 3.1B.5 a). Having said this, Mr Wakefield acknowledged that the schedules could still helpfully be referenced to assist with the preparation of assessments of landscape effects for proposals requiring resource consent.

145. In our view the wording in the preambles, and in particular 2.1.1 and 2.1.2, is now sufficiently clear. We agree with Ms Evans that attempting to list all of the zones that the PA schedules *do not* apply to is neither efficient nor necessary, and may lead to unintended consequences.
146. We note that Ms Lucas challenged the inclusion of the wording of 2.1.2 of the preambles and suggested the deletion of the words “*but are not required to be considered*”. While we agree that these words are prima facie superfluous, we do not accept that they are confusing. We are mindful that this wording was agreed by those experts that attended the expert conferencing, as recorded in the Planning Joint Witness Statement and, accordingly, are comfortable with the weight of evidence in this respect.
147. Mr Giddens considered it desirable to make it absolutely clear in the preamble text as to how the Exception Zones are to be administered. Mr Ferguson also suggested further changes to strengthen an understanding for plan users as to how the “*landscape capacity*” ratings within each schedule were to be administered,<sup>99</sup> having a clear reference back to strategic policy 3.3.46,<sup>100</sup> and with reference to the Exception Zones listed in 3.1B.5 a.<sup>101</sup>
148. Mr Gardner-Hopkins suggested to us that the Exception Zones should be removed from the PA mapped areas in their entirety; however, for the reasons set out earlier in this decision around scope, we do not consider this to be a course of action that is open to us, instead preferring to utilise the preamble text to explain how the schedules are to be administered for Exception Zones.
149. In her Reply evidence, Ms Evans provided a well-considered response to the remaining matters raised by submitters,<sup>102</sup> and suggested further changes to the preambles (as reflected in the above extract), to assist in making it clear as to how the schedules are to be applied to the Exception Zones. We are grateful for the time and effort by the Council team in reviewing and, where appropriate, adjusting the wording of the preambles in response to submitter concerns, which has improved the clarity of the preambles and PA schedules.<sup>103</sup>
150. Having had regard to the issues raised by submitters and the Council’s subsequent detailed and considered responses, we record that we are generally comfortable with the wording of the

---

<sup>99</sup> Ferguson summary evidence, para 20.

<sup>100</sup> Ferguson summary evidence, para 15.

<sup>101</sup> Ferguson summary evidence, paras 17-20.

<sup>102</sup> Evans reply evidence from para 3.2.

<sup>103</sup> As set out in Ms Evans’s Reply evidence at 3.30 to 3.31.

preambles included within the Council’s Reply submissions and evidence (subject to our further discussion below). Our recommendation, therefore, is that the content of the preambles is now very clear, noting that the wording has been considerably strengthened through various inputs during expert conferencing and through changes that have been made throughout the hearing process in response to evidence and submissions.

### Landscape capacity descriptions

151. At the hearing, Mr Ferguson expressed a view that the landscape capacity descriptions may be straying into policy, for example by touching on landscape outcomes, or requirements for enhancement.<sup>104</sup> He cited the landscape capacity description for rural living in the West Wānaka schedule as an example.
152. Ms Evans addressed this issue in her reply evidence.<sup>105</sup> She explained her understanding that the qualifying comments in the landscape capacity descriptions are intended to provide the *context* in which each activity may be appropriate, at a PA scale, to provide helpful guidance to plan users. The descriptions are based on a review of the characteristics of the existing environment, including consents for development within each PA. Were these comments to be removed, in her opinion the landscape capacity ratings would lose this context, and the PA schedules would effectively provide a rating only. Ms Evans considered that the latter approach could lead to potential risks, including that of being more determinative, which is inconsistent with the role of the PA schedules and the landscape capacity descriptions to provide high level guidance. Further, if the qualifying comments were not included, the landscape capacity ratings may need to become more restrictive to reduce the risk of inappropriate activities being established.
153. Having considered the evidence, we agree with Ms Evans that it is important to find a balance between providing useful context for the landscape capacity ratings, so that the schedules guide the type of activity that may be appropriate, and providing a more “*blunt*” rating. We accept her advice that assessing landscape capacity naturally includes consideration of the context in which an activity may be appropriate.
154. We are cognisant that there is no express direction in Chapter 3 to provide qualifying comments when providing “*the record of the related landscape capacity*” required by strategic policies 3.3.38 and 3.3.41. We accept Ms Evans’s evidence that when considered against the definition of landscape capacity in 3.1B.5 b., a record of landscape capacity should provide some guidance as to when the ‘threshold’ is reached such that identified landscape values could be compromised. We note that the recommended qualifying comments are intended to work in a similar way, although they describe potentially appropriate activities that would not compromise landscape values.

---

<sup>104</sup> Summary Statement of Mr Ferguson presented at the hearing, at 21 to 28.

<sup>105</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 4.1 to 4.6.

155. For the reasons set out above, we are comfortable that the landscape capacity ratings in the Reply version of the preambles, subject to our further amendments below, strike an appropriate balance without straying into policy.
156. The majority of issues concerning the structure of the proposed landscape capacity terms and associated descriptions was agreed during expert conferencing, including the significant change to amend an earlier “no capacity” rating, which we note Mr Gardner-Hopkins likened to an “avoid type directive”, to “extremely limited to no capacity”. There were, however, a few continuing concerns expressed by submitters over the wording of the rating scale descriptions, primarily associated with the “extremely limited to no capacity” rating.
157. In their legal submissions, Anderson Lloyd (representing a number of submitters),<sup>106</sup> as well as Messrs Bentley and Farrell who provided similar sentiments in their respective evidence, suggested to us that:
- “... there may be 'exceptions where occasional, unique, or discrete development protects identified landscape values' is contrary to the intended nature of the schedules as a 'starting point' which does not preclude future site-specific assessment of case-by case proposals” and that changes since expert conferencing may have “the effect of undermining or unravelling other agreements reached through schedule-specific joint witness statements, in particular where those were agreed to...”*
158. Having considered the evidence in relation to the proposed wording of the preambles, we prefer the Reply evidence of Ms Gilbert,<sup>107</sup> as set out at paragraphs 4.8 to 4.11, supported by the submissions and evidence on behalf of the Upper Clutha Environmental Society, which we respectfully adopt. That said, and without taking away the thrust of the descriptions or making any wholesale amendments,<sup>108</sup> which we are generally comfortable with, we recommend making the following ‘wordsmithing’ changes in relation to how landscape capacity is described at paragraphs 4.5 of each of Schedule 21.22 and 21.23:

4.5 For the purposes of the PA Schedules, landscape capacity is described using the following five terms:

**Some landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which a careful or measured amount of some sensitively located and designed development of this type is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is near its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values and where only a small-limited amount of sensitively located and designed development is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Very limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is very close to its capacity to accommodate

<sup>106</sup> Anderson Lloyd legal submissions, dated 7 November 2023, at para 4(c)-(d).

<sup>107</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Gilbert dated 15 December 2023 at 4.4 – 4.11.

<sup>108</sup> Mr Wakefield for the Council cautioned us against this temptation primarily because there might be unintended consequences that could run counter to the agreements reached during expert conferencing.

development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only a very ~~small~~limited amount of sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

**Extremely limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is extremely close to its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only an extremely ~~small~~limited amount of very sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

**Extremely limited or no capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is extremely close to, or already at, capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where ~~only either no, or~~ an extremely ~~small~~limited amount of ~~extremely~~very sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

159. In our view, these suggested minor changes are more consistent with the structure of the rating scale, and will aid in providing clarity to the users of the PA schedules, particularly as between the very slight differences of scale in the capacity ratings.

#### Other Areas of Disagreement between the Experts with regard to the wording of the Preambles

##### *“Estimates an Unknown Future”*

160. The Upper Clutha Environmental Society disagreed with inclusion of the phrase “*estimates and unknown future*” in the preambles (which followed expert conferencing), noting that the Council landscape experts also view these words as superfluous, as outlined at paragraph 17 of the planning and landscape experts joint witness statement. Ms Lucas considered that inclusion of the wording may potentially weaken the landscape schedules, and that it should be excluded. Ms Gilbert referenced *Te Tangi a te Manu*, which highlights landscape assessment as being an inexact science. Her preference was to rely on the definition of landscape capacity under Chapter 3 of the PDP, which she considered to be sufficient without the addition of the wording. Mr Bentley also discussed this matter at paragraphs 47 to 50 of his evidence, quoting *Te Tangi a te Manu* (at paragraph 5.49) that an evaluation of (landscape) capacity is ‘*necessarily imprecise because they estimate a future.*’
161. We acknowledge that the majority of planning and landscape witnesses were in agreement that the wording should remain, and that the Council landscape experts noted in the joint witness statement that the inclusion of the wording does not detract from their overall level of comfort with the preambles. However, we have determined that the wording is superfluous and unnecessary, particularly given the monitoring requirements of the Plan in relation to cumulative effects of development over time on the landscape and the specific definition of ‘Landscape Capacity’ at 3.1B.5 of the PDP, which is very clear and could potentially be weakened by the inclusion of these words in the preambles. We have therefore recommended that these words be deleted from paragraphs 4.4 of each schedule.

*“Reasonably difficult to see”*

162. In her Reply submissions,<sup>109</sup> Ms Gilbert advised that having reflected on the issue, she considered the proposed terminology in Schedule 21.22.21 West Wānaka PA ONL of *“barely discernible”* could lead to some confusion for Plan users and that it should be amended to *“reasonably difficult to see”*. She noted that the *“reasonably difficult to see”* terminology is used in the PDP in policy 6.3.3.1(b) for ONFs and ONLs, and it also appears in the ODP District wide issues 3(a)(iii) and 5(a)(iii). As such, the long-established use of this terminology means that it is generally well understood by plan users. Mr Head also supported amending the wording contained in Schedule 21.22.21 to *“reasonably difficult to see”*.
163. Mr Krüger expressed a preference for the term *“extremely difficult to see”*, which he considered to be the established test. However, we can find no supporting evidence for this opinion. Accordingly, we prefer Ms Gilbert’s evidence and accept her proposed amendment to Schedule 21.22.21.

#### Activities and Definitions

164. The Joint Witness Statement records the acknowledgement of the experts in attendance that the list of activities in the Preambles is as specified in strategic policies 3.3.38 and 3.3.41, that this list is not exclusive, and that there may be other activities proposed within the PAs that fall outside the listed activities. It was noted that: *“We understand that such proposals will be assessed within the context of the relevant PA, and that a landscape capacity assessment will need to be undertaken against the site-specific landscape that the proposal may sit in.”*
165. Ms Evans comprehensively discussed the listed activities and definitions that remained in issue in her Reply evidence.
166. With regard to the list of activities, we accept Ms Evans’s advice,<sup>110</sup> and do not propose to add any further activities to the list of activities specified in the relevant policies. We agree that it is not efficient to list every similarly consented activity with the PAs, such as distilleries, and that a landscape capacity assessment is not necessary for all potential activities, particularly as non-listed activities will almost certainly require a site-specific assessment during the consenting stage.
167. We comment on specific matters as follows:

#### *Earthworks*

168. In response to suggestions in evidence from Mr Greaves, the *“earthworks”* activity descriptions in various schedules have been amended in the Council’s Reply version to be more explicit when differentiating between different types of earthworks activities, including in relation to tracks and trails for mountain biking (as discussed further below). We note that Ms Evans acknowledged that earthworks for tracks and trails would be a consenting trigger that highlights

---

<sup>109</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Gilbert dated 15 December 2023 at 3.14 to 3.17.

<sup>110</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 5.19 and 5.20.

the need for landscape consideration. We also acknowledge that the submissions from the Queenstown Mountain Bike Club, Bike Wānaka and the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust highlighted this issue as potentially lacking the necessary clarity without further refinement. We recommend a slight further change to these references (as suggested by Mr Greaves) by amending any references to “downhill” mountain bike trails, to “downhill/gravity” mountain bike trails.

### *Tracks and Trails*

169. The Council acknowledged in their Reply legal submissions that there was a degree of inconsistency with the approach to tracks and trails the schedules.<sup>111</sup> To provide clarity, Ms Gilbert and Mr Head recommended amendments to the PA schedules so that:<sup>112</sup>

- (a) Tracks and trails are referenced under the ‘earthworks’ capacity subheading only, and not under ‘transport infrastructure’; and
- (b) the terminology used refers to tracks and trails for recreational use throughout all PA schedules.

Ms Gilbert and Mr Head suggested that these changes would assist to provide greater clarity for plan users and avoid confusion.

170. We agree with Council that including tracks and trails under the “earthworks” subheading is appropriate, given that resource consent for tracks and trails will more often be required in the Rural Zone where earthworks standards are infringed. We also accept Council’s advice that the creation of a new definition for recreational tracks and trails was not necessary, given that the PA schedules are intended to provide high level guidance. We also accept the updated wording of the schedules in relation the landscape capacity of ‘earthworks’ for tracks and trails, as suggested by Ms Gilbert (at paragraph 3.22 of her evidence in reply).

### *Rural living, Farm dwellings and Workers Accommodation*

171. We note that “*Rural Living*” has the same meaning as ‘Rural Living’ in Chapter 3 section 3.1B.5 d, which is cross-referenced in the preambles. Importantly, the definition *excludes* residential development for farming or other rural production activities, which correspondingly falls to be assessed on a case-by case basis in order to determine the relevant values/character of the landscape, and the related landscape capacity.

172. Mr Devlin raised concern with what he termed a potential gap, in that the PA schedules do not list capacity for farmhouses. In Ms Evans’s view, farm dwellings were not included in the list of activities in strategic policy 3.3.38 as they were not known to be creating particular development pressure at the time the list of PAs was developed. She further noted that there is no change to the consenting pathway for farmhouses (or any other non-listed activity) and that landscape capacity for this type of activity will continue to be assessed on a case-by-case basis, which she considered to be an appropriate pathway.

---

<sup>111</sup> Reply Legal Submissions of Council at 11.2.

<sup>112</sup> Reply Legal Submissions of Council at 11.2 – 11.5.

173. While we acknowledge Ms Evans’s evidence in this respect,<sup>113</sup> we consider the exclusion of farm dwellings (which are often difficult to practically distinguish from residential development in the rural zones generally) from both the definition of Rural Living and/or the landscape capacity analysis to be problematic. We are mindful that at the hearing, Mr Haworth considered rural living, which he described as “*the real problem*”, to be the main contributor to inappropriate development pressure in ONFs, ONLs and RCLs. His views were indirectly supported by several submitters concerned that no provision had been made in the schedules for farm dwellings associated with family succession.<sup>114</sup> It seems plain to us that this will continue to be an area of ongoing tension (and development pressure) that should be addressed comprehensively in the PDP and in the schedules. Accordingly, we suggest that the exclusion of residential development for farming or other rural production activities from the definition of Rural Living in Chapter 3, and potentially from the PA schedule of listed activities, be subject to review at the first available opportunity under the Chapter 3 monitoring provisions.
174. The challenge of providing accommodation for farm workers was also raised as an issue by several submitters. Ms Evans advised that workers’ accommodation is not defined in the PDP and is generally treated as a residential activity in the PDP for consenting purposes. She was of the view that a proposal specific assessment will be required regardless of whether or not the activity is listed (as it triggers a discretionary activity consent status), and that including landscape capacity for this type of activity is therefore not required. In her view, a proposal specific assessment is appropriate, as the form and scale of this type of accommodation could vary from a standard dwelling to a scale of building that houses a number of individual workers, with potential landscape effects varying accordingly. We accept Ms Evans’s evidence on this point.<sup>115</sup>

#### *Tourism related activities*

175. As recorded in the planning and landscape joint witness statement that was produced following expert conferencing, Ms Shepherd and Mr Farrell retained a degree of uncomfortableness with the term “*tourism related activities*” being listed in the schedules (as part of the wider description of “*visitor accommodation and tourism related activities*”) as an activity for which landscape capacity was to be determined. Both these planning witnesses were of the opinion that the term “*resort*” would be more appropriate because this term is defined within Chapter 2 of the PDP whereas “*tourism related activities*” is not. We were informed by the Council planning and landscape witnesses that, in preparing the schedules when considering this matter, they had in their minds that this activity was indeed akin to the “*resort*” definition. However, strategic policies 3.3.38 and 3.3.41 specifically refer to “*visitor accommodation and tourism related activities*” and the Council has chosen not to amend this reference. Mr Farrell suggested that this option would be open to the Council and that there was no reason, in his mind, as to why this change could not occur.

---

<sup>113</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 5.7 – 5.12.

<sup>114</sup> In particular, various landowners in the 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley RCL PA.

<sup>115</sup> Ibid.



176. In response to this issue, the Council have included a clarification within the preambles of the schedules, under the heading “*Meaning of activities for the purpose of the PA Schedules*”, to specify that “*tourism related activities: has the same meaning as Resort in Chapter 2.*” We understand that Ms Shepherd and Mr Farrell were comfortable with this pragmatic approach and that no areas of disagreement remain for us to make any determination over. As such, we confirm our agreement with the way in which the preambles and schedules address this issue.

#### *Intensive agriculture*

177. An issue arose in response to a matter highlighted in the planning and landscape Joint Witness Statement following expert conferencing (at paragraph 18 of that statement), which recorded a discussion around the definition of activities listed in the preambles where there is an indirect definition elsewhere in the PDP (for example, within Chapter 2).

178. The Panel questioned whether the term “*Intensive agriculture*” in the schedules, which has the same meaning as Factory Farming in Chapter 2 of the PDP, required further clarification. This definition did not appear to correlate comfortably with our understanding of an intensive agricultural activity, which may, for example, utilise pivot irrigators (being a permitted activity in the Rural Zone). We were not assisted greatly in resolving this issue by the Council’s Reply evidence, which suggested that the term “*factory farming*” could be added to the landscape capacity descriptions under the “*intensive agriculture*” heading.<sup>116</sup> The Joint Witness Statement did not assist us either, recording that “*we accept that, while not ideal, these are the best available [definitions], given the activities prescribed in Policy 3.3.38 and Policy 3.3.41.*”

179. We are therefore unable to resolve this issue, as we have no submissions or evidence before us that gives us scope to do so, and we simply record in this recommendation our remaining discomfort with this definition. We suggest that the definition of “*intensive agriculture*” be reviewed in conjunction with the monitoring review required by strategic policies 3.3.47 and 3.3.48.

#### *Renewable energy*

180. The issue of how renewable energy as an activity was to be addressed in the schedules was highlighted during the hearing with representatives of Submitter #96 (Treespace No.1 Limited), as we were told that they may have plans for a small scale renewable energy (solar) generation activity on their property, which is within the Central Wakatipu Basin PA. Messrs Freeman (planning) and Skelton (landscape) suggested that the description of “*renewable energy generation*” within the preambles to the schedules should include reference to “*small-scale community scale*” schemes, which they considered to comprise a scheme that supplies 100 or less residential dwellings.

181. In reply, Ms Gilbert<sup>117</sup> cautioned against including such specificity in the schedules because that would suggest a level of certainty around a defined scale of renewable energy activity (which

---

<sup>116</sup> Evans Reply evidence, para 3.35.

<sup>117</sup> Gilbert Reply evidence at para 3.19.

may include wind turbines, hydro, or solar panel installation). Ms Gilbert also noted that there is a tension between such infrastructure and landscape values, such that the Council would be unwise to signal a comfort with renewable energy generation activity at a particular scale, when the appropriateness of such an activity would need to be assessed on a case-by-case basis through the resource consenting process.

182. In short, we share Ms Gilbert’s concerns and do not accept the submitter’s evidence that the schedules should be amended as suggested by Mr Freeman. We note that the schedules appropriately reference the definition of Renewable Energy Generation under Chapter 2 of the PDP. The National Policy Statement for Renewable Electricity Generation 2011 includes direction (at Policy F) for provision for small and community-scale renewable electricity generation activities to be incorporated into regional policy statements and regional and district plans. Were we to agree with the suggestion of Mr Freeman, that would be akin to *‘putting the cart before the horse’* when the PDP has not comprehensively addressed this issue at this point in time. If the Council were to do so, that would be the time to debate the appropriateness of such activities for inclusion within the Plan, including whether specific provisions were required to mitigate adverse effects on identified landscape values, for example.

### *Forestry*

183. The term *“Forestry”* in the list of activities for the purpose of the PA schedules has the same definition as *“Forestry Activity”* in Chapter 2 of the PDP:

*“Means the use of land primarily for the purpose of planting, tending, managing and harvesting of trees for timber or wood production in excess of 0.5ha in area.*

*Plantation Forestry is as defined by the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017.”*

184. Several submitters, and the Panel members, expressed concern that the definition adopted in schedules may inadvertently constrain other forms of ‘forestry’, such as indigenous forest cover for carbon farming. This matter was comprehensively addressed by Ms Evans in her Reply evidence.<sup>118</sup> She noted that the schedules do not seek to change the PDP approach, including the activity status for forestry or indigenous forest cover, or carbon farming. While the presence of existing production forestry is acknowledged as an attribute in several schedules (such as 21.22.22 Dublin Bay ONL), in general the capacity descriptions focus on exotic forestry and remain silent on other forestry activities, including carbon farming. While she did not consider the PA schedules to be constraining on indigenous forestry, Ms Evans noted that the PDP does not seek to specifically manage carbon/native forests in Chapter 21 or Chapter 23. As a result, this activity could potentially default to non-complying status in the Rural zone.

185. Miss Evans also reviewed the implications for the Variation arising from the new National Environmental Standard for Commercial Forestry, which replaces the previous National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry. She noted that the key difference is that the NES-CF also manages effects from carbon forestry, whether the NES-PF did not. In her opinion,

---

<sup>118</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 5.15 to 5.18.

there is nothing in the NES-CF that presents any inconsistency issues for the PA schedules, noting that the schedules are a “descriptive” tool rather than a management regime.

186. Although we are prepared to accept Ms Evans's advice in relation to the definition of forestry for the purposes of the schedules at this juncture, we suggest that this definition be reviewed at the first available monitoring opportunity, in order that emerging forms of ‘forestry’ land use, such as both exotic and indigenous carbon farming (as addressed in the NES-CF), are accommodated within the PA schedules, and indeed the PDP, as appropriate.
187. Within the above context we have considered the submission of Te Arawhiti in relation to Schedule 21.22.22 Dublin Bay ONL. Te Arawhiti sought to amend the capacity rating for forestry to add the words “*establishing new*” in relation to exotic forestry. We consider this amendment to be appropriate within the context of the existing land use pattern and as an aid to clarity, and have amended the landscape capacity rating accordingly.

### **Are the contents of each specific schedule appropriate or are further changes required?**

188. We note that the content of each specific schedule was mostly resolved through expert conferencing. However, as noted above, not all experts attended conferencing and, as such, any remaining matters of disagreement over the content of the schedules was addressed via evidence and summary statements.
189. As signalled in the above discussions, we recommend making the following amendments to each of the schedules:
  - (a) Amending the titles of each schedule to remove the ONL, ONF or RCL terms and including, where relevant, reference to these terms within the introductory “*General Description of the Area*” text for each schedule and throughout each schedule generally.
  - (b) Deleting the word “important” from the titles for each attribute and value under each schedule and various consequential amendments, including deletion of the footnote explaining why the word “important” was not included for mana whenua related attributes and values.
  - (c) Amending the spelling of “discrete” to “discreet” where this term was used.
  - (d) Amending references to “downhill”, to “downhill / gravity” mountain bike trails within the Central Whakatipu Basin PA (21.22.15).
  - (e) Updating the schedules to correct minor errors noted in the Council’s memorandum dated 15 February 2024, accompanying receipt of Council’s Reply version of the accept/reject recommendations spreadsheet, which stated:  
“...upon updating spreadsheet, we came across several errors in the s42A version ... and additionally please note the below formatting clarifications:

- *In the tracked reply version of 21.23.2 Haliday Road / Corbridge, there should be underline at Landscape Capacity section i. to show the amendment made in response to OS77.5.*
- *In the clean reply version of 21.22.1 Peninsula Hill, there is a residual struck through 'or' at Landscape Capacity section ix. that should have been removed."*

190. In addition, for specific schedules, we suggest the following recommended changes:

- (a) Removal of the reference to "a distillery" from the Victoria Flats PA (21.22.17) schedule because we understand that the relevant consent for that activity has now lapsed (as agreed in the joint witness statement discussion in relation to this schedule); and adding in reference to the "Queenstown Trail" at paragraph 28 of this schedule.
- (b) Addition of the words "...establishing new..." before the words "...exotic forestry" under the "Forestry" landscape capacity activity for the Dublin Bay PA (21.22.22), at the suggestion of Ms Pull for Ngāi Tahu and for the reasons set out earlier in our Report under the Forestry heading.
- (c) Amendments to the descriptions (paragraphs 11, 31, 33, 34 and 44) and capacity rating for rural industrial activity (from very limited to extremely limited) for the Church Road – Shortcut Road PA (21.23.4), alongside the addition of the words "...and includes appropriately scaled buildings" to the landscape capacity description for rural industrial activity. We have recommended these changes as a result of our review of the resource consent decisions for the existing building developments on the eastern side of Church Road, which appear not to have addressed landscape values to the degree or with a level of rigor that might be expected in a RCL.

191. We have not made changes to the Kawarau River PA (21.22.9) schedule or the Northern Remarkables PA (21.22.14) landscape capacity descriptions and ratings, as recommended by Mr Brown for Queenstown Park Limited. While we received no evidence in reply from the Council on these suggested amendments, we have determined that these relatively wholesale changes would bring a degree of unnecessary specificity to the schedules. The detailed descriptions may well be helpful; however, these are likely better suited for inclusion within an assessment of landscape effects that might accompany an application for resource consent.

192. We have also not made changes to the Cardrona Valley PA (21.22.18) schedule to include specific reference to the Cardrona Distillery as a rural industrial activity (at the suggestion of Mr Espie) because we agree with the evidence in reply by Mr Head and Ms Evans that should a specific assessment of any future expansion of the distillery activity be sought, the appropriate avenue to address potential effects on landscape values is through the resource consent process.

193. We record that we have also considered the submissions of several other parties in relation to changes requested to the landscape capacity ratings for particular schedules;<sup>119</sup> however, in all

---

<sup>119</sup> Including the Morven Hill PA and the Ferry Hill PA.

such instances we have concluded that there is insufficient expert evidence on which to base a very fine-grained finding that goes against the recommendations of the Council's experts.

### **Will the schedules be 'fit for purpose' and meet the PDP and Court's intended purpose?**

194. As discussed in detail above, and set out in the preambles at 1.2, the purpose of the PA schedules is to assist with the identification of the landscape values and related landscape capacity to provide guidance with respect to landscape-related policy outcomes in the PDP.<sup>120</sup> The schedules contain both factual information and evaluative content designed to inform plan development and plan implementation processes, and to assist with technical landscape assessment.
195. One of the most significant areas of contention, addressed in evidence and during the hearing, was whether the PA schedules, which have been prepared at a 'high level', will achieve the purpose envisaged by the Court as subsequently codified in the relevant Chapter 3 strategic objectives and policies. The majority of landscape architects agreed at expert conferencing, as recorded in the Landscape Joint Witness Statement, that as the schedules have been prepared at a broad scale PA level, they represent a high-level description and assessment and that any proposed project will be "set at a smaller scale" within the PA. Accordingly, each proposed project will require a specific landscape assessment that identifies how the project sits within the PA, which attributes and values of the PA are relevant to the project, and an assessment against those values. While this approach to preparation of the schedules has been criticised by some submitters and a minority of landscape architects and planners, we are satisfied for the reasons given previously that it is both a reasonable and pragmatic approach to fulfilling the directions contained in strategic policy 3.3.42, and that the resulting content will achieve the intended purpose.
196. Although the *primary* users of the PA schedules are anticipated to be landscape architects and planners assisting applicants and decision makers in relation to plan implementation, as discussed previously the schedules will be read and used by a much wider range of plan users, including lawyers, landowners and the public more generally, including developers and community organisations such as the Upper Clutha Environmental Society.
197. We note that the two preambles, which describe the role, purpose in general approach of the PA schedules, are instrumental in assisting plan users to apply the schedules. As the preambles are intended to provide guidance, the key concern has been to ensure that they are as certain and as easily understandable (by all users) as possible. In terms of process, the preambles were subject to expert conferencing, as a result of which they were generally agreed to be appropriate. However, throughout the course of the evidence exchange and hearing, amendments have been made by Council to assist with clarity as follows:
- (a) Due to the PA scale of the landscape assessment underpinning the schedules, acknowledgement that a finer-grain, location-specific assessment of landscape attributes

---

<sup>120</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Gilbert at 3.1.

and values will typically be required for plan development or plan implementation purposes, including resource consent applications.

- (b) To clarify that as a result of more fine-grained site-specific assessments, other proposal or location-specific landscape values may be identified that do not exist, or have not been identified, at PA scale.
  - (c) An explanation that the capacity ratings and associated descriptions are based on an assessment of each PA as a whole, and are not intended to describe the relevant capacity of specific sites within a PA.
  - (d) As the PA schedules represent a point in time, they are not intended to provide a complete, or fixed description, of values or landscape capacity.
198. For the reasons explained above, we are comfortable that the PA schedules strike an appropriate balance between the necessary technical concepts and content, and ease of readability. The hearing process has assisted enormously with achieving this outcome, and we are very grateful for the participation of all parties in this respect.
199. One final matter related to ‘fitness for purpose’ that came to our attention during hearing was whether there is a risk that the schedules, as drafted, might have the effect of “locking in” present activities (those specified in Chapter 3), based on what is relevant at the present point in time. We questioned how the schedules could be “future-proofed” to provide for activities that are not currently specifically listed or provided for (such as carbon farming; alternative proteins, which may have infrastructure requirements that require consent; and renewable energy generation) but that potentially should, at some future date, be appropriately included. From the evidence and submissions, it appears highly likely that there will be development pressure in some PAs (particularly RCLs) for these kinds of activities in the future, to varying degrees.
200. Miss Evans helpfully addressed this issue in her Reply evidence.<sup>121</sup> She observed that the PA schedules are drafted “at a point in time” and that they are not intended to be “fixed” in any way. This has been made clear in the preambles, and strengthened through an amendment in the Reply version that notes that the references to existing attributes are not intended to lock in existing land uses (section 3.4). She also noted that the plan contains several strategic policies (3.2.1.8 and 3.3.21) that enable existing farming activities and evolving forms of agricultural land use, and which provide for diversification of land use beyond traditional activities, including farming, provided that the policy direction to protect (for ONF/ONLs) or maintain/enhance (RCLs) is met.
201. In Ms Evans’s view, the collective effect of Chapter 3 is that it does anticipate some appropriate change, and sets out policy guidance on how that change should occur in terms of outcomes. Importantly, the monitoring requirements set out in strategic policies 3.3.47 and 3.3.48 also anticipate change, and have been included as a means to assess whether the provisions of

---

<sup>121</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 5.3 to 5.6.

Chapters 3, 4, 6 and 21 are being implemented successfully for a non-specific range of activities. Finally, Ms Evans observed that it is not the role of the PA schedules to constrain or regulate development, as they are intended to be a tool to assist with processing applications.

202. In general, we accept Ms Evans’s evidence on this issue. That said, we are of the view that for the schedules to remain an effective and efficient tool in the longer term, the Council will need to implement a regular monitoring programme to ensure that any material changes that might be required, particularly in response to cumulative development, or to include future relevant activities that may create development pressure, are given effect to. Otherwise there is a risk that the schedules, and in particular the landscape capacity assessments, will become irrelevant over time.
203. In terms of s 32AA of the RMA, we accept Ms Evans’s advice that the additional changes recommended in the Council's reply improve effectiveness with respect to implementation of the PA schedules, efficiency in terms of how they apply within the wider PDP context and, overall, ensure the PA schedules better achieve the strategic objectives and policies of Chapter 3 of the PDP.<sup>122</sup>

## Conclusions and recommendations

204. We have reached a similar finding to that of the Council’s reporting officers and legal counsel, which is set out succinctly by Ms Evans’ reply evidence and which states that the Variation, as amended through this hearing process:<sup>123</sup>
- “ . . . will achieve the relevant strategic objectives and policies of the PDP, and are the most appropriate to achieve the objective of the Variation and purpose of the RMA.”*
205. While we have made additional minor changes to the content of the proposed preambles and schedules, as set out in the above discussion, these changes have not fundamentally altered the scheme and intention of the schedules proposed in the Council’s Reply evidence.
206. We note from Ms Evans’ Reply evidence that an administrative task will still need to be undertaken to amend the labels for the PA mapping to ensure that these match the PA titles listed in strategic policies 3.3.36 and 3.3.39, and to match the schedule titles.<sup>124</sup>
- 207. We recommend that the Council adopt the version of the preambles and schedules attached to this report at Appendix 4, to be included in the PDP as Schedules 21.22 and 21.23.**
- 208. We recommend that Council implements a formal monitoring process as required by strategic policies 3.3.47 and 3.3.48, noting our specific immediate suggestions as set out above, to ensure that Schedules 21.22 and 21.23 remain efficient and effective in future years.** In this respect, it was acknowledged by all expert witnesses that landscape capacity will change over time as a result of the cumulative effects of subdivision, use and development. We have

---

<sup>122</sup> Reply evidence of Ms Evans at 9.1.

<sup>123</sup> Evans, reply evidence, para 10.4.

<sup>124</sup> Ibid, para 7.4.

highlighted, in particular, the more immediate issues associated with the exclusion of residential development for farming or other rural production activities from the definition of Rural Living in Chapter 3, and the definitions of “forestry” and “intensive agriculture” for the purposes of the landscape capacity assessment.

209. We further recommend that the submission points on the Variation be accepted or rejected as set out within the spreadsheet attached as **Appendix 5** to this report.
210. Finally, we wish to express our thanks to the Council’s legal counsel and team of experts, and all submitters, their legal counsel and expert witnesses, particularly those that participated in the hearing, for your collaborative and constructive assistance, which has been greatly appreciated.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Jane Taylor', written in a cursive style.

Jane Taylor  
For the Commission



## **Appendix 1**

**Minute of Commissioners dated 30 August 2023**

**QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN: PRIORITY AREA LANDSCAPE  
SCHEDULES**

**MINUTE OF COMMISSIONERS**

**30 August 2023**

1. The Queenstown Lakes District Council (Council) has appointed a Hearing Panel, which comprises Commissioners Jane Taylor, Peter Kensington and Quentin Smith (the Commission), to hear all submissions and, after it has heard the submissions, to make recommendations on the Variation to the Proposed District Plan: Priority Area Landscape Schedules as to whether to accept or reject the submissions received and any amendments to the provisions of the Schedules.
2. The Council is then required to decide whether to accept or reject the Hearing Panel's recommendations.

Memorandum on behalf of Dr John Cossens dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 2023

3. A Memorandum on behalf of Dr John Cossens dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 2023 (the Memorandum) has been received by the Hearing Panel. The Memorandum challenges the appointment of Councillor and Deputy Mayor Smith ("Councillor Smith") to the Hearing Panel on the grounds of alleged "potential bias and conflict of interest". The grounds giving rise to the allegations of potential bias and conflict of interest, set out in paragraphs 4 to 11 of the Memorandum, relate to Councillor Smith's involvement as a member of the Queenstown Lakes District Council Planning and Strategy Committee and, in particular, his participation and voting record in relation to various motions concerning the process surrounding the landscape variation schedules.
4. At paragraph 27, the Memorandum seeks that Councillor Smith recuse himself from the role of commissioner, or alternatively that the Chair of the Hearing Panel, having considered the alleged facts as set out in the Memorandum, asks Councillor Smith to resign from his role.

Discussion

5. The Hearing Panel has carefully considered the allegations raised in the Memorandum by adopting the following approach:
  - (a) Consideration of the applicable legal principles and rules that apply to issues of bias or conflict of interest;
  - (b) The application of the principles to the alleged facts, as informed by our understanding following discussions with Councillor Smith and Council officers; and
  - (c) Any other relevant matters that have come to our attention as a result of our internal investigations.
6. The rules and expectations in relation to potential bias and conflict of interest, which includes predetermination, are governed by legislation, the common law, and general standards and expectations as applicable.

*Legislative Framework*

7. The Local Authorities (Members' Interests) Act 1968 ("the Act") applies to elected councillors and regulates *financial* interests. The Act essentially codifies the common law position that a councillor with

a financial interest is presumed to be biased as a result of that interest. Councillors are prohibited from discussing or voting on any matter in which they have a financial interest unless that interest is “in common with the public”. Whether an interest can be said to be “in common with the public” will depend on the nature of the interest; the size of the group affected and whether the group is large enough to comprise “the public”; and whether the interests of the councillor and the public are affected in a similar way. A councillor may apply to the Auditor General for an exemption from the financial interest rule, or alternatively a declaration that the rule does not apply in a specific circumstance.<sup>1</sup>

8. It is also relevant that in the Resource Management Act 1991 context, the prohibition contained in the Act in relation to financial interests does not apply to the approval or review of a district plan; however, it does apply to a plan change or variation, and to the consideration of a resource consent application.<sup>2</sup>
9. As there have been no allegations, or indeed evidence, that Councillor Smith has any *financial interest* in the landscape variation schedules, or *any interest that is any greater than that of the public*, the provisions of the Act do not, prima facie, apply in this situation.

#### *Applicable Principles of Common Law and General Standards and Expectations*

10. The common law requires that all public decision making must be procedurally fair, including being free from the taint of bias and predetermination. Known as “the rule against bias”, the common law rule has two main objectives: first, to ensure that the best decision is made based on relevant information and arguments, not ulterior motives or prejudices; and secondly, to ensure that people affected by, or interested in, a decision have trust and confidence in the process.<sup>3</sup>
11. The rule against bias operates both to avoid actual bias and the *perception* of bias. The overriding principle is that justice should not only be done but should be seen to be done.<sup>4</sup>
12. The courts generally approach questions of bias by asking the following:<sup>5</sup>

*“Would a fair-minded observer reasonably think that the decision-maker or member of the decision-making body might not bring an impartial mind to the decision, in the sense that they might unfairly treat someone’s case with favour or disfavour?”*
13. We note that the Auditor-General has proposed a very similar test for determining whether a common law (or non-financial) interest exists:<sup>6</sup> *“The test for whether a non-financial conflict of interest exists is whether an objective observer who knows the relevant facts would perceive the person to be biased because of that interest”*.
14. In addition to the common law tests set out above, there is a general expectation that public business should be conducted in the spirit of integrity, impartiality, accountability, trustworthiness, respect, and responsiveness. All decisions about conflicts of interest must be guided by ethical principles.
15. There is no single source of rules or expectations specifying what constitutes ethical behaviour for all situations or all public organisations. However, in this particular situation the Council's code of conduct or relevant internal policies and procedures are likely to be relevant, together with general guidance or

---

<sup>1</sup> Managing Conflicts of Interest in Regional Councils 2020: [Part 5: Managing conflicts of interest in regional councils — Office of the Auditor-General New Zealand \(oag.parliament.nz\)](https://www.oag.parliament.nz/publications/2020/06/Managing-conflicts-of-interest-in-regional-councils)

<sup>2</sup> *Making Good Decisions: A resource for RMA Decision-makers (5<sup>th</sup> ed)*, Ministry for the Environment, at page 26.

<sup>3</sup> *“Managing conflicts of interest: A guide for the public sector”*, Office of the Auditor General, June 2020 at 6.8 – 6.9.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid* at 6.10.

<sup>5</sup> *Saxmere Company Ltd v Wool Board Disestablishment Company Ltd* [2010] 1 NZLR 35; [2010] 1 NZLR 76.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid*, footnote 1, at 5.10.

good practice guides, customary practice and behaviour in the public sector or a particular part of it, and analogies drawn from legal rules that apply to similar situations.

16. There are a number of good practice guides that are applicable to this situation, including the guidance issued by the Auditor General,<sup>7</sup> the Quality Planning Resource online website,<sup>8</sup> together with the guidance contained in Making Good Decisions: A resource for RMA decision-makers (5<sup>th</sup> edition).<sup>9</sup>

17. We have found the following paragraphs from the Auditor-General's guidance, which concern issues of predetermination (as has been broadly alleged in the Memorandum), to be particularly apposite:<sup>10</sup>

3.32 *Predetermination is any situation where you are making a decision about something and there is a risk that people will think you have made-up your mind before you have considered all of the evidence. Suggestions of predetermination usually arise because of something you have previously said or done.*

3.32 *Technically, predetermination is not a form of conflict of interest. However, the concept of predetermination is derived from the common law on bias, so we have covered it in this guide. The underlying risk with predetermination is the same as for conflicts of interest - that is, the risk that you will "taint" a decision you are involved in making because you are biased or appear to be biased.*

....

3.36 *The seriousness of the risk will depend on the context, such as what your role is and what sort of decision you are being asked to make.*

3.37 *For quasi-judicial decisions, decision makers are held to an exacting standard of impartiality and objectivity. Quasi-judicial decisions are those that directly affect the legal rights, interests, and obligations of an individual or small group of individuals. Quasi-judicial decisions can be, for example, a decision to grant a permit, confer a specific benefit, or impose a punishment.*

3.38 *In other situations, it might nevertheless be acceptable for employees or officeholders to bring personal or previously formed views to decision making - for example, when:*

- *discussing issues and exchanging ideas with members of the public;*
- *developing a preliminary position, especially where a proposal is being consulted on or where the public organisation is expected to perform an advocacy role;*
- *already holding - and perhaps having expressed - strong personal views about the matter, for decisions that are made by an elected or representative body and are political in nature or involve high level policy-making;*
- *promoting a particular view during debate in public hearings on a matter; and*
- *drawing on your own knowledge or experience, especially for discussions that are entrusted to particular people because of their special expertise in the subject.*

*Is there any substance to the allegations at common law?*

18. We make the following observations based on our understanding of the relevant law and general standards and expectations (with reference to the applicable guidance):

- (a) The hearing panel has been convened to make *recommendations* to Council in relation to the proposed landscape variation schedules, a component of the Proposed District Plan. Accordingly the panel is not acting in a quasi-judicial capacity that will impact on the legal rights, interests and obligations of an individual or small group of individuals; on the contrary, the

---

<sup>7</sup> Refer to the material at footnotes 1 and 3, *ibid*, together with the *Local Authorities (Members Interests) Act 1968: A Guide for members of local authorities on managing financial conflicts of interest* (oag.parliament.nz).

<sup>8</sup> [Welcome to the Quality Planning Website | Quality Planning](#)

<sup>9</sup> Available to commissioners that have completed the Making Good Decisions certification, published by the Ministry for the Environment, 2023 ed.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid*, footnote 3, at 3.32 to 3.40.

landscape schedules are in the nature of broad policy that will apply to the public generally, as an integral component of the Proposed District Plan.

- (b) It is open to Councils to appoint elected members to be commissioners of hearings panels that are tasked with making recommendations on matters of policy, such as plan changes or, as in this case, landscape schedules that will comprise part of a proposed plan, provided that the commissioners meet the relevant training and experience requirements, and have no actual or perceived conflict of interest under the Act or at common law. In these situations, it is accepted that such appointees will almost certainly have been involved in the relevant Council processes, and that they may hold personal views on the matters that will be the subject of the recommendations.
19. Having considered the allegations based on the facts outlined in the Memorandum, it is our preliminary view that no relevant issue of predetermination or conflict of interest arises for the following reasons:
- (a) Councillor Smith's membership of the Council's Planning and Strategy Committee (the Committee) does not, prima facie, preclude his appointment as a commissioner in relation to this particular hearing panel, which is not acting in a quasi-judicial capacity. On the contrary, it is entirely appropriate for elected members to be appointed to hearing panels concerned with policy matters in situations where their knowledge and expertise will enhance the quality of the hearing and the panel's subsequent recommendations.
- (b) The allegations refer to Councillor Smith's voting record on *matters of process*. Notwithstanding that the allegations in relation to the motion of the Committee concerning consultation appear to have been misconstrued,<sup>11</sup> we do not consider that the discharge by Councillor Smith of his lawful responsibilities as a member of the Committee in relation to process matters raises any issue of predetermination or perceived bias apropos the substantive issues that will be the subject of the hearing panel's recommendations.
- (c) The allegation that Councillor Smith voiced his willingness to be part of the hearing panel does not raise any issue of predetermination. On the contrary, his knowledge, interest and experience in relation to the subject matter of the hearing is considered to be an asset to the hearing panel.
- (d) The standard of independence and objectivity required of an elected member of Council appointed to a non quasi-judicial hearing panel should not be compared to that of an expert witness, or for that matter, an independent commissioner. It is anticipated that elected members such as Councillor Smith will have been involved in the Council processes leading up to the hearing, that they may have prior knowledge and, potentially, thoughts on the issues. What it required is that they keep an open mind, and be prepared to adjust their views if the evidence warrants it.
20. We have discussed the matters raised in the Memorandum with Councillor Smith, including his obligations as a member of the hearing panel. We are satisfied that Councillor Smith is fully apprised of his responsibilities, including that of maintaining an open mind throughout the hearing and, ultimately, the overriding obligation of the hearing panel to make a recommendation to Council based on the evidence before us (as tested throughout the hearing process).

---

<sup>11</sup> For clarification purposes only, it is our understanding from discussions with Councillor Smith and Council staff that Councillor Smith voted against the resolution outlined at paragraph 4 of the Memorandum because he did not agree with the *question that was to be consulted on*, not against consultation per se.

21. It should also be noted that the hearing panel comprises a majority of independent commissioners (including the Chair), which accords with good practice guidelines. As such, any elected member of Council is in the minority, and we are confident that were any conflicts of interest to arise with respect to Councillor Smith, these can be appropriately managed.
22. In summary, having regard to the applicable legal principles, we have concluded that a fair-minded observer would not reasonably think that Councillor Smith might not bring an impartial mind to the recommendations, and that no question of predetermination, bias or conflict of interest arises.

#### *Other Relevant Matters*

23. During the course of our discussions, Councillor Smith alerted us to his role as a trustee of the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust (“the Trust”). The Upper Clutha Tracks Trust is a charitable organisation that advocates for, funds and builds walking and cycling tracks for the public, and advocates for public access in general. The Trust has lodged a submission on the proposed landscape variation schedules (Submission #99), seeking: *“That all of the VIF landscape schedules are amended such that they state that there is development capacity for future public walking and cycling tracks”*. Councillor Smith has advised us that he was not involved in the development of the Trust’s submission, in relation to which the Trust sought third party planning advice.
24. Given the nature of the Trust, which is a charitable organisation that is acting in the public interest only, together with the nature of the relief sought, we are of the view that there is no relevant or actionable conflict of interest in all of the circumstances, and certainly not one that would preclude Councillor Smith’s involvement on the hearing panel.
25. In accordance with best practice, the hearing panel has agreed that Councillor Smith will not be involved in deliberations or any subsequent recommendations in relation to the Trust’s submission.
26. That said, it is entirely appropriate to draw this matter to the attention of the parties in the interests of full disclosure, and to seek any objections that parties may have.

#### Next Steps

27. We are grateful to Dr Cossens for raising this matter at the earliest opportunity, so that the issues of Councillor Smith’s alleged bias and conflict of interest can be considered, and a determination reached, well in advance of the commencement of the hearing.
28. Having set out our preliminary position, we now invite memoranda from any other parties that wish to be heard on the matter of Councillor Smith’s alleged bias or conflict of interest, including in relation to his role as a trustee of the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust. Memoranda should clearly set out the reasons for the views expressed, with reference to the law and to any relevant case law as may be applicable.
29. Following consideration of any memoranda received, we will issue a final Minute summarising our views, and making any recommendations or directions that we determine appropriate. Given our preliminary views as outlined above, we have not received advice from Council’s legal team on the panel’s delegated authority in this matter at this stage; however, we will do so should this become necessary.
30. Any parties wishing to lodge a memorandum in relation to this matter should do so prior to **12 noon, 6 September 2023**.
31. Should any party have any queries in relation to this Minute or require any clarification in relation to the process for this hearing, please contact the Hearings Administrator at [dp.hearings@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:dp.hearings@qldc.govt.nz).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Jane Taylor', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Jane Taylor

For the Commission

30 August 2023

## **Appendix 2**

**Minute of Commissioners dated 14 September 2023**



**QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN: PRIORITY AREA LANDSCAPE  
SCHEDULES**

**MINUTE OF COMMISSIONERS**

**14 September 2023**

1. The Queenstown Lakes District Council (Council) has appointed a Hearing Panel, which comprises Commissioners Jane Taylor, Peter Kensington and Quentin Smith (the Commission), to hear all submissions and, after it has heard the submissions, to make recommendations on the Variation to the Proposed District Plan: Priority Area Landscape Schedules as to whether to accept or reject the submissions received and any amendments to the provisions of the Schedules.
2. The Council is then required to decide whether to accept or reject the Hearing Panel's recommendations.

Background - Memorandum on behalf of Dr John Cossens dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 2023

3. A memorandum was received on behalf of Dr John Cossens dated 7<sup>th</sup> August 2023 (the Cossens Memorandum), in which the appointment of Councillor and Deputy Mayor Smith ("Councillor Smith") to the Hearing Panel was challenged on the grounds of alleged "potential bias and conflict of interest". The grounds giving rise to the allegations of potential bias and conflict of interest, set out in paragraphs 4 to 11 of the Cossens Memorandum, related to Councillor Smith's involvement as a member of the Queenstown Lakes District Council ("the Council") Planning and Strategy Committee and, in particular, his participation and voting record in relation to various motions concerning the process surrounding the landscape variation schedules.
4. The relief sought in the Cossens Memorandum was that Councillor Smith recuse himself from the role of commissioner, or alternatively that the Chair of the Hearing Panel, having considered the alleged facts as set out in the Memorandum, asks Councillor Smith to resign from his role.
5. A Minute setting out our draft position in relation to the issues raised in the Cossens Memorandum was issued on 30<sup>th</sup> August 2023 (the August Minute). In summary, having had regard to the applicable legal principles and relevant authoritative guidance, we concluded that a fair-minded observer would not reasonably think that Councillor Smith might not bring an impartial mind to the recommendations, and that no question of predetermination, bias or conflict of interest arises.
6. We also discussed Councillor Smith's role as a trustee of the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust, which submitted on the landscape variation schedules. In accordance with best practice, the hearing panel agreed that Councillor Smith would not be involved in deliberations or any subsequent recommendations in relation to the Trust's submission.
7. Having set out our preliminary position in the August Minute, we invited memoranda from any other parties that wish to be heard on the matter of Councillor Smith's alleged bias or conflict of interest, including in relation to his role as a trustee of the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust, prior to issuing a final determination on the matters.

Memorandum on behalf of the Cardrona Cattle Company Limited dated 6 September 2023

8. A memorandum on behalf of the Cardrona Cattle Company Limited (CCCL) dated 6 September 2023 (the CCCL Memorandum) was received in response to our August minute. The CCCL Memorandum discussed

the relevant principles of law at paragraphs 6 to 14 and, at paragraph 15, supported the “general concerns” raised in the Cossens Memorandum.

9. The CCCL Memorandum further outlined some specific additional concerns that it considered must preclude Councillor Smith from taking any part in the Panel's consideration, hearing, or deliberations on its recommendations in respect of CCCL's submission and further submission, as well as Queenstown Lakes District Council's own (late) submission, which see CCCL further submitted on.<sup>1</sup>
10. We discuss the two areas of concern raised in the CCCL Memorandum as follows.

#### *The Legal Principles and General Concerns raised in the Cossens Memorandum*

11. In short, we largely agree with the brief summary of principles of law as set out in paragraphs 6 to 12 of the CCCL Memorandum, which is not materially dissimilar to the discussion of relevant legal principles set out in our August Minute. It may also be helpful, as an aid to understanding the test to be applied, to set out the Court's description of a “fair-minded, impartial and properly informed observer” as found in *Saxmere v New Zealand Wool Board Disestablishment Co Ltd (No 1)*.<sup>2</sup> The Court stated:<sup>3</sup>

[5] *The fair-minded lay observer is presumed to be intelligent and to view matters objectively. He or she is neither unduly sensitive or suspicious nor complacent about what may influence the judge's decision. He or she must be taken to be a non-lawyer but reasonably informed about the workings of our judicial system, as well as about the nature of the issues in the case and about the facts pertaining to the situation which is said to give rise to an appearance or apprehension of bias. Lord Hope of Craighead commented in Helow v Secretary of State for the Home Department that:*

11 *before she takes a balanced approach to any information she is given, she will take the trouble to inform herself on all matters that are relevant. She is the sort of person who takes the trouble to read the text of an article as well as the headlines. She is able to put whatever she has read or seen into its overall social, political or geographical context. She is fair-minded, so she will appreciate that the context forms an important part of the material which she must consider before passing judgment.*  
[Our emphasis]

[6] *The elaboration of the features of the objective observer is, as Kirby J remarked in Smits v Roach, a reminder to judges, the parties and the community reading their reasons that the standard that is applied is not simply the reaction of the judges to a particular complaint:*

13 *It is, as far as it can be, an objective standard: one aimed at emphasising the undesirability of idiosyncratic and personal assessments of such matters. As the cases show, in such decisions different judges can reflect different assessments and reach different conclusions. The fact that this is so should make contemporary judges aware that, ultimately, they themselves have to shoulder the responsibility of reaching conclusions on the point and giving effect to them. They cannot ultimately hide behind a fiction and pretend that it provides an entirely objective standard by which to measure the individual case.*

12. In applying the principles to the facts as alleged in the Cossens Memorandum, we remain satisfied that a properly informed, impartial and fair minded observer, as described by the Court in *Saxmere*, would not hold a perception that Councillor Smith was biased,<sup>4</sup> noting in particular that there has been no allegation that Councillor Smith has stated a view or opinion in relation to the substantive issues that will form the basis of the recommendations to Council.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 15 of the CCCL Memorandum.

<sup>2</sup> [2009] NZSC 72, [2010] 1 NZLR 35 (*Saxmere*).

<sup>3</sup> Ibid at [5].

<sup>4</sup> Paragraph 10 of the CCCL Memorandum.

<sup>5</sup> As per paragraph 11 of the CCCL Memorandum.

13. We further note that the CCCL Memorandum, in voicing support for the “general concerns” of Dr Cossens, did not set out any further evidence of actual or perceived bias in relation to Councillor Smith’s appointment to the hearing panel.
14. We do not agree with the statements set out at paragraphs 13 and 14 of the CCCL Memorandum, which discuss the nature of the panel’s role and function, recognising that our use of the term “quasi-judicial” is perhaps too broad a brush in this context without further explanation. Our conclusions in this regard were in part based on the Auditor-General’s guidance, which was set out at paragraph 17 of the August Minute and repeated here:<sup>6</sup>
- 3.37 *For quasi-judicial decisions, decision makers are held to an exacting standard of impartiality and objectivity. Quasi-judicial decisions are those that directly affect the legal rights, interests, and obligations of an individual or small group of individuals. Quasi-judicial decisions can be, for example, a decision to grant a permit, confer a specific benefit, or impose a punishment.*
- 3.38 *In other situations, it might nevertheless be acceptable for employees or officeholders to bring personal or previously formed views to decision making - for example, when:*
- *discussing issues and exchanging ideas with members of the public;*
  - *developing a preliminary position, especially where a proposal is being consulted on or where the public organisation is expected to perform an advocacy role;*
  - *already holding - and perhaps having expressed - strong personal views about the matter, for decisions that are made by an elected or representative body and are political in nature or involve high level policy-making;*
  - *promoting a particular view during debate in public hearings on a matter; and*
  - *drawing on your own knowledge or experience, especially for discussions that are entrusted to particular people because of their special expertise in the subject.*
15. Essentially, as we understand it, the panel is tasked with making recommendations as to what is *in the public interest* with respect to the landscape variation schedules. A decision as to what is in the public interest can be contrasted with determination of the legal rights, interests and obligations of an individual or small group of individuals, such as in relation to an application for resource consent(s). A recommendation as to the public interest, which is essentially a policy decision, is quite different from the determination of a right. Although the panel does have the ability to exercise discretion, taking multiple factors into account, the resulting recommendations will not give any person affected by the recommendations the right to any particular outcome. It is, of course, acknowledged that the panel does have a duty, in accordance with the rule of law, to behave fairly in the decision or recommendation-making procedure. But the decision or recommendation itself is not a judicial or quasi-judicial act, as alleged at paragraph 14(a) of the CCCL Memorandum. It does not involve deciding between the rights or interests of particular persons; rather, it is the exercise of a power delegated by the Council, representing the community, to decide what the public interest requires. This approach corresponds with the Auditor General’s guidance, as previously mentioned.
16. That said, it is plain that the administrative functions of the panel must uphold the principles of fair process and natural justice, including the avoidance of actual or perceived bias or conflict of interest. In a *procedural* sense the panel, once convened, could therefore be considered to be functioning in a ‘quasi-judicial’ manner, notwithstanding that the decision or recommendations are not a judicial or quasi-judicial act. However, for the reasons set out above and in our August Minute, we do not accept that the common law test, as set out in *Saxmere*, has been met generally in the case of Councillor Smith, other than in relation to the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust. We now turn to the specific concerns with respect to CCCL.

---

<sup>6</sup> *Managing Conflicts of Interest: A Guide for the Public Sector*, Office of the Auditor-General, June 2020 at 3.37-3.38.

### *The specific concerns in relation to CCHL*

17. THE CCCL Memorandum sets out its specific concerns at paragraphs 17 to 22. It concludes, at paragraph 22, that *“it is untenable for Councillor Smith to take any part in the panel’s consideration, hearing or deliberations on its recommendation in respect of CCCL’s submission and further submission, as well as the Council’s own (late) submission, which CCCL further submitted on”*. This conclusion was reached by CCCL after applying the principles in the *Muir v Commissioner of Inland Revenue*<sup>7</sup> and *Saxmere v New Zealand Wool Board Disestablishment Co Ltd (No 1)*<sup>8</sup> cases, together with the general guidance found in the Making Good Decisions – Chair Re-certification material.
18. Having considered the specific concerns raised with respect to CCHL, the panel is of the view that, at first glance, the correspondence described in paragraph 20 of the CCCL Memorandum between Councillor Smith and Mr Henderson may give rise to a perception of bias in an impartial, fair-minded observer. We record, however, that the alleged “significant falling out” to which the correspondence related arose in a previous matter and, in Councillor Smith’s view, appears to be one-sided on the part of Mr Henderson.
19. We do not accept that it follows (as set out at paragraph 24 of the CCCL Memorandum) that because of the concerns raised by CCCL in relation to the relationship between Councillor Smith and Mr Henderson, there is a risk of actual or perceived bias or conflict of interest with respect to other submitters who own land in the Gibbston Valley Character Zone, noting that no other memoranda have been received in relation to this issue. There is no relevant basis or evidence to support such a finding, which the CCCL Memorandum refers to as “an observation” only.
20. Given the above findings, the panel has determined, applying an abundance of caution, that Councillor Smith will not be involved in deliberations or any subsequent recommendations in relation to CCCL’s submission or further submission and, to the extent that it concerns CCCL’s submission or further submission, the Council’s submission (which CCCL further submitted on).
21. We reiterate our previous observation that the hearing panel comprises a majority of independent commissioners (including the Chair), which accords with good practice guidelines. As such, any elected member of Council is in the minority, and we are confident that were any conflicts of interest to arise with respect to Councillor Smith, these can be appropriately managed.

### Summary of Findings

22. In summary, having regard to the applicable legal principles and authoritative guidance, we have concluded that a fair-minded observer would not reasonably think Councillor Smith might not bring an impartial mind to the recommendations, and that no question of predetermination, bias or conflict of interest arises, except as noted in relation to the Upper Clutha Tracks Trust (as per our August Minute) and the specific concerns of CCCL as set out above.
23. We have determined that in addition to not taking part in deliberations and recommendations in relation to the Upper Clutha tracks trust submission, Councillor Smith will not take part in any deliberations or any subsequent recommendations in relation to CCCL’s submission or further submission and, to the extent that it concerns CCCL’s submission or further submission, the Council’s submission (which CCCL further submitted on).

---

<sup>7</sup> [2007] 3 NZLR 495 (CA) at [64].

<sup>8</sup> [2009] NZSC 72, [2010] 1 NZLR 35 at [37].

24. Should any party have any queries in relation to this Minute or require any clarification in relation to the process for this hearing, please contact the Hearings Administrator at [dp.hearings@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:dp.hearings@qldc.govt.nz).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Jane Taylor', written in a cursive style.

Jane Taylor

For the Commission

14 September 2023

## **Appendix 3**

**Minute of Commissioners dated 11 October 2023**

**QUEENSTOWN LAKES DISTRICT COUNCIL PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN: PRIORITY AREA LANDSCAPE  
SCHEDULES**

**MINUTE OF COMMISSIONERS**

**11 October 2023**

1. The Queenstown Lakes District Council (Council) has appointed a Hearing Panel, which comprises Commissioners Jane Taylor, Peter Kensington and Quentin Smith (the Commission), to hear all submissions and, after it has heard the submissions, to make recommendations on the Variation to the Proposed District Plan: Priority Area Landscape Schedules as to whether to accept or reject the submissions received and any amendments to the provisions of the Schedules.
2. The Council is then required to decide whether to accept or reject the Hearing Panel's recommendations.

Memorandum on behalf of Dr John Cossens (2) dated 12 September 2023

3. A second Memorandum on behalf Dr John Cossens dated 12 September 2023 has been received by the Hearing Panel (the Memorandum).
4. At paragraph 1, the Memorandum seeks that the Hearing Panel:
  - “(a) Consider the matter of whether the landscape schedule methodology, in particular the community consultation, was fair, reliable, robust and representative.*
  - “(b) Initiate an expert peer review of the consultative method and landscape methodology employed by [Council]; and*
  - “(c) Allow for submissions to be received on the methodology employed by [Council]”*
5. At paragraph 30 Dr Cossens outlines the relief sought through the Memorandum as follows:
  - a. To find there is a case to be heard in regard the consultative and landscape schedules methodology employed by the QLDC.*
  - b. To call for submissions on the matter of the landscape and consultation method employed by the QLDC, and*
  - c. Once having had the evidence and submissions, determine whether the landscape and consultative methodology was fair, reasonable and provided sufficient information for respondents to make an informed submission on landscape values.*
  - d. If the Commission finds the consultative process was not fair, then it is submitted the Commission would have no choice in calling for the consultative process to be redone in a more reliable, fair and representative manner.*
6. Dr Cossens summarised his concern as relating to whether the proposed variation to the plan with respect to the landscape variation schedules is based on reliable information and accurately portrays the views of the community and/or those most likely to be affected by the proposed variation.<sup>1</sup> After setting out the reasons for his view that the Council's consultation process was deficient, Dr Cossens submitted that:<sup>2</sup>

*“In summary, it is respectfully submitted that it is a logical and fair approach for the Commission to first consider the matter of ‘methodology’ before it hears submissions on the landscape*

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 8 of the Memorandum.

<sup>2</sup> Paragraph 29 of the Memorandum.

*schedules and that submitters, their experts and counsel should be able to make submissions on the matter. It would seem ill founded to hear the substantive submissions on landscape schedule matters when the Commission may find the landscape methodology unfair, biased, and has not allowed the community at the heart of these hearings to have been misled and that ultimately, impinges on their rights to natural justice and to be fairly heard. In a nutshell, has the community being given a fair go?"*

7. Although it was not drawn to our attention in the Memorandum, we note that this same issue was substantially the subject of an application to the Environment Court by Dr Cossens for a Declaration and Enforcement action against the Council in 2022, which was subsequently decided by the Environment Court on 11 October 2022.<sup>3</sup> The Court struck out the relief sought in paragraphs 48.a, c, d and e of the Declaration and Enforcement Application, and declined the remaining relief.<sup>4</sup> Hassan J stated:<sup>5</sup>

*[23] Effective community consultation is plainly integral to sound practice particularly for the proper identification of landscape values. Mr. Ferguson's opinions as an experienced planner give force to that proposition. Effective consultation is an important underpinning for the sound identification of landscape values. That is in the sense that it can help inform appreciation of predominant community values. It can also assist fact checking. For example, NZILA's recently published guidelines, Te Tangi a te Manu, comments that a landscape assessor should remain aware of the range of options and perceptions of landscape matters in the community and draw on available sources of information.*

*[24] However, the RMA does not require such consultation to be undertaken (except to the narrow extent that cl 3(1) Sch 1 prescribes that consultation with certain named parties to be undertaken). Nor is this prescribed in any direction in any of the court's Topic 2 decisions (including in the prescribed values identification framework policies).*

...

*[26] What QLDC has elected to do in regard to consultation and other input into its Proposed Variation falls within the legitimate scope of its planning authority discretion. In terms of s310, nothing undertaken or not undertaken constitutes any identifiable misuse of any RMA function or power or breach of duty or denial of any identifiable RMA right. Nor do the circumstances call for any declaration as to how QLDC has interpreted its planning authority functions, powers or duties.*

*[27] Insofar as Dr Cossens or Darby Planning have concerns about such matters, their proper recourse is to make a submission under Sch 1 RMA and, if not satisfied with the outcome, to appeal.*

*[28] It follows that I find these aspects of the Declaration and Enforcement Application misconceived and disclosing no reasonable or relevant case. Therefore, I strike out the declaration and enforcement relief sought in paragraphs 48.a, c, d, and e of the Declaration and Enforcement Application.*

8. We have considered the matters raised in the Memorandum and set out our findings as follows. In doing so, we have necessarily focused on the process that is required under the RMA with respect to the plan changes and subsequent variation(s). We have also considered our powers as a delegated hearing panel under the RMA with respect to the relief sought by Dr Cossens.

#### Discussion

9. Schedule 1 of the RMA sets out the plan making process, which includes the process required for proposed variation to district plans. In doing so, Schedule 1 creates statutory rights for various persons

---

<sup>3</sup> *JJ Cossens v Queenstown Lakes District Council* [2022] NZEnvC 206, 11 October 2022, Hassan J.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid* at [31].

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid* at [23] to [28].



to participate in the process. The manner by which a local authority must conduct its hearings is prescribed by ss 39 to 42A RMA.<sup>6</sup>

10. Clause 3 of Schedule 1 sets out a hierarchy with respect to consultation and provides (our emphasis underlined):

**3 Consultation**

(1) *During the preparation of a proposed policy statement or plan, the local authority concerned shall consult –*

*(a) the Minister for the Environment; and*

*(b) those other Ministers of the Crown who may be affected by the policy statement or plan; and*

*(c) local authorities who may be so affected; and*

*(d) the tangata whenua of the area who may be affected, through iwi authorities; and*

*(e) any customary marine title group in the area.*

(2) *A local authority may consult anyone else during the preparation of a proposed policy statement or plan*

...

(4) *In consulting persons for the purposes of subclause (2), a local authority must undertake consultation in accordance with section 82 of the Local Government Act 2002.*

11. Relevantly, Clause 3 of Schedule 1 RMA does not require a local authority to carry out pre consultation with the public as part of developing a plan change or variation. However, if a local authority chooses to consult anyone else, including the public, this must be undertaken in accordance with s 82 of the Local Government Act 2002 (the LGA), which sets out principles of consultation.

12. The Court in *Cossens* made it very clear that under the Schedule 1 process, the Council was not obliged to consult the public in preparing a plan change or variation. Further, what the Council ultimately elected to do with regard to consultation and other input into the proposed variation falls within the legitimate scope of its planning authority discretion. In terms of s 310, nothing undertaken or not undertaken constitutes any identifiable misuse of any RMA function or power or breach of duty or denial of any identifiable RMA right. As a delegated hearing panel, much like the court, we have no powers under the RMA or the LGA<sup>7</sup> to review the Council's processes with respect to its consultation with the public, or to grant the relief sought at paragraph 30. a, c or d of the Memorandum with respect to consultation.

13. Even if we were wrong with respect to our powers, it is plain that any alleged defect with respect to public consultation has been remedied by the Schedule 1 process following public notification of the proposed variation.<sup>8</sup>

14. With respect to the other apparent area of concern, being the landscape schedules methodology, Dr Cossens, together with all members of the public, have had full participatory rights under Schedule 1 to make submissions on the landscape methodology employed, and have appeal rights to the Environment Court once Council's decision is received. We note that many of the submitters (as further elaborated in their expert landscape evidence) have made submissions with respect to the landscape methodology. Accordingly, there would seem to be no utility whatsoever in granting the relief sought at paragraph 30. b of the Memorandum and we see no reason to do so. Under the notification process, the public has had

---

<sup>6</sup> *Paraparaumu Airport Coalition Inc v Kapiti Coast District Council EnvC W077/08.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*

the opportunity to make submissions with respect to the landscape methodology and, indeed, in many instances has done so. Were we to grant the relief sought at 30. b, we consider it would seriously disadvantage other submitters who have legitimately participated in the process to date and have a reasonable expectation that the hearing panel will consider their submissions and subsequently make recommendations to the Council.

15. It goes without saying that part of the Hearing Panel's function under the RMA is to consider all points raised in submissions and to hear all of the evidence prior to making our recommendations, which includes those submissions concerned with landscape methodology (as opposed to public consultation on the landscape methodology). The hearing will commence on 16<sup>th</sup> October 2023 in accordance with the directions set out in our first Minute. If we consider it necessary after considering the submissions and evidence, we do have the powers to seek a peer review of the landscape methodology.

Decision

16. For the reasons given above, we decline the relief sought by Dr Cossens with respect to public consultation on the landscape methodology. We do, however, note that the hearing will consider submissions and expert evidence from all parties on the landscape methodology, as notified, as part of this statutory process.
17. Should any party have any queries in relation to this Minute or require any clarification in relation to the process for this hearing, please contact the Hearings Administrator at [dp.hearings@qldc.govt.nz](mailto:dp.hearings@qldc.govt.nz).



Jane Taylor

For the Commission

11 October 2023

## **Appendix 4**

### **Landscape Schedules 21.22 and 21.23**

## 21.22 Schedule of Landscape Values: Outstanding Natural Feature and Outstanding Natural Landscape Priority Areas – Preamble

### 1. Purpose

- 1.1 Schedule 21.22 identifies and describes 24 Priority Areas (PA) Schedules that relate to Outstanding Natural Features (ONF) or Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL)<sup>1</sup>.
- 1.2 The PA Schedules are a tool to assist with the identification of the landscape values that are to be protected within each PA and related landscape capacity. They contain both factual information and evaluative content and are to inform plan development and plan implementation processes and assist technical landscape assessment.
- 1.3 The description of each PA must be read in full. Each description, as a whole, expresses at a PA scale, the landscape values, and the attributes from which those values derive.

### 2. Application

- 2.1 The PA schedules have been prepared to reflect that the PA mapping extends beyond the Rural Zone. The application of the PA Schedules to resource consents is as follows:
  - 2.1.1 The PA Schedules apply to any proposal requiring resource consent for a restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity<sup>2</sup> in the Rural Zone, including the Rural Industrial Sub Zone, but not the Ski Area Sub Zone (see 2.1.2 below).
  - 2.1.2 The PA Schedules do not apply to proposals requiring resource consent in any other zone, including Exception Zones<sup>3</sup>. They may inform landscape assessments for proposals involving any land within a PA but are not required to be considered.
- 2.2 The PA Schedules will be used where relevant for any plan development proposal.

### 3. Landscape Attributes and Values

- 3.1 The landscape attributes and values identified, are based on an assessment of the PA as a whole and are not intended to describe the relevant attributes and values of specific sites within the PA. The schedules for each PA set out the 'key' attributes and values, summarised from a wide range of information sources and knowledge about the landscape.
- 3.2 Given the PA scale of the landscape assessment underpinning the PA schedules, a finer grain proposal-specific assessment of landscape attributes and values will typically be required for plan development or plan implementation purposes (including plan changes or resource consent applications)<sup>4</sup>. Through any proposal-specific assessment, additional landscape values may be identified that are not recorded in the PA Schedules. The PA Schedules represent a point in time and are not intended to provide a complete record.

---

<sup>1</sup> Refer to Strategic Policies 3.3.36, 3.3.37 and 3.38

<sup>2</sup> Refer to Strategic Policy 3.3.46

<sup>3</sup> Refer to Chapter 3 part 3.1B.5.a

<sup>4</sup> Refer to Strategic Policy 3.3.43 and Strategic Policy 3.3.45

- 3.3 The PA Schedules include attributes<sup>5</sup> that contribute positively to landscape values, attributes that detract from landscape values, and attributes that are neutral with respect to informing landscape values.
- 3.4 The reference to 'Other distinctive vegetation types' and the 'Land use and patterns and features' in the PA Schedules do not relate to attributes or landscape values that need to be protected. Rather, these are attributes that influence landscape values (and landscape capacity). Reference to these existing attributes is not intended to 'lock in' existing land uses.
- 3.5 The reference to 'Plant and Animal Pests' corresponds to attributes that detract from landscape values. Pest information is included at the end of the landscape capacity section of each PA Schedule. Few, if any of the District's ONF/Ls are pristine and there are varying levels of modification evident (including plant and animal pests). This means that landscape restoration and enhancement (which can include the management of pests) is a highly desirable outcome. The reference to plant and animal pests is intended to guide appropriate future landscape management within the PA. (For example, where a resource consent or plan change is proposed within the PA, the proposal or provisions may seek to specifically address the management of pests).

#### 4. Landscape Capacity

- 4.1 The landscape capacity ratings used in the PA Schedules, which are described below, are intended to reflect the capacity of the landscape or feature to accommodate various types or forms of development, without compromising the identified landscape values. The definition of landscape capacity applied in the PA Schedules is set out at Chapter 3 part 3.1B.5b.i.
- 4.2 The capacity ratings, and associated descriptions, are based on an assessment of each PA as a whole, and are not intended to describe the relevant capacity of specific sites within a PA. The ratings of landscape capacity do not apply to activities within any Exception Zone<sup>6</sup> that is located within a PA.
- 4.3 Landscape capacity ratings and qualifying comments in the PA Schedules are 'high level' and focus on describing potential outcomes that would likely be appropriate within each PA. These descriptions are not a replacement for any relevant policies, rules or standards in the District Plan, and are intended to provide guidance only.
- 4.4 Landscape capacity is not a fixed concept and it may change over time as development occurs or landscape characteristics change. In addition, across each PA there is likely to be variation in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through future plan changes or resource consent applications.
- 4.5 For the purposes of the PA Schedules, landscape capacity is described using the following five terms:

**Some landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which a careful or measured amount of some sensitively located and designed development of this type is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is near its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values and where only a limited amount of sensitively located and designed development is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Very limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is very close to its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only a very limited amount of sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

**Extremely limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is extremely close to its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only an extremely limited amount of very sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

---

<sup>5</sup> The identification of an attribute in the PA schedule is not confirmation or otherwise as to whether the attribute has been legally established.

<sup>6</sup> Refer to Chapter 3 part 3.1B.5(a)

**Extremely limited or no capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is extremely close to, or already at, capacity to accommodate development of this type without material **compromise** of its identified landscape values, and where either no, or an extremely limited amount of very sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

- 4.6 It is intended that the use of this five-tier landscape capacity terminology, along with a description of the characteristics that are likely to frame development that is appropriate (from a landscape perspective), and the description of the landscape attributes and values of the PA will assist in providing high level guidance with respect to the scale, location and characteristics of each land use type that will protect landscape values in each PA that relates to ONF/Ls.

## 5. Meaning of activities for the purpose of the PA Schedules

- 5.1 For the purpose of the PA schedules, activities listed have the following meanings:

- **Commercial recreational activities:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Visitor accommodation:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Tourism related activities:** has the same meaning as Resort in Chapter 2.
- **Urban expansions means:**
  - a change from a rural activity to urban development; or
  - a change (including any proposed change) in zoning to an urban zone, including any change to the urban growth boundary or any other zone changes (or proposed changes) that would provide for urban development.
- **Intensive agriculture:** has the same meaning as Factory Farming in Chapter 2.
- **Earthworks:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Farm buildings:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Mineral extraction:** has the same meaning as Mining Activity in Chapter 2.
- **Transport infrastructure:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Utilities:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Regionally significant infrastructure:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Farm scale quarries:** means mining of aggregate for farming activities on the same site.
- **Renewable energy generation:** has the same meaning as Renewable Electricity Generation and Renewable Electricity Generation Activities in Chapter 2.
- **Forestry:** has the same meaning as Forestry Activity in Chapter 2.
- **Rural living:** has the same meaning as rural living in Chapter 3 section 3.1B.5.
- **Rural industrial activities:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2.
- **Passenger lift systems:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2 except that for the purposes of the PA schedules it includes base and terminal buildings and stations.
- **Jetties, lake structures, moorings, boat sheds:** have their plain meaning (and may be used interchangeably).

- 5.2 The range of land use activities addressed in the capacity section of the PA Schedules includes the activities prescribed by SP 3.3.38. It is acknowledged that this does not span the full array of land use activities that may be contemplated in the PAs over time. In the case of a future application for a land use activity that is not addressed in a PA Schedule, an assessment applying the principles set out in 3.3.43, 3.3.45 and 3.3.46 is required.

---

## 21.22.1 - Peninsula Hill PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Peninsula Hill PA includes the ONF that encompasses the elevated roche moutonnée landform of Peninsula Hill which frames the south side of Whakatipu Waimāori's (Lake Whakatipu's) Frankton Arm. Along its north and west boundaries, the PA adjoins urban zoned land at Kelvin Peninsula. The southern part of the PA coincides with the Jacks Point Zone (Exception Zone) and the Jacks Point Urban Growth Boundary. The south boundary adjoins the Jacks Point Zone Tablelands and Homesites area. The eastern boundary adjoins urban zoned land including Hanley Downs and the Coneburn SHA.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. Largely unmodified roche moutonnée glacial landform of Peninsula Hill with a smoother and more coherent 'up ice' slope to the southwest/south, and a steeper rough 'plucked' slope extending from the northeast around to the northwest. Highest point: 834m. This form indicates the direction of travel of the glacier that formed the roche moutonnée clearly.
2. Exposed and irregular rock faces and outcrops, landslips and loose boulders throughout the north-western, northern and north-eastern flanks with thin soil cover.
3. Two elevated landform 'ribs' extending on a west to east alignment on the south side of the hill.
4. Further afield, the roche moutonnée of Peninsula Hill is linked to the roche moutonnée of Jacks Point Hill by the Tablelands - a hummocky elevated area formed by glacial processes.

### Hydrological features:

5. A series of steep gullies draining from the western, northern, and eastern hill slopes to the Frankton Arm of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) or the Kawarau River.
6. Shallow gullies (including localised wetlands) draining the lower-lying landform ribs to the south of the hill in an easterly direction, and which eventually discharge into the Kawarau River.
7. A series of small tarns, formed in topographic depressions in the bedrock left by glacial processes, around the crest of Peninsula Hill and the lower north-western hill slopes.

### Ecological features and vegetation types:

8. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Swathes and scattered pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri, occur across the hillslopes with more extensive areas associated with the steeper bluffly terrain overlooking Frankton and Frankton Arm.

9. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. Grazed pasture covers the lower southeastern slopes facing the Remarkables, while rough pasture (exotic grassland) occurs on the southern and western side of the hill.
  - b. Mixed exotic tree plantings throughout the north-western lower slopes in the vicinity of the access from Kelvin Peninsula.

### **Land-use patterns and features:**

10. Grazed pasture is the dominant land use across the PA. Associated with this activity is a network of farm tracks throughout the north-western and northern slopes that provide access between Kelvin Peninsula and the hilltop which is also used for paid scenic drive and animal encounter activities, and throughout the lower-lying rib/gully landforms to the south of the hill 'proper' (accessed from Hanley Downs and Jacks Point).
11. Other human modification is limited to: a cluster of communication towers on the hilltop; a dwelling on the north-eastern edge of the PA (on Peninsula Road); and a dwelling on the south-western edge (accessed via Preserve Drive).
12. The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) at Jacks Point Zone includes the lower-lying ribs and gullies to the south of the hill. Much of this area is zoned Landscape Protection Area (LPA) under the Jacks Point zone and provides an important counterpoint or 'offset' for the urban and rural living development at Jacks Point and Hanley Downs. Within the LPA, policy focuses on enabling low-intensity pastoral farming and landscape restoration. A dwelling is anticipated in a localised hollow at the western end of the uppermost gully with a second dwelling anticipated adjacent the south boundary of the PA. A range of location-specific assessment criteria and development controls are included in the zone provisions to guide an appropriate development outcome. Walking and cycling trails are also anticipated linking between Hanley Downs, Jacks Point and the existing track along the edge of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) that connects to Homestead Bay.
13. State Highway 6 which runs along the outside of the north-eastern edge of the PA.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

14. Rees or Boyes Cottage (archaeological site F41/761) at the base of Peninsula Hill.

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

15. 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.
16. The north-eastern extent of the PA overlaps the mapped wāhi tūpuna Tititea. Tititea was a pā located on the south side of the Kawarau River near Whakatipu Waimāori.

### **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:**

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



18. Kāi Tahu tradition tells of an incident where a 280 strong war party was repelled from this area and chased to the top of the Crown Range, which is now named Tititea in memory of this incident.
19. The mana whenua values associated with Peninsula Hill and Tititea include, but may not be limited to, kāiika and tauraka waka.

**Historic attributes and values:**

20. The association of the hill with W. G. Rees' early sheep run.

**Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

21. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
22. The popularity of the views across the Frankton Arm to Peninsula Hill, (partially flanked and backdropped by the Remarkables) as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.
23. The identity of the area as an important gateway feature on the south side of Queenstown.
24. The landmark qualities of the landform as a reference point in views from Queenstown.
25. The popularity of the recreational 'features' listed below.

**Recreation attributes and values:**

26. The popularity of the area as a tourism destination: as a breeding and finishing farm with deer, sheep, cattle, goats, donkeys, pigs, and miniature horses, many of which can be fed by the public as paid visitors of Deer Park Heights. The area also has a number of film location attractions and picnic spots. Access by vehicle only.
27. Walking and cycling on the Jacks Point Trail (part of the Queenstown Trail) that runs along the western edge of the PA that connects to Homestead Bay.
28. SH6 as a key scenic route in very close proximity.

**Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

**Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

29. The area's natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above) which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial, slope and fluvial processes.

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

30. Engaging and attractive long-range views from the Frankton Arm, Queenstown, Frankton (including the airport), SH6, Queenstown Hill, the Queenstown Gondola, Queenstown Gardens, and the Frankton Track to the rugged and dramatic north-western, northern, and north-eastern hill slopes. From this orientation the open and distinctive roche moutonnée landform is highly legible and its generally undeveloped character forms a memorable contrast with the fringe of urban development along its base. The waters of the Frankton Arm seen in the foreground of view along with the Remarkables in the background of the outlook add to the scene, establishing it as one of the key vistas associated with Queenstown.
31. Intermittent closer-range views from Kelvin Peninsula that afford an appreciation of the rocky and 'plucked' landform character and dynamic nature of the northwest to northeast side of the hill. The contrast

established by this natural landform backdrop seen within an urban context adds to the memorability and appeal of such views.

32. Highly attractive and memorable close to long-range views from the Jacks Point Trail to the south of Peninsula Hill across the undulating tablelands to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, flanked by Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and the distant peaks of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) and Coronet Peak. The careful siting and design of rural living and urban development within the Jacks Point zone means that, where visible, built development is subservient to the natural landscape in these views.
33. Memorable 'gateway' views from SH6 to the southern and eastern sides of the hill and which screen views to Queenstown. The dominance of the landform feature by virtue of its proximity, scale, distinctive physical form, and undeveloped character, together with the limited awareness of urban development at Jacks Point, adds to the scene.
34. Attractive mid and long-range views from Jacks Point, Hanley Downs, and Coneburn SHA to the southern and/or eastern hill slopes. These orientations afford an appreciation of the rugged character of the eastern side of the feature and the smoother and more coherent landform character on the southern side. The mountainous backdrop against which the feature is seen together with its visual dominance (as a consequence of its scale, proximity, and appearance) and visual connection to the patterning of open and undeveloped hummocky terrain in the foreground of view (which is a fundamental development strategy of the Jacks Point zone) adds to the appeal of the outlook.
35. Appealing longer-range views westbound on the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road. In these views there is an awareness of the scale and form of the landscape feature rising out of the low-lying fans, deltas and hummocky terrain throughout the Coneburn valley. This theme of contrast is reinforced by the legible patterning of urban development (existing or anticipated) across the majority of the valley floor juxtaposed against the undeveloped roche moutonnée. At higher elevations along the road the broader mountain setting adds to the spectacle.
36. Highly attractive mid and long-range views from Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) to the west and southwest to the smoother western and southern roche moutonnée slopes. From this orientation, built development within the Jacks Point zone is largely screened from view, or, where visible, difficult to see.
37. Engaging and seemingly 'close-range' views from planes approaching or exiting Queenstown airport via the Frankton Arm. Such views offer an appreciation of the rugged nature of the northern hill slopes and the broader glacial landscape context within which the roche moutonnée is set.
38. In all of the views, the dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes is evident within the PA along with the very limited extent and generally subservient nature of built development within the PA and the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpinning the high quality of the outlook.

#### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

39. The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Peninsula Hill set within an urban context, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to its pastoral, tourism, and infrastructure use are visible, the very low number of buildings, the relatively modest scale of tracks and limited visibility of infrastructure on top limits their influence on the character of the landform as a natural landscape element.
40. The irregular patterning and proliferation of grey shrubland, exposed rock faces, and areas of visible erosion in places adds to the perception of naturalness.

#### **Memorability attributes and values:**

41. The appealing and engaging views of the largely undeveloped and highly legible roche moutonnée landform of Peninsula Hill. The juxtaposition of the landscape feature within an urban context, along with

its location on a key scenic highway route and the airport approach path, and the magnificent mountain and lake context within which it is seen in many views, are also factors that contribute to its memorability.

### Transient attributes and values:

42. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the roche moutonnée slopes.

### Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

43. The juxtaposition of the generally undeveloped 'natural' landform in close proximity to Queenstown contributes to an impression of wildness, and the experience afforded from locations such as the Jacks Point Trail and Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) to the west and southwest, where views of Peninsula Hill are generally unencumbered by visible built development contributes an impression of remoteness.

### Aesthetic attributes and values:

44. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
45. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the generally undeveloped roche moutonnée landform, juxtaposed beside an urban context or natural lake/mountain setting.
  - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. the clearly legible roche moutonnée landform profile and character;
    - ii. the open and pastoral character of Peninsula Hill;
    - iii. the distinctly rugged character of the northern side of the feature and the more coherent appearance of the southern side of the feature as a consequence of the landform and vegetation character; and,
    - iv. the very limited level of built modification evident through the PA.
46. It is noted that control of plant pest species such as wilding pines can temporarily detract from aesthetic values.

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

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for PA Peninsula Hill can be summarised as follows:

47. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
48. **High associative values** relating to:
  - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.

- b. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
- c. The recreational attributes of the ONF.

49. **Very High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Queenstown, Frankton, SH6, Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), the Jacks Point and Frankton Trails, Kelvin Peninsula, Hanley Downs, Coneburn SHA, Jacks Point, the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road, and the airport approach path, along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
- c. A high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of the more natural landscape across Peninsula Hill.
- d. A sense of remoteness and wildness primarily as a consequence of the landform's proximity to Queenstown and urban development within the Coneburn valley and the overt contrast established by its scale, naturalness and dramatic appearance within an urban context. From some orientations on the lake and local trail network, the very limited visibility of built development in the wider outlook establishes Peninsula Hill as part of the expansive natural landscape.

## Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for tourism related activities. **Excepting in relation to the two homesites within the Jacks Point zone and consented dwellings within the PA at Hanleys Farm, extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm tracks or tracks and trails for recreational use, 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 reinforce existing rural character in lower-lying flat land within the PA.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity excepting very small-scale farm quarries.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – extremely limited or 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.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy developments. **Very limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for exotic forestry.
- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited** landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; is designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).

## **PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS**

- A. Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
- B. Plant pest species include wilding pines, hawthorn, broom and sweet briar. Woody weeds cover much of the north facing slopes including the bluffy terrain overlooking Frankton and the Kawarau River.

---

## 21.22.2 - Ferry Hill PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Ferry Hill PA encompasses the ONF that is the elevated roche moutonnée landform of Ferry Hill.

### Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

### Landforms and land types:

1. The steeply sloping roche moutonnée glacial landform of Ferry Hill (694m), with a smooth 'up-glacier' slope to the southwest and south, and a steeper rough 'plucked' down-glacier slope generally to the west, northwest, north, and northeast.
2. Ferry Hill, formed by the over-riding Wakatipu glacier, is recognised in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory as being one of the four best examples of roche moutonnée in Central Otago and one of the most easily seen and appreciated. It is of national scientific, aesthetic or educational value and is assessed to be vulnerable to significant damage by human related activities.
3. The cone-like peak landform of Ferry Hill.

### Hydrological features:

4. The unnamed streams along the western side of the PA.
5. The irrigation race around the eastern and southern lower flanks of Ferry Hill.

### Ecological features and vegetation types:

6. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Swathes and scattered pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri and mingimingi occupy the bluffs, rocky slopes and gullies on the landform. Some of these shrublands are interspersed with hawthorn, sweet briar and elderberry.
7. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. Open pasture and scattered scrub throughout the elevated steep slopes and crest of Ferry Hill.
  - b. Grazed pasture with scattered shelterbelts (including poplars) and clusters of pine and willow trees throughout the lower and more gently sloping flanks of Ferry Hill and the saddle between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill.
  - c. Amenity and shelter plantings around the few scattered dwellings on the northern and western sides of Ferry Hill.

### **Land-use patterns and features:**

8. Grazed pasture which is the dominant land use across the PA. Associated with this activity is a network of farm tracks, fencing and farm buildings.
9. Short stretches of unformed road: at the north end of Hansen Road (south) linking to Waipuna (Lake Johnson); at the southern end of Hansen Road (north) extending southwards along the western side of Ferry Hill.
10. The very sparse scattering of rural and rural living dwellings (including consented but unbuilt platforms) and farm buildings in rural zoned areas around the edges of the PA.
11. Infrastructure is evident within the PA and includes: Aurora distribution lines over the saddle near Lake Johnson (one crossing the river at Tucker Beach).
12. The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) associated with Queenstown which adjoins the southern and eastern sides of the PA.
13. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character and/or proximity include: the urban residential and commercial development adjoining the south and eastern edges of the area (taking in Frankton and Quail Rise); Frankton Road (SH6A); and the rural living development at Tucker Beach and Hansen Road on the northern and north-western lower slopes of Ferry Hill (Wakatipu Basin Lifestyle Precinct Zone).

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

14. Archaeological features relating to historic farming in the area around Lake Johnson.

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

15. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.

### **Associative Attributes and Values**

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

### **Mana whenua associations and experience:**

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

### **Important hHistoric attributes and values:**

17. The general area as a site of early gold mining.
18. Early farming around Waipuna (Lake Johnson).

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

19. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
20. The identity of Ferry Hill as part of the dramatic backdrop to Frankton and the western side of the Whakatipu Basin.

## Recreation attributes and values:

21. SH6 as a key scenic route in close proximity.

## Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

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

## Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

22. The area's natural landforms, land type, and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial processes (excepting the water race which is man-made).
23. Indigenous rocky outcrop, steep slope and gully plantings which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values throughout the area.

## Particularly important views to and from the area:

24. Engaging and attractive short to long-range views from the Frankton Arm, Frankton (including the airport), SH6 and Kelvin Peninsula to the cone-like peak of Ferry Hill (in combination with the roche moutonnée landforms of Pt781 and Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) which are within the West Whakatipu Basin PA). In many of these views the open pastoral character of the smooth and more rough roche moutonnée slopes forms a bold contrast with the urban context. In longer range views from many of the more distant locations on the south side of the feature, there is a clear appreciation of the roche moutonnée landform profile and the waters of the Frankton Arm in the foreground of view, along with the often-snow-capped mountains of Ben Lomond and Coronet Peak in the background add to the appeal. In closer range views (e.g. Frankton and SH6), intervening landforms, vegetation and/or built development curbs the field of view in places. Despite the limited expanse of the feature visible, the contrast established by the natural landform within an urban context adds to the memorability and appeal of such views.
25. Attractive mid and long-range views from the Fitzpatrick Basin, Dalefield, Hawthorn Triangle, the elevated flanks and foothills associated with Slope Hill and sections of Queenstown Trail coinciding with this part of the Whakatipu Basin, to the distinctive cone-like peak of Ferry Hill. In closer range views, the expanse of the PA is curtailed by intervening landform and vegetation; however, there is an increased appreciation of the localised rocky outcrops, scarps, and hummocky terrain of the landforms adding to their appeal. In some views, there is an appreciation of the band of urban (Quail Rise) and rural living development (Tucker Beach) throughout the lower and gentler slopes of Ferry Hill and along the north side of the Waipuna (Lake Johnson) saddle along with the poplar shelterbelts, scattered shade trees and the odd rural dwelling across the north side of Ferry Hill. Nevertheless, from this orientation, the large-scale and distinctive sculptural form of the landform and its generally undeveloped character makes it memorable.
26. Attractive mid and long-range views from Ladies Mile to the southeast and east sides of Ferry Hill. From this orientation, the distinguishing roche moutonnée landform profile is clearly legible and there is an awareness of the transition from the smooth 'ice up' character to the rough 'plucked' character indicating the direction of travel of the glacier that sculpted this landform.
27. Engaging and seemingly 'close-range' views from planes approaching or exiting Queenstown airport via the Frankton Arm. Such views offer an appreciation of the roche moutonnée and the broader glacial landscape context within which the PA is set.
28. In all of the views, the dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONF, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the PA and the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook.



### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

29. The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Ferry Hill PA set within an urban or rural living context, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to pastoral and infrastructure uses are visible, the very low number of buildings, the relatively modest scale of tracks and the limited visibility of infrastructure limits their influence on the character of the area as a natural landscape element.
30. The irregular patterning and proliferation of grey shrubland, exposed rock faces and scrub in places, adds to the perception of naturalness.

### **Memorability attributes and values:**

31. The appealing and engaging views of the largely undeveloped and legible roche moutonnée landform. The juxtaposition of the landscape feature within an urban or rural living context, along with its location on a key scenic highway route and the airport approach path, along with the magnificent mountain and lake context within which it is seen in many views, are also factors that contribute to its memorability.

### **Transient attributes and values:**

32. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the roche moutonnée slopes.
33. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation (poplars and willows in particular).

### **Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

34. A sense of the remoteness across the western side of the landform that is set well apart from urban and rural living development and strongly associates with the broader undeveloped ONL mountain context associated with Pt 781 and Sugar Loaf.

### **Aesthetic qualities and values:**

35. The experience of all of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
36. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the generally undeveloped roche moutonnée landform, juxtaposed beside an urban or rural living context.
  - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. The distinctly rugged character of the west, northwest, north and northeast sides of the roche moutonnée landforms and the more coherent appearance of the southwest and south of each as a consequence of the landform and vegetation character and patterns.
    - ii. The generally open and pastoral character of Ferry Hill.
    - iii. The cone-like peak landform of Ferry Hill.
    - iv. The very limited level of built modification evident through the ONF.

## **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 combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for the Ferry Hill PA can be summarised as follows:

37. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
38. **High associative values** relating to:
  - a. The mana whenua associations of the area
  - b. The historic associations of the area
  - c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
39. **High perceptual values** relating to:
  - a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
  - b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Frankton, the scenic route of SH 6, sections of the Queenstown Trail network, the Ladies Mile corridor, the western side of the Whakatipu Basin, and the airport approach path, along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
  - c. The identity of the roche moutonnée as a natural and dramatic landscape backdrop to Frankton and the western side of the Whakatipu Basin.
  - d. A sense of remoteness and wildness associated with the western side of the PA.

## Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that integrate with, and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing consented platforms (including on the low lying southern margins of the PA adjacent Hansen Road) and which: are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); enhance public access (where appropriate). **Extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA. **Extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.

- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm tracks or tracks and trails for recreational use, 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 reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity excepting very small-scale farm quarries.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – extremely limited** landscape capacity.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are 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 and/or co-located with existing 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 – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy developments. **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for exotic forestry.
- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited** landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; is designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Existing elements that require management: Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
- B. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, hawthorn, buddleia, elderberry, sycamore, broom and gorse.

---

## 21.22.3 Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA takes in the river corridor and context, winding broadly southwards from west of Mount Dewar, through Arthurs Point, around Tucker Beach to the confluence with the Kawarau River. The PA includes the lower reaches of Moonlight Creek to the west of Mount Dewar.

The mapped PA includes the upper edges of the landforms framing the river corridor encompassing both the ONF and parts of the adjoining ONL. This takes in the gravel beds and river floodplains to the west of Arthurs Point and at Big Beach (south of Arthurs Point), Tucker Beach and the Kawarau confluence. It also includes the steep hill slopes bordering Piano Terrace and the western end of the Shotover Canyon Track to the west of Mount Dewar.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. Steep escarpments, scarps, gorges/canyons, bluffs and river cliffs, where glacial and alluvial processes have eroded underlying schist.
2. Alluvial floodplains and terraces, dynamic river braids and gravel shoals at bends in the course of the river to the west of Arthurs Point and at Big Beach, Tucker Beach and the confluence with the Kawarau River.
3. The overall transition along the course of the river from a predominantly narrow and steeply incised corridor (interspersed with alluvial flats and gravel beds at river bends) upriver (north) of Tucker Beach to a more consistently broad and open riverbed and valley at the confluence with the Kawarau.
4. In places, the seamless merger of the riverbanks with the flanking large-scale mountain landforms of Ferry Hill, Sugar Loaf, Bowen Peak and Mount Dewar.

### Hydrological features:

5. The Kimiākau (Shotover River) and in particular, the following features and attributes:
  - a. Waterbody with a gravel and schist bed.
  - b. The fast-flowing waters with numerous rapids.
  - c. Emerald green colouring of the waters in the vicinity of the gorge.

### Ecological features and vegetation types:

6. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Pockets of grey shrubland, especially within the gorged sections upstream of Tucker Beach and upstream of Arthurs Point and on adjacent hillslopes.

- b. Remnant pockets of mountain beech in the gorge upstream of Arthurs Point.
  - c. Cushion vegetation associated with stable areas of riverbed at Tucker Beach and Big Beach.
  - d. A large regionally significant wetland known as the Shotover River Confluence Swamp by the lower braided section near the Kawarau River confluence. The wetland features a mosaic of sedgeland, rushland and willow.
7. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
- a. The almost continuous patterning of willows and poplars along the riverbanks.
8. The rocky gorges and associated beech forest and grey shrubland provide habitat for New Zealand falcon and other native birds including bellbird, South Island tomtit, grey warbler, fantail and silvereye.
9. The river and adjoining stable areas of riverbed provide suitable feeding and nesting habitat for the black-fronted tern (*Chlidonias albotiatus*) (nationally endangered), black billed gull (*Larus bulleri*) (nationally critical) and the banded dotterel (*Charadrius bicinctus*) (nationally vulnerable).
10. Habitat for trout and salmon.

### **Land-use patterns and features:**

11. A very limited number of rural living dwellings on the intermediate ledges framing the river corridor, with two located near the southern end of Domain Road, three scattered across the elevated ledges to the northwest of the Edith Cavell Bridge, two located on the elevated terraces to the northeast of the Edith Cavell Bridge, one located on the elevated terrace southeast of Edith Cavell Bridge and one opposite Big Beach. The very limited number of dwellings and/or their discreet location (with the latter factor not applying to all of the existing dwellings) are important factors in the appropriateness of these elements within the river corridor.
12. The Lower Shotover / Kimiākau Trail along the true left bank of the river linking between Littles Road and Domain Road and parts of the Countryside Trail and Twin Rivers Trail and the southern end of the PA. All of the trails are part of the Queenstown Trail network.
13. The network of relatively short tracks along the river, to the north and south of Arthurs Point.
14. The western end of the Shotover Canyon Track (north of Arthurs Point).
15. An almost continuous patterning of 'conservation' focused land along Kimiākau and the Moonlight Creek (comprising Stewardship Area, DoC marginal strip or Council Reserve). Noteworthy publicly accessible reserve areas are located at Tucker Beach and the river terraces north of Arthurs Point.
16. The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) associated with Arthurs Point adjoins either side of the river PA.
17. Infrastructure is evident within the corridor and includes: pipelines at the Old Shotover Bridge; the Cromwell-Frankton A 110KV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid and gravel extraction is located near the confluence with the Kawarau; informal gravel trails and vehicular tracks; fencing; and two Aurora distribution lines (one crossing the river at Tucker Beach, and the other running along the corridor roughly between Tucker Beach and Big Beach); the Queenstown Airport runway and Runway End Safety Area (RESA) located at the southern end of the PA; Morningstar Reserve area comprising a range of industrial commercial activities and facilities beneath the Edith Cavell Bridge including Shotover Jet and Queenstown Rafting tourism operations, and carparking; the Shotover Canyon Swing which has a steel cable line that crosses the river and is located north of the Edith Cavell bridge. A bridge is planned to be built in the future to cross the Shotover River at Tuckers Beach Reserve as part of the Queenstown Trail.
18. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the river corridor due to their scale, character and/or proximity include: the Queenstown Wastewater Treatment Plant, the

urban area of Quail Rise on the eastern side of Ferry Hill; the scattering of rural living properties throughout Tucker Beach rural living area, along the top of the cliffs adjacent Domain Road, Littles Road and Fitzpatrick Road; and throughout the river terraces adjacent Littles Stream.

19. SH6 which crosses the river at the southern end of the PA.
20. Gorge Road which crosses the river at Arthurs Point (via the Edith Cavell Bridge).
21. The very popular commercial jet boat and rafting operations at the southern end of the PA and the area north and south of the Edith Cavell Bridge.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

22. Edith Cavell Bridge at Arthurs Point (District Plan reference 35, archaeological site E41/300).
23. The Thomas Arthurs Monument, beside Edith Cavell Bridge, Arthurs Point (District Plan reference 29).
24. The steam tractor beside the Oxenbridge Tunnel near Arthurs Point (true right bank; District Plan reference 31).
25. The house and sleepout, Paddy Mathias Place Arthurs Point Road (true left bank, District Plan reference 62).
26. The Old Shotover River Bridge (District Plan reference 222).
27. The Oxenbridge Mining Tunnel near Arthurs Point (true right bank). The 170m tunnel was part of a failed mining scheme by the Oxenbridge brothers, attempting to divert water from the river to recover gold from the riverbed. Today it is used by rafters and kayakers (HNZPT List Number 5607; archaeological site E41/94).
28. Sew Hoy's Big Beach Claim Historic Area (at Big Beach; HNZPT List Number 7545).
29. A protected Poplar near Arthurs Point (true right bank; District Plan reference 163).
30. Old Shotover Bridge Stone Causeway (archaeological site F41/790).
31. Kawarau Diversion Syndicate Project features (dredge and diversion tunnel, archaeological site E41/255).
32. Stone abutment of 1862 bridge (archaeological site E41/301).
33. Prince Arthur Dredge (archaeological site E41/95).
34. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, and associated domestic sites along the riverbanks (for example, archaeological sites E41/247, E41/243, and F41/766).
35. Shotover Jet and Queenstown Rafting Operations (Queenstown's first commercial jet boating and rafting operations).

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

36. 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.
37. The ONF is mapped as wāhi tūpuna Kimiākau (Shotover River), part of the extensive networks of mahika kai (food & resource gathering) and traditional travel routes in this area.
38. A contemporary nohoaka (camping site to support traditional mahika kai activities provided as redress under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlements Act 1998) is located at Tucker Beach.
39. The confluence of the Kimiākau and the Kawarau is known as Puahuru.

## **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:**

40. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
41. For generations, mana whenua traversed these catchments gathering kai and other resources.
42. The mana whenua values associated with this ONF include, but may not be limited to, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

43. Gold mining in and alongside the river, which is reputed to have been one of the richest gold bearing rivers in the world.
44. The naming of the river which was coined by William Gilbert Rees after his business partner, George Gammie's English estate, Shotover Park. The river had been previously called Tummel by two Scottish pioneers named Donald Angus Cameron and Angus Alphonse Macdonald who had passed through the area before Rees arrived. It was also referred to as the Overshot by the early goldminers, but it was the name Shotover that stuck.
45. The scattering of various historic features (including the Old Ferry Hotel on Spence Road), especially bridges and bridge sites, along and adjacent the PA, which collectively tell the story of the early European history of the area.

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

46. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
47. The popularity of Kimiākau (Shotover River) as an inspiration/subject for art, photography, postage stamps and books. Also as a wedding venue.
48. The identity of the river as an important natural and historic landscape context for Arthurs Point, Tucker Beach, Quail Rise, and the various rural living areas along its margins.
49. The popularity of the recreational 'features' listed below and their general ease of accessibility.
50. The importance of the natural heritage area to the local community as evidenced by the efforts of local community groups (e.g. APCA and KAPOW) to manage weeds and pests, clear debris in the river and revegetate sections of the river corridor.

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

51. Gold panning on the river; walking (including dog walking), running and cycling the trail alongside the river (including footbridges); jetboating, rafting, paddleboarding and kayaking on the river, particularly through the Shotover gorge/canyon section; swimming in the river; picnicking by the river.
52. Some motorbiking activities at the southern end of the PA.
53. Arthurs Point DOC Visitor Services office and tourism ticketing / access points.

- 54. Te Araroa Trail connection via the Wakatipu Track, passing over the Shotover River near Frankton.
- 55. Sport fishing for trout and salmon.

### **Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

#### **Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

- 56. Clearly legible glacial, fluvial / hydrological processes that have shaped the river corridor and which continue to add to its dynamic qualities. These are evident in scarps, floodplains and the changing patterns of channels and alluvial deposits and gravel banks along the river course.

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

- 57. Highly attractive close, mid and long-range views from tracks/bridges (which are public places and including Edith Cavell Bridge), local roads, reserve land, the water, the SH6 bridge and nearby dwellings (including at Arthurs Point) along the river corridor. Vegetation and landform patterns, together with the winding corridor, contain and frame views, contributing a highly variable character to the outlook.
- 58. Throughout the gorge/canyon sections near Arthurs Point, the fast-flowing narrow channel, framed by unmodified rock escarpments, bluffs and large-scale vegetation-clad river cliffs, is spectacular.
- 59. Throughout river bends and towards the lower reaches, the corridor is wider, affording longer-range views of the broader mountain setting. Here, the engaging patterning of the dynamic river waters and gravel beds framed by the undeveloped vegetation-clad river cliffs and terraces dominates the outlook. The filtering and framing effect of vegetation in places along with the alternating availability of such views serves to enhance their interest and appeal. In places, the steep and large-scale mountainous landforms of Ferry Hill, Sugar Loaf, Bowen Peak, Mount Dewar and the broader mountain setting add to the sense of drama and grandeur. Elsewhere, historic features within or adjacent the corridor, rapids and/or the dynamic gravel shoals add to the appeal of the outlook.
- 60. From low-lying vantage points within the corridor (on the water and on tracks) intervening landform and/or vegetation features largely obscure views to urban and rural living development adjacent the area adjacent.
- 61. Appealing mid and long-range views from SH6 Shotover Bridge in which the broad river corridor reads as a swathe of natural landscape bookmarking the interface between Queenstown and the Wakatipu Basin proper. In these views, the attractive vegetation dominated riverbanks, along with the dynamic gravel beds and water channels and Old Shotover bridge, create the impression of a relatively undeveloped river corridor. The visibility of the distant Northern Remarkables and Coronet Range in outlooks adds to the appeal.
- 62. In all of the views, the dominance of 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONF, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the ONF and the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook. The limited visibility of urban development at Arthurs Point from much of the corridor also plays a role in this regard.

#### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

- 63. The seemingly undeveloped character of the river corridor due to the dominance of the escarpment, cliff and bluff landforms, the waterbody and its largely vegetated margins. While trails, tunnels, footbridges, road bridges, National Grid, power lines, wilding conifers, the odd house and vehicular tracks are evident in the corridor, these features either indicate the high recreational values of the ONF (see shortly) or are



of a character, location and/or extent that means they are not dominant elements. The exception to this is the transmission corridor at the southern end of the area which contributes a localised utilitarian influence.

64. From the bridges and more elevated locations within the corridor, there is an awareness of the urban or rural living land use adjacent the corridor. Even so, there remains a perception of significant naturalness within the river landscape, largely due to the densely vegetated riverbanks, escarpment and bluff landforms and/or close proximity to the dramatic mountain context. Buildings tend to be glimpsed behind plantings making them recessive, with the historic character of some contributing to the charm of the area. Structures such as the historic bridges, signage, and seating associated with the trails also contribute positively to the appearance of the area. Overall, there is the impression of a landscape that is highly picturesque, variable and aesthetically appealing.
65. For the gorge stretches of river corridor, the dramatic escarpments, scarps, cliffs, and bluffs that frame the river create the impression of a strongly enclosed, intimate, and dramatic river character. The wild waters and exotic vegetation add to this impression and there is generally a very high perception of naturalness and 'getting away from it all' due to very limited exposure to development.

### **Memorability attributes and values:**

66. The dramatic gorges near Arthurs Point and stretches of rapids.
67. The appealing and engaging views of the sinuous braided river corridor flanked by vegetation.
68. The various footbridges and historic features along the river corridor.

### **Transient attributes and values:**

69. The fluctuations and changing patterns of the river waters and floodplain gravel banks.
70. The autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation (river edge poplars and willows in particular).
71. Seasonal snowfall throughout the riverbanks provides a noteworthy spectacle.

### **Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

72. The gorge sections of the corridor where there is a strong sense of wildness.
73. Large stretches of the balance of the area, where despite the greater corridor width, intervening vegetation and / or landforms, screens views of surrounding buildings and roads.
74. The dark night sky (i.e. lack of light pollution), contributes to the impression of wildness and remoteness in places.

### **Aesthetic qualities and values:**

75. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
76. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. The highly attractive and intimate composition created by the fast-flowing watercourse framed by the dramatic scarps, escarpments, bluffs, and vegetation-clad cliffs throughout the gorge sections.
  - b. The dynamic and natural patterning of the braided channel and gravel shoals throughout wider sections, seen framed by vegetation.
  - c. The striking seasonal leaf colour display associated with the area.

- d. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
  - i. the visually discreet character of the majority of built development bordering the area;
  - ii. the historic built development that is seen in places;
  - iii. the sympathetic design of the trail tracks and structures; and
  - iv. the exotic trees along the river course, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

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

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA can be summarised as follows:

77. **Very High physical values** relating to the velocity and clarity of the waters, the dynamic attributes of the river corridor, the gorges and floodplains shaped by the river, the habitat values for native fauna, the areas of indigenous vegetation and the mana whenua features in the area.
78. **Very High associative values** relating to:
  - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
  - b. The historic features in the area.
  - c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
  - d. The recreational attributes of the ONF.
79. **Very High perceptual values** relating to:
  - a. The strong legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
  - b. The appealing aesthetic and distinctive memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural and cultural landscape elements. The area's transient values, the intimate, dramatic, and enclosed character of the gorge sections and the accessibility of the area generally play an important role.
  - c. A strong perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of more natural landscape elements and processes throughout the area.
  - d. A sense of remoteness and wildness in places, particularly throughout the gorge sections due to the sheer scale of natural landforms and wildness of the wild river waters and elsewhere, in places where landform and/or vegetation obscure views of built development.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Kimitiākau (Shotover River) PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – **some** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access. It is acknowledged that larger scale commercial recreation is anticipated in connection with the Shotover Jet development.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** – **very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms which are: located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). **Extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA. **Extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks** – **very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with tracks and trails for recreational use, tunnels, and bridge structures, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – **extremely limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled farm buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure** – **extremely limited or 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 utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be co-located with existing infrastructure or designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.
- x. **Renewable energy generation** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for exotic forestry.
- xii. **Rural living** – **extremely limited** landscape capacity for development that is: clustered with existing development; located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
- B. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, sycamore, elderberry, buddleia, hawthorn, sweet briar, broom and gorse. Large areas of stable riverbed being colonised by buddleia.

---

## 21.22.4 Morven Hill PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Morven Hill PA comprises ONF, being 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

### 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.

### 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.

### Land use patterns and features:

6. Predominantly used for extensive pastoral farming (cattle, goats, sheep or deer), baleage/hay or hobby farming. Limited farming infrastructure, including farm tracks, fencing, stock yards, water tanks and four farm sheds.
7. A farm quarry on the upper southern slopes of the main hill.

8. 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 with associated gardens and domestic curtilage.
9. 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 transmission corridor on the toe of the southern slopes.
10. Neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, nature and proximity include: the area of rural living development adjacent to SH6 and Alec Robins Road extending up the north-western slopes of Morven Hill and Little Morven Hill respectively; 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.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

11. Stone chimney breast and house site belonging to 19<sup>th</sup> century orchardist Henry Steele at the south-western side of the PA, close to Hayes Creek.
12. Mature trees (walnut, chestnut and other species) associated with early European settlement and farming.

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

13. 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.
14. 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:**

15. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
16. The Kawarau River was a traditional travel route that provided direct access between Whakatipu-Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and Mata-au (the Clutha River).
17. The Kawarau is a significant kāika mahika kai where weka, kākāpō, kea and tuna (eel) were gathered.
18. The mana whenua values associated with the ONF include, but may not be limited to, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

19. Historical significance of early primary industry around Morven Hill (pastoral farming, fruit growing, fishing at Te Whaka-ata (Lake Hayes).
20. Contextual significance as a landscape feature that has defined communication routes in the Whakatipu Basin, with early tracks and roading around its base.

### **Shared and recognised values:**

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

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

22. 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:**

23. 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:**

24. 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 ski field 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.
25. 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:**

26. 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.

### **Memorability attributes and values:**

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

### **Transient attributes and values:**

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

### **Aesthetic attributes and values:**

29. 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 Morven Hill PA can be summarised as follows:

30. **High physical values** relating to the prominent and largely unmodified roche moutonnée landform and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
31. **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.
32. **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 Morven Hill PA 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).
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - very limited** landscape capacity to absorb visitor accommodation within existing buildings or building platforms. Extremely limited or no landscape capacity for tourism-related activities.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with additional tracks and trails for recreational use 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 – extremely limited or 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. In the case of the National Grid there is **limited** landscape capacity for the upgrade of existing infrastructure within the same corridor.

- x. **Renewable energy generation – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation. **Very limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small scale renewable energy generation that is reasonably difficult to see from public places.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity, except within existing approved residential building platforms or where adjacent to SH6 on the extreme lower slopes of the Morven Hill PA and where reasonably difficult to see.

## **PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS**

- A. Plant pest species include sweet briar, hawthorn, elderberry, buddleia, gorse and broom.
- B. Animal pest species include rabbits, possums, stoats, rats, and mice.



---

## 21.22.5 Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) PA encompasses the ONF of the pronounced ridgeline extending north-eastwards from Slope Hill and framing the western side of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes), and Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) itself.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. The pronounced and steep glacier overridden schist ridgeline extending north-eastwards from Slope Hill and framing the eastern side of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).

### Hydrological features:

2. The shallow lowland, glacial lake of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) (325m). The lake is currently eutrophic (with poor water quality) due to elevated nutrient inputs from its catchment. While nutrient loads have stabilised in the past 20 years, the lake remains eutrophic due to its internal phosphorus load. Sediment run-off also threatens the recovery of Lake Hayes.

### Ecological features and vegetation types:

3. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. A raupō (*Typha orientalis*) - makura (*Carex secta*) community at the south end of Lake Hayes fronting crack willow woodland.
  - b. Swathes and scattered pockets of grey shrubland along the steep western slopes framing the western side of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes). Small pockets of grey shrubland also occur along the shoreline.
4. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. The almost continuous patterning of willows and Lombardy and black poplars along the shoreline of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).
  - b. Proliferation of exotic weeds around the edges of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes). Dense growth of hawthorn, broom, elderberry, sweet briar and blackberry encountered along the northwest side of the lake above the shoreline willows.
  - c. Numerous indigenous plantings have been established along the loop trail, particularly on the southern and western side of the lake.

5. Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) is a valued habitat for threatened native fish species: the Koaro (*Galaxias brevipinnis*). Other native fish species present include: the upland bully (*Gobiomorphus breviceps*) and shortfin eel (*Anguilla australis*).
6. Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) is a valued habitat for the nationally threatened swamp birds Australasian Bittern (*Botaurus poiciloptilus*) classified as nationally critical and Great Crested Grebe (*Podiceps cristatus australis* - classified as nationally vulnerable).
7. Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) is of special value as a breeding area for a variety of waterfowl, including Paradise Shelduck (*Tadorna variegata*), Grey Duck (*Anas superciliosa*), the New Zealand shoveller / Kuruwhengi (*Anas rhynchotis variegata*), Black Swan (*Cygnus atratus*), Grey Teal (*Anas gracilis*), Mallard (*Anas platyrhynchos*) and New Zealand Scaup (*Aythya novaeseelandiae*).
8. Other aquatic birds that inhabit Lake Hayes include white-faced Heron (*Ardea novaehollandiae novaehollandiae*), White Heron (*Egretta alba modesta*), Black shag (*Phalacrocorax carbo*), Little shag (*Phalacrocorax melanoleucos*), the Marsh Crake (*Porzana pusilla affinis*), Australian Coot (*Fulica atra australis*) (*Anas platyrhynchos*), Swamp hen/Pukeko (*Porphyrio porphyrio melanotus*), and New Zealand Kingfisher (*Halcyon sancta vagans*).
9. The raupō (*Typha orientalis*) - makura (*Carex secta*) community provides important nesting habitat and shelter for waterfowl and rails while the crack willow trees along the shoreline provide important roosting sites for shags and kingfisher.
10. Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) is an important recreational fishery with brown trout (*Salmo trutta*) and European perch (*Perca fluviatilis*) with Mill Creek providing the only spawning source for these species.

#### **Land-use patterns and features:**

11. Human modification which is currently concentrated around the northern and eastern margins of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) (adjacent and close to the ONF). Along the southern and western side of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes), built development is generally well set back from the lake edge.
12. The Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata (part of the Queenstown Trail) which forms a loop around the lake, creating multiple access points to the lake.
13. State Highway 6 which at the southern end of the lake and the northern and western side of the lake coincides with a block of conservation land that extends westwards (beyond the ONF) to Slope Hill Road.
14. Informal jetties in places. Public boat ramps.

#### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

15. No historic heritage features, heritage protection orders, heritage overlays or archaeological sites have been identified/recorded to date within the ONF.

#### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

16. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
17. Waiwhakaata is the Kāi Tahu name for Lake Hayes.

## **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 are:**

18. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
19. Wāi māori (fresh water) is a central element in Kāi Tahu creation traditions. The whakapapa of wāi māori describes bonds, relationships, and connections that bind Kāi Tahu to the land, waters and all life supported by them.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

20. Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) has historical significance for its association with early commercial fishing in the area.

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

21. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
22. The popularity of the postcard views across Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.
23. The very high popularity of the recreational 'feature' listed below.

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

24. Walking, running and cycling along the Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata (part of the Queenstown Trail).
25. Non-motorised activity permitted on Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes); rowing, kayaking, swimming (when water quality permits), paddleboarding and fishing at Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).
26. Picnicking around the lake shoreline.
27. A large carparking area at the northern end of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) where visitors base themselves from for recreational activities.
28. The Wakatipu Rowing Club located on the eastern edge of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes). Also used by local community groups such as Scouts and Cubs.
29. Aotearoa's National Walkway, the Te Araroa Trail passing along the western edge of the lakefront via the Wakatipu Track connecting Frankton / Queenstown (south) to Arrowtown (north).
30. Regionally significant fishery, spawning habitat (Mill Creek) and game bird habitat.

## Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

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

### Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

31. The area's natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial processes.

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

32. 'Postcard' long-range views from SH6 at the south end of the lake, across the lake that includes the historic homestead and mature trees at Threepwood (outside the ONF), the Lake Hayes Showground Reserve, the lake edge deciduous tree plantings, and the Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata, all viewed against a mountain backdrop. The seasonal leaf colour and mirror-like qualities of the lake during still weather are particularly memorable aspects of this composition.
33. Appealing mid to long-range views westbound on SH6 to the southern end of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes), and the ridgeline framing the western side of the lake. The depth of the outlook together with its 'classic' elements that include water in the foreground and a structured layering of mountainous landforms and gateway impression (enabling first glimpses of Queenstown) contribute to the memorability of the vista.
34. Attractive close to mid-range intermittent views from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road across the lake to Slope Hill and the ridgeline framing the western side of the lake, backdropped by the surrounding mountain context. The filtering and framing effect of vegetation in places along with the alternating availability of such views enhances their interest and appeal.
35. Highly attractive close to long-range views from the Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata, the necklace of reserves around the edge of Lake Hayes and the residential properties around Lake Hayes (outside the ONF), across the lake to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, the undeveloped ridgeline farming the western side of the lake and/or the more distant surrounding mountain backdrop.
36. Attractive long-range views of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) from the Northern Remarkables, in particular the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts).
37. Attractive long-range views from the Queenstown Trail on Christine's Hill and from Arrowtown Lakes Hayes Road at McIntyre's Hill southwards out over the lake, backdropped by the dramatic ONF and ONL mountain context.
38. In all of the views, the dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONF, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the ONF and the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

### Naturalness attributes and values:

39. The exotic vegetation bordering Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) which, along with almost continuous patterning of rural living development along its northern and eastern sides, contribute a reduced perception of naturalness. While the waterbody itself is relatively unencumbered by structures (excepting the odd informal jetty and the public boat ramps) and overt modification, its widely reported water quality issues detract from its perceived naturalness. The generally undeveloped character of land along the southern and western sides, together with the proliferation of wetland, grey shrubland and large-scale exotic vegetation in places around the lake edges, serves to increase the perceived naturalness at a localised level.

### Memorability attributes and values:

40. The highly attractive outlook of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes). The close proximity of Slope Hill ONF in the outlook, collectively seen within a relatively developed immediate context serves to enhance the memorability of the outlook.

### Transient attributes and values:

41. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation (lake edge poplars and willows in particular).
42. The mirror-like qualities of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) during calm and settled weather conditions.

### Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

43. The track along the western side of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) and localised sections of the balance of the track where intervening landform and vegetation screens views to nearby development.

### Aesthetic qualities and values:

44. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
45. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. The highly attractive large-scale composition created by the glacial lake, juxtaposed beside a rural living and urban context.
  - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. the very limited level of built modification evident within the ONF;
    - ii. the mirror-like qualities of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) during certain weather conditions; and
    - iii. the poplars and willows around the edges of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes), which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

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

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for the Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) PA can be summarised as follows:

46. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
47. **High associative values** relating to:
  - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
  - b. The historic features of the area.

- c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
- d. The significant recreational attributes of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).

48. **Very High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The very high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the scenic route of SH6, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road, The Remarkables Ski Field Access Road and the Queenstown Trail, along with the area's transient values, also play an important role.
- c. A high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of more natural landscape elements and patterns along the southern and western sides of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).
- d. A localised sense of remoteness and wildness associated with the track around Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes).

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – limited** landscape capacity for activities small scale and low-key activities that: integrate with, and complement/enhance, existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – very limited** capacity for earthworks associated with farm tracks or tracks and trails for recreational use, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, limited landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.

- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xiii. **Jetties, and boatsheds, lake structures and moorings – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.

## **PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS**

- A. Animal pest species include feral cats, hares, rabbits, ferrets, stoats, weasels, possums, rats and mice.

---

## 21.22.6 Slope Hill PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Slope Hill PA encompasses the elevated roche moutonnée landform of Slope Hill ONF.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. The roche moutonnée glacial landform of Slope Hill, formed by the over-riding Wakatipu glacier, with a smooth 'up-glacier' slope to the southwest and a steeper rough 'plucked' (down-glacier) slope to the east adjacent to Lake Hayes. Rock outcrops throughout the elevated north-western flanks. Highest point: 625m.
2. The Slope Hill roche moutonnée is recognised in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory as one of the best examples of this type of landform in Otago and one of the most easily seen and accessible. It is identified as a site of national scientific, aesthetic and recreational values and is considered to be vulnerable to significant damage by human related activities.

### Hydrological features:

3. Three steep (unnamed) stream gullies draining the southern faces of Slope Hill.
4. A gully draining the north-eastern side.
5. A small kettle lake on the elevated south-western flanks.
6. The irrigation race along the western flanks.

### Ecological features and vegetation types:

7. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Remnant native vegetation comprising matagouri shrubland in the stream gullies and on some adjacent slopes on Slope Hill.
8. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. Grazed pasture with scattered shelterbelts and clusters of exotic shade trees throughout the elevated slopes.
  - b. Amenity and shelter plantings around the two dwellings and wetland on the north side.
  - c. Poplar plantings around the flanks.



### **Land-use patterns and features:**

9. Slope Hill PA is predominantly in pastoral use with very limited rural living use. Modification is limited to a network of farm tracks across the landform, other infrastructure (e.g. water tanks, fencing, utilities), a trig point and communication tower on the highpoint and two dwellings and associated farm buildings on the northern sides of Slope Hill. Built development is generally characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is well integrated by a mix of established and more recent vegetation features and reads as being subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns.
10. Other neighbouring land-uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character and or proximity include: the rural living development throughout the western, southern and northern lower flanks of the roche moutonnée, outside the PA; the existing or anticipated urban development associated with the Ladies Mile area; and the historic Glenpanel Homestead (listed Item 22) adjacent the south side of the PA.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

11. No historic heritage features, heritage protection orders, heritage overlays or archaeological sites have been identified/recorded to date within the ONF.

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

12. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.

### **Associative Attributes and Values**

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

### **Mana whenua associations and experience:**

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

### **Historic attributes and values:**

14. Slope Hill has contextual value for its association with Threepwood Farm, one of the Wakatipu Basin's earliest farms.

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

15. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.

## Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

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

### Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

16. The area's natural landforms, land type, and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial processes.
17. Indigenous gully plantings which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values within the gullies on Slope Hill.

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

18. Highly attractive framed mid-range views eastbound on SH6, west of the Shotover Bridge to the south-western smooth 'up ice' flanks of Slope Hill. The composition comprises an attractive patterning of the Shotover River terraces and their layered tree plantings (a mix of evergreen and exotic species including Lombardy poplars) below the highly legible and more 'natural' pastoral elevated slopes of the roche moutonnée and backdropped by (often) snow-capped mountain ranges of Cardrona and the Crown Range. The large-scale road cuttings that frame the highway add to the structure and distinctiveness of the vista. Overall, the outlook impresses as an engaging and memorable gateway to the Wakatipu Basin and seemingly more spacious 'rural' landscape beyond Queenstown / Frankton.
19. Appealing mid to long-range views westbound on SH6 on the elevated section of the highway east of the intersection with Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road to the south-eastern flanks of Slope Hill. The open pastoral character of the rough 'plucked' slopes of the landform in this view forms a bold contrast with the exotic vegetation and building-dominated low-lying terraces of Ladies Mile and Frankton to the left of view. From this orientation, the roche moutonnée blends seamlessly with the layered patterning of dramatic mountains and roche moutonnée that frame the western side of the Wakatipu Basin and Lake Wakatipu more generally. The depth of the outlook together with its 'classic' elements that include a structured layering of mountainous landforms and the gateway impression (enabling first glimpses of Queenstown) contribute to the memorability of the vista. It is possible that anticipated urban development throughout Ladies Mile may obscure views of the lower margins of the landform feature, adjacent Ladies Mile.
20. Highly attractive close to long-range views from the Lake Hayes Trail / Wai Whaka Ata, the necklace of reserves around the edge of Lake Hayes, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road and the residential area around Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) (outside the ONF), across the lake (ONF) to the dramatic and generally undeveloped roche moutonnée, the undeveloped ridgeline framing the western side of the lake and/or the more distant surrounding mountain backdrop.
21. Attractive mid to long-range views from the western side of the Wakatipu Basin (including Tuckers Beach, Domain Road, Hawthorn Triangle, Dalefield, parts of the Shotover River corridor, the Hawthorn Triangle, the eastern end of Slope Hill Road and parts of the Queenstown Trail) to parts of the smooth pastoral elevated south-western flanks and the more rugged north-western flanks. From these orientations, the open and generally undeveloped landform forms a marked contrast with the rural living development context in the foreground of view.
22. Attractive long-range views from the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts), the Queenstown Trail on Christine's Hill and from Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road at McIntyre's Hill to Slope Hill beside the highly attractive glacial lake of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) and viewed within a broader ONL mountain context.
23. Attractive close, mid, and long-range views from Ladies Mile, Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country to the south side of Slope Hill. From this orientation the distinguishing roche moutonnée landform profile is clearly legible and there is an awareness of the transition from the smooth 'ice up' character to the rough

'plucked' character. It is possible that anticipated urban development throughout Ladies Mile may obscure views of the lower margins of the landform feature, adjacent Ladies Mile.

24. In all of the views, the dominance of 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONF, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the ONF and the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

25. The seemingly 'undeveloped' character of Slope Hill which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to its pastoral use are visible, the very low number of buildings, the relatively modest scale of tracks and limited visibility of infrastructure (excepting the airport radar structure on the top of the landform) kerbs their influence on the character of the landform as a natural landscape element.

### **Memorability attributes and values:**

26. The appealing and engaging views of the largely undeveloped and legible roche moutonnée landform of Slope Hill. The close proximity of Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes) ONF in the outlook, collectively seen within a relatively developed immediate context serves to enhance the memorability of the outlook.

### **Transient attributes and values:**

27. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation.
28. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the roche moutonnée slopes.

### **Aesthetic qualities and values:**

29. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
30. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. The highly attractive large-scale composition created by the generally undeveloped and distinctive roche moutonnée landform, juxtaposed beside a rural living and urban context.
  - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. the clearly legible roche moutonnée landform profile and character;
    - ii. the open and pastoral character of Slope Hill;
    - iii. the very limited level of built modification evident through the ONF; and
    - iv. the poplars around the flanks of Slope Hill, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

## **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 combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for the Slope Hill PA and Lake Hayes / Remarkables can be summarised:

31. **Very High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
32. **High associative values** relating to:
  - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
  - b. The historic associations of the area.
  - c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
33. **Very High perceptual values** relating to:
  - a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
  - b. The very high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Lake Hayes Estate, Shotover Country, the Ladies Mile corridor, the eastern side of the Wakatipu Basin, the scenic route of SH6, Arrowtown Lake Hayes Road, the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road and the Queenstown Trail, along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
  - c. The identity of the roche moutonnée as a natural landscape backdrop to Ladies Mile and the western and central portion of the Wakatipu Basin and as a gateway feature to Queenstown / the Wakatipu Basin.
  - d. A high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of natural landscape elements and patterns at Slope Hill.

## Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that: integrate with, and complement/enhance, existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms which: are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; are designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). **Extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA. **Extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for tourism related activities within the PA.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.

- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm tracks or tracks and trails for recreational use, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings – very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity excepting very small-scale farm quarries.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – extremely limited or 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.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. **Extremely limited** landscape capacity or discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for exotic forestry.
- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited** landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; is designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Animal pest species include feral cats, hares, rabbits, ferrets, stoats, weasels, possums, rats and mice.
- B. Exotic plant pests such as willow, hawthorne and broom in gullies.

---

## 21.22.7 Feehly Hill PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Feehly Hill PA comprises an ONF being the steep slopes and crest of the small hill (also known as Daggs Hill) immediately west of the historic Arrowtown village.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. A small but distinctive roughly triangular schist roche moutonnée formed by previous glaciations in the Whakatipu Basin. Exposed schist outcrops and bluffs on the north-western side.

### Ecological features and vegetation types:

2. The hill is covered mostly in exotic woody weeds, notably broom, hawthorn, sycamore, wilding conifers and rowan. Sycamore woodland prevails in the southern side of the hill and surrounds plantings of mountain beech on the southern side of the hill. Pockets of grey shrubland persist on the sunnier upper northern and western faces.
3. Diverse indigenous plantings have been established around the base of the hill near the cemetery and behind new housing developments on Manse Road.
4. Potential for ongoing ecological enhancement through weed control and indigenous plantings.
5. Areas of grey shrubland, exotic grassland and associated rocky and bluffy terrain provide suitable habitat for skinks and geckos along with the indigenous plantings as they become more established.

### Land use patterns and features:

6. Water supply tanks for Arrowtown, together with a pump station and access road on the eastern side of the hill above Arrowtown cemetery. The remainder of the PA is open space covered with either wilding trees and shrubs or indigenous revegetation. A public walking track leads from Arrowtown cemetery to the crest of the hill.

### Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

7. There are no known archaeological or heritage features within the ONF.

### Mana whenua features and their locations:

8. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.

## Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

### Mana whenua associations and experience:

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

### Historic attributes and values:

10. Historic attributes associated with early European pastoral farming and as part of the identity of Arrowtown. The hill was named Cemetery Hill in the 1860s and was later associated with the Feehly family of Arrowtown. The hill has been burned many times and used for farming, including as a ram paddock for Mt Soho Station.
11. Contextual value as a landscape feature that historically defined the westernmost extent of Arrowtown.
12. Contextual association with the Arrowtown Cemetery and Arrowtown War Memorial.

### Shared and recognised values:

13. Important local shared and recognised values as part of the sense of place and distinctiveness of Arrowtown village, the setting for the local cemetery and as a site of community involvement in indigenous vegetation restoration.

### Recreation attributes and values:

14. Local walking destination valued for the panoramic views south over the Whakatipu Basin.

## 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:

15. Easily accessible and visible roche moutonnée, expressive of the glacial processes that have formed the Whakatipu Basin.

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

16. Expansive highly attractive views available from the eastern shoulder and crest of the hill across Arrowtown, Millbrook and The Hills golf courses to Lake Hayes, the Crown Range and the Remarkables.
17. Views to the hill when approaching Arrowtown on Malaghans Road and Arrowtown – Lake Hayes Road, where the distinctive scrub-covered hill forms a prominent 'sentinel' at the gateway to the village.

### Naturalness attributes and values:

18. Moderately high level of naturalness, with unmodified landform apart from the water tanks, treatment plant and associated access track. Perceptions of naturalness likely to increase over time as wilding tree and shrub cover is progressively replaced by indigenous plant communities.

### Memorability attributes and values:

19. Distinctive steep-sided triangular landform and contrast of the vegetative cover with the surrounding urban or parkland character makes the hill memorable to both locals and visitors.

### Transient attributes and values:

20. Transient attributes include the presence of wildlife, and seasonal changes in the colours of wilding sycamore and rowan trees.

### Aesthetic attributes and values:

21. Distinctive and expressive landform.
22. Expansive and highly attractive views available from public trails on the hill.
23. Immersion in areas of indigenous revegetation adjacent to the trails.

## 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 Feehly Hill PA are summarised as follows:

24. **Moderate-high physical values** relating to the distinctive and relatively unmodified roche moutonnée landform, the areas of regenerating indigenous vegetation, and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
25. **Moderate associative values** relating to the mana whenua associations of the area, and the strong shared and recognised and recreational values for the local community.
26. **Moderate-high perceptual values** relating to the expressiveness and memorability of the hill, the moderately high and improving level of naturalness, and the impressive and expansive views available from the hill.

## Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks and tracks and trails for recreational use that provide walking access for the public or are associated with water storage and treatment and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.



- vi. **Farm buildings – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for expansion or renewal of existing facilities. 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 – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.

## **PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS**

- A. Plant pest species include broom, hawthorn, sycamore, wilding conifers and rowan.
- B. Animal pest species include rabbits, possums, stoats, rats and mice.

---

## 21.22.8 Haehaenui (Arrow River) PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Haehaenui (Arrow River) PA is the river corridor stretching broadly southwards from the confluence of the river and Pizollis Gully (on the south side of Big Hill), along the eastern side of Arrowtown and the toe of the Crown escarpment to meet the Kawarau River near Chard Farm, west of the Kawarau Bridge, all being ONF. The mapped PA includes the upper edges of the landforms framing the river corridor ONF. This takes in the river floodplains near Arrowtown.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. The steep river cliffs and localised gorges (generally located downstream of the SH6 bridge) and the more gently profiled riverbanks (generally to the north of the SH6 bridge).
2. Dynamic river braids and gravel shoals at bends in the course of the river near Arrowtown and Morven Ferry Road.
3. The interaction of fluvial processes with a landscape and sediments derived under a range of climatic and geomorphic processes over different time scales.
4. Small waterfalls along the course of the river including where the Sawpit Gully Stream flows into the Arrow River.
5. Contains the Arrow Junction piemontite-schist quarry which is recognised in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory and as being of national importance with respect to scientific, aesthetic or educational values and being vulnerable to significant damage by human related activities.

### Hydrological features:

6. The Haehaenui (Arrow River), in particular the following features and attributes:
  - a. Waterbody with a gravel and schist bed.
  - b. Clarity of the waters.

### Ecological features and vegetation types:

7. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri and mingimingi (*Coprosma propinqua*) and remnant pockets of mountain beech bordering the Arrow River. Sweet briar is a component of the grey shrubland.

8. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. The almost continuous patterning of willows, poplars, and a range of exotic deciduous trees along the riverbanks.
  - b. The proliferation of lupins and other exotic wildflower species along the riverbanks.
  - c. Wilding conifers occur in places along the riverbanks.
  - d. Exotic grass floodplains, flats and banks in places.
9. The indigenous forest and shrubland vegetation, exotic grassland and rocky to bluffy terrain provide habitat for New Zealand falcon, bellbirds, grey warbler, fantail and silver eye as well as skink and geckos.
10. Habitat for eel, kōaro and salmon, rainbow trout, brown trout, and rainbow trout.
11. Valued habitat for sports fishing spawning in Haehaenui (Arrow River).

### **Land-use patterns and features:**

12. The network of public walking (some of which are universally accessible) and cycling trails along the riverbanks (including the Arrow River Bridges Trail which forms part of the Queenstown Trail network). This includes:
  - a. Several footbridges which are regarded as noteworthy features in their own right along the trail network as a consequence of their scale, design and/or the views afforded. Including the Southern Discoveries suspension bridge, the Swain Family Bridge, the Edgar Suspension Bridge and Norman Smith footbridge (where the Arrow River trail joins the Macetown Road).
  - b. The Knights Family Underpass and the Barfoot Tunnel (beneath SH6).
13. The almost continuous patterning of Informal Recreation zoned land along the western side (true right side) of the river extending from the northern end of Arrowtown to the SH6 bridge at Arrow Junction.
14. The swathe of Informal Recreation zoned land on the eastern side of the river (true left side) to the north of the SH6 bridge at Arrow Junction.
15. The Urban Growth Boundary associated with Arrowtown which adjoins the western boundary of the PA (in the vicinity of Arrowtown).
16. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the river corridor due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include: the Arrowtown Golf Course (south of Arrowtown); the scattering of relatively spacious rural living properties along the eastern side of Centennial Avenue and Morven Ferry Road and the western side of SH6 (Gibbston Highway); and the established cluster of rural living dwellings throughout Arrow Junction.
17. State Highway 6 which crosses the river at Arrow Junction.
18. The Macetown pipeline which runs from Macetown to Arrowtown alongside and crossing over parts of the Arrow River.
19. The flood berm in the vicinity of Bush Creek.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

20. The Macetown Road and stone retaining walls along the river upstream of Arrowtown, and the William Fox Memorial at Coopers Terrace to the north of Arrowtown (at the base of German Hill, District Plan reference 6).

21. The Macetown Heritage Area Overlay (MHAO) extends throughout the river corridor north of Arrowtown. This forms part of the much larger area of heritage significance due to its concentration of historic gold mining sites, focussed on the deserted mining town of Macetown, which span from the earliest exploitation of gold in the Arrowtown area in 1862, through to the end of gold mining in the 1930's. Such a continuum of mining activity – first alluvial then hard-rock or quartz – has left a distinct and intelligible landscape with diverse features and stories linked by a series of mining tracks that still allow access to this remote and stunning countryside. The MHOA encompasses three key areas; the Rich Burn Valley, Macetown and the Arrow River valley, all three of which have distinctive characters and features that coalesce to form a broader mining heritage of regional significance. Among these, Macetown (outside the PA) is highly significant, representing the surviving remains of a remote 19th century mining village to which stories are still attached and some history has been traced to its founders, occupants and demise. Situated within its larger mining heritage context (which includes part of the PA), Macetown can be interpreted as part of a community of gold mining activity sites, which are a key part of the wider Otago gold mining story.
22. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, dams, and associated domestic sites along the riverbanks (for example, archaeological sites F41/653, F41/748, and F41/652).

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

23. 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.
24. The ONF is mapped as wāhi tūpuna Haehaenui (Arrow River), part of the mahika kai networks in this area.

### **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:**

25. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
26. For generations, mana whenua traversed these catchments gathering kai and other resources.
27. The mana whenua values associated with this ONF include, but may not be limited to, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

28. Gold mining in and alongside the river which led to the establishment of a settlement at Arrowtown. The sites associated with Macetown represent a particularly rich archaeological landscape.
29. The naming of the river, which was named the Arrow because its point of junction with Bush Creek resembled the outline of an arrowhead.
30. The scattering of various historic features along and adjacent the PA, which collectively tell the story of the early European history of the area.

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

31. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.

32. The popularity of the Arrow River as an inspiration/subject for art, photography, and books.
33. The identity of the river as an important natural and historic landscape context for Arrowtown.
34. The popularity of the recreational 'features' listed below.
35. The importance of the natural heritage area to the local community as evidenced by the efforts of the Arrowtown Wilding Group, Predator Free Arrowtown, and the Arrowtown Choppers to manage weeds and pests, clear debris in the river and revegetate sections of the river corridor.
36. The Wall of Recognition along the route of the Arrow River Bridges Trail, which recognises the landowners and members of the local community that have been instrumental in the establishment and development of the Queenstown Trail.

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

37. Gold panning and fishing on the river; walking and cycling the trails alongside the river.
38. The highly accessible nature of the river, particularly from Arrowtown creates a popular destination for picnicking and dog exercise as recreation activities, and river access for wading/ dogs/ water play.
39. A gateway to four-wheel drive recreation access trails.
40. Significant sports fishery and spawning habitat.

### **Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

### **Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

41. Clearly legible alluvial / hydrological processes that have shaped the river corridor and which continue to add to its dynamic qualities. These are evident in the floodplains, the gorge landform and the changing patterns of channels and gravel banks along the river course.

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

42. Highly attractive close, mid and long-range views from tracks, footbridges, reserve land, the SH6 bridge and adjacent dwellings along the predominantly vegetation-clad river corridor. Vegetation and landform patterns together with the winding corridor contain and frame views, contributing a highly variable, albeit generally relatively enclosed, character to the outlook. In places, the steep and large-scale escarpment edging the Crown Terrace and/or the mountain slopes of German Hill, Big Hill, and other enclosing mountains add a sense of drama and grandeur. Elsewhere, historic buildings bordering the corridor (for example, Dudley's Cottage and the Chinese Settlement in Arrowtown, and quaint cottages at Whitechapel) and the dynamic river waters and/or waterfalls add to the appeal of the outlook.
43. Appealing mid and long-range views from Tobin's Track and parts of the zig-zag section of the Crown Range Road to discreet sections of the river corridor and its predominantly vegetation-clad banks. In such views, the expansive outlook across the eastern portion of the Whakatipu Basin, seen framed by mountains and dotted with roche moutonnée adds to the appeal of the outlook.

### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

44. The seemingly undeveloped character of the river corridor due to the dominance of the waterbody and its vegetated margins. While trails, footbridges, underpasses, and a road bridge are evident in the corridor,

these activities indicate the high recreational values of the ONF (see previously). Where evident, structures are typically modest in scale and/or of an appealing or sympathetic character, which means that they are subservient to the natural landscape.

45. Between Arrowtown and the SH6 bridge there is an awareness of the urban or rural living land use adjacent the corridor. Even so, there remains a perception of significant naturalness within the river landscape, largely as a consequence of the densely vegetated margins and close proximity to the seemingly untamed and dramatic slopes of the Crown Escarpment. Buildings tend to be glimpsed behind plantings, making them recessive, with the historic character of some contributing to the charm of the area. Structures such as bridges, underpasses, signage, and seating associated with the Arrow River Trail also contribute positively to the appearance of the area. Overall, there is the impression of a landscape that is highly picturesque, variable, and aesthetically appealing.
46. For the stretch of river corridor north of Arrowtown and south of the SH6 bridge, steeper slopes and gorges with exposed schist outcrops frame the river to form a contained and intimate river character. Whilst exotic vegetation is apparent, grey shrubland and manuka / beech remnants are more common and there is generally an increased perception of naturalness due to very limited exposure to development.

### **Memorability attributes and values:**

47. The appealing and engaging views of the vegetated river corridor generally, and in places, seen flanked by historic buildings.
48. The various foot / cycle bridges, underpasses, historic features, and the dramatic gorges along the river corridor.

### **Transient attributes and values:**

49. The fluctuations and changing patterns of the river waters and floodplain gravel banks.
50. The signature reds and golds of the autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation (river edge poplars and willows in particular).
51. The seasonal display of wildflowers (including lupins) along the riverbanks.
52. Distinctive dappled light impression throughout the wooded river margins on sunny days.
53. Seasonal snowfall and, during which, frosted trees in the shaded river corridor by Arrowtown provide a noteworthy spectacle.

### **Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

54. The river corridor upstream (north) of Arrowtown that is flanked by undeveloped mountains and hills.
55. Stretches of the river corridor tracks where intervening vegetation and / or landforms screen views of surrounding buildings, roads and pastoral areas.

### **Aesthetic qualities and values relate to:**

56. The experience of all of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
57. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. The highly attractive and intimate composition created by the watercourse framed by the densely vegetation-clad riverbanks.
  - b. The striking seasonal leaf colour display associated with the area.

- c. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
  - i. the river cliff and gorge formations to the south of the SH6 bridge;
  - ii. the visually discreet character of the majority of built development bordering the area;
  - iii. the historic built development that is seen in places;
  - iv. the sympathetic design of the trail tracks and structures; and
  - v. the exotic trees and wildflowers along the river course, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

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

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for Haehaenui (Arrow River) PA are summarised as follows:

- 58. **High physical values** relating to the clarity of the waters, the dynamic attributes of the river corridor, the gorges and floodplains shaped by the river, the habitat values for native and introduced fauna, the areas of indigenous vegetation and the mana whenua features in the area.
- 59. **High associative values** relating to:
  - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
  - b. The historic features in the area.
  - c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
  - d. The recreational attributes of the ONF.
- 60. **High perceptual values** relating to:
  - a. The strong legibility and expressiveness values of the area derived from the visibility of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
  - b. The appealing aesthetic and distinctive memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural and cultural landscape elements. The area's transient values, intimate and enclosed character, and the accessibility of the area play an important role in this regard.
  - c. A strong perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of more natural landscape elements and processes throughout the area.
  - d. A sense of remoteness and wildness in places where the landform and/or vegetation serves to obscure views of built development.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Haehaenui (Arrow River) PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for tourism-related activities. **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms which are: located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). **Extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation elsewhere in the PA.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with tracks and trails for recreational use, underpasses, and bridge structures, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings – extremely limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character and maintain the openness and legibility attributes.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – extremely limited or 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 utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be co-located with existing infrastructure or designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, **limited** landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. **Very limited to no** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for exotic forestry.
- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited** landscape capacity for rural living development which: is located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; is designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, mice, and rats.



B. Plant pest species include sycamore, elderberry, wilding conifers, sweet briar, broom, gorse and lupin.

---

## 21.22.9 Kawarau River PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Kawarau River PA is the Kawarau River corridor stretching from the Frankton Arm of Whakatipu-wai-Māori (Lake Whakatipu) eastwards to Roaring Meg. The mapped PA includes the upper edges of the landforms framing the river corridor. This takes in the river floodplains between Whakatipu-wai-Māori and the Kawarau Bridge.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. Spectacular steep scarps, gorges and cliffs where the river has cut through the underlying schist. The gorge from Gibbston to Ripponvale (outside the QLDC boundary) is identified as a Geopreservation Site of national importance and a landslide on the north bank of the river opposite Gibbston is identified as being of regional importance. The gorge is being continuously modified by landslides, some of extremely large scale.
2. Flat alluvial floodplains between the confluence with Kimiākau (Shotover River) and Chard Farm.
3. Confluence of the Kawarau and Kimiākau (Shotover) rivers and the dynamic changes in river braids and shoals in this area.
4. A number of large-scale landslides (e.g., the Gibbston landslide that is the most studied in the area and the K9 landslide that extends 4km between the Roaring Meg and Scrubby Stream) related to the interaction of the downcutting of the Kawarau River with the regolith overlying bedrock. Downstream of the Arrow River confluence is a suite of river terraces faulted and offset by the NW Cardrona Fault. These landforms are recognised in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory as nationally important.

### Hydrological features:

5. The Kawarau River, in particular the following features and attributes:
  - a. Waterbody notable for its volume and fast flow, with a gravel and schist bed.
  - b. Clarity and distinctive turquoise colour of the waters.
  - c. Presence of white-water rapids.
  - d. Scientific rarity of the potential reverse flow of the river towards Whakatipu-Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) when the Kawarau and Kimiākau (Shotover) rivers are in flood. River training earthworks at the confluence of the rivers may prevent this occurring in the future.
  - e. The Water Conservation (Kawarau) Order 1997 requires the outstanding amenity and intrinsic values afforded by the river waters to be sustained and the water body preserved as far as possible in its natural state.

## **Ecological features and vegetation types:**

6. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Pockets of indigenous grey shrubland (often mixed with sweet briar) border the river along its entire length, particularly on scarps.
  - b. Valued habitat for eel, kōaro and rare native fish, trout and salmon.
  - c. Numerous rocky outcrops and bluffs that characterise the river corridor are refugia for specialist indigenous plants.
7. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. Crack willow lining the banks of the river along much of its length.
  - b. Stands of Lombardy poplar and Black poplar in places.
  - c. Rural shelter belts and woodlots on the alluvial floodplains.
8. The river corridor with its bordering rocky terrain and areas of shrubland provide favourable nesting habitat and hunting opportunities for New Zealand falcon. The grey shrubland is likely to support populations of grey warbler, fantail, silvereye and possibly geckos.

## **Land use patterns and features:**

9. Pastoral land use dominates the floodplain areas between Whakatipu-Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and the Kawarau Bridge Bungy. Nearly all the vegetation immediately flanking this section of the river is exotic, including, extensive willows, stands of poplars, pine woodlots and shelterbelts, and pockets of broom and gorse. The Cromwell-Frankton A 110kV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid are transmission lines, located generally parallel to the river between the Kawarau Bridge and Lake Hayes Estate and are in or over the ONF at some points.
10. The Gibbston Character zone (GCZ) is located near the eastern section of the ONF incorporating the terraced Victoria Flats area above the Kawarau River, lying between and including Chard Farm and Waitiri. Part of the ONF overlays the GCZ where the GCZ encroaches the river escarpment. The GCZ has a distinctive character and sense of place, reflected in a statutory environment which has enabled development activity different to what is expected within an ONF.
11. Between the Kawarau Bridge Bungy and Roaring Meg, the river scarps and slopes are largely covered in rosehip, matagouri, weed species and coarse grasses, with land uses limited to low intensity grazing, public access on Gibbston walking/cycling trail, the Kawarau Bungy commercial recreation facility, parts of the Gibbston Cromwell Highway (SH6) and the Roaring Meg hydro station.

## **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

12. There are a number of scheduled historic heritage features along the river, including the Kawarau Falls Bridge (QLDC Ref. 40), the late 1880s Brunswick Flour Mill (QLDC ref. 49), the 1881 Kawarau Suspension Bridge (QLDC Ref. 41), the supports of the Victoria Bridge (QLDC Ref. 223), the 1936 Roaring Meg Power Station (QLDC Ref. 94), Chard Road (QLDC Ref. 216) and Rum Curries Hut at Rafters Road (QLDC Ref. 236).
13. Various ferry sites along the river and associated hotel remains, including Victoria Flat, Owens Ferry and Morven Ferry.
14. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, dams and associated domestic sites along the riverbanks.

15. Numerous pre-European archaeological sites along the river, including the Owens Ferry moa hunter site (archaeological sites F41/1 and F41/66) and the former natural bridge access across the river (now widened by floods) near Roaring Meg.

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

16. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
17. The Kawarau River is mapped as a wāhi tūpuna. The ONF also overlaps with the mapped wāhi tūpuna Tititea. Tititea was a pā located on the south side of the Kawarau River near Whakatipu-Waimāori.
18. Ōterotu is the traditional Māori name for the Kawarau Falls.
19. Potiki-whata-rumaki-nao is the name for the former natural bridge over the Kawarau, which was a major crossing point for Kāi Tahu whānui.

### **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:**

20. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
21. The Kawarau River was a traditional travel route that provided direct access between Whakatipu-Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and Mata-au (the Clutha River).
22. The Kawarau is a significant kāika mahika kai where weka, kākāpō, kea and tuna (eel) were gathered.
23. Kāi Tahu tradition tells of an incident where a 280 strong war party was repelled from the Tititea area and chased to the top of the Crown Range, which is now named Tititea in memory of this incident.
24. The mana whenua values associated with the Kawarau ONF include, but may not be limited to, ara tawhito, mahika kai, nohoaka, kāika and tauraka waka.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

25. The historic and contextual values of gold mining in and alongside the river and associated physical remnants.
26. The historic and contextual values of the feature as a factor shaping early European transport in the District, including historic roads, bridges, ferry sites, and associated infrastructure.
27. The historic significance of the river and its tributaries as a source of water and power.

### **Shared and recognised values:**

28. Nationally recognised values set out in the Water Conservation Order that applies to the river (with its wild and scenic characteristics; natural characteristics; scientific values and recreational purposes specifically identified).
29. Very strong shared and recognised values as a popular recreational destination.

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

30. Kayaking, jetboating (both commercial and private), rafting, swimming, and fishing on the river.
31. Walking and cycling on the popular Twin Rivers and Gibbston trails alongside the river, and occasional recreational events on the southern side of the river between Whakatipu-Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and Chard Farm.
32. Bungy jumping and zip lining at the Kawarau Bridge Bungy.

### **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:**

33. Clearly legible, glacial and alluvial / hydrological processes that have shaped the river valley landscape and which continue to add to its dynamic qualities. These are evident in the scarps, floodplains and the changing patterns of channels and gravel banks at the confluence with the Kimiākau (Shotover) and along the river course.

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

34. Highly attractive close, mid and long-range views along the predominantly vegetation clad river corridor. Vegetation and landform patterns together with the winding corridor contain and frame views, contributing a highly variable albeit generally relatively enclosed character to the outlook. In places, the roche moutonnée of Morven Hill and/or the mountain slopes of the Remarkables add a sense of drama and grandeur. The dynamic river waters are a dominant visual element. The mixing of different water colours at the Kimiākau (Shotover) confluence, particularly when the Kimiākau is in flood, adds to the appeal and interest of the views in this section of the Kawarau.
35. Appealing mid and long-range views from Remarkables Park, Shotover Country, Lake Hayes Estate, Bridesdale, SH6 and the Queenstown Trail to discreet sections of the Kawarau River and its predominantly vegetation clad banks and floodplains. In such views, the rugged mountain backdrop of the Remarkables and other enclosing mountains adds to the appeal of the outlook.
36. From some proximate vantage points, the vegetation fringed, dynamic waters of the Kawarau River are seen alongside the more domesticated pastoral flood plains and terraces.

### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

37. Generally, there is a high perception of naturalness throughout the river corridor due to the dominance of the waterbody and its vegetated margins. Whilst boating activity and trails are evident in the corridor, these activities indicate the high recreational values of the ONF. Where evident, structures are modest in scale and/or sympathetic character and remain subservient to the natural landscape.
38. Between Whakatipu-Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and the Kawarau Bridge Bungy, pastoral land use dominates the floodplain areas and nearly all the vegetation flanking the river is exotic. Even so, there remains a perception of significant naturalness within the river landscape. The very limited visibility of built development on the Remarkables side of the river contributes to this, even if pasture, farm tracks, fencing, power lines and the margins of the Kawarau Heights, Lake Hayes Estate and Bridesdale settlements are evident. However, the confined, often intimate nature of the river corridor provides terrain shielding and limits exposure to such elements.
39. For the stretch of river corridor between the Kawarau Bridge Bungy and Roaring Meg, dramatic gorges with exposed schist outcrops frame the river to form a contained and intimate river character. Whilst exotic

vegetation is apparent, grey shrubland is dominant and there is generally an increased perception of naturalness due to very limited exposure to development. The exception to this is visibility of SH6 within the corridor between Victoria Flats and Roaring Meg.

### Memorability attributes and values:

40. Views of the dramatic river scarps and gorges east of Morven Ferry Road are highly memorable, as is the distinctive turquoise colour of the water and notable volume and flow of the river through the gorges and rapids.

### Transient attributes and values:

41. Transient attributes include the fluctuations and changing patterns of the river waters and flood plain gravel banks, flood-related changes in the confluence with the Kimiākau (Shotover), and the seasonal changes evident in the vegetation – most notably in the stands of willows and poplars.

### Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

42. Visitors on the surface of the river east of the Kawarau Bridge Bungy are enclosed within the gorge and experience a strong sense of remoteness. In addition, the river corridor east of the Gibbston Valley and Victoria Flats has a high level of wildness and remoteness, although SH6 and the historic Roaring Meg Power Station also influence the perception of this riverscape. Much of this river corridor comprises a steep V-shaped valley that is both deep and sinuous – winding its way eastward past Mt Allen and Mt Difficulty.

### Aesthetic attributes and values:

43. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
44. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. Strong sense of enclosure within the river corridor, defined by escarpments or gorges and the surrounding mountain ranges and roches moutonnées.
  - b. Coherence and distinctiveness of the waterway as a feature.
  - c. Highly picturesque and aesthetically appealing views.
  - d. Ability to travel along the river on trails, roads, or the water itself and to be immersed in the scenic and remoteness attributes of the river corridor.

## 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 physical, associative and perceptual attributes and values described above for the Kawarau River PA can be summarised as follows:

45. **Very high physical values** relating to the volume, flow and clarity of the waters, the dynamic attributes of the confluence with the Kimiākau (Shotover), the scarps, gorges and floodplains shaped by the river, the habitat values for native and introduced fauna, the areas of indigenous vegetation, and the mana whenua features associated with the area, acknowledging that these attributes are counterbalanced by the presence of pastoral land use, fencing, tracks, powerlines.

46. **Very high associative values** relating to the Kāi Tahu associations with the river, the rich history of gold mining and early European settlement, the significant recreational attributes, and the strong shared and recognised values, as evidenced by the 2013 Water Conservation Order.
47. **Very high perceptual values** relating to the expressiveness of the river landforms, the memorability of the spectacular gorges and fast flowing turquoise waters, the high level of naturalness, the scenic views available to and within the corridor, and the sense of remoteness and wildness experienced east of the Kawarau Bungy.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Kawarau River PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – **some** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of existing natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** – **very limited** landscape capacity east of Bridesdale, extending to the unnamed stream that bisects the Chard Farm vineyard for activities limited to the flat and low-lying terraces and floodplains that are: designed to be reasonably difficult to see in views from the Kawarau River, Twin River Trail, Bridesdale, Shotover Country and Lake Hayes Estate; are of a modest or sympathetic scale; have a low-key 'rural' or 'non-urban' character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access. **Extremely limited or no** landscape capacity elsewhere except for sensitively located and designed glamping activities.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **very limited** landscape capacity on floodplains or terraces that are not subject to flood hazard.
- v. **Earthworks** – **limited** landscape capacity for earthworks and tracks and trails for recreational use or works that are necessary to mitigate natural hazard risks that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONF with pastoral land uses, **limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction** – **very limited** landscape capacity for small scale gravel extraction.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure** – **very limited** landscape capacity for low key 'rural' roading infrastructure outside of the State Highway corridor. **Very limited** landscape capacity for wharfs or jetties that are located in more modified parts of the ONF between Whakatipu-Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and Morven Ferry and are designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement and enhance public access. **Limited** capacity for pedestrian and cycle bridges that are visually lightweight, include recessive colours and are designed and located so that they are not visually prominent.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is co-located with existing facilities. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid there is **limited** 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.

- x. **Renewable energy generation – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity. **Very Limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry– extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xiii. **Passenger Lift Systems – limited** landscape capacity to improve public access including to focal recreational areas higher in the mountains (including between lower lying areas and the Remarkables Ski Area Sub Zone) via non-vehicular transportation modes such as gondolas, (including base and terminal buildings and stations) provided they are positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, are located and designed to be recessive in the landscape.

## **PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS**

- A. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, crack willow, sweet briar, buddleia, hawthorn, sycamore, broom and gorse.
- B. Animal pest species include rabbits, possums, stoats, rats and mice.



---

## 21.22.10 Mount Barker PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Mount Barker PA comprises the ONF summit and slopes of the hill located between Mount Barker, Boundary and Maxwell Roads, near the toe of the Criffel Range.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. Roche moutonnée landform of schist bedrock that has been over-ridden and sculpted by glacial action. Moraine remnants are present on the south-eastern side of the summit, possibly from the Lindis glacial advance. The conical hill rises to 596m and has rock outcrops and bluffs on the western faces and an easier gradient on the south-eastern side. It is joined to the base of the Criffel Range by a low saddle.

### Ecological features and vegetation types:

2. Mount Barker is predominantly covered with a mixture of bracken, (hawthorn, broom and other exotic weeds such as sweet briar and woolly mullein), with scattered regenerating kānuka. There are patches of mature radiata pine and eucalypt, (with some wilding pine spread) and an open grassed summit. A semi-mature Douglas fir plantation on the saddle between Mount Barker and the Criffel Range extends part way up the southern slopes within the PA. Rough pasture covers the higher southern slopes of the hill and around the lower toe slopes. Natural forest successional processes are found on the lower slopes.
3. Potential for ongoing enhancement through removal of exotic trees and weeds, and regeneration of kānuka woodland.
4. The mixed pattern of indigenous and exotic vegetation combined with the rocky areas on the northern and western side of the hill provide suitable feeding habitat for New Zealand falcon and Australian harrier. The rocky terrain and adjacent rough pasture (exotic grassland) may provide suitable habitat for skinks.

### Land use patterns and features:

5. Mount Barker has been used in the past for low intensity grazing but is currently retired from productive use other than plantation forestry on the southern slopes. The PA forms part of two private lots - the northern lot contains the Akitu vineyard. A vehicle access track winds up the south-eastern slopes from Mt Barker to the summit.

### Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

6. No historic features, heritage protection orders, heritage overlays or archaeological sites have been identified/recorded to date within the ONF.

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

7. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.

### **Associative Attributes and Values**

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

### **Mana whenua associations and experience:**

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

### **Historic attributes and values:**

9. Mount Barker has some contextual significance as a key reference point within the early survey of the area. It was named after Charles Barker, an early European landholder in the area.

### **Shared and recognised values:**

10. Important values as part of the identity and sense of place of the Upper Clutha Basin – a widely visible landmark from many parts of the southern basin, including Wānaka township, Albert Town and the Wānaka - Luggate Highway (SH6).

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

11. No current public access.

### **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**

12. Prominent and distinctive bedrock landform with a high degree of legibility and a strong visual contrast with the surrounding undulating moraine dominated depositional landscape.

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

13. A prominent and distinctive component of views from surrounding areas of the Upper Clutha Basin, including Wānaka township, Albert Town and Wānaka - Luggate Highway. The steep slopes, with their rough pasture or vegetation cover contrast with the more manicured and smooth character of the surrounding rolling moraine. From some vantage points (e.g. Ballantyne Road to the north), Mount Barker is viewed against the backdrop of the Criffel Range and is perceived as an extension of the mountain slopes.

### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

14. Moderate level of naturalness due to the largely unmodified landform and continuous vegetation cover with some indigenous regeneration. The presence of forestry plantations, wilding tree spread and exotic weeds reduce perceptions of naturalness, but control of wildings is in progress and there is potential for ongoing enhancement of naturalness values if exotic vegetation is replaced by indigenous vegetation.

## Memorability attributes and values:

15. Highly memorable landform because of its visual coherence, distinctive conical shape, and the contrast of the roughly textured steep-sided hill with the smooth green of the surrounding undulating farmland.

## Aesthetic attributes and values:

16. Moderate-high aesthetic attributes due to the visual prominence of the landform, its memorability and high degree of contrast with surrounding areas.

## 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 Mount Barker PA can be summarised as follows:

17. **Moderate-high physical values** relating to the prominent unmodified roche moutonnée landform, the regenerating indigenous vegetation, with high potential for enhancement of ecological values, and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
18. **Moderate associative values** relating to the mana whenua associations of the area, the shared and recognised attributes as part of the local sense of place and identity.
19. **Moderate-high perceptual values** relating to the legibility, visual prominence and memorability of the hill, and its contrast with surrounding rural farmland.

## Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key commercial recreational activities that do not require additional built infrastructure.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks 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 – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.

- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity. In the case of the National Grid **limited** landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.

## **PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS**

- A. Plant species include hawthorn, broom, sweet briar, woolly mullein and radiata pine wildings.
- B. Animal pest species include rabbits, stoats, possums, rats and mice.

---

## 21.22.11 Mount Iron PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Mount Iron PA comprises an ONF being the summit and slopes of the hill between Wānaka and Albert Town, extending to the toe of the hill on the southern and eastern sides and, other than in the northeastern corner, extends to the urban-zoned land on the western and northern sides of the hill.

### 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

### Landforms and land types

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

### Ecological features and vegetation types

2. Extensive areas of regenerating kānuka woodland (*Kunzea serotina*) across much of the landform, mixed with grey shrubland dominated by matagouri, mingimingi and bracken, generally on the steeper and rockier terrain. More discreet areas of short tussock grassland, exotic grassland, cushionfield and turf communities occur on the summit plateau and western slopes of Mount Iron. The cushionfields and turfs in particular support nationally threatened plant species such as *Carmichaelia kirkii*, *Acaena rorida*, *Myosotis brevis* and *Pimelia serviceovillosa*. Kānuka and matagouri have a threat classification of At-Risk Declining.
3. Mount Iron is one of the best examples of roche moutonnée habitats in the Pisa Ecological District with a diversity of habitats and moderate species richness. The relatively large size of the site and its compactness are conducive to ecological attributes being self-sustained, but it is also an important component of a network of kānuka woodlands in the vicinity of the upper Mata-au Clutha River.
4. Revegetation with indigenous species is being implemented in some of the more open areas of the ONF.
5. The diversity of habitats afforded by the rocky terrain and various vegetation types provides suitable habitat for New Zealand falcon, bellbird, grey warbler, fantail and silvereye, skinks and geckos and an assemblage of native invertebrates.

### Land use patterns and features:

6. The majority of the PA is kānuka woodland or grey shrubland protected as conservation reserve, council reserve or by Significant Natural Area overlay. Some open retired pastoral areas are present on the western side and the rocky cliffs on the southern and south-eastern sides do not support tall vegetation. A network of walking tracks criss-crosses the landform and there are Wānaka water supply tanks on the north-western flank, as well as two dwellings amidst the kānuka forest. There is one additional consented but unbuilt building platform further to the east on the hill.

## Archaeological and heritage features and their locations

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

## Mana whenua features and their locations

8. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.

### Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

## Mana whenua associations and experience

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

## Historic attributes and values

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

## Shared and recognised values

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

## Recreation attributes and values

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

### Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

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

## Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values

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

## Particularly important views to and from the area

15. A prominent and distinctive component of views from surrounding areas of the Upper Clutha Basin, including Wānaka township, Albert Town and the southern parts of Lake Wānaka. Natural landmark at the entry to Wānaka from the east, where it dominates the entry experience.

16. Very highly valued panoramic views from the slopes and summit of the hill that allow people to locate themselves within the Upper Clutha Basin and to take in the urban and rural areas of the basin and the enclosing mountain ranges and lakes. Elevated viewpoints allow appreciation of the array of legible and expressive landforms within and surrounding the basin.

### Naturalness attributes and values

17. High level of naturalness due to the extent of regenerating indigenous vegetation and the largely unmodified nature of the landform. This is despite some more modified areas containing tracks, roading and structures (with the majority of roading and structures contained in the northwest corner of the PA).

### Memorability attributes and values

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

### Transient attributes and values

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

### Aesthetic attributes and values

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

## Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

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

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

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

22. **Very high physical values** relating to the prominent and classic roche moutonnée landform, the predominance of regenerating indigenous vegetation with important habitat values for indigenous fauna, reflected in its partial SNA status and the mana whenua features association with the area.
23. **Very high associative values** relating to the mana whenua associations of the areas, the significant recreational attributes, historic farming use, and the strong shared and recognised values as part of the local and regional sense of place.
24. **High perceptual values** relating to the legibility, visual prominence, memorability and naturalness of the hill, its contrast with surrounding urban areas and the ability for people to access and experience the feature.

## Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities - very limited** landscape capacity to absorb visitor accommodation within existing buildings or building platforms. **Extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for tourism-related activities.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – extremely limited** landscape capacity for earthworks and additional tracks and trails for recreational use, excluding mountain bike tracks, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns. **Limited** capacity for mountain bike tracks that are located to integrate with existing track networks, designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character, and integrate with landscape restoration and enhancement.
- vi. **Farm buildings – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – extremely limited** landscape capacity. In the case of the National Grid, **limited** landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity excepting for the replacement or repairs of existing dwellings at the current building locations where the existing footprint and building height is not substantially exceeded and if so, other positive effects are included so that the landscape values are protected.

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Pest plants including wilding conifers, hawthorn and sycamore are scattered across much of the steeper southern and eastern sides of Mount Iron and have the potential to invade the kānuka woodland and the sensitive cushionfield and turf communities if not controlled.
- B. Animal pest species include possums, stoats, rabbits, mice and rats.



---

## 21.22.12 Western Whakatipu Basin PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Western Whakatipu Basin PA encompasses the ONL of the steep south-eastern mountain slopes of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), the steep south and eastern mountain slopes of Bowen Peak and the two elevated roche moutonnée landforms of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill and including Sugar Loaf) and Pt 781. The PA also takes in Waipuna (Lake Johnson) sitting in the ice-eroded gully between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill (a separate PA and ONF). Collectively, the mountain slopes form the northern backdrop to Sunshine Bay, Fernhill and Queenstown, and the mountain setting to Gorge Road and Arthurs Point. The PA adjoins the Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA along its north-eastern boundary in the vicinity of Arthurs Point.

### Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

### Landforms and land types:

1. The steeply sloping foliated schistose mountain landforms of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond 1,748m) and Bowen Peak (1,631m), which form part of the wall of mountains typical of the u-shaped glaciated valleys of which the Whakatipu Valley is an example.
2. The distinctive peaks of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) and Bowen Peak.
3. Exposed rock outcrops and bluffs in places.
4. The Ben Lomond saddle that extends on a west-east orientation between Ben Lomond and Bowen Peak and (in combination with the flanking peaks) separates the Whakatipu Valley from the Moke Creek Valley to the north.
5. The elevated ridgeline spurs extending southwards from the Ben Lomond saddle and taking in Pt 1121 and Cemetery Hill (812m, also known as 'Bobs Peak') immediately west of Queenstown (upon which the skyline Gondola and luge development is located).
6. The extensive ridgeline descending south-westwards from Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) to Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu (ONL)) and taking in Pt 1580, Pt 1395, Pt 1335, Pt 1138 and Pt 850.
7. The small roche moutonnée landform (480m) towards the western edge of the PA, Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu (ONL)).
8. Glacial till deposits at the toe of the steep mountain slopes forming shallow localised shelves and throughout the more gently sloping lower reaches of gullies within the PA.
9. A localised area of ribs of bedrock on the lower-lying slopes to the west of Sunshine Bay.

10. The steeply sloping roche moutonnée glacial landforms of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill, 907m), Sugar Loaf (911m), and Pt 781, with a smooth 'up-glacier' slope to the southwest and south of each landform and a steeper rough 'plucked' down-glacier slope generally to the west, northwest, north and northeast.
11. The elevated saddle-like landform between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill, within which Lake Johnson is located.
12. Scarps and hummocky topography on the southeast slopes of Queenstown Hill and the eastern side of Sugar Loaf which are indicative of historic large-scale landslides.

### Hydrological features:

13. One Mile Creek and its numerous steeply incised tributaries draining the south-eastern flanks of Ben Lomond to Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu).
14. The series of unnamed streams on either side of the One Mile Creek network, draining directly to Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu).
15. The steeply incised Horn Creek (or Bush Creek), McChesney Creek, Domestic Creek, Shady Creek, and numerous unnamed streams draining the southern and eastern sides of Bowen Peak to Kimiākau (Shotover River PA).
16. The shallow lowland, glacial lake of Waipuna (Lake Johnson, 399m). The lake is currently eutrophic (with poor water quality) due to elevated nutrient inputs from its catchment.
17. The numerous unnamed streams on the western, northern and south-eastern side of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill)/Sugar Loaf; the south side of Pt 781; between Sugar Loaf and Pt 781; and between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill.
18. Small kettle lakes and wetlands across the elevated slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
19. The wetland at Matakauri Park, on the east side of Gorge Road.

### Ecological features and vegetation types:

20. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri and mingimingi occur throughout the low-lying rocky slopes of Bowen Peak adjacent to Gorge Road and Moonlight Track.
  - b. Kohuhu (*Pittosporum tenuifolium*) dominant (broadleaved) shrubland at the western end of the PA bordering the lake shore.
  - c. Pockets of mountain beech forest remnants in the gullies of One and Two Mile Creek and Bushy Creek.
  - d. Relic specimens of kowhai on the bluffs above McChesney Creek.
  - e. Subalpine shrubland and snow tussock grassland higher up above the bushline and areas of grey shrubland. The shrubs associated with the subalpine shrubland include species of the genera *Dracophyllum*, *Hebe*, *Leucopogon*, *Gaultheria*, *Pimelea* and *Ozothamnus*.
  - f. Parts of the beech forest in One Mile Creek and adjoining areas of subalpine shrubland and snow tussock grassland within the Ben Lomond Scenic Reserve.
  - g. Wetland vegetation comprising a mix of rushes and sedges at the southern and northern end of the lake where there is an absence of crack willows. Pockets of rushland and sedgeland also in isolated shoreline areas where gaps exist in the willow cover.
  - h. Swathes and scattered pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri and mingimingi occupy the bluffs, rocky slopes and gullies on each of the roche moutonnée landforms, as well as some

hillslopes such as above the eastern shoreline of Waipuna (Lake Johnson). Some of these shrublands are interspersed with hawthorn, sweet briar and elderberry.

- i. Extensive patches of manuka (*Leptospermum scoparium*) and scattered specimens of bog pine (*Halocarpus bidwillii*) on the higher western slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
- j. Short tussockland grassland covers large parts of the undulating crest terrain between Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and Sugar Loaf.
- k. A large wetland (sedgeland) called the Matakauri wetland on the outskirts of Queenstown by Gorge Road which is classified as a Regionally Significant Wetland.

21. Other distinctive vegetation types include:

- a. The almost continuous patterning of plantation *Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Douglas fir) forest throughout the mid and lower flanks of Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) and the southern flanks of Bowen Peak.
- b. Areas of pasture adjacent to Gorge Road as far as Watties Track.
- c. The almost continuous patterning of plantation larch and Douglas fir forest throughout the southern lower flanks of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
- d. The more fragmented patterning of wilding conifers intermixed with grey shrubland, hawthorn, sycamore, broom, gorse and crack willow throughout the southern lower flanks of Pt 781, the western and northern lower slopes of Sugar Loaf and western lower slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
- e. Open pasture and scattered scrub throughout the elevated steep slopes and crest of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill), Sugar Loaf and Pt 781.
- f. Grazed pasture with scattered shelterbelts (including poplars) and clusters of pine and willow trees throughout the saddle between Pt 781 and Ferry Hill.
- g. Amenity and shelter plantings around the scattered rural and rural living dwellings at the southern end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) and on the north-western side of Sugar Loaf.
- h. Amenity plantings around the two groupings of dwellings on the south side of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill), near the entrance to the Queenstown Hill Time Walk.
- i. Scrub and exotic trees/weeds throughout the lower mountain slopes to the west of Sunshine Bay and adjacent Gorge Road, Arthurs Point and the Moonlight Track.

22. Waipuna (Lake Johnson) is a SNA in the District Plan. The riparian vegetation is of significance to aquatic values. Crack willows line much of the Waipuna (Lake Johnson) shoreline.

**Land-use patterns and features:**

- 23. Grazed pasture across the low-lying flatter land on the eastern side of the PA adjacent to Gorge Road, parts of the slopes to the west of Arthurs Point and the majority of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill), Sugar Loaf, Pt 781 and around Waipuna (Lake Johnson). Very low-intensity grazing across the elevated pastoral slopes. Associated with this activity are a network of farm tracks, fencing and farm buildings.
- 24. The proliferation of plantation and wilding conifers around the edges of the PA that define the interface between much of the PA and urban Queenstown/Arthurs Point.
- 25. The gondola (towers, cableway and cabins in a cleared area of Douglas fir forest), luge tracks and chairlift and associated buildings (top and bottom stations, maintenance workshop), café/restaurant/terminal building, service buildings, lighting, signage, jumping-off point for paragliders, vehicular access track, star

gazing platforms, bungy platform and associated buildings, zip lining and associated tree top huts and network of mountain bike trails (Queenstown Mountain Bike Park) on Cemetery Hill.

26. The swathe of Community Purpose and Informal Recreation zoned land across the slopes of Cemetery Hill facing towards Queenstown (where the Skyline gondola, luge, and mountain bike tracks are) and along either side of the lower reaches of One Mile Creek.
27. The Queenstown Hill Time Walk that leads from near the Queenstown city centre (Belfast Street) to the summit of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and coincides with Informal Recreation zoned land across the lower south-western slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
28. An area of Community Purposes zoned land adjacent the northern edge of the Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) on Gorge Road and coinciding with Matakauri Park wetland and boardwalk.
29. The Tiki Trail, Fernhill Loop and Ben Lomond tracks near Queenstown; the Arawata Track at the western end of Sunshine Bay; and the Moonlight Track on the north-western side of Arthurs Point. Associated with these tracks are signage, stiles, and seating.
30. The general absence of rural and rural living buildings within the PA, excepting a scattering at the north-western end of Arthurs Point, a scattering along the Gorge Road valley floor (including adventure tourism related facilities and activities with trails and lookouts on the lower eastern slopes of Bowen Peak), a very small pocket of urban dwellings at the toe of the Queenstown Time Walk, and the small cluster of rural living dwellings at the south end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
31. An unformed road leading from Gorge Road up the lower slopes on the east side of Bowen Peak; from Wynyard Crescent up the mountain slopes; and from Lomond Crescent up the mountain slopes (Ben Lomond Track).
32. Short stretches of unformed road: at the north end of Hansen Road (south) linking to Waipuna (Lake Johnson); at the southern end of Hansen Road (north) extending southwards along the western side of Ferry Hill; and from the western end of Tucker Beach Road extending southwards to the lower northern slopes of Pt 781.
33. Infrastructure is evident within the PA and includes: Aurora distribution lines around the lower slopes of Ben Lomond to the west of Sunshine Bay, along the Gorge Road corridor and on the south-eastern side of the area, and over the saddle near Waipuna (Lake Johnson); water reservoir designations near Greenstone Place and Scott Place in Fernhill; and a firefighting pond near the luge.
34. The UGB associated with Queenstown and the Fernhill/Sunshine Bay suburban area which adjoins the southern edges of the PA, and the Arthurs Point UGB which adjoins the north-western margins of the PA.
35. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include: the urban residential and commercial development adjoining the southern edges of the PA (taking in Sunshine Bay, Fernhill, Queenstown and Frankton); the urban residential and commercial development adjoining the north-western edges of the area (including Arthurs Point); the Queenstown Mountain Bike Club pump track area used for recreation and events on Kerry Drive near the south boundary; rural living development towards the western end of Tucker Beach; and Gorge Road, Glenorchy Queenstown Road and Frankton Road (SH6A).

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

36. Queenstown Powerhouse, One Mile Creek (District Plan reference 96).
37. Old McChesney Bridge Abutment Remains, Arthurs Point (District Plan reference 104, archaeological site E41/236).
38. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, dams, and associated domestic sites in the area (for example, archaeological sites E41/204, E41/228, and E41/279).

39. A protected horse chestnut (*Aesculus hippocastanum*) on Gorge Road (western side of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill)) and a grouping of protected English oaks (*Quercus robur*) at the south-western end of Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
40. Various archaeological features associated with goldmining across the area (e.g., sluicings, tailings, water races, hut sites, dams, etc.), especially in the area around Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
41. Archaeological features relating to historic farming in the area around Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
42. Historic walking track from Queenstown to the top of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

43. 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.
44. Much of the ONL is mapped as the wāhi tūpuna Te Taumata o Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) or Te Tapunui wāhi tūpuna. The very northern extent overlaps the Kimiākau (Shotover River) wāhi tūpuna.

### **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:**

45. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
46. Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura is named after Hakitekura, a Kāti Māmoë woman who was the first person to swim across Whakatipu Waimāori. After watching other young women from the mountains attempting to outswim each other, she decided that she wanted to outdo them. She got a kauati (a stick used to start fire) from her father, and a bundle of dry raupō as kindling. The next morning, Hakitekura set out from Tāhuna (the flat land where Queenstown now stands). With the kauati and raupō bound tightly in harakeke (flax) to keep them dry, she swam across the lake in darkness, with the bundle strapped to her. When Hakitekura was discovered missing, her father remembered his daughter's request for a kauati, and a waka was sent across the lake to bring her back. The mountains where she would look across the lake were thereafter known as Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (The Resting Place of Hakitekura).
47. The name Te Tapunui signifies a place considered sacred to Kāi Tahu whānui both traditionally and in the present.
48. Kimiākau is part of the extensive network of mahika kai (food & resource gathering) and traditional travel routes in the area.
49. The mana whenua values associated with this ONF include, but may not be limited to, wāhi tapu, wāhi taoka, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

50. The naming of the Ben Lomond, after Ben Lomond in Scotland by the early shepherd, Duncan McAusland.
51. Early European interactions with the creeks in the area as sources of water, power, and gold, as well as obstacles that needed to be bridged.

52. Gold mining in the area and the associated physical remnants.
53. Early farming around Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
54. The contextual value of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) as a landscape feature that historically defined communication routes around the Whakatipu Basin.
55. The importance of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) as an early tourist destination.

**Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

56. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
57. The popularity of the postcard views from Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak), Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill), Walter Peak, Cecil Peak, the Remarkables, Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), lower eastern slopes of Bowen Peak and the broader mountain context, as an inspiration/subject for art and photography and adventure tourism.
58. The very high popularity of the Skyline Gondola and luge facility and the Queenstown Time Walk (both described below). The very close proximity of these recreational features to Queenstown urban area also plays a role.
59. The identity of Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak), Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) and, further afield, Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) as part of the dramatic backdrop to Queenstown.
60. The identity of Bowen Peak as part of the dramatic backdrop to Arthurs Point.

**Recreation attributes and values:**

61. Walking, running, mountain biking, paragliding, lugging, riding the gondola, bungee jumping and enjoying the view from the café/restaurant facilities on Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak).
62. Walking and running on the Tiki Trail, Ben Lomond Track, Arawata Track and the Moonlight Track.
63. Mountain biking within the Queenstown Mountain Bike Park and trails within and around the Wynyard Jump Park.
64. Walking, running, and picnicking on the Queenstown Time Walk which includes several heritage interpretation panels, lookout points and the 'Basket of Dreams' sculpture by Caroline Robinson.
65. Walking and running on the Matakauri Park boardwalk (near Gorge Road).
66. Adventure tourism tracks, facilities and activities in and above the Gorge Road valley.
67. Trout fishing at Waipuna (Lake Johnson).
68. Glenorchy-Queenstown Road and Gorge Road as key scenic routes in close proximity.

**Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

**Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

69. The area's natural landforms, land type, and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial processes.

70. Indigenous gully and wetland plantings which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values throughout the area.

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

71. The postcard views from vantage points on Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak), Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill), Walter Peak, Cecil Peak, the Remarkables, Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), and the broader mountain context.
72. The spectacular panoramic views from the Ben Lomond saddle and Ben Lomond summit out over the Whakatipu Valley to the south (including the lake) and the rugged and dramatic expanse of Harris and Richardson mountains ranges to the north.
73. The highly attractive short to long-range views from the Moonlight Track along the vegetation-clad gorge of the Shotover Corridor, across the rugged and largely undeveloped slopes of Mount Dewar and northwards to The Point.
74. The appealing short to long-range views from the Arawata Track across the mixed bush and scrub-clad lake margins to Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and Cecil Peak.
75. The engaging mid to long-range views from Queenstown, Fernhill, Sunshine Bay, Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights), Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), parts of the Queenstown Trail network, and the Glenorchy-Queenstown Road, in which the largely forested slopes of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) form the backdrop to Queenstown. The bold contrast between the urban development throughout the lower flanks of the hill and the elevated wooded slopes is memorable and of importance to the identity of Queenstown as a settlement tucked into the base of a mountain.
76. The appealing long-range views from more distant elevated vantage points such as the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts) in which the visibility of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) peak and the connection of Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak) and Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) to the broader glacial landscape confers a sense of grandeur to the outlook.
77. Dramatic close and mid-range views from Gorge Road to the rugged and vegetation-pocked slopes of Bowen Peak. The somewhat wild and unkempt character of the slopes where rocky outcrops and patches of scrub and grey shrubland dominate at relatively close range, combined with the broader mountain context (Sugar Loaf and Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill)), add to the spectacle.
78. Dramatic mid and long-range views from Arthurs Point, the Kimitiākau (Shotover River) ONF, the western Whakatipu Basin / Littles Stream area and sections of the trail network coinciding with this part of the basin, to the rugged eastern and north-eastern slopes of Bowen Peak and Sugar Loaf. In views the mountainous context within which the largely undeveloped and open mountain-scape is seen, together with its visual dominance (as a consequence of its scale, proximity, and appearance), adds to the appeal of the outlook.
79. Engaging and attractive short to long-range views from the Frankton Arm, Frankton (including the airport), SH6, and Kelvin Peninsula to the smoother south-facing slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and the more irregular profile of Pt 781 (seen in combination with the cone like peak of Ferry Hill which is a separate PA and ONF). In more distant views (e.g. Frankton Arm and Kelvin Peninsula), this part of the PA is perceived as a continuous, albeit varied, landform feature with the Ferry Hill PA and ONF. The almost unbroken patterning of vegetation (plantation forest) along the southern flanks of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and wilding conifers intermixed with grey shrubland and scrub throughout the southern lower flanks of Pt 781, together with its generally undeveloped character, forms a memorable contrast with the urban development below and the more open pastoral slopes sitting above, which reinforces the impression of coherence. In longer range views from many of the more distant locations to the south, there is a clear appreciation of the roche moutonnée landform profile and the waters of the Frankton Arm seen in the foreground of view, along with the often-snow-capped mountains of Ben Lomond and Coronet Peak in the background add to the appeal. In closer range views (e.g. Frankton and SH6), intervening landforms, vegetation and/or built development curbs the field of view in places. Despite the limited expanse of the

feature visible, the contrast established by the natural landform seen within an urban context adds to the memorability and appeal of such views.

80. Attractive mid to long-range views from Queenstown, Lake Whakatipu, and the Glenorchy-Queenstown Road, in which the smoother 'up-glacier' largely forested south-western slopes of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) form the backdrop to Queenstown. The bold contrast between the urban development throughout the lower flanks of the hill and the elevated wooded slopes is memorable and of importance to the identity of Queenstown as a settlement tucked into the base of a mountains. From more distant vantage points, the connection of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) to the broader glacial landscape is more legible and adds a sense of grandeur to the outlook.
81. Attractive mid and long-range views from the Fitzpatrick Basin, Dalefield, Hawthorn Triangle, the elevated flanks and foothills associated with Slope Hill and sections of Queenstown Trail coinciding with this part of the basin, to the more irregular steep profile of Pt 781 and the more rounded, albeit rugged, northern side of Sugar Loaf. In closer range views, the expanse of the PA is curtailed by intervening landform and vegetation; however, there is an increased appreciation of the localised rocky outcrops, scarps, and hummocky terrain of the landforms adding to their appeal. In some of these views, there is an appreciation of the band of rural living development (Tucker Beach) along the north side of the Waipuna (Lake Johnson) saddle along with the poplar shelterbelts, scattered shade trees. Nevertheless, from this orientation, the large-scale and distinctive sculptural form of the landforms and their generally undeveloped character make them memorable.
82. Highly attractive close and mid-range views across Waipuna (Lake Johnson), seen enclosed by the steeply rising roche moutonnée features of Pt 781 and Ferry Hill (ONF). Scattered largely exotic lake edge, shelterbelt, shade tree, and amenity plantings (around dwellings) add to the scenic appeal.
83. Engaging and seemingly 'close-range' views from planes approaching or exiting Queenstown airport via the Frankton Arm. Such views offer an appreciation of the roche moutonnée and the broader glacial landscape context within which the PA is set.
84. In all of the views, the dominance of 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONL, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the ONL and, in the case of the southern and north-eastern sides of the area, the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

85. The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Western Whakatipu Basin PA set within a largely urban context (Queenstown and Arthurs Point), which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to its forestry, pastoral, recreational, and infrastructure uses are visible, the very low number of buildings and the limited visibility (excepting the gondola etc described below), limits their influence on the character of the area as a natural landscape.
86. The irregular patterning and proliferation of grey shrubland, exposed rock faces, and scrub in places, adds to the perception of naturalness.
87. While the gondola forms a bold manmade 'cut' up the hillside, with a sizeable terminal building and luge development atop Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak), the movement of the gondola cabins together with the connection the gondola and associated development establishes between the mountain setting and Queenstown adds a degree of interest to the view, meaning that it is not an overwhelmingly negative visual element. Put another way, these landscape modifications make an important contribution to Queenstown's recreational values (see above), suggesting a degree of landscape 'fit'. The scale of the seemingly 'undeveloped' mountain setting within which this development is viewed together with its strong visual connection to Queenstown also play a role in this regard. At night, the patterning of lights up the mountain slopes forms a bold contrast to the darkness of the surrounding mountain slopes. Again, it is the very close proximity of the area to Queenstown that lends a visual fit.



88. The forestry plantings across the south and southeast flanks of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill), Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) and parts of Bowen Peak contribute a reduced perception of naturalness. However, the underlying natural (and largely unmodified) schistose mountain and roche moutonnée landform character remains legible and dominant, thus ensuring this part of the area displays at least a moderate-high level of naturalness. The visual appearance of these parts of the PA during and after harvesting cycles forms a prominent negative visual element within the broader landscape setting and serves to (temporarily) further reduce the perception of naturalness in this part of the PA.

### **Memorability attributes and values:**

89. The appealing and engaging views of the largely undeveloped mountains and largely undeveloped and legible roche moutonnée landforms from a wide variety of public vantage points. The juxtaposition of the mountains and landforms within a largely urban context, along with the magnificent broader mountain and lake context within which they are seen in many views, are also factors that contribute to memorability.
90. The 'close up' experience of the alpine setting that the PA affords for many residents and visitors to Queenstown as a consequence of the relatively high accessibility of the area (via the tracks and gondola in very close proximity to the town centre).
91. The panoramic alpine landscape views afforded from: the Ben Lomond track, saddle and peak; and the top of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
92. The sense of Queenstown and Arthurs Point tucked in at the toe of a majestic mountain setting.
93. The sense of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) as a 'hidden gem' tucked away in the hillslopes by Frankton.

### **Transient attributes and values:**

94. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain and roche moutonnée slopes.
95. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation.

### **Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

96. A strong sense of the sublime as a consequence of the sheer scale, dramatic character and undeveloped appearance of the mountain and roche moutonnée which is evident: on the Ben Lomond track above the Gondola and luge development; along Gorge Road (away from existing built development and adventure tourism related activities); and across the northern part of the PA which contributes a sense of remoteness and wildness to the wider setting (including Arthurs Point, Kimiākau (Shotover River) ONF and the western part of the Whakatipu Basin), despite the more developed immediate context.

### **Aesthetic qualities and values:**

97. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
98. More specifically, this includes:
- a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the generally undeveloped, vegetation-dominated, mountain landforms and roche moutonnée juxtaposed beside an urban context and/or an (ONF/L) lake or river context.
  - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. The large-scale and dramatic character of the steep mountain landforms backdropping Queenstown and Arthurs Point.
    - ii. The sculptural peaks of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) and Bowen Peak.

- iii. The ever-changing play of light and weather patterns across the mountain and roche moutonnée slopes.
- iv. The more rugged and wild character of the eastern side of Bowen Peak.
- v. The distinctly rugged character of the west, northwest, north and northeast sides of each of the roche moutonnée landforms and the more coherent appearance of the southwest and south of each as a consequence of the landform and vegetation character and patterns.
- vi. The rounded tops of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill) and Sugar Loaf, and the more rugged and irregular profile of Pt 781.
- vii. The open and pastoral character of Pt 781 and the top of Te Tapunui (Queenstown Hill).
- viii. The contained and enclosed nature of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) set within a largely pastoral context interspersed with largely exotic plantings.
- ix. The general confinement of visible built development to ~~two~~ three distinct locations: Cemetery Hill (gondola, luge, etc.); parts of the Gorge Road valley floor (rural living, rural buildings, and adventure tourism related buildings, facilities and tracks); and near Arthurs Point (limited scattering of rural living development).

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

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for the Western Whakatipu Basin PA can be summarised as follows:

99. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.

100. **High associative values** relating to:

- a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
- b. The historic features and associations of the area.
- c. The very strong shared and recognised values associated with the area (deriving in part from the proximity of parts of the PA to urban areas).
- d. The significant recreational attributes of Cemetery Hill (Bob's Peak), Ben Lomond and Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill) and trout fishing in Lake Johnson.

101. **High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area due to its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Queenstown, Arthurs Point, Sunshine Bay, Fernhill, Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights), the scenic routes of

Glenorchy-Queenstown Road and Gorge Road, parts of the Queenstown Trail network, the Ladies Mile corridor, the western side of the Wakatipu Basin, the airport approach path and the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road (and lookouts), along with the area's transient values, play an important role.

- c. A moderate-high to high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of more natural landscape elements and patterns across the PA.
- d. The identity of the PA as a natural and dramatic landscape backdrop to the urban areas of Fernhill, Sunshine Bay, Queenstown, Arthurs Point, Frankton and the western side of the (more rural) Whakatipu Basin.
- e. The sense of Waipuna (Lake Johnson) as a 'hidden gem' tucked away in the hillslopes by Frankton.
- f. A strong sense of remoteness and wildness throughout the elevated parts of Te Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond), along the western and north side of Te Tapanui (Queenstown Hill), the northern sides of Sugar Loaf and Pt 781 and on the slopes of Bowen Peak near Arthurs Point.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Western Whakatipu Basin PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – some** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation associated with existing dwellings and consented platforms (including on the low lying southern margins of the PA adjacent Hansen Road) and which are: located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for small scale visitor accommodation and small scale tourism related activities in low lying and/or visually discreet parts of the PA where development is located so that existing landform and/or vegetation features provide an appreciable integrating benefit; is designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhances public access (where appropriate).
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity unless it is very discreetly located so that it is reasonably difficult to see from outside the site and has a rural character.
- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm tracks, adventure tourism, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns. **Limited** landscape capacity for tracks and trails for recreational use that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement.
- vi. **Farm buildings –** in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, **very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity excepting very small scale farm quarries.

- viii. **Transport infrastructure** (excluding Passenger Lift Systems) – **limited** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement. **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.
- 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 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 and/or co-located with existing 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** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation unless it is very discreetly located so that it is reasonably difficult to see from outside the site. **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for exotic forestry.
- xii. **Rural living** – **extremely limited** landscape capacity. Where such development is appropriate, it is likely to be: co located with existing development; sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access (where appropriate).
- xiii. **Passenger Lift Systems** – **limited** landscape capacity to improve public access to focal recreational areas higher in the mountains via non-vehicular transportation modes such as gondolas (including base and terminal buildings and stations), provided they are positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, are co-located with existing gondola infrastructure and designed to be recessive in the landscape.

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
- B. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, hawthorn, buddleia, elderberry, sycamore, broom, cotoneaster and gorse.

---

## 21.22.13 Queenstown Bay and Environs PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Queenstown Bay and Environs PA encompasses the ONL of the waters of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) adjacent to Queenstown. The western limit of the area is defined by the ridgeline descending from Taumata-o-Hakitekura (Ben Lomond) along the western side of Sunshine Bay. The eastern limit coincides with the eastern side of Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course). The PA takes in much of the lake margin between Sunshine Bay and Two Mile Creek, Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course). The PA excludes the inner waters and lake edge (Queenstown Bay Beach) in Central Queenstown and the Frankton Arm.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. The glacier carved basin of the Whakatipu Valley, which split into two ice tongues when it met the Remarkables, with the terminal moraine deposited at its southern end (at Kingston) leading to the damming of the valley and creation of the lake.
2. The small peninsula landforms of Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course).
3. Range of lakeshore and fluvial processes and landforms that have modified the largely glacially-derived and dominated landscape. These landforms tend to be of small scale.

### Hydrological features:

4. Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), notable for its largely undeveloped mountain context, scale (at 80 km in length, it is New Zealand's longest lake, and, at 291 km<sup>2</sup>, its third largest), depth (with its floor being below sea level), high water quality (used for urban Queenstown water supply), distinctive shape (dog leg), unmodified lake level (with a seiche period of 26.7 minutes, which causes the water level to rise and fall some 200mm in Queenstown Bay) and highly dynamic character (as a consequence of its scale and the effects of weather).
5. Ornamental pond in Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens).

### Ecological features and vegetation types:

6. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Small pockets of remnant mountain beech and grey shrubland along the lake edge between Fernhill and Sunshine Bay.
7. Other distinctive vegetation types include:

- a. The proliferation of mature exotic specimen trees along the lake shore between Queenstown and Sunshine Bay and at Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens). Species include: *Abies grandis* (grand fir), *Abies nordmanniana* (Algerian fir), *Araucaria araucana* (monkey puzzle), *Populus nigra 'Italica'* (Lombardy poplar), *Quercus velutina* (black oak), *Quercus rubra* (red oak), *Tsuga heterophylla* (western hemlock), *Sequoiadendron giganteum* (wellingtonia), *Salix babylonica* (weeping willow), *Tilia x europaea* (lime). *Pseudotsuga menziesii* (Douglas fir) is a dominant species at Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) forming a protective forest around much of the gardens.
- b. The rose garden and other largely exotic amenity plantings throughout Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens).
- c. Mown grass areas studded with specimen trees along the lake edge between Queenstown and Fernhill.
- d. Amenity plantings of indigenous trees and shrubs have been established along the walking track between Sunshine Bay and Queenstown.
- e. Coniferous and amenity plantings throughout Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course).
- f. Southern Rata re-establishment on Queenstown Gardens periphery and presence of notable solitary specimen trees.
- g. In places, there are stands of wilding blue gum (*Eucalyptus globulus*).

#### **Land-use patterns and features:**

8. Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course) with a wide range of recreational uses (described below).
9. Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) features include;
  - a. operational facilities to manage the park e.g., the depot;
  - b. amenity display structures: conservatory;
  - c. daytime parking for freedom camping.
10. The reserve or open space zoning of almost all of the land-based part of the area under the District Plan.
11. The walkway along the lake edge between Queenstown and Sunshine Bay forms a linkage of the Aotearoa's national walkway, the Te Araroa Trail passing through the ONL along the lakefront via the Wakatipu Track.
12. The Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) of Queenstown and Kelvin Heights which adjoins the lake edge within the PA.
13. Uses on the lake (and the lake margin) including water-based transport, commercial recreation and recreation-based activities (e.g., the TSS Earnslaw, kayaking, scenic cruising/touring, jet boating, sailing, parasailing and recreational boating, jet skiing and water sports, water taxis, barges).
14. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include: the commercial development in central Queenstown (which includes wharves and jetties around the inner portion of Queenstown Bay), residential development at Sunshine Bay, Fernhill, Queenstown Hill and Kelvin Heights, Glenorchy Queenstown Road, Bob's Peak and the Skyline gondola and building, the TSS Earnslaw slipway and hard-stand facilities and infrastructure at Kelvin Peninsula.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

15. The numerous protected exotic specimen trees throughout Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and along the lake shore between Queenstown and Fernhill.
16. Queenstown Gardens and Plantation Reserve Block, including the Queenstown Gardens Gate (District Plan reference 13).
17. William Rees Memorial, Hakitekura Plaque, and Scott Rock Memorial, Queenstown Gardens (District Plan references 24-26).
18. Queenstown Bowling Club Pavilion, Queenstown Gardens (District Plan reference 65).
19. Shipping navigation beacon at the end of the Gardens Peninsula (District Plan reference 221).
20. Rifle butt adjacent to the lake esplanade (District Plan reference 220, archaeological site E41/305).
21. Kelvin Peninsula midden/oven site (archaeological site E41/13).

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

22. 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.
23. Much of the ONL is within the mapped wāhi tūpuna Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu). Whakatipu Waimāori is a Statutory Acknowledgement under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.
24. It also includes the mapped wāhi tūpuna Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course) and Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens).

### **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:**

25. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
26. The name Whakatipu Waimāori originates from the earliest expedition of discovery made many generations ago by the tupuna Rākaihautū and his party from the Uruao waka. In tradition, Rākaihautū dug the lakes with his kō known as Tūwhakarōria. The Lake is key in numerous Kāi Tahu pūrakau (stories) and has a deep spiritual significance for mana whenua.
27. For generations, the lake supported nohoaka, kāika, mahika kai as well as transportation routes for pounamu. The knowledge of these associations hold the same value for Kāi Tahu to this day.
28. Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura is related to the feats of Hakitekura, the famous Kāti Māmoe woman who was the first person to swim across Whakatipu Waimāori.
29. Te Kararo was the site of a kāika (permanent settlement).
30. The mana whenua values associated with this ONL include, but may not be limited to wāhi taoka, tauraka waka, kāika, ara tawhito and mahika kai.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

31. Early Māori occupation around the lakeshore.
32. Historic recreational use of the lake, lakeshore, and gardens.
33. Historic use of the lake for transport (including the TSS Earnslaw).
34. The early establishment and continued use of the gardens as a public reserve.

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

35. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
36. The popularity of the postcard views from Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course), the various lake-edge trails and the waters across the lake to Cecil Peak and Walter Peak and the broader mountain context, as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.
37. The very high popularity of the Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens), Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course), the various lake-edge trails and water-based activities on the lake (including the TSS Earnslaw). The very close proximity of this recreational feature to Queenstown urban area also plays a role.
38. The critical role of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens), Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course), the various lake-edge trails and water-based activities on the lake in shaping the identity of Queenstown.

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

39. Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens), botanical gardens by the town centre that is home to a wide range of recreational uses (children's playground, lawn bowls, frisbee golf, tennis, skateboarding, skating, BMX biking, ice skating, ice hockey, walking and jogging, cycling, picnicking, outdoor events, peaceful contemplation).
40. Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course), which includes the golf course and a sculpture walk around the lake edges of the golf course, used by walkers, joggers, cyclists, and picnickers.
41. The Queenstown Trail around the lake edge of Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course).
42. Walking, running, cycling and picnicking along the lake-edge trail between Queenstown and Sunshine Bay.
43. Water-based activities including: swimming, kayaking, sailing, paddle boarding, boating, jet skiing, sightseeing (acknowledging that many of these activities are commercial in nature).
44. Fishing for rainbow trout, brown trout, and chinook salmon in Whakatipu Waimāori.
45. Glenorchy - Queenstown Road as a key scenic route in close proximity.
46. Band rotunda at the Queenstown Gardens; music, contemplation, performance arts.



## Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

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

### Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

47. The area's natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and expressive of the landscape's formative geomorphic processes.

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

48. The postcard views from Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens), Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course), the various lake-edge trails, Glenorchy - Queenstown Road and the dynamic waters of the lake to Cecil Peak and Walter Peak and the broader mountain context. The frequent movement of vessels on the lake (including the TSS Earnslaw) adds to the interest of the outlook.
49. Iconic mid to long-range views from central Queenstown, across the waters of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) to the rugged and dramatic landforms of Cecil Peak, Walter Peak and the broader mountain context framing the lake. The seemingly undeveloped and green finger of Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and almost continuous fringe of green along the northern lake edge (Queenstown to Sunshine Bay) along with marine craft (including the TSS Earnslaw), adds to the appeal of the outlook.
50. In all views, the striking juxtaposition of urban development alongside the grandeur of the natural landscape adds to the spectacle.

### Naturalness attributes and values:

51. The very close proximity of urban development and level of human activity within the area inevitably colours the impression of naturalness within the ONL. Nonetheless, the contrast created between the area and its urban context due to the dominance of more natural landscape elements (i.e., water or vegetation), together with the largely unmodified underlying landform character (glacial lake and legible peninsulas), means that the area displays at least a moderate-high level of naturalness. Historic forestry land uses throughout the broader mountain context serve to ensure that the exotic vegetation character of much of the landward area is not discordant or incongruous within the wider high-value landscape setting.
52. The general avoidance of structures along the lake edge within the PA, excepting the jetties and boat sheds, etc. on the south side of Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens).

### Memorability attributes and values:

53. The highly memorable experiences associated with using Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), along with views of the Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and its surrounding mountain frame.
54. The sense of Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) as a place of beauty and tranquillity close to central Queenstown.

### Transient attributes and values:

55. The ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the lake.
56. Human activity on the lake (including vessels) and its margins.
57. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation around the lake edges and throughout Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course).

## Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

58. A localised sense of remoteness along parts of the lake edge trails within the ONL, where intervening landforms and/or vegetation screen views to nearby development and the focus is confined to the lake and broader undeveloped mountain context.

## Aesthetic attributes and values:

59. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
60. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. The highly attractive and engaging large-scale composition created by the tree-lined glacial lake and 'green' peninsulas set within a broader mountain context seen either individually or collectively, juxtaposed beside an urban context.
  - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. The highly dynamic qualities of the lake waters in terms of natural processes (wind and wave action, etc.) and human activity.
    - ii. The general absence of structures and the dominance of vegetation along the lake edges.
    - iii. The limited level of built modification evident within the landward parts of the PA, which forms a marked contrast to the urban context and imbues an impression of 'green relief'.
    - iv. The mature trees throughout the area which contribute to the scenic appeal.
    - v. Human activity on and around the bay, along with some of the surrounding buildings and marine craft within the bay.

## 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 combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for the Queenstown Bay and Environs PA can be summarised as follows:

61. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
62. **Very High associative values** relating to:
  - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
  - b. The historic features of the area.
  - c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
  - d. The significant recreational attributes of Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens), Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course) and the lake-edge trails.

63. **High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and highly appealing composition of natural landscape elements juxtaposed beside Queenstown. The visibility of the area from Queenstown, Glenorchy-Queenstown Road, and sections of the Queenstown Trail network, along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
- c. A sense of tranquillity and green relief at Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens).
- d. A localised sense of remoteness and wildness along parts of the lake edge trails in Te Kararo (Queenstown Gardens) and Te Nuku-o-Hakitekura (Kelvin Heights Golf Course) where views to nearby urban development are screened by landforms and/or vegetation.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Queenstown Bay and Environs PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that integrate with, and complement/enhance, existing recreation features and activities; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements (where appropriate); designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with tracks and trails for recreational use, and outdoor recreation (including the TSS Earnslaw) that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – extremely limited** landscape capacity if associated with water-based transport or the TSS Earnslaw. **Extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – very 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 overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent and/or co-located with existing 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 – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.

- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xiii. **Jetties, and boatsheds, lake structures and moorings – very limited** landscape capacity for additional jetties and boatsheds that are co-located with existing features, designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement (where possible); and enhance public access.

## **PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS**

- A. Animal pest species include feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
- B. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, hawthorn, buddleia, broom and gorse.

---

## 21.22.14 Northern Remarkables PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Northern Remarkables PA relates to the ONL of the northern faces of the Remarkables Range framing the southern side of the Wakatipu Basin. The southern boundary of the PA corresponds with the ONL of the mountain peaks and ridgelines of that range around, and east of the Remarkables Ski Area Sub-zone – extending through to near Chard Farm. The Northern Remarkables PA's northern boundary follows the upper edge of the low-lying Kawarau River terraces on the south side of the Kawarau River to near Chard Farm, being ONL. In so doing, the PA captures the steep mountain faces above the Kawarau River valley and terraces at the toe of the Northern Remarkables.

### Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

### Landforms and land types:

1. Steep to very steep mountain slopes with frequent exposed schist outcrops and scree slopes. The northern faces consist principally of large landslides which occurred after the retreat of glaciers at the end of the last glaciation.
2. Alluvial fans and shingle beds associated with the Rastus Burn and Owens Creek.
3. Elevated fans and flat alluvial floodplains and terraces bordered in places by steep escarpments.
4. Located to the north of, and downslope of, the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road, the Remarkables Terrane Boundary and Block Field are identified as a Geopreservation Site of national importance; and the Frankton Block Field is identified as being of regional importance. Both of these features are rated as being robust and not considered to be vulnerable to most human-related activities.
5. This ONL also contains the Lake Alta cirque which is a classic lake-filled cirque with steep rocky sides. There are areas of moraine over the schist bedrock at the front lip.

### Hydrological features:

6. The Rastus Burn.
7. Owens Creek.
8. The cirque lake of Lake Alta (i.e., amphitheatre-shaped basin with precipitous walls at the head of a glacial valley). Identified as a Geopreservation Site of regional significance that is rated as being robust and not considered to be vulnerable to most human-related activities.
9. The series of small tarns in the vicinity of the Remarkables Ski Field.

## Ecological features and vegetation types:

10. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Extensive areas of regenerating indigenous grey shrubland, particularly in the Owens Creek and Rastus Burn valleys. The larger areas of shrubland are designated as SNAs.
  - b. Snow tussock grasslands, mixed snow tussock *Dracophyllum* scrub and cushionfields covers the higher slopes generally above c. 900 m, including the Rastus Basin.
  - c. Alpine cushion bogs are a feature of the Basins in the upper Rastus Burn bordering the streams and tarns.
  - d. Expansive areas of mixed short tussock – exotic grassland interspersed with grey shrubland occur above the prominent alluvial fans and terraces of the Rastus Burn and Owens Creek.
  - e. Scattered, locally rare, mature kowhai across the lower and mid slopes especially on bluffy sites.
11. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. Grazed pasture throughout the flat river terraces while extensive grazing occurs on the lower hillslopes.
12. Valued habitat for a range of lizards, New Zealand falcon, New Zealand pipit and grey warbler, and endemic invertebrates. Mingimingi and the tree daisies (*Olearia sp*) are important to endemic invertebrates during parts of their life cycles while rocky areas amongst low stature shrubs and short and exotic grassland is important habitat for skinks and geckos.
13. The upper part of the PA lies in the DOC managed Remarkables Conservation Area.

## Land-use patterns and features:

14. Human modification which is concentrated throughout the low-lying river terraces at the base of the mountain slopes (and adjacent the Kawarau River ONF), where pastoral and viticultural land use dominate; in the three elevated basins near Lake Alta within which the ski field is located; and throughout the north-western portion of the PA associated with the ski field access road and communication infrastructure near Double Cone.
15. Built development patterns which, throughout the lower-lying river terraces includes a farmhouse at Owens Creek, the Chard Farm winery, scattered farm buildings, farm tracks, fencing and a power line (on poles) roughly traversing the toe of the steeper slopes. Generally, development is characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings that have an obvious connection with the working rural landscape, are well integrated by plantings and remain subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Elsewhere, the modest scale of buildings, together with their distinctly working rural character and sparse arrangement, ensures that they sit comfortably into the setting.
16. The location of the Remarkables Ski Field within three interconnected elevated basins which means that it is relatively visually discreet in views from low-lying places in the Wakatipu Basin and Queenstown. The ski field access road, however, is prominent in such views.
17. Gibbston Character Zone in the vicinity of Chard Farm which includes viticulture and commercial activities with and affiliation to viticulture and farming.
18. Queenstown Park Station is a large, farmed landholding within the ONL, the continued productive use of this land contributes to pest control and landscape enhancement.

## Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

19. Chard Road (District Plan reference 216) and Chard Farm (archaeological site F41/52).

20. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, dams, and associated domestic sites in the area (for example, archaeological sites E41/204, E41/228, and E41/279).

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

21. 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.
22. The western part of the ONL overlaps the mapped Kawarau wāhi tūpuna. Kawarau is the traditional name for the Remarkables.
23. The very northern extent of the ONL overlaps the mapped Kawarau River wāhi tūpuna.

### **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:**

24. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
25. As one of the highest and most prominent ranges overlooking Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), closeness to the Ātua gives significance to Kawarau.
26. The Kawarau River was a traditional travel route that provided direct access between Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and Mata-au (the Clutha River).
27. The Kawarau River is a significant kāika mahika kai where weka, kākāpō, kea and tuna (eel) were gathered.
28. The mana whenua values associated with the ONL include, but may not be limited to, mauka, wāhi taoka, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

29. Gold mining in the area and the associated physical remnants.
30. Historic farming, especially early pastoralism.
31. Chard Road, which was part of the old main coach link between Queenstown and Cromwell. Identified in the PDP Inventory of listed Heritage Features, QLDC Category 2 (three categories, 1 to 3, with Category 1 being the most significant).

### **Shared and recognised values:**

32. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
33. The popularity of the mountain slopes as an inspiration/subject for art, education, film and photography and as a key outlook from Queenstown, (acknowledging that it is the Western Remarkables (outside the PA) that are the primary focus of interest, with the Northern Remarkables playing a secondary role in the outlook). The close proximity of the area to Queenstown and its visibility from much of the Whakatipu Basin and Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) play an important role.
34. The high popularity of the recreational features listed below.

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

35. The Remarkables Ski Area for year-round use and recreation; access to the ski area also offers people close-up, first-hand experience of the Northern Remarkables PA.
36. The Remarkables Ski Field Access Road, tracks, trails and lookouts, and SH 6 as key scenic routes either within the PA or in close proximity.
37. The popular Queenstown Park Station Fun Ride and Kawarau River Run annual events.
38. Walking and cycling along the Twin Rivers Trail on the north side of the Kawarau River. Although the trail is outside the Northern Remarkables PA, its close proximity means that the landscape character experienced on the trail is strongly influenced by the PA.
39. The Lake Alta and Wye Creek Route walking tracks.
40. Climbing in the Rastus Burn Recreation Reserve.
41. Jetboating, kayaking, rafting, and fishing on the Kawarau River (ONF), for the same 'proximity' reasons to those described above.
42. Chard Farm winery.

### **Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

### **Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

43. The area's natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above) which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial and fluvial / alluvial processes.
44. Indigenous gully and stream plantings which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values within the Owen and Rastus Burn catchments.
45. More generally, the vegetation cover and land uses found within the area which reinforce the landform differences throughout the ONL, with more cultural vegetation patterns evident on the lower-lying flat areas and more natural vegetation cover apparent across elevated areas.

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

46. Impressive and highly appealing mid to longer-range views from the Twin Rivers Trail across the Kawarau River and its floodplains to the largely open pastoral terraces and dramatic mountain slopes, peaks, ridges and valleys of the Northern Remarkables PA.
47. Impressive close-up views across tussock-dominated slopes near the Remarkables Ski Field Road towards the deeply etched valley of the Rastus Burn and up into the valley corridor of the ski field itself.
48. Highly attractive close, mid and longer-range views from the Kawarau River to the edges of the pastoral terraces, backdropped by a vast and rugged mountain setting. The complex river edge landforms and vegetation patterns frame and filter views in places, contributing to views that have highly variable content and a variable character.
49. Complex and highly attractive mid-range views from Lake Hayes Estate, Bridesdale and Shotover Country over intervening riverside vegetation to the exposed, relatively bare, pastoral terraces and mid slopes, either side of the Rastus Burn valley and the crenelated ridges and peaks that top the range.



50. Dramatic longer-range views from the Whakatipu Basin, the Crown Range Road and Queenstown urban area (including the airport and key scenic routes), to the elevated mountain slopes, peaks and ridges.
51. In all of the views, the dominance of 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes along with the generally subservient nature of built development and impression of openness underpins the high quality of the outlook.
52. From the more distant vantage points (i.e., Queenstown, Whakatipu Basin and Crown Terrace area), views of the jagged alpine peaks and rugged incised mountain slopes comprise signature views that are critical to the identity of the wider area.
53. From more proximate vantage points, the vegetation-fringed, dynamic waters of the Kawarau River add to the locality's spectacle – acting as the centrepiece to an enclosed, U-shaped valley that becomes increasingly incised east of Morven Hill (ONF). In such views, the seemingly 'tamed' pastoral floodplains and elevated terraces on both sides of the river are also apparent, offering attractive contrast with, and counterpoint to, the sheltered river corridor and its mountain backdrop.

### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

54. The mountain slopes which exhibit a very high level of naturalness, except in the more immediate vicinity of the Remarkables Ski Area and its access road. This perception is accentuated by the sheer scale and visual grandeur of the mountain range as a whole. While modifications related to the ski area and its access road are visible from much of the catchment associated with the Kawarau River, Queenstown, and the southern Whakatipu Basin (albeit to varying degrees), their confined location and limited scale – relative to that of the Northern Remarkables in totality – limits impact on those areas and means that they are not dominant elements. These landscape modifications also make an important contribution to Queenstown's recreational values (see above), suggesting a degree of landscape 'fit'.
55. The elevated river terraces closer to the Kawarau River, where pastoral and viticultural land uses dominate, giving rise to a lower level of perceived naturalness within this part of the Northern Remarkables PA. Scattered farm dwellings, rural buildings, shelterbelts, woodlots, power lines, fencing, and tracks add to this impression in places and its 'cultural' dimension is further amplified by the predominance of exotic plant species near the river, including willows, poplars, broom, gorse and rosehip.

### **Memorability attributes and values:**

56. Views of the steep mountain slopes and crenelated ridges and peaks that top the range are highly memorable.
57. Experiences associated with accessing and using the Remarkables Ski Area, which are highly memorable.

### **Transient attributes and values:**

58. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain slopes.
59. The changing colours of pasture areas, which are green in some seasons and tawny brown in others.
60. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation (river edge poplars in particular).

### **Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

61. A strong sense of the sublime associated with the Northern Remarkables' main slopes, which contribute a sense of remoteness and wildness to their wider setting. Such feelings are less apparent near the valley floor, due to the more obvious influence of rural production, mostly on the south side and the presence of residential development along the northern edge of the ONL – most notably near Bridesdale, Lake Hayes Estate and Shotover Country. The valley corridor reveals significant landscape transition, from the sublime and predominantly natural, to the picturesque and cultural.

## Aesthetic qualities and values:

62. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
63. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. The highly attractive and striking composition created by the powerful and dramatic mountain slopes and peaks juxtaposed beside the more modified and 'tamed' river terraces.
  - b. At a broad scale, this 'natural' large-scale landscape scene forms a bold contrast with, and backdrop to, Queenstown and the Wakatipu Basin.
  - c. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. the sculpted exposed schist outcrops and scree slopes throughout the elevated slopes;
    - ii. the steeply incised Rastus and Owen Burns;
    - iii. the bold patterning of elevated fans and flat alluvial floodplains and terraces interspersed with steep escarpments;
    - iv. the picturesque glacial Lake Alta;
    - v. the relatively low-key and 'rural vernacular' or sympathetic style of the majority of built development; and
    - vi. the poplars along the river edge, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

## 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 combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for Northern Remarkables PA can be summarised as follows:

64. **Very High physical values** due to the proliferation of high-value landforms, geological features along with the vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area, acknowledging that these attributes are counterbalanced by the presence of pastoral and viticultural land uses, scattered farm buildings, rural buildings, shelterbelts, woodlots, powerlines, fencing, tracks and exotic vegetation near the river.
65. **Very High associative values** relating to:
  - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
  - b. The historic features and associations of the area.
  - c. The very strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
  - d. The significant recreational attributes.
  - e. The significant scenic values associated with the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road.

66. **Very High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The very high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its dramatic and highly appealing visual character. The attractive composition of both natural and rural / farmed landscapes, with a strong focus on the mountains (and river), are critical features of the area. The proximity of the area to Queenstown, the Whakatipu Basin, key gateways / scenic routes, accessibility and popular recreational features, which allows the experience of these values along with the area's transient values, also play a role.
- c. An impression of high naturalness arising from the dominance of the more natural landscape and the generally relatively modest or visually recessive nature of built development.
- d. A strong sense of remoteness and wildness associated with large-scale steep slopes and rugged peaks, which is heightened as a consequence of the area's close proximity to Queenstown and the Whakatipu Basin.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Northern Remarkables PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – some** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities (including at Chard Farm) that: integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; are designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – some** landscape capacity for activities on the very gently sloping to flat and low-lying terraces and floodplains (including at Chard Farm) that are: designed to be reasonably difficult to see in views from the Kawarau River, Twin River Trail, Bridesdale, Shotover Country and Lake Hayes Estate; are of a modest or sympathetic scale; have a low-key rural or non-urban character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access. **Extremely limited or no** landscape capacity on the mountain slopes and fans except for sensitively located and designed glamping activities.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farming, viticulture, existing recreational facilities, natural hazard mitigation risk or tracks and trails for recreational use, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral and viticultural land uses, **limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled or sympathetically located and designed buildings that reinforce existing rural character (including viticultural land use) and maintain openness where openness is an important existing landscape characteristic.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for extraction larger than farm / vineyard-scale quarries. **Limited** capacity for farm / vineyard-scale quarries that protect the naturalness and aesthetic attributes and values of the ONL.

- viii. **Transport infrastructure** (excluding Passenger Lift Systems) – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried, co-located with existing infrastructure 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.
- x. **Renewable energy generation** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation unless it is very discreetly located so that it is reasonably difficult to see from outside the site. **Limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation on the flat and low-lying terraces and floodplains.
- xi. **Forestry** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for exotic forestry.
- xii. **Rural living** – **very limited** landscape capacity for activities on the flat and low-lying terraces and floodplains that are: designed to be reasonably difficult to see in views from the Kawarau River, Twin River Trail, Bridesdale, Shotover Country and Lake Hayes Estate; are of a modest scale; have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access. **Extremely limited or no** landscape capacity on the mountain slopes and fans.
- xiii. **Passenger Lift Systems** – **limited** landscape capacity to improve public access to focal recreational areas higher in the mountains (including between lower lying areas and the Remarkables Ski Area Sub Zone) via non-vehicular transportation modes such as gondolas, (including base and terminal buildings and stations) provided they are positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, are located and designed to be recessive in the landscape.

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Animal pest species include feral red deer, feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
- B. Plant pest species include sweet briar which is often a component of grey shrubland, wildings conifers, buddleia, broom, and gorse.

---

## 21.22.15 Central Whakatipu Basin PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Central Whakatipu Basin PA encompasses an ONL being the steep western end southern slopes of Mount Dewar and the steep south-facing slopes of Coronet Peak, Brow Peak and Pt 1120 near Big Hill, taking in German Hill and Pt 675. Collectively the mountain slopes form the northern backdrop to the Whakatipu Basin and Arrowtown. The western edge of the PA adjoins Kimiākau (Shotover River) PA and the eastern end adjoins the Haehaenui (Arrow River) PA.

### Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

### Landforms and land types:

1. The steeply sloping, foliated, schistose mountain landforms of Mount Dewar (1,310m), Skippers Saddle (1,036m), Coronet Peak (1,651m), Brow Peak (1,456m) and Pt 1,120 near Big Hill which form part of the wall of mountains framing the northern side of the Whakatipu Basin.
2. Scree slopes throughout the elevated, very steep and rugged areas towards the eastern end of the area.
3. The secondary mountain landforms of German Hill (780m) and Pt 716 that enclose the southern side of Sawpit Gully (north of Arrowtown).
4. The secondary mountain ridgeline on the south side of Bush Creek (to the north of Millbrook), that takes in Pt 897, Pt 929, Pt 842 and Pt 876.
5. The ridgeline descending south-westwards from Mount Dewar summit to Pt 965 and which frame the eastern side of Devils Creek.
6. A small roche moutonnée along the foot of the Coronet Peak slopes between the Skippers Road junction and Willowbank, all on the north side of Malaghans Road. A well-preserved relic glacial landform from the last ice age. This feature exists as several landforms within the PA. Identified as a Geopreservation Site of national scientific, aesthetic, or educational value and being vulnerable to significant damage by human related activities.
7. Exposed schist outcrops and bluffs throughout the south-facing mountain slopes and along the east side of the small ice-melt basin in the vicinity of Littles Road.
8. Glacial till deposits and alluvial fans at the toe of the steep mountain slopes framing the northern side of the Whakatipu Basin and throughout the more gently sloping lower reaches of gullies near German Hill.

## Hydrological features:

9. Devils Creek and its steeply incised tributaries draining the south-western flanks of Mount Dewar and the northern slopes of the secondary ridgeline descending from Mount Dewar to Pt 965, to Kimiākau (Shotover River).
10. The unnamed relatively gently sloping streams and kettle lake in the ice-melt basin around Littles Road which drain south-westward to Kimiākau (Shotover River).
11. The numerous steeply incised streams draining the southern side of the range extending from Mount Dewar across to Coronet Peak, including Dan O'Connell Creek, Station Creek and McMullan Creek.
12. The numerous unnamed streams draining the southern slopes of Brow Peak to Bush Creek, which discharges to the Arrow River.
13. The series of unnamed streams draining to Sawpit Gully and the Haehaenui (Arrow River) from the mountain slopes extending between Brow Peak and Pt 1120 (near Big Hill) and German Hill.
14. The series of small tarns in the vicinity of Coronet Peak ski area and near Skippers Saddle.

## Ecological features and vegetation types:

15. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Pockets of mountain beech forest remnants confined to gullies in the Bush Creek and Sawpit Gully catchments behind Arrowtown, on the Coronet Peak front faces and in the Devils Creek catchment on Mount Dewar.
  - b. Swathes of beech restoration plantings throughout Mount Dewar (as part of consented development).
  - c. Extensive areas of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri (*Discaria toumatou*) and mingimingi (*Coprosma propinqua*) occur in the mid to upper reaches of the Bush Creek catchment, Sawpit Gully catchment and across the steep terrain associated with the lower Haehaenui (Arrow River) Gorge. Scattered patches of grey shrubland occur across the lower slopes of Coronet Peak and Mount Dewar.
  - d. Above about 900 m the vegetation is dominated by snow tussock grassland and, in places, patches of *Dracophyllum* shrubland.
  - e. Indigenous vegetation is more extensive and diverse towards the Arrowtown end of the PA.
  - f. Rough to semi-improved pasture occurs on the mid to lower slopes of Coronet Peak mixed with patches of short tussock grasslands and grey shrubland.
  - g. Woody exotic weeds prevail throughout the PA but are most extensive on the lower slopes of Mount Dewar, where there are dense thickets of mature hawthorn, sweet briar, broom, elderberry and scattered wilding conifers.
16. Rocky outcrops, beech forest, grey shrublands and snow tussock grasslands provide a diverse range of habitats for New Zealand falcon, New Zealand pipit, South Island tomtit. Grey warbler, skinks and geckos and a diverse assemblage of native invertebrates.
17. Other distinctive vegetation types:

Areas of production forestry (Douglas fir) occur:

  - a. across the south-facing slopes of the secondary mountain ridgeline on the south side of Bush Creek (to the north of Millbrook) that includes Pt 897, Pt 929, Pt 842, and Pt 876.

- b. on the lower slopes of Mount Dewar.

### **Land-use patterns and features:**

18. Human modification which is concentrated throughout the low-lying glacier carved terrace areas along the northern edge of the Whakatipu Basin; on the western flanks of Mount Dewar and across the south-facing slopes of the secondary mountain ridgeline on the south side of Bush Creek (to the north of Millbrook) that includes Pt 897, Pt 929, Pt 842, and Pt 876 where production forestry dominates; across Mount Dewar more generally, where development is anticipated; on the elevated south-facing slopes of Coronet Peak where the ski area (including carparks, buildings, structures, infrastructure) and roading (including Skippers Road, which provides access to the Skippers Bungy site, outside the PA) is located; and throughout the western portion of the PA at Coronet Peak Road.
19. Built development patterning which includes a very limited scattering of rural and rural living dwellings around the margins of Arthurs Point; the scattering of small-scale rural living and visitor accommodation development (including commercial recreation uses, cabins, chalets, amenity facilities and a lodge) within regenerating beech forest across the lower southern slopes of Mount Dewar along with approximately 50km of publicly accessible hiking and biking trails; and the occasional farm building or dwelling towards the eastern end of the unit (adjacent the southern boundary of the PA). Generally, development is characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings that are well integrated by plantings and remain subservient to the more 'natural' landscape patterns. Elsewhere, the modest scale of buildings, together with their distinctly working rural character and sparse arrangement, ensures that they sit comfortably into the setting.
20. Pastoral farming including rural and farm buildings (as described above), fencing, shelterbelts, tracks, ponds and the like.
21. The location of the Coronet Peak Ski Area (inclusive of all associated activities and built development) across the elevated south-facing slopes, together with the exposed nature of the access road climbing up the steep slopes at the western end of the area, make this development prominent in views from much of the western and northern portion of the Whakatipu Basin. Night-time lighting of the ski field during the winter season adds to its prominence.
22. The Shotover Canyon Track, the Mount Dewar Track, Hot Rod and Devils Creek track on Mount Dewar; the Dan O'Connell Track and Coronet Face Water Race Trail across the lower slopes of Coronet Peak; the ridgeline track linking between Coronet Peak and Big Hill that runs along the northern edge of the PA; the Bush Creek Track between Coronet Peak and Arrowtown; the Te Araroa Trail that winds its way to the west of German Hill (between Arrowtown and Big Hill) and the Sawpit Gully Track; the Rude Rock, Zoot, DH, XC mountain bike trails within the Coronet Peak ski area. Associated with these tracks are signage, stiles, and seating, typically of a modest scale and low-key character.
23. The general absence of rural and rural living buildings throughout the eastern end of the PA.
24. Infrastructure is evident within the corridor and includes: the power line (on poles) traversing the steep slopes up to Coronet Ski Area and Coronet Peak; telecommunication masts at the top of Mount Dewar; forestry tracks; farm fencing; and farm tracks.
25. The Arthurs Point Urban Growth Boundary (UGB) which adjoins the south-western margins of the PA and the Arrowtown UGB which adjoins the south-eastern end of the PA.
26. The Coronet Peak Ski Area Sub Zone which provides for the ongoing use and development of that area.
27. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include: the urban residential and commercial development adjoining the south-western edge of the PA at Arthurs Point; the urban residential and commercial development adjoining the south-eastern edges of the area at Arrowtown; the rural living development throughout the western and northern sides of the Whakatipu Basin; Millbrook Resort towards the north-eastern end of the Whakatipu Basin; and Malaghans Road which runs along the northern side of the Whakatipu Basin, roughly parallel with the PA.

## **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations are:**

28. The Macetown Heritage Area Overlay (MHAO) which extends throughout the eastern end of the PA roughly coinciding with Sawpit Gully. This forms part of the much larger area of heritage significance due to its concentration of historic gold mining sites, focussed on the deserted mining town of Macetown, which span from the earliest exploitation of gold in the Arrowtown area in 1862, through to the end of gold mining in the 1930s. Such a continuum of mining activity – first alluvial then hard-rock or quartz – has left a distinct and intelligible landscape with diverse features and stories linked by a series of mining tracks that still allow access to this remote and stunning countryside. Macetown (outside the PA) is highly significant, representing the surviving remains of a remote 19th century mining village to which stories are still attached and some history has been traced to its founders, occupants, and demise. Situated within its larger mining heritage context (which includes part of the PA), Macetown can be interpreted as part of a community of gold mining activity sites, which are a key part of the wider Otago gold mining story.
29. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, dams, etc., and associated domestic sites in the area (for example, archaeological sites F41/288, F41/851, and F41/653).
30. Cockburn Homestead, Malaghans Road (District Plan reference 125).
31. William Fox Memorial, Police Camp Building, and Stone Wall, Arrowtown (District Plan references 309, 375, and 311).
32. Macetown Road (District Plan reference 6).
33. Scholes Tunnel (District Plan reference 304).
34. Coronet Peak ski area.
35. Skippers Hotel (Part Lot2 DP16632).

## **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

36. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.

### **Associative Attributes and Values**

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

## **Mana whenua associations and experience:**

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

## **Historic attributes and values:**

38. Gold mining in the area and the associated physical remnants (including Skippers Road). The sites associated with Macetown represent a particularly rich archaeological landscape.
39. Early pastoral farming across the area.
40. The historic significance of Coronet Peak (New Zealand's first commercial ski field) as one of New Zealand's earliest commercial ski fields.



### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

41. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
42. The popularity of the postcard views from Coronet Peak and the ski field access road (which has several lookout points) out over the Whakatipu Basin to the Remarkables, as an inspiration/subject for art and photography.
43. The identity of Coronet Peak Ski Area as an integral part of the Whakatipu Basin. The very close proximity of this recreational feature to Queenstown urban area and its visibility from much of the Whakatipu Basin (and including from the airport, particularly at night when the ski field is lit for night skiing) play an important role.
44. Skippers Road is popular with commercial tourism activity providers using the access road for scenic tours and white-water rafting. The road is used for mountain bike access out of the valley.
45. The identity of the sequence of mountains stretching from Mount Dewar across to Big Hill as a dramatic (northern) backdrop to the Whakatipu Basin (including Arrowtown).
46. The identity of Mount Dewar as part of the dramatic backdrop to Arthurs Point.

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

47. Very popular year-round destination for outdoor recreation including skiing, snowboarding, walking, running, mountain biking, paragliding, hiking, orienteering and enjoying the view from the various trails and lookouts and café/restaurant facilities at Coronet Peak.
48. Aotearoa's National Walkway, the Te Araroa Trail passes through the eastern side of the PA via the Motatapu Alpine Track connecting with the Whakatipu Track heading to Lake Hayes.
49. Walking, running, and mountain biking on trails and tracks in the area.
50. Coronet Peak Road, Skippers Road and Malaghans Road as key scenic routes either within the PA or in close proximity.
51. The recreation area to the north of Millbrook.

### **Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

### **Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

52. The area's natural landforms, land type, and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial processes.
53. Indigenous gully plantings and remnant beech stands which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values throughout the area.
54. Good examples of landscape evolution in response to slope and fluvial processes and alternating climatic conditions.

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

55. The postcard views from various lookouts on Coronet Peak Road and the ski area out over the Whakatipu Basin, Waiwhakaata (Lake Hayes), Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), the Remarkables and the broader mountain context.
56. The spectacular panoramic views from Mount Dewar and the summit of Coronet Peak, of the Whakatipu Basin to the south and the rugged and dramatic expanse of the Harris Mountain range to the north.
57. The highly attractive short to long-range views from parts of the Devils Creek Track, the Hot Rod, the Mount Dewar Track, the Dan O'Connell Track, the Coronet Face Water Race Trail, the ridgeline track linking Coronet Peak and Big Hill that runs along the northern edge of the PA, the Bush Creek Track, the Te Araroa Trail west of German Hill, and the Sawpit Gully Track out over the Whakatipu Basin, the Remarkables and the broader mountain context.
58. The appealing short to long-range views from the Shotover Canyon Track and parts of the Devils Creek Track along the gorge of the Shotover Corridor, across the rugged and largely undeveloped slopes of Bowen Peak and northwards to The Point.
59. The dramatic mid and long-range views from Arthurs Point, the Kimiākau (Shotover River) ONF, Arrowtown, the western and northern parts of the Whakatipu Basin (including Malaghans Road), and sections of the Queenstown Trail network coinciding with those parts of the basin, to the coherent sequence of mountains framing the northern side of the basin. In these views the continuity of the large-scale and largely open, dramatic landforms, together with their seemingly undeveloped appearance (as a consequence of the diminishing influence of distance in relation to the ski field and access road), means that the PA is of critical importance in shaping the visual amenity values of the area from which they are viewed.
60. The engaging early evening views from Frankton and the airport to the Coronet Peak Ski Area when the ski field is lit for night skiing.
61. The appealing long-range views from more distant elevated vantage points such as the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road, Tobins Track (east of Arrowtown), and the Crown Range Zig Zag lookout in which the scale and shape of the glacial valley landscape, of which the PA is a part, is legible in its entirety and confers a sense of grandeur to the outlook.
62. The highly engaging short-range views from Littles Road, Arthurs Point Road and trails in the vicinity across the pastoral ice-melt basin to the dramatic and rugged bluffs and rocky outcrops near Pt 558.
63. In all of the views, the dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the ONL, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the ONL and, in the case of the western and eastern ends of the area, the contrast with the surrounding 'developed' landscape character, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

64. The open, and in places, 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Central Whakatipu Basin PA positioned adjacent an urban (Arthurs Point and Arrowtown) or mixed working rural and rural living (Whakatipu Basin) context, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to its forestry, pastoral (including farm buildings, rural dwellings, ponds, fencing, tracks, shelterbelts and the like), rural living and visitor accommodation (including the consented development across the lower southern slopes of Mount Dewar), recreational (including the ski area and access road), and infrastructure uses are visible, the sheer scale of the continuous high mountain-scape and extent of restoration planting that forms part of the consented development at Mount Dewar recreational, and infrastructure uses are visible, the sheer scale of the continuous high mountain-scape ensures that, for the most part, these elements remain subservient to more natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes.
65. The irregular patterning and proliferation of grey shrubland, exposed rock faces and scrub in places adds to the perception of naturalness.

66. While the ski area and its access road form a bold manmade element on the southern slopes of Mount Dewar and Coronet Peak, the connection this development establishes and enables between the mountain setting and the inhabited Whakatipu Valley adds a degree of interest to the view, meaning that it is not an overwhelmingly negative visual element. The scale of the seemingly 'undeveloped' mountain setting within which this development is viewed, together with its identity as a popular recreational feature, also play a role in this regard. Because these landscape modifications also make an important contribution to Queenstown's recreational values (see above), there is a degree of landscape 'fit' associated with them. During the ski season the patterning of lights throughout the groomed slopes forms an engaging element.
67. The forestry plantings and wilding spread at the western and eastern ends of the area (noting that recreational land-uses are anticipated across the slopes at the eastern end, north of Millbrook) contribute a reduced perception of naturalness. However, the underlying natural (and largely unmodified) schistose landform character of the area remains legible and dominant, thus ensuring these parts of the PA display at least a moderate-high level of naturalness. The visual appearance of these parts of the PA during and after harvesting cycles forms a prominent negative visual element within the broader landscape setting and serves to (temporarily) further reduce the perception of naturalness in this part of the PA.

### **Memorability attributes and values:**

68. The appealing and engaging views of the continuous mountains framing the north side of the Whakatipu Basin and the interplay of the mountain's humps and hollows with diurnal and seasonal variations from a wide variety of public vantage points. The juxtaposition of the large-scale and continuous rugged mountain sequence beside the basin landform, along with the magnificent broader mountain and lake context within which it is seen in many views, are also factors that contribute to its memorability.
69. The 'close up' experience of the alpine setting that the PA affords for many residents and visitors to Queenstown as a consequence of the relatively high accessibility of the area (via the ski field access road, ski field and tracks, gondola and chairlifts in close proximity to Queenstown and Arrowtown)
70. The panoramic alpine landscape views afforded from Mount Dewar, Coronet Peak Road, Coronet Peak Ski Area and Coronet Peak.

### **Transient attributes and values:**

71. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain slopes.
72. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with exotic vegetation.
73. Night lighting of the ski field during the ski season.

### **Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

74. A sense of remoteness across the upper northern slopes and ridges at the western end of the PA and at the north-eastern ends of the PA despite their respective proximity to Arthurs Point and Arrowtown, due to the contained nature of the area and the limited level of built development evident. Elsewhere, the proximity of the PA to urban areas and proliferation of recreation-based activities and facilities, roading and the ski area, reduce the impression of remoteness, particularly during peak seasonal use.
75. A limited sense of wildness across parts of the PA as a consequence of the large scale and continuity of the majestic mountain range framing the northern side of the basin along with its generally 'undeveloped' or open and in places, seemingly unkempt or rugged character. The contrast with the 'settled' and more manicured character of the basin plays an important role in this regard. Such impressions are reduced in the parts of the PA where forestry and the ski field/access road are located and where there is a concentration of recreation activities such as trails and paragliding and across the lower southern slopes of Mount Dewar where rural living and visitor accommodation development is consented.

## Aesthetic qualities and values:

76. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
77. More specifically:
- a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the continuous 'wall' of rugged and dramatic mountains framing the northern side of the Whakatipu Basin.
  - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. The large scale and dramatic character of the steep mountain landforms backdropping Arthurs Point and Arrowtown.
    - ii. The precipitous bluffs and rocky outcrops along the east side of the small ice-melt basin in the vicinity of Littles Road.
    - iii. The everchanging play of light and weather patterns across the mountain slopes.
    - iv. The openness of the mountain landforms and scree slopes.
    - v. The rugged and wild character of the western and north-eastern ends of the PA.
    - vi. The confinement of appreciably visible built development to the Coronet Peak Ski Area and its access road.

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

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for Central Whakatipu Basin PA can be summarised as follows:

78. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
79. **Very high associative values** relating to:
- a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
  - b. The historic features in the area.
  - c. The very strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
  - d. The significant recreational attributes of Coronet Peak Ski Area, Skippers Road and the network of walking and biking tracks in the area.
  - e. The scenic values associated with Coronet Peak Road.
80. **High perceptual values** relating to:
- a. The high legibility and expressive values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.

- b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area due to its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Arthurs Point, Arrowtown, the Whakatipu Basin, the scenic route of Malaghans Road, parts of the Queenstown Trail network, the Remarkables Ski Area Access Road, the Zig Zag lookout, and Tobins Track, along with the areas' transient values, play an important role.
- c. A moderate-high to high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of natural landscape elements and patterns across the PA. Impressions of naturalness are reduced in localised areas of the PA where forestry and recreational uses (including the ski area) are concentrated.
- d. A sense of remoteness and wildness throughout the north facing slopes at the western end and the upper north-eastern portions of the PA.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Central Whakatipu Basin PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – some** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – extremely limited** landscape capacity for tourism related activities outside the Coronet Peak Ski Area Sub Zone. **Very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are: co-located with existing development (including sensitive development associated with Skippers Hotel); sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity unless it is very discreetly located so that it is reasonably difficult to see from outside the site and has a rural character.
- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farming, tracks and trails for recreational use, existing recreational facilities, sensitive development associated with historic heritage, consented rural living and visitor accommodation development, or public access tracks, (excepting single track downhill / gravity mountain bike trails), that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with natural landform patterns. **Some landscape capacity** for earthworks associated with single track downhill / gravity mountain bike trails, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses **very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity, excepting very small-scale farm quarries.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure (excluding Passenger Lift Systems) – extremely limited or 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 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 and/or co-located with existing 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 – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for large scale renewable energy developments, unless it is very discreetly located so that it is reasonably difficult to see from outside the site. **Very limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for exotic forestry.
- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited** landscape capacity. Where such development is appropriate, it is likely to be: co-located with existing development (including sensitive development associated with Skippers Hotel); sited to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be small scale and have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access (where appropriate).
- xiii. **Passenger Lift Systems - limited** landscape capacity to improve public access to focal recreational areas higher in the mountains (including between lower lying areas and the Coronet Peak Ski Area Sub Zone) via non-vehicular transportation modes such as gondolas (including base and terminal buildings and stations), provided they are positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, are located and designed to be recessive in the landscape.

## **PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS**

- A. Wilding conifer spread in the Bush Creek and Sawpit Gully catchments, across Big Hill and in the Devils Creek catchment from areas of production of forestry. Control measures are being implemented.
- B. Animal pest species include feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, mice and rats.

---

## 21.22.16 Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA encompasses an ONL being the steep predominantly west-facing slopes of the mountain range framing the east side of the Whakatipu Basin stretching from the Arrow River to the Kawarau River. The PA takes in Pt 1108, Pt 1080, Pt 1331, Crown Peak, and Pt 1426. It also includes Mt Beetham, the New Chum Gully and the Crown Terrace Escarpment, and the lower reaches of feeder gullies on the Crown Terrace.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. The steeply sloping, foliated (in the geological sense, not botanical), schistose mountain landforms of Pt 1108, Pt 1080, Pt 1331, Crown Peak (1,731m), and Pt 1426 (including much of the western sides of Mt Scott), which form part of the wall of mountains framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin.
2. The numerous secondary and varying steep to more rounded ridgeline 'shoulders' extending westwards from the continuous (eastern) mountain 'frame' to the Crown Terrace Escarpment.
3. The cone-shaped roche moutonnée glacial landform of Mt Beetham with the smooth 'up-glacier' face along its west side and a steeper rough 'plucked' 'down-glacier' slope to the east. Rock outcrops throughout the elevated north-eastern flanks. Highest point: 929m.
4. Partly collapsed solifluction slopes above the Crown Terrace. (NB Solifluction is a collective name for gradual processes by which regolith (unconsolidated material overlying bedrock) moves down a slope ("mass wasting") generally caused by freeze-thaw activity.)
5. The steep large-scale and continuous remnant river terrace escarpment landform along the western edge of the Crown Terrace and the elevated glaciated terrace of the Crown Terrace itself (noting that the majority of the escarpment and terrace are outside the PA).
6. Glacial till deposits and alluvial fans at the toe of the steep mountain slopes framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin and along the finger of the Crown Terrace that extends between the western side of Mt Beetham and the Crown Escarpment (including New Chums Gully).
7. The distinctive Judge and Jury rock formations near the Kawarau Bridge.
8. Located on the western side of Mt Scott, the Crown Range Superimposed Folds formed in greenschist are identified in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory as a site of national importance and is rated as being robust and not considered to be vulnerable to most human-related activities.

## Hydrological features:

9. The numerous unnamed streams in the northern portion of the PA draining to the Arrow River, including along New Chums Creek along the New Chums Gully.
10. The numerous streams draining from the eastern mountain range across the Crown Terrace and down to the Arrow River via the Crown Escarpment. Including Royal Burn, Swift Burn, along with several unnamed watercourses. Generally the watercourses are steeply incised where they cross the Crown Escarpment.

## Ecological features and vegetation types:

11. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Below approximately 800m on the slopes facing the Arrow River and the lower section of New Chums Gully, a dense mosaic of shrubland with scattered areas of trees. The shrubland is dominated by sweet briar (*Rosa rubiginosa*) and matagouri (*Discaria toumatou*). Other shrub species include mingimingi (*Coprosma propinqua*), *Coprosma rugosa*, tutu (*Coriaria arborea*), NZ broom (*Carmichaelia arborea var arborea*), bush lawyer (*Rubus cissoides*) and koromiko (*Veronica salicifolia*).
  - b. Kowhai (*Sophora microphylla*) behind the Glencoe homestead in New Chums Gully.
  - c. Pockets of a diverse range of native shrubs in more inaccessible gullies (such as the narrow gorge at the head of New Chums Creek), including turpentine scrub (*Dracophyllum uniflorum*), *Astelia nervosa*, shrub daisy (*Olearia nummulariifolia*), native broom (*Carmichaelia petriei*), bush snowberry (*Gaultheria antipoda*), and mountain ribbonwood (*Hoheria lyallii*).
  - d. Pockets of matagouri and mingimingi across the Crown Terrace Escarpment and throughout gullies.
  - e. Expansive areas of short and snow tussock grassland throughout the eastern mountain frame between approximately 800m and 1,700m. Tall tussock (*Chionochloa rigida*) dominates on cool aspects with short tussock (*Festuca novae-zelandiae*) increasing in dominance with decreasing altitude. Pockets of grey shrubland dominated by matagouri and mingimingi throughout lower slopes.
  - f. Strong cover of silver tussock (*Poa cita*) throughout the eastern flank of Mt Beetham.
  - g. Narrow leaved snow tussock (*Chionochloa rigida amara*) dominates above 1,000m.
  - h. Cushionfields on ridge crest in vicinity of Crown Peak.
12. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. Exotic grasses and herbs mixed with tussock throughout the slopes below approximately 1,000m.
  - b. Sycamore and black poplars throughout the Crown Terrace Escarpment in the vicinity of Tobins Track and the Arrow River, and in parts of New Chums Gully below the shearing shed.
  - c. Sweet briar, broom, scrub, hawthorn, wilding conifers, and pockets of plantation forestry (larch and Douglas fir) across the Crown Terrace Escarpment.
  - d. Grazed pasture associated with the Glencoe Station land with mature exotic shade and amenity trees, orchard trees and pockets of bush and patches of scrub in gullies.
13. Diverse vegetation types and rocky terrain associated with the Crown Range and lower landforms including escarpments provide suitable habitat for New Zealand falcon, New Zealand pipit, grey warbler, fantail and silvereye and skink and gecko species.



### **Land-use patterns and features:**

14. Human modification which is concentrated: around the Glencoe Station homestead in New Chum Gully (north of Mt Beetham); roughly in the centre of the Crown Terrace Escarpment, where the Crown range (or 'Zig Zag') Road winds its way up the escarpment; and the southern end of the PA where the Crown Range Road winds its way around the southwestern flanks of Mt Scott.
15. Built development patterning which includes a cluster of rural dwellings and farm buildings associated with Glencoe Station in New Chum Gully (to the north of Mt Beetham); a limited scattering of rural living dwellings to the northwest of Mt Beetham (including consented but unbuilt platforms); two rural living dwellings to the north of the Zig Zag Road (one located at the base of the escarpment and one near the top); and a small cluster of rural living dwellings towards the southern end of the PA, northwest of the Kawarau Bridge (and accessed from Gibbston Highway). Generally development is characterised by carefully located and designed buildings that are well integrated by plantings and remain subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Elsewhere, the modest scale of buildings, together with their distinctly working rural character, ensures that they sit comfortably into the setting.
16. Several rural and rural living dwellings and farm buildings are located along the edges of the PA within the Crown Terrace and along the toe of the escarpment, south of the point where the course of Arrow River diverges from the base of the escarpment. With the exception of New Chum Gully environs, generally built development has been carefully located outside of the PA.
17. Tobins Track, Tobins Drop, Mt Beetham Track, the New Chum Gully Track, Peters Way, the New Chum Ridge Track, Miners Route, Brackens Saddle Track, Crown Peak Track (small section). Associated with these tracks are signage, stiles, and seating, typically of a modest scale and low-key character.
18. Infrastructure is evident within the northern and southern portions of the PA and includes: a section of the Cromwell Frankton. A 110kV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid in the vicinity of the Kawarau bridge (southern end of PA); a short section of power lines on poles servicing the rural living cluster near the Kawarau Bridge; the power/telephone lines (on poles) servicing Glencoe station and farm fencing / farm tracks.
19. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character and/or proximity include: the rural living development along the toe of the Crown Terrace Escarpment and the base of the range of mountains framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin (on the Crown Terrace); the close proximity of SH 6 (Gibbston Highway) which is on the western side of the southern end of the Crown Terrace Escarpment and the Crown Range Road, where it runs across the Crown Terrace.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

20. The Judge and Jury Rocks near the Kawarau Bridge (District Plan reference 9).
21. Historic farmstead at Glencoe Station and associated outbuildings.
22. Various inter-related complexes of gold sluicings, tailings, water races, dams, and associated domestic sites in the area (for example, archaeological sites F41/743, F41/632, and F41/633).
23. Notable transport routes and associated infrastructure, including Tobin's Track.

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

24. 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.
25. Parts of the ONL overlap the mapped Haehaenui (Arrow River) wāhi tūpuna. The southern extent of the ONL overlaps the mapped Kawarau River wāhi tūpuna. These wāhi tūpuna were part of a network of mahika kai areas, with the Kawarau River also being a traditional travel route between the Mata-au (Clutha River) and Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Wakatipu).

## 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:

26. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
27. Kāi Tahu tradition tells of an incident where a 280 strong war party was repelled from the Tititea settlement on the south side of the Kawarau river and chased to the top of the Crown Range, which is now named Tititea in memory of this incident.
28. The mana whenua values associated with the Eastern Wakatipu Basin PA include, but may not be limited to, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

### Historic attributes and values:

29. Gold mining in the area and the associated physical remnants including sluiced faces and water races.
30. Use of the Crown Terrace for pastoralism.
31. Glencoe homestead and remaining historic buildings from William Paterson's establishment of the Glencoe Run.
32. Historic transport tracks and infrastructure, including Tobins Track (constructed 1874) and features associated with the construction of SH6 (e.g. F41/744).

### Shared and recognised attributes and values:

33. The descriptions and photographs of the area in tourism publications.
34. The popularity of the postcard views from the Zig Zag lookout (on the Crown Range Road, where it scales the Crown Terrace Escarpment) out over the Whakatipu Basin and surrounding mountains, as an inspiration/subject for photography.
35. The high popularity of Tobins Track in part due to its very close proximity to Arrowtown.
36. The identity of the line of mountains along the eastern side of the PA in forming the dramatic 'eastern frame' of the Whakatipu Basin.
37. The identity of the Crown Terrace Escarpment (and distinctive 'zig zag' section of the Crown Range Road) as marking the transition between the mixed rural and rural residential landscape of the low-lying part of the Whakatipu Basin and the more overtly 'working' rural landscape of the Crown Terrace.
38. The identity of the sequence of mountains and the escarpment at the northern end of the PA as a dramatic (western) backdrop to Arrowtown.

### Recreation attributes and values:

39. Enjoying the view from the Zig Zag lookout on the Crown Range Road.
40. Walking, running, dog walking (where allowed) and mountain biking on Tobins Track, Tobins Drop, Mt Beetham Track, the New Chum Gully Track, Peters Way, the New Chum Ridge Track, Miners Route, Brackens Saddle Track, Crown Peak Track.

41. SH 6 Gibbston Highway and the Crown Range Road as key scenic routes either within the PA or in close proximity.

### **Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

#### **Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

42. The area's natural landforms, land type, and hydrological features (described above), which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative glacial processes.
43. Indigenous gully plantings and remnant vegetation which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values throughout the area.

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

44. The postcard views from the Zig Zag lookout (on the Crown Range Road), out over the Whakatipu Basin, Te Whaka-ata (Lake Hayes), Whakatipu Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu), Morven Ferry roche moutonnée, the Remarkables, Coronet Peak and the broader mountain context. The 'bird's eye' like quality of the vista across a complex mixed rural and rural living/resort landscape adds to its appeal. The accessibility of the vantage point also plays an important role.
45. The spectacular panoramic views from the Crown Peak Track, and the New Chum Ridge Track out over the Whakatipu Basin to the west and/or the rugged and dramatic expanse of the Crown Range to the east and north.
46. The highly attractive and engaging short to long-range views from Tobins Track and Tobins Drop, Mt Beetham Track, Peters Way, the New Chum Ridge Track, Miners Route, Brackens Saddle Track, out over the PA, the Whakatipu Basin, the Remarkables, and the broader glacial valley and mountain context.
47. The dramatic mid and long-range views from Arrowtown, the Arrow River ONF, the scenic routes of the Crown Range Road and SH6 Gibbston Highway, much of the Whakatipu Basin (including sections of the Queenstown Trail network) to the large-scale and coherent river terrace escarpment landform and/or the continuous sequence of mountains that frame the eastern side of the Crown Terrace. From more distant vantage points, the contrast established between these more natural landscape elements seen in combination with the gently sloping (predominantly) working rural 'plinth' of the Crown Terrace adds to the memorability and appeal of such views. At closer range, the large-scale, rugged and unkempt appearance of much of the Crown Terrace Escarpment reinforces its role as a 'break' between the more developed low-lying basin to the west and the (predominantly) working rural landscape of the Crown Terrace.
48. The appealing long-range views from more distant elevated vantage points such as the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road and Coronet Peak Road in which the scale and shape of the glacial valley and river terrace landscape that underpins the PA is legible in its entirety and confers a sense of grandeur to the outlook.
49. The highly engaging mid-range views from Glencoe Road, in which the roche moutonnée profile of Mt Beetham is clearly legible. The contrast between the landform feature and planar working rural context adds to the appeal of the outlook.
50. Engaging and seemingly close-range views from planes approaching or exiting Queenstown airport via the Gibbston Valley. Such views offer an appreciation of the broader glacial landscape context within which the PA is set.

51. In all of the views, the dominance of 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes evident within the PA, along with the generally subservient nature of built development within the PA, underpins the high quality of the outlook.

### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

52. The 'seemingly' undeveloped character of Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA set within the mixed working rural and rural living (Whakatipu Basin) context and/or the working rural setting of the Crown Terrace, which conveys a relatively high perception of naturalness. While modifications related to rural living, farming, forestry, recreational, and infrastructure uses are visible, the sheer scale and continuity of the high mountain-scape along the eastern side of the Crown Terrace and the river terrace escarpment landform along its western edge ensures that, for the most part, these elements remain subservient to natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes.
53. The irregular patterning and proliferation of grey shrubland, exposed rock faces and scrub in places adds to the perception of naturalness.
54. While the Crown Range Road forms a bold manmade element within the PA, the connection this development establishes and enables between the mountain setting, the inhabited Whakatipu Valley and further afield, Wanaka, adds a degree of interest to the view, meaning that it is not an overwhelmingly negative visual element. The scale of the seemingly 'undeveloped' escarpment and mountain setting within which this development is viewed, together with its identity as a popular scenic route, also play a role. Put another way, these landscape modifications also make an important contribution to Queenstown's recreational values (see above), suggesting a degree of landscape 'fit'.
55. The localised forestry plantings across parts of the Crown Terrace Escarpment contribute a reduced perception of naturalness in places. However, the underlying natural (and largely unmodified) rugged river terrace landform character of the area remains legible and dominant, thus ensuring these parts of the PA display at least a moderate-high level of naturalness. The visual appearance of these parts of the PA during and after harvesting cycles forms a prominent negative visual element within the broader landscape setting and serves to (temporarily) further reduce the perception of naturalness in this part of the PA.

### **Memorability attributes and values:**

56. The appealing and engaging views of the continuous 'wall' of mountains framing the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin from a wide variety of public vantage points. The juxtaposition of the large-scale and continuous rugged mountain sequence beside the elevated 'farmed' river terrace landform of the Crown Terrace contributes to its memorability.
57. The more developed context of the low-lying basin appreciated within the seemingly untouched mountain-scape beyond signals the role of the PA as a gateway. This factor, along with the magnificent broader mountain setting within which the PA is seen in many views, contribute to its memorability.
58. The dramatic closer-range views from low-lying vantage points throughout the eastern side of the basin to the rugged and large-scale escarpment which forms a bold contrast with the developed setting throughout the basin floor.
59. The distinctive landscape layering that is apparent in longer-range views where the patterning of the escarpment, stepping up to the farmed terrace and backdropped by the line of mountains (along the eastern edge of the terrace) is visible.
60. The 'close up' experience of the alpine setting that the PA affords for many residents and visitors to Queenstown as a consequence of the relatively high accessibility of the area via the Crown Range Road.
61. The panoramic alpine landscape views afforded from ridgeline tracks.

### **Transient attributes and values:**

62. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain slopes.
63. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with exotic vegetation.

### **Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

64. A sense of remoteness across the mountains along the eastern side of the Crown Terrace, due to their coherent and continuous large-scale character and the limited level of built development evident.
65. A sense of wildness across the Crown Terrace Escarpment portion of the PA as a consequence of its continuous rugged character along with its generally 'undeveloped' and, in places, seemingly unkempt character. The contrast with the 'settled' and more manicured character of the basin plays an important role in this regard.
66. Such feelings reduce in the parts of the PA where forestry, rural living, farm dwellings and sheds and the Crown Range Road are located.

### **Aesthetic attributes and values:**

67. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
68. More specifically:
  - a. The highly attractive and memorable composition created by the continuous 'wall' of rugged and dramatic mountains backdropping the distinctive river terrace escarpment, which together frame the eastern side of the Whakatipu Basin.
  - b. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. The cone like peak of Mt Beetham and its distinctive roche moutonnée profile.
    - ii. The uninterrupted and muscular sequence of predominantly tussock-clad steep to more rounded mountains and ridges along the eastern side of the Crown Terrace.
    - iii. The seemingly wild escarpment landform that forms a 'wall' along the eastern side of the basin floor and serves as a transition between the basin floor and the predominantly working rural landscape of the Crown Terrace.
    - iv. The ever-changing play of light and weather patterns across the mountain slopes.
    - v. The confinement of visible built development within the PA to lower lying flat to gently sloping land near Glencoe Road.
    - vi. The very limited level of built modification evident through the ONL.
69. It is noted that control of plant pest species such as wilding pines can temporarily detract from aesthetic values.

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

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for the Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA can be summarised as follows:

70. **High physical values** due to the high-value landforms, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features in the area.
71. **High associative values** relating to:
  - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
  - b. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
  - c. The significant recreational attributes of the network of walking and biking tracks in the area.
  - d. The scenic values associated with Crown Range Road.
72. **High perceptual values** relating to:
  - a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of physical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
  - b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its distinctive and appealing composition of natural landscape elements. The visibility of the area from Arrowtown, the Whakatipu Basin, the scenic routes of the Crown Range Road and SH6, parts of the Queenstown Trail network, the Remarkables Ski Field Access Road, Coronet Peak Road, and the airport approach path, along with the area's transient values, play an important role.
  - c. A high perception of naturalness arising from the dominance of more natural landscape elements and patterns across the PA.
  - d. A strong sense of remoteness and/or wildness across much of the PA. Such feelings are reduced in the parts of the PA where forestry, rural living, farm dwellings and sheds and the Crown Range Road are located).

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Eastern Whakatipu Basin PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation in low lying locations and clustered with existing buildings, that: is small scale-and has a

low-key rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhances public access. **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for tourism related activities in visually discreet low-lying locations, that is designed to: be small scale and have a low-key, rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.

- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity, unless it is very discreetly located so that it is reasonably difficult to see from outside the site and has a rural character.
- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks associated with farm tracks, existing recreational facilities, or tracks and trails for recreational use, that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, **very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity, excepting very small-scale farm quarries.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – extremely limited** landscape capacity for other transport infrastructure.
- 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 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 and/or co-located with existing infrastructure. 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.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation unless it is very discreetly located so that it is reasonably difficult to see from outside the site. **Limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for exotic forestry.
- xii. **Rural living – very limited** landscape capacity for rural living in the base of localised valleys, gullies and folds in the landscape and that have a small scale and low-key rural character; integrates landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhances public access.

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Animal pest species include feral goats, hares, possums, mice, rats, stoats, ferrets, feral cats, and rabbits.
- B. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, sweet briar, hawthorn, buddleia, sycamore, broom and gorse.

---

## 21.22.17 Victoria Flats PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Victoria Flats PA comprises the fluvio-glacial outwash terrace on the true right bank of the Kowarau River between Nevis Bluff and the Waitiri peninsula, and the immediate mountainous landforms enclosing the flats (including the eastern faces of Mt Mason). It is a small landscape unit within the wider ONL of the Mt Mason/Mt Rosa/Mt Edward range, the southern Pisa Range and the Carrick and Horne ranges and the Doolans (outside the district boundary). The PA overlays two areas of Gibbston Character zoning - between SH6 and the Kowarau River and on the flats south of the Queenstown Lakes District (QLD) landfill, as well as Rural zoned land.

The Kowarau River PA passes from west to east through the Victoria Flats PA. The PA boundaries include those that follow the topographical edges of the Kowarau Riverine system (refer Kowarau River PA Schedule) which separates the upper extent of the river gorge with adjacent land of a flatter and distinctly different character.

There are three sub-areas within the PA, being: the flat fluvio-glacial outwash terrace (the 'Flats'); the steep surrounding mountain slopes and knolls, and the river corridor / gorge – which passes through the PA and is addressed in the 21.22.9 Kowarau River PA Schedule.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. A small fluvio-glacial terrace on the true right bank of the Kowarau River comprising slightly weathered outwash gravels and measuring approximately 2.2 km long in an east-west direction and 1.6 km wide in a north-south direction. It is bisected by the Gibbston – Cromwell Highway (SH6). Large boulders scattered across the flats, with a greater density close to Nevis Bluff, are thought to have been deposited by a debris flow from a landslide that dammed the river and formed a lake at the bluff.
2. The Kowarau River corridor / gorge.
3. Enclosing schist mountain slopes: including the eastern face of Mt Mason, the lower slopes of Mt Malcolm and the western escarpment of Waitiri Peninsula. Steep strongly eroded slopes with thin leached soils.
4. The upstream boundary of the PA is Nevis Bluff, formed from grey and greenschist. One of the best exposures of greenschist in New Zealand and a limburgite dike cutting the Haast schist. This landform is recognised in the NZ Geopreservation Inventory as having national significance.

### Hydrological features:

5. Kowarau River, which passes through the Victoria Flats PA (refer Kowarau River PA Schedule for landscape attributes and values).
6. Water storage ponds for previous mining or farm irrigation and ponds constructed as part of the landfill and quarry activity.



7. Irrigation water race from a spur of Mt Mason across the flats.

### **Ecological features and vegetation types:**

8. Mainly unimproved pasture on the flats, (with a high density of invasive species such as sweet briar, elderberry and broom). Screen planting of predominantly eucalypts around the QLDC landfill and an avenue of poplars on the access road.
9. Recent indigenous revegetation plantings at the Oxbow commercial recreation facility, the Wakatipu Gun Club and on the screening mounds for the quarry and processing yard north of SH6.
10. Rough pasture on the mountain slopes, (with a high density of sweet briar) and occasional matagouri on the shadier slopes and wetter toe slopes. Transition within the PA to very dry barren hillslopes in the eastern sector that support little vegetation (other than thyme and sweet briar).
11. Flocks of black backed gulls are frequent, attracted by the QLDC landfill.

### **Land use patterns and features:**

12. Mountain and hill slopes within the PA are undeveloped and have largely been retired from pastoral farming. The flats themselves, which include the Gibbston Character Zone that support several rural industrial, residential and commercial/community recreation activities, which have reduced levels of naturalness to varying degrees including:
  - a. The QLD solid waste facility, which dominates the flats, with the designated landfill buffer extending across the terrace from SH6 to the enclosing hillslopes and knolls. The presence of the landfill including its odour has influenced the nature of subsequent development, with no established rural living or viticulture, despite Gibbston Character zoning and some approved residential building platforms;
  - b. Quarry, gravel processing and cleanfill operation within the Gibbston Character Zone between SH6 and the river, screened from the road by planted mounds;
  - c. Commercial/community recreation facilities, including but not limited to the Wakatipu Clay Target Club shooting range, the Oxbow Adventures Facility (jetboat sprinting, clay target shooting, off-road vehicles), and access to the Nevis bungy facility. Remnant tracks from previous off-road 4-wheel drive commercial recreation. Facilities include small buildings, parking areas and planted mounds that screen activities from SH6.
  - d. Consented residential / rural lifestyle building platforms and other commercial operations exist on the terrace flats.
13. The remaining 'flats' that are not developed (as per 12a – 12d above) are relatively small in area and are used for low intensity grazing/baleage, with a few scattered sheds, or have been retired from productive use.
14. The Kawarau River PA passes through the Victoria Flats PA. Other than a very small area of tracking associated with quarrying activity on the outwash flats above, the narrow river corridor is unmodified and highly natural other than the presence of some exotic species including weeds.
15. The Cromwell-Frankton A 110kV overhead transmission line that forms part of the National Grid along the southern periphery of the flats and over Mt Mason to the Gibbston Valley.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

16. History of 19<sup>th</sup> century and early 20<sup>th</sup> century gold mining along the Kawarau River, with numerous archaeological sites along the river's edge and frequent evidence of sluicing and tailings. Within the PA, sites include ferry crossings, the historic road formation across the flats, stone ruins, the sites of the Victoria Bridge Hotel (archaeological site F41/195) and Edward's Ferry Hotel (archaeological site

F41/202), areas of sluicing and tailings and significant gold mining sites such as Doolan's Creek Tunnel (archaeological site F41/2080).

17. The supports of the Victoria Bridge over the Kawarau (constructed in 1874) are a QLDC Category 3 listed heritage feature (QLDC Ref. 223).

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

18. 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.
19. The PA overlaps the mapped wāhi tūpuna Kawarau River (refer Kawarau River PA Schedule for landscape attributes and values).

### **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:**

20. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
21. The Kawarau River was a traditional travel route that provided direct access between Whakatipu-Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) and Mata-au (the Clutha River).
22. The Kawarau is a significant kāika mahika kai where weka, kākāpō, kea and tuna (eel) were gathered.
23. The mana whenua values associated with the ONL include, but may not be limited to, ara tawhito, mahika kai and nohoaka.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

24. The strong associations of the Kawarau River valley with 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> century gold mining and early European settlement, with physical evidence of ferry sites, mining activities and associated settlement.
25. Historic route between the Clutha River Mata-au and Whakatipu-Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu).

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

26. Shared and recognised values as part of the dry, barren and wild rural hinterland of the Kawarau valley downstream of Nevis Bluff, experienced by people travelling between Cromwell and the Whakatipu Basin on SH6.

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

27. Destination for commercial and community recreation activities.
28. The Queenstown Trail and the walking trail connecting Victoria Flats and Gibbston Valley over Mount Mason and Mount Rosa.

## Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

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

### Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

29. Moderately legible glaciofluvial outwash terrace, partially modified by alluvial gold mining, landfill activities and screening mounds.
30. Legible evidence of an historic landslide near Nevis Bluff in the large boulders scattered across the flats.
31. Highly legible and expressive river gorge and highly legible processes of uplift and erosion in the open and craggy mountain slopes.

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

32. Views from SH6 across the flats to the enclosing mountain ranges and hills. Some built development is evident in views, as the landfill and other activities on the flats are (or will be) largely screened by mounding and planting. From SH6, the flats appear relatively unkempt, with rough pasture and predominantly natural patterns of vegetation cover (mainly exotic sweet briar and elderberry). The flats have a more modified landscape character than the surrounding higher ground within the PA and are dominated and strongly enclosed by the dry rugged slopes of the mountains. There is a strong contrast between the remote rough rural character of the flats and the viticultural landscape of the main Gibbston Valley west of Nevis Bluff.
33. Views from the Mt Rosa walking track as it ascends the hillslopes of Mt Mason take in the entire northern area of the flats, including the gravel processing facility within the Gibbston Character Zone, clay shooting range and Oxbow Adventures facility. The landfill is largely screened by planting or topography. The aesthetic coherence and perceived naturalness of the flats is undermined by the spread of rural industrial and recreational activities, but the surrounding mountains remain dominant in the views.

### Naturalness attributes and values:

34. Despite modified vegetation cover, weed infestation and farm tracks, the mountain slopes and knolls around the flats retain a high level of naturalness.
35. Within the Victoria Flats PA, the 'terrace flats' area has been partially modified and now retains only a low-moderate level of naturalness. The SH6 corridor contributes to this. However, the level of naturalness perceived from SH6 remains relatively high, as most existing and consented, but as yet unbuilt activities are/will be largely screened from road view leaving the surrounding, higher mountain slopes and knolls as the prominent landscape features.

### Memorability attributes and values:

36. Forms part of a highly memorable journey through the barren, seere and strongly enclosed landscape of the Kawarau Gorge, downstream of Nevis Bluff. The wildness and inhospitable nature of the gorge add to its memorability.

### Transient attributes and values:

37. Changing colours of pasture across the seasons, spring flowering of sweet briar and elderberry, and the play of light and shadow on the craggy mountain slopes.

### Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

38. A sense of relative remoteness and wildness, particularly when away from SH6.

## Aesthetic attributes and values:

39. The experience of the attributes identified above by a significant number of residents and visitors travelling on SH6.
40. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. The strong sense of enclosure by steep dry eroding mountain slopes.
  - b. The sense of relative remoteness and wildness, and the contrast with the more tamed and inhabited Gibbston Valley.
  - c. The relatively moderate-high level of naturalness perceived from SH6, with most development effectively screened by mounding and/or planting including natural and introduced vegetation cover (albeit largely exotic weeds) apparent.

## 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 Victoria Flats PA:

41. **Moderate-high physical values** relating to the river and its escarpments, the unmodified uplifted mountain ranges, and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
42. **Moderate associative values** relating to the mana whenua associations of the area, the historic attributes of the river and flats and the shared and recognised values as part of dry rural hinterland of the Kawarau valley downstream of Nevis Bluff.
43. **Moderate-high perceptual values** relating to:
  - a. The legibility and expressiveness attributes of the river gorge and mountain slopes.
  - b. The aesthetic and memorability values of the area due to its strong enclosure by dramatic eroded mountain ranges, its dryness, barrenness and relative wildness and remoteness.
  - c. A relatively high impression of naturalness arising from the dominance of the more natural landscape over visible built development.
44. **Low-moderate** physical, associative and perceptual values associated with the more modified parts of the terrace flats, typically where roading, buildings, quarrying activities and the landfill are located.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Victoria Flats PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – **some** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that are set back from SH6; integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access (where appropriate).

- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation on the terrace flats south of SH6 where such development can be screened when viewed from SH6, is of an appropriate scale and character, will integrate with and complement/enhance existing development and will not compromise the identified landscape values in the broader context. **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for **tourism related activities** on the terrace flats south of SH6 and where not visible from SH6.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – some** landscape capacity on the terrace flats for intensive agriculture that maintains views to the surrounding mountains from SH6.
- v. **Earthworks – limited** landscape capacity for earthworks and tracks and trails for recreational use that protect historic, naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings – limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – some** landscape capacity for extraction that is screened from SH6 by landform and/or vegetation and is remediated to enhance the naturalness and aesthetic values of the ONL.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low key ‘rural’ roading on the flats.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – some** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is co-located with existing facilities and is designed to minimise visual prominence from SH6. In the case of the National Grid **limited** landscape capacity for the upgrade of existing infrastructure within the same corridor and 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 from SH6, including associated earthworks.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation. **Very limited** landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation that is screened from SH6.
- xi. **Forestry – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale production forestry on the flats that maintains views to the surrounding mountains from SH6.
- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity alongside SH6. **Some** landscape capacity for rural living development south of the landfill.

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Plant pest species include sweet briar, thyme, elderberry and broom.
- B. Animal pest species include rabbits, stoats, ferrets, rats and mice.

---

## 21.22.18 Cardrona Valley PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Cardrona Valley PA covers the ONL within the north-south oriented valley enclosed by the Cardrona Range/Harris Mountains to the west and the Pisa/Criffel Range to the east. The PA extends to the crest of the western Pisa Range flanks and to the landforms visually containing the valley to the west, including the eastern flanks of Mount Cardrona and a ridge of Mount Alpha. In a north-south direction the PA starts just north of Timber Creek and ends at Blackmans Creek about 3.25 kilometres upstream of Cardrona village. The majority of the Cardrona Ski Area Sub-Zone falls within the area.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. A deeply cut fault valley with a flat alluvial floor of up to 700 m in width below Cardrona Village, narrowing above this point.
2. The Pisa/Criffel Range: the westernmost and highest element of the characteristic 'basin and range' fault block landscape that stretches across Central Otago. The parallel schist ranges of this sequence are characterised by broad planar crests and frequent tors. The western flanks of the range are relatively even in gradient and form a linear eastern 'wall' to the valley, with few significant ridges or gullies apart from Tuohys Gully.
3. Cardrona low hills: low hills and terraces of strongly weathered sandstone-dominant gravels between the valley floor and the main Cardrona Range/Harris Mountains. An angular ridge and gully landform, with alluvial flats and small terraces.
4. The Cardrona Range/Harris Mountains: dissected mountain slopes and hummocky slump topography with scattered schist outcrops and schist tors at higher elevations on Mount Cardrona.
5. Contains the Geopreservation Sites: Branch Creek Road faulted aggradation on an alluvial surface; and the NW Cardrona Fault at Blackmans Creek. These are regionally significant and not considered vulnerable to most human activities.

### Hydrological features:

6. The Ōrau (Cardrona River) is the most important water course within the PA, flowing the length of the valley. It is a usually shallow water course with gravel substrate, low banks, and substantial seasonal and weather-related flow variations. There is also significant surface water–shallow groundwater interactions with the river having adjacent influent and effluent reaches that may vary temporally. Significant floods occasionally spread across the valley floor (for example 1878 and 1999).
7. Other larger water courses are Tuohys Creek, Branch Burn (McPhees Creek) and Spotts Creek.

8. The water courses within the valley are a fishery resource and spawning habitat. They provide habitat for longfin eels, kōaro, upland bullies and Clutha flathead galaxias (nationally critical) and brown and rainbow trout.

### **Ecological features and vegetation types:**

9. Particularly noteworthy vegetation types include:
  - a. Kānuka shrubland / forest succession on mountain slopes towards the Upper Clutha mouth of the valley.
  - b. Grey shrubland communities on lower elevation south and east facing slopes and within prominent gullies in the Spotts Creek, Branch Creek and Boundary Creek catchments and bordering the main stem of the Cardrona River upstream of Cardrona township. Some of these shrublands are SNAs. The shrublands support tree daisy communities, including the At-Risk Declining *Olearia lineata*. Patches of bracken are common in and around areas of shrubland.
  - c. *Dracophyllum* shrubland on shady wetter faces and within gullies.
  - d. Dryland vegetation character, including tussock grasslands on mid and lower slopes.
  - e. Distinct gradient of indigenous vegetation types on Mount Cardrona from mixed grey shrubland-exotic grassland near the valley floor to mid slope short tussock grasslands in the montane zone to tall snow tussock grasslands and mixed snow tussockland-*Dracophyllum* spp. and herbfield communities in the sub-alpine and alpine zones. Small alpine wetlands (cushion and sedge bogs) occur in the upper basins on Mount Cardrona associated with low gradient streams and flushes.
10. Other characteristic vegetation types are:
  - a. Improved irrigated pasture on the valley floor, on flats within the Cardrona hills, and on some lower slopes of the Pisa/Criffel Range.
  - b. Short tussock over-sown with pasture on the lower and mid-slope mountain faces and Cardrona hills.
  - c. Crack willows lining the Cardrona River and other water courses.
  - d. Groups of exotic shelter trees around station homesteads, including distinctive mature Lombardy poplars.
  - e. Plantation of Douglas fir near Spotts Creek.
11. Valued habitat for skinks and geckos, a wide range of invertebrate species (including the threatened flightless shield bug and Otago endemic grasshopper), New Zealand falcon, Australasian harrier, New Zealand pipit, South Island oystercatchers, banded dotterels, black fronted tern, paradise shelduck and grey duck.

### **Land use patterns and features:**

12. On the less developed slopes, including some areas which have been retired for conservation and recreation purposes, a natural dryland vegetation cover including tussock grasslands prevails. In the valley floors and on the more accessible slopes and terraces the predominant land use is pastoral farming, although some areas have been retired for conservation and recreation. The Cardrona Ski Area Sub Zone partly within the PA, and the Southern Hemisphere Proving Ground and Nordic Skiing Snow Farm are just outside of and accessed through the PA on the Pisa Range. Access roads to these activities are visually prominent within the landscape. Apart from Cardrona Valley Road and some roads around Cardrona Village which are sealed, all public and private access roads are unsealed.

13. Cardrona Village (Settlement Zone) is the main settlement within the valley, but significant urban development is anticipated and is starting to occur within the Mount Cardrona Special Zone. Some rural living development is present north and south of the village, and there is also a loose cluster of farming, commercial and other development including the Cardrona Distillery near the Cardrona Alpine Resort Road intersection. Widely spaced station homestead clusters set within areas of mature exotic trees are a feature of the flats and lower valleys, and there are a few consented but undeveloped building platforms in the Timber Creek gully on Hillend Station.
14. Ski area activities occur on the upper eastern slopes of Mount Cardrona and comprise significant built development (including ski fields, chairlifts, terminal and base station buildings and transport infrastructure), within the landscape but are not visually prominent from the valley floor.
15. With the exception of Cardrona Village and development near the Cardrona Alpine Resort Road intersection, buildings are generally well integrated within the landscape by existing landform features and/or established trees, so they are not highly visible from Cardrona Valley Road.
16. Aurora Energy electricity distribution lines servicing the village, ski areas and proving ground follow the valley floor, and there are substation sites adjacent to Cardrona Valley Road.
17. Gravel extraction has been undertaken at times in the Cardrona River and side streams.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

18. Rich history of 19<sup>th</sup> century gold mining and early European pastoral farming throughout the valley, with numerous archaeological and heritage features. These include the Roaring Meg and Little Criffel pack tracks, river flat ground sluicing and tailings, hydraulic sluiced cliffs, the Criffel Face and Tuohys Gully sluicings and reservoirs, water races, tunnels, dredge remains, domestic sites and homestead sites associated with historic farming. There are large, sluiced cliffs and water races extending along almost the entire length of the valley and at Mount Cardrona.
19. Historic route between Wānaka and Queenstown, and between Cromwell and Cardrona via Tuohys Gully.
20. Scheduled heritage sites include Old Butchery, Tuohy's Gully (QLDC ref. 500); Studholme Nursery Plaque, Cardrona Road (QLDC ref. 510), Hotel façade, hall and church, Cardrona (QLDC ref. 510).

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

21. 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.
22. The Ōrau (Cardrona River) has been identified as a wāhi tūpuna by Kāi Tahu.

### **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:**

23. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
24. The Ōrau is a traditional ara tawhito (travel route) linking Whakatipu-Waimāori (Lake Whakatipu) with Lakes Wānaka and Hāwea. It also provided access to the natural bridge on the Kawarau River.



25. Ōrau is also recorded as a kāika mahika kai where tuna (eels), pora ('Māori turnip'), āruhe (fernroot) and weka were gathered.
26. The mana whenua values associated with the ONL include, but may not be limited to, mahika kai, ara tawhito, nohoaka.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

27. The very strong associations of the valley with 19<sup>th</sup> century gold mining, with physical evidence of mining activities and associated settlement, preservation and interpretation of mining areas on both conservation and private, and names of claims being retained in place names.
28. Strong associations with high country dryland vegetation cover including tussock grasslands, pastoral farming, including historic buildings, homestead clusters/former sites, and features, places and station names.
29. Historic route between the Upper Clutha and Whakatipu Basins.

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

30. A nationally and regionally renowned scenic and historic route between Queenstown and Wānaka, and a gateway for both the Upper Clutha Basin and the Whakatipu Basin.
31. An internationally recognised tourist, high performance alpine sport, and recreational destination.
32. High country dryland vegetation character, including tussock grasslands and divaricating shrublands, punctuated with exposed rock outcrops at higher altitudes.

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

33. Very popular destination for trout fishing, mountain biking, hiking, horse trekking, snowsports, as well as visits to historic sites and commercial recreation activities such as the distillery, mountain carting and shuttle services in the summer season for mountain biking/hiking and horse trekking providers.
34. The area features the highly popular Cardrona Ski Area Sub Zone, providing a year-round destination offering snow-based recreation such as skiing/snowboarding in winter and hiking/mountain biking opportunities in the summer. Year-round activities are also facilitated here, such as sightseeing, star gazing, mountain carting. The access road to Snow Farm (a ski touring area) is also within the PA area.
35. Popular walking trails including: Tuohys Track/Roaring Meg Pack Track, Spotts Creek Track, Little Criffel Track.
36. The Cardrona Valley Road is a popular route for both locals and visitors due to the distinct and engaging valley views.
37. Other popular tracks include diverse mountain biking trails and horse trekking trails within the valley.
38. The area is also a location for high performance sport e.g., skiing, snowboarding and LANDSAR training.

### **Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

### **Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

39. Easily legible form of the valley, with long views available up and down, and the close, steep mountain walls or hills providing a strong sense of enclosure. Landforms are highly expressive of their formative

processes and the open character of the mountains due to the low, dryland vegetation cover, including tussock grasslands means that the hummocky or gullied surface of the land is clearly displayed.

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

40. Dramatic and highly attractive views from Cardrona Valley Road to the contained valley floor and enclosing mountains. The scale of the landforms and their proximity dwarf the viewer, giving a sense of sublime grandeur. There is a progressive opening up of views as people move down the valley, particularly north of the Cardrona Village node and Cardrona Distillery complex. From this point the consistent 'wall' of the Pisa/Criffel range, with its open, natural and relatively wild character, dominates views across the sparsely inhabited 'working farm' rural foreground. To the west, views are often enclosed by the pastoral land of the Cardrona low hills but in places (e.g. north of Cardrona Village, Branch Creek, Spotts Creek and Timber Creek) vistas open out to the rugged and often snow-covered Mount Cardrona and Harris Mountains in the distance. Activities within the Cardrona Ski Area Sub Zone are reasonably difficult to see from the road and the Mount Cardrona Station Special Zone is largely screened by rising topography.
41. Spectacular panoramic views from ski field roads, ski areas and Little Criffel Track, taking in the greener and more vegetated valley, and the contrasting open expanses of tawny or craggy surrounding mountains, with glimpses to the Upper Clutha Basin in the north.

### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

42. The landscape is perceived as having a high level of naturalness, particularly to the south of the Cardrona settlement. Little apparent human modification is present on the mountain slopes and Cardrona hills other than roads, tracks, pasture improvements and fencing. Natural spread of kānuka, grey shrubland and bracken on the mountain slopes and gullies are evidence of a progression towards regenerating native forest, and remaining tussocklands on the mountains enhance the naturalness of the landscape.
43. The presence of development on the valley floor, in Cardrona Village, in Mount Cardrona Special Zone, and in the Cardrona Ski Area Sub-Zone (including access roads) modifies perceptions of naturalness, but pastoral land on the valley floor is still perceived as a pleasant rural foreground to the mountains and hills and retains a significant level of naturalness. The ski areas, village and special zones are nodes of human occupation and development within a landscape dominated by natural patterns and farming land use.

### **Memorability attributes and values:**

44. Highly memorable journey through a large, enclosed valley with views of dramatic mountain ranges, largely clothed in dryland vegetation / tussock grasslands enhanced by their changing vegetation colours and snow cover across the seasons.
45. Highly memorable views from elevated roads, tracks and ski areas within the PA that take in the entire valley form and its relationship to the Upper Clutha Basin.

### **Transient attributes and values:**

46. Seasonal snowfall and ice, large variations in the Cardrona River flow, changing green, brown and tawny gold of pastoral areas, the characteristic autumn colours of poplars and willows, changes in the play of light and shadow on the hummocky mountain slopes, and the presence of birdlife and stock.

### **Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

47. A sense of remoteness and wildness can be experienced on walking and mountain biking tracks within the landscape, including Tuohys Track and Spotts Creek Track and in locations away from Cardrona Valley Road on the high-country stations and the ski areas when viewing the surrounding landscape.

## Aesthetic attributes and values:

48. The experience of the values identified above by a significant number of residents and visitors travelling on Cardrona Valley Road or visiting Cardrona village and the ski areas (including access roads).
49. More specifically:
  - a. The muscular unmodified slopes of the Pisa/Criffel range with their relatively even gradient and crest.
  - b. The craggy Cardrona Range/Harris Mountains largely clothed in natural dryland vegetation including tussock grasslands.
  - c. The contrast between the mountains and the pastoral alluvial flats and terraces in the valley floor and on the low hills.
  - d. The strong sense of enclosure within a long, straight and legible valley.
  - e. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. the open tussock grasslands and indigenous shrublands on the mountain slopes;
    - ii. the presence of snow and ice during winter months;
    - iii. the contrasting and changing colours of sky, mountain slopes, snow cover and rocky outcrops;
    - iv. the play of light and shadow on the mountain slopes;
    - v. Historic buildings, buildings that display a historic character and scattered station homestead clusters in the valley and Cardona hills;
    - vi. the rural character and mature exotic trees within the valley;
    - vii. the autumn colours of willows and poplars on the valley floor, contributing to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

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

These various physical, associative and perceptual attributes and values described above for the Cardrona Valley PA come together and can be summarised as follows:

50. **High physical values** due to the high value landforms, faulted valley, Cardrona River, the range of vegetation features and habitats, and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
51. **Very high associative values** relating to the mana whenua associations with the area, the historic attributes of the valley, the very strong shared and recognised values, and the popularity of the area as a tourism and recreational destination.

52. **High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The legibility and expressiveness values deriving from the visibility and openness of the landscape, enabling a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its dramatic and highly appealing visual character and the large number of people visiting or moving through the valley.
- c. An impression of high naturalness arising from the dominance of the more natural landscape over built development and landform modification.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Cardrona Valley PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – some** landscape capacity for activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features, particularly the Cardrona Ski Area Sub-Zone. Activities should be: located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of existing natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – some** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are: co-located with existing facilities; designed to be of sympathetic scale, appearance and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement and enhance public access. **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for tourism-related activities outside of the Settlement Zone, Mount Cardrona Station Special Zone and SASZ except where co-located with the Settlement Zone on the valley floor and is: of a modest or sympathetic scale; has a low-key, visually recessive 'rural' character; integrates appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhances public access; integrates a strong defensible edge to avoid the potential risk of development sprawl; and complements the existing character of Cardrona settlement.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – some** landscape capacity on the valley floor that maintains naturalness and scenic views from roads.
- v. **Earthworks – limited** landscape capacity for earthworks that protect historic, naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values, and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns. **Some** capacity for tracks and trails for recreational use.
- vi. **Farm buildings – limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for gravel extraction in the Cardrona River riverbed only that protects the naturalness and aesthetic attributes and values of the ONL.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low key 'rural' roading and carpark areas on the valley floor that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns. **Very limited** landscape capacity for additional roads, upgrades or expansions to existing roads, carparking areas and passing bays on the enclosing mountain slopes of the valley.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that it is screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. 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 – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. **Limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited** landscape capacity for small scale production forestry on the valley floor.
- xii. **Rural living – limited** landscape capacity for rural living development co-located with existing development on the valley floor and Cardrona hills and sited so that it is set back from Cardrona Valley Road and contained by landform and/or existing vegetation – with the location, scale and design of any proposal ensuring that it is generally difficult to see from external viewpoints. **Very limited** landscape capacity for rural living development close to Cardrona Village or Mount Cardrona Special Zone without cumulative adverse effects on the rural character and naturalness of the PA.
- xiii. **Passenger lift systems – limited** landscape capacity to improve public access to focal recreational areas higher in the mountains (including between lower lying areas and the Cardrona Ski Area Sub Zone) via non-vehicular transportation modes such as gondolas, provided they are positioned in a way that is sympathetic to the landform, are located and designed to be recessive in the landscape.

## **PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS**

- A. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, crack willow, sweet briar and lupin.
- B. Animal pest species include deer, goats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, mice and rats.

---

## 21.22.19 Mount Alpha PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Mount Alpha PA comprises an ONL being the northern and eastern slopes of Roys Peak (1,578m) and Mount Alpha (1,630m), a north-south oriented mountain range that extends from Damper Bay in the north to Cardrona Valley Road in the south. On the eastern side the PA includes the hummocky glaciated land between Waterfall Creek and Damper Bay, and the upper Alpha fan immediately south of Wānaka township.

There are four sub areas within the PA:

- The mountain slopes;
- The Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay area (from the toe of the mountains to the edge of Wānaka (Lake Wānaka);
- The upper Alpha fan; and
- The glacial outwash/alluvial terrace at the southern end of the PA.

### Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Mana whenua

### Landforms and land types:

1. Mount Alpha range, a north-south oriented mountain range rising from the Cardrona Valley to a height of 1,630m at Mount Alpha and 1,578m at Roys Peak before descending to Damper Bay. Forming part of the Harris Mountains, it comprises steep uplifted schist that is visibly scoured on the eastern faces by previous glaciations, resulting in characteristic horizontal striations and areas of exposed bedrock. Waterfall, Stoney and Centre creeks have carved deep valleys into the eastern mountainside, draining basins on the higher slopes. On the southern side, the range is dissected by stream gullies flowing to the Ōrau (Cardrona River).
2. The upper Alpha fan, a prominent and distinctive wedge-shaped fan that has been truncated by river erosion (possibly as part of a Wānaka glacial event about 15,000-18,000 years ago). It is a composite alluvial fan system made up of numerous coalescing smaller fans from Centre and Stoney creeks and the other small water courses that drain the mountain slopes.
3. The series of relatively small roches moutonnées wrapping around the base of Roys Peak on the lake edge and reducing in scale and drama from Damper Bay to Wānaka township. The tallest (415m) and most distinctive is Ironside Hill. The schist outcrops rise steeply from the lake, with prominent bluffs on the Damper Bay headlands.
4. An area of remnant Quaternary outwash/alluvial terrace in the southern part of the PA, with steep escarpments leading down to the Cardrona Valley.

## Hydrological features:

5. Waterfall Creek is the main water course on the eastern mountain faces, flowing from a wide basin catchment below the peak of Mount Alpha, through deeply eroded gorges and bluffs and across lower ice-eroded flats to the lake. The waterfall the creek is named for is visible from Wānaka – Mount Aspiring Road and is a local landmark.
6. Timber Creek drains the southern faces of the Alpha Range but most of its tributaries are outside the PA.
7. Centre and Stoney Creeks originate above the Alpha fan. While ephemeral in nature, they naturally carry significant debris from the mountain slopes during high rainfall events and contribute to ongoing aggradation on the Alpha fan.
8. Small wetlands in the Damper Bay to Waterfall Creek area, where the elevated rocky outcrops on the lake edge naturally impede the drainage of surface water.

## Ecological features and vegetation types:

9. Particularly noteworthy vegetation types include:
  - a. Snow tussock grasslands, cushionfields and herbfields above 1,100m;
  - b. Remnant mountain and silver beech and indigenous shrublands in the gorged sections of Waterfall Creek;
  - c. Early successional processes for native forest regeneration including regenerating kānuka shrubland with varying densities of bracken and matagouri along the lake edge landforms and on the lower mountain slopes below 1,100 m near Wānaka;
  - d. Areas of indigenous planting and restoration planting along Wanaka-Mount Aspiring Road, the Millennium Trail / Glendhu Bay Track, including on private properties;
  - e. Wetland vegetation (sedgeland, rushland and reedland) in small wetlands in the Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay area, between Wānaka - Mt Aspiring Road and Lake Wānaka.
10. Other characteristic vegetation types are:
  - a. Improved or semi-improved pasture below 1,100m, with sweet briar and occasional shelter trees and wilding pines;
  - b. Irrigated pasture or cropping on the southern outwash terrace;
  - c. Small scale forestry plantations and shelter belts on the escarpment faces around the southern outwash terrace, on some toe slopes of the mountain and in the Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay valley; ongoing management of wilding spread on the lower slopes.
  - d. Deciduous exotic trees associated with rural living development and stock shelter in the Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay area.
11. Beech forest remnants in Waterfall Creek, broadleaved shrublands and the rugged terrain provide suitable habitat for New Zealand falcon, South Island tomtit, bellbird, grey warbler, fantail and silvereye. The tussock grasslands and rocky areas in the sub-alpine and alpine zones provide suitable habitat for skinks and geckos, including Mount Roy gecko recorded in 1999, New Zealand falcon, New Zealand pipit and a range of invertebrate species.

## Land use patterns and features:

12. Predominant land use is extensive pastoral farming (Hillend Station to the south, Alpha Burn to the north and Hawthenden Farm on the Alpha fan). Roys Peak and the southern slopes of the range are part of the conservation estate. A wedge of conservation land also covers the upper basin catchment of Waterfall

Creek and extends down the ridge on the true left of Waterfall Creek, with a connection to Wānaka – Mount Aspiring Road.

13. Apart from pastoral management, human modification on the mountain range is limited to farm and recreational tracks, fencing, airstrips, water tanks, farm buildings and the use of fire and chemicals for vegetation control purposes. Telecommunication infrastructure on Roys Peak and on the ridge at Hillend and a large, sealed visitor carpark at the start of the Roys Peak track. Improved irrigated pasture and seasonal cropping on the upper Alpha fan and on the southern moraine plateau.
14. Low density rural living and small farming/viticulture on lots of between 20 and 100 ha (with a few smaller 4-8 ha lots) and a lodge are located in the Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay area. There are 9 small undeveloped rural living lots around the southern moraine plateau on Hillend Station. Dwellings are largely set back from public roads and from the Millennium Trail / Glendhu Bay Track and well-integrated by landform and/or vegetation so that they are generally reasonably difficult to see from these public places. A few dwellings are clearly visible from Wānaka – Mount Aspiring Road, and some are visible along the lake edge from the surface of Lake Wānaka.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

15. Associated with the early pastoral use of Mount Alpha and surrounding land as part of the Wanaka Station, including historic homesteads at Hillend and Hawthenden.
16. Scaife Plaque (QLDC ref. 511) on Mount Roy adjacent to the Roys Peak track, commemorating the grave site of Wallis Alan Scaife (who owned Glendhu Station in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century).

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

17. 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.
18. The ONL overlaps parts of mapped wāhi tūpuna 7, 11 and 34: Area surrounding Te Poutu Te Raki (Matukituki River delta, Glendhu Bay and Surrounds), Ōrau (Cardrona River) and Wānaka (Lake Wānaka).
19. Lake Wānaka is highly significant to Kāi Tahu and is a Statutory Acknowledgement under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.
20. The ONL includes the entirety of the Lake Wānaka (Ruby Island Road) nohoanga, a contemporary nohoaka (camping site to support traditional mahinga kai activities) provided as redress under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlements Act 1998.

### **Associative Attributes and Values**

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values •

### **Mana whenua associations and experience:**

21. The whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
22. The mapped area covers a vast area with kaika mahika kai which were once part of the extensive mahika kai network in the area. Tuna, kāuru, weka, kākāpō and aruhe were gathered throughout the area.
23. Lake Wānaka is one of the lakes referred to in the tradition of “Ngā Puna Wai Karikari o Rakaihautu” which tells how the principal lakes of Te Wai Pounamu were dug by the rangatira (chief) Rakaihautu. Through



these pūrakau (stories), this area holds a deep spiritual significance both traditionally and for Kāi Tahu today.

24. The Ōrau is a traditional ara tawhito (travel route) linking Whakatipu Waimāori with Lakes Wānaka and Hāwea. It also provided access to the natural bridge on the Kawarau River.
25. The mana whenua values associated with the Mount Alpha PA include, but may not be limited to, kāika, mahika kai, ara tawhito, nohoaka, urupā and wāhi taoka.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

26. Significance as part of an early pastoral landscape, which later became part of the large Wanaka Station landholding. History maintained in the ongoing pastoral land use and in the naming of landscape features such as Roys Peak (presumably named after the early runholder, John Roy), Damper Bay and Ironside Hill. Damper Bay was named after 'damper' cooked there by an early settler, 'Dublin' Jack Shepherd. Slaughterhouse Creek near the unformed Lake Road was named after a nearby slaughterhouse that supplied Wānaka with fresh meat in the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

27. Internationally recognised destination for recreation and for the spectacular panoramic views from Roys Peak.
28. Very highly valued as part of the setting, scenic quality and sense of place of Wānaka township.

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

29. Internationally recognised walking track to Roys Peak, which is incredibly popular in the summer months and includes a large carpark and toilets located on the Wānaka Mt Aspiring Road; connecting tramping route along the Mount Alpha ridge to the Cardrona Valley (Spotts Creek Track).
30. Walking, running and mountain biking on the Millennium Trail / Glendhu Bay Track around the lake foreshore from Wānaka township to Glendhu Bay, with beaches at Ironside Hill and Damper Bay for picnicking. The Millennium Trail / Glendhu Bay Track forms part of the Te Araroa Trail.
31. Backcountry tramping and hunting.
32. Popular road biking routes along Wānaka - Mt Aspiring Road.

### **Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

### **Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

33. Legibility of mountain uplift, glacial scarification and fluvial erosion along the eastern face of the range; series of striking ice-eroded landforms along lake edge; distinctive 'wedge' form of the upper Alpha fan; southern ridge of the mountain range that defines the entry to the Cardrona Valley. Formative processes of the PA are legible and highly expressive.

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

34. Dramatic and highly valued panoramic views (very popular as 'selfies' and postcard images) from Roys Peak over Lake Wānaka and the Motatapu and Mātakitaki (Matukituki) valleys.

35. Views from Wānaka township, where the distinctive eastern mountain faces and the upper Alpha fan are visually dominant. They form an important part of the scenic quality of the area, because of the massive scale, rugged peaks, coherent appearance and strong contrast with the lake waters and flats. Ironside Hill is an important landmark along the western lakeshore, as together with the Damper Bay headlands it forms the visual boundary of Roys Bay to the west.
36. Engaging and attractive close range views of the Wānaka lake margin, lake escarpments and roches moutonnées from the Millennium Trail (part of Te Araroa). While attention is often focused on the spectacular panorama of lake and its surrounding mountain ranges, the rocky bluffs, beaches and vegetation-covered escarpments alongside the trail contribute strongly to the character and appeal of the views. Little built development is visible from the trail and there is progression towards higher perceived naturalness and a greater sense of remoteness as people travel from Ruby Island Road to Damper Bay.
37. Highly attractive views from Wānaka - Mount Aspiring Road to the close and dominating mountain slopes, with their natural patterns of bracken and shrubland regeneration and exposed schist outcrops and ridges, and across the farmland of the Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay valley to the series of hummocky ice-eroded landforms and the more distant lake and mountains. The remaining openness and legibility of the series of roches moutonnées along the lake edge contributes to the high quality of these views.
38. Spectacular views from popular trails on the slopes and summit of Mount Iron to the entire eastern extent of the Mount Alpha/Mount Roy range, including the distinctive wedge-shaped form of the upper Alpha fan, and to the distinctive ice-eroded landforms along the lake edge. The changing effects of light and shade on these landforms and the natural patterns of regenerating indigenous vegetation add to their aesthetic appeal.

#### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

39. High level of perceived naturalness, despite management of vegetation for pastoral farming. Very few built structures and only limited evidence of landform modification on the mountain slopes and Alpha fan. Presence of alpine tussocklands and areas of remnant or regenerating woodland and shrubland. Moderate level of naturalness in the Waterfall Bay to Damper Bay area. Natural elements of pasture, vegetation and wetlands remain dominant, but the presence of farming/viticultural land uses, and rural living modifies perceptions of naturalness, particularly from Wānaka – Mount Aspiring Road. Users of the Millennium Trail / Glendhu Bay Track perceive a higher level of naturalness, as their experience is dominated by the lake, relatively unmodified beaches and landforms, and indigenous regeneration around the trail.

#### **Memorability attributes and values:**

40. The visual dominance of the mountain range and the landmark qualities of the ice-eroded schist outcrops along the lake edge, contrasting with the lake surface, are significant and valued components of people's remembered images of Wānaka.

#### **Transient attributes and values:**

41. Changing snow levels, light, and shadow patterns on the open rugged slopes and roches moutonnées, and the changing colours of pasture areas, which are green in some seasons and tawny brown in others.

#### **Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

42. Due to its proximity to urban Wānaka and the farming or rural living land uses in the valley, the majority of the PA does not have a strong sense of remoteness. However, people using the Spotts Creek route over Mount Alpha to the Cardrona Valley experience a high level of remoteness and wildness.

#### **Aesthetic attributes and values:**

43. The experience of the attributes outlined above by a large local and visitor audience in Wānaka township, on public roads and on the Millennium Trail / Glendhu Bay Track and Roys Peak tracks.

44. More specifically, this includes:
- a. The spectacular and dominating eastern faces of the range and their contrast with the lower ice-eroded shelf and lake waters.
  - b. The openness of the landforms and their resulting high level of expressiveness.
  - c. The distinctive more gently sloping and smoother form of the upper Alpha fan.
  - d. The striking series of unmodified schist outcrops along the lakeshore, enclosing Roys Bay.
  - e. The very high national and international profile of the Roys Peak track and the spectacular panoramic views available from the summit.
  - f. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. the tussocklands and mosaic of indigenous vegetation on the mountain slopes, creek gullies and schist outcrops;
    - ii. the play of light and shadow on the open topography of the mountain slopes and schist/moraine landforms;
    - iii. the low-density rural character of the Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay area, with domestication largely screened from public places by topography or vegetation.

## 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 Mount Alpha PA come together and can be summarised as follows:

45. **High physical values** as a consequence of the largely unmodified mountainous landform, alluvial fans and roches moutonnées, the presence of native forest and shrubland regeneration, indigenous tussocklands, and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
46. **Very high associative values** relating to mana whenua associations, including kāika, mahika kai, ara tawhito, nohoaka, urupā and wāhi taoka, the ability to access and experience the landscape and the very strong shared and recognised values as part of the sense of place and aesthetic quality experienced by residents of and visitors to Wānaka.
47. **Very high perceptual values** relating to:
  - a. The expressiveness values as a result of the open character and legible uplift, glacial and fluvial formative processes;
  - b. The high aesthetic and memorability values due to the proximity to urban Wānaka, the dominant scale, highly attractive character and visual coherence of the PA, and its contrast with urban areas and the lake waters.
  - c. An impression of high naturalness arising from the legible and unmodified landform and the limited extent of built structures.

## Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – **some** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that do not require built infrastructure on the mountain slopes and upper Alpha fan. **Limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure associated with commercial recreation in the Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay area and on the southern moraine plateau that is: co-located with existing consented facilities; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement and enhance public access (where appropriate).
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity on the mountain range or upper Alpha fan. **Very limited** landscape capacity in the Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay area and on the southern moraine plateau for visitor accommodation activities. **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for tourism related activities. Both activities shall be co-located with existing consented activities, designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access (where appropriate) and have a low key 'rural' character.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **some** landscape capacity in the Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay area and on the southern moraine plateau. **Limited** landscape capacity on the upper Alpha Fan. **Extremely limited or no** landscape capacity on the mountain slopes.
- v. **Earthworks** – **limited** landscape capacity for earthworks that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns. **Some** capacity for tracks and trails for recreational use that are located to integrate with existing networks, designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – **limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings on lower mountain slopes, plateaus and flats that reinforce existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction** – **very limited** landscape capacity for small farm-scale extraction in the Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay area and southern moraine plateau.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure** – **very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low key 'rural' roading and public parking in the Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay area that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is co-located with existing facilities, buried or located such that it is screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, **limited** landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- x. **Renewable energy generation** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation. **Limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation in the Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay area and on the southern moraine plateau.
- xi. **Forestry** – **very limited** landscape capacity for small scale forestry on toe slopes, plateaus and flats that is consistent with the area's ONL values.

- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity on the mountain slopes and upper Alpha fan. **Very limited** capacity for rural living development in the Waterfall Creek to Damper Bay area and on the southern moraine plateau that is: contained by landform and/or existing vegetation – with the location, scale and design of any proposal ensuring that it is generally not discernible from external viewpoints. Developments should be of a modest scale; have a low key ‘rural’ character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement and enhance public access (where appropriate).

## **PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS**

- A. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, sweet briar and lupin.
- B. Animal pest species include ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, mice and rats.

---

# 21.22.20 Roys Bay PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

## General Description of the Area

The Roys Bay PA encompasses the ONL of the Roys Bay and Bremner Bay area of Lake Wānaka as far north as Beacon Point. It includes Mātakitaki (Ruby Island) ONF and the lakefront reserves from Ruby Island Road in the west to Beacon Point in the east.

## 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 •

## Landforms and land types:

1. Mātakitaki (Ruby Island): schist bedrock island overridden by the glaciers that formed Lake Wānaka.
2. Range of generally small-scale landforms developed under lakeshore processes and periods of high lake level.
3. Lake beach deposits and associated landforms around the shores of the bay.

## Hydrological features:

4. Lake Wānaka: important attributes include the clarity, quality and significant extent of the water body and its character as a deep glacial lake surrounded by ice-eroded landforms and terminal moraines. The lake is a nationally significant fishery.
5. Creeks flowing into the bay: Stoney Creek and the spring-fed Bullock Creek.

## Ecological features and vegetation types:

6. Regenerating kānuka woodland on the lake margins north of Ruby Island Road and north of Bullock Creek outlet.
7. Mixed poplars, willows, kānuka and Douglas fir on the lakefront between Bullock Creek and Beacon Point, with a mature mixed conifer forest at Eely Point.
8. Mixed indigenous vegetation plantings, willows and poplars between Eely Point and Beacon Point, with potential for further enhancement through additional plantings and removal of exotic woody weeds such as broom.
9. Lake margins provide habitat for a range of indigenous water birds, including the nationally critical, black-billed gull, the nationally vulnerable Australasian crested grebe, which nests at the Bullock Creek outlet and Wānaka Marina, and the New Zealand scaup. Bullock Creek which flows through the township into Lake Wanaka is a valued habitat for fish spawning.
10. Restoration planting on Mātakitaki (Ruby Island), providing habitat for a range of indigenous fauna, including some that are rare on the mainland.

### **Land use patterns and features:**

11. Lakefront reserve land: recreational parkland, including manicured open space, walking/running/cycling trails, playgrounds, toilet facilities, picnic areas and seating, shelters, public art and parking areas.
12. Lake edge and waters: permanent and temporary jetties at the head of the bay; additional boating facilities at Marina Reserve. Boat moorings are present around the marina and in a cluster south of Eely Point. Swimming platforms are moored at the head of the bay in summer.
13. Community recreation buildings.
14. Council infrastructure (water intakes and treatment facilities).
15. Council development plans for the foreshore between the Wānaka Yacht and Powerboat Club and the Mount Aspiring Road carpark involve upgrade and formalisation of the reserve, with continuous walking/cycling connections, additional facilities, ecological enhancement, and relocation of informal parking to formed carparks or road edges. Potential expansion of the marina is included in the plan.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

16. Protected giant sequoia trees on the lakefront near the Wānaka Watersports building.
17. Mature Lombardy poplars and willows lining the lake margins between Rippon Vineyard and Bullock Creek.
18. Site of the old homestead and associated mature trees at Wānaka Station Park, adjacent to the PA.
19. Site of the 1920s and 1930s tearoom and Saturday night 'cabaret' (QLDC ref. 514) on Mātakitaki (Ruby Island).
20. Midden/oven remains located near Beacon Point (archaeological site F40/10).

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

21. 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.
22. The ONL is mapped within the wāhi tūpuna Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) and overlaps with the wāhi tūpuna Take Kārara (central Wānaka area).
23. Lake Wānaka is highly significant to Kāi Tahu and is a Statutory Acknowledgement under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1988.

### **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:**

24. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
25. Wānaka is one of the lakes referred to in the tradition of "Ngā Puna Wai Karikari o Rākaihautū" which tells how the principal lakes of Te Wai Pounamu were dug by the rangatira (chief) Rākaihautū. Through these pūrakau (stories), this area holds a deep spiritual significance both traditionally and for Kāi Tahu today.

26. Take Kārara was a kāika nohoaka (seasonal settlement) at the southern end of Lake Wānaka. It was also a pā and a kāika mahika kai (food-gathering site), where pora (“Māori turnip”), mahetau (potato), tuna (eels) and weka were once gathered.
27. The mana whenua values associated with this area include, but may not be limited to, wāhi taoka, mahika kai, ara tawhito, kāika and nohoaka.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

28. Early Māori occupation around the lakeshore.
29. Historic recreational use of the lake, lakeshore and islands.
30. Historic use of the lake for transport and tourism.
31. History of early European pastoral farming at Wanaka Station, including the old homestead site adjacent to Roys Bay and the mature trees on the lakefront, planted during early settlement.
32. Historical attributes embodied in place names: Roys Bay named after John Roy, the first pastoral runholder in the district in 1859; Eely Point, believed to derive from ‘Healy’, an early resident of the point; Bremner Bay, named after the Bremner family who resided on Eely Point or Lakeside Road.

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

33. Nationally and internationally recognised visitor destination.
34. Significant contribution of the bay to the character, amenity and sense of place of downtown Wānaka and the wider district.
35. Colourful autumn displays of the poplars and willows that line the head of the bay, celebrated in tourism promotions and in the autumn ‘Festival of Colour’ arts festival.
36. Iconic photograph locations along the lakefront, including the willow within the lake waters in the western corner of the bay.

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

37. Lake Wanaka is classified as a Nationally Significant Fishery due to both its physical and recreational significance.
38. Highly popular and valued foreshore reserves, used for passive recreation, picnics, children’s play, walking/running/cycling, swimming, water sports, campervan parking and events. The shallow warmer lake waters at the head of the bay and in Bremner Bay make these locations popular for picnics and swimming.
39. Commercial recreation activities including bicycle hire, paddleboard/kayak hire, jetboat and jetski rides, guided lake cruises, unguided water taxis and fishing charters.
40. Mātakitaki (Ruby Island) is a popular picnic and boating destination.
41. Te Araroa (New Zealand’s Trail) and Ngā Haerenga (New Zealand Cycle Trails) pass along the lake shore from Beacon Point to Wānaka township.



## 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

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

42. Iconic postcard views from the head of Roys Bay up the lake to The Peninsula and the Southern Alps, framed by Eely Point to the east, and by Ironside Hill and Ruby Island to the west. Variations in the character of the view at different times of the day, and in different weather conditions and seasons, enhance the scenic values of the views.
43. Highly attractive sequential views experienced as people travel on the network of trails around the bay. Views are focused on and dominated by the open expanse of the lake and the enclosing mountains, as well as the lakeshore vegetation and activities. The consistent linking elements of lake water, beaches, continuous parkland and trails and lake shore vegetation enhance the coherence of landscape.
44. Views from the lake waters within Roys Bay and from Mātakitaki (Ruby Island) towards Wānaka township. Indigenous and exotic vegetation along the edges of the bay and at Eely Point provide an identity and setting for the township, and the autumn colours of willows and poplars add to the appeal of these views.

### Naturalness attributes and values:

45. Lake Wānaka has a very high level of natural character due to of the clarity and quality of the waters and the very low overall level of human modification on the lake margins and enclosing landforms. Roys Bay is a confined landscape unit within the lake that is more modified and has lower natural character than the rest of the lake. The moderate natural character of the bay results from the physical attributes of the unmodified lake waters, beaches and indigenous vegetation, combined with the largely manicured parkland character of the reserve, the built modifications on the lake surface (moorings, marina and jetties), the buildings close to the margins, and the surrounding urban, suburban and rural living development. Human modification is greatest at the head of the bay and less noticeable west of Rippon Vineyard and north of Eely Point. Within the bay, the lake and its immediate margins are perceived as having a moderately high level of natural character.

### Memorability attributes and values:

46. Highly memorable for the dramatic and sublime contrasts between the fringing vegetation, the expanse of lake waters and the surrounding mountains, with constant change across days and seasons.

### Transient attributes and values:

47. Significant transient values related to the influence of climatic conditions on the lake colour and texture, changing light effects during the day, variations in mountain snow levels and vegetation colours, changing lake levels and the autumn colours of willows and Lombardy poplars along the lakeshore.

### Aesthetic attributes and values:

48. Very strong aesthetic attributes and values, due to the large number of residents and visitors able to be immersed in and move through the PA ~~and~~ which includes the following attributes:
  - a. Dramatic and sublime views across the lake to the mountains.
  - b. Dramatic transient effects of light and weather conditions and the changing seasons.
  - c. Moderately high perceived natural character of the lake waters and margins.

- d. Manicured parkland character of reserves at the head of the bay, contrasting with the more informal and indigenous character of reserves to either side.
- e. The iconic Lombardy poplars and willows, and their autumn colours, contrasting with the blue of the lake and skies.

## 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 Roys Bay PA can be summarised as follows:

- 49. **Moderate-high physical values** due to the clarity, quality and largely unmodified nature of the lake and its margins, the regenerating indigenous vegetation, the recreational land and water uses, and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
- 50. **Very high associative values** relating to the mana whenua associations of the area, the very strong recreational attributes of the landscape, and the significant shared and recognised values as a visitor destination, iconic photography location, and as part of the sense of place and identity of Wānaka and the wider district.
- 51. **High perceptual values** relating to the coherence of area, the quality and amenity of the linking reserve parkland and vegetation, the moderately high level of perceived naturalness at the lake edge, and the strong aesthetic and memorability values resulting from the dramatic and sublime views available across the expanse of lake to surrounding mountains, enhanced by the transient effects of weather, light and the seasons.

## Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character; enhance public access and integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement. Landscape capacity is greater at the head of the bay and in Marina Reserve than in other parts of the PA.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- v. **Earthworks – very limited** landscape capacity for earthworks that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns. **Some** landscape capacity for additional tracks and trails for recreational use that complement the manicured parkland or informal character of lakeshore reserves.
- vi. **Farm buildings – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.

- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity for additional vehicle access/parking that is designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character and enhances public access.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is co-located with existing facilities, buried or designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character. 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 – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xii. **Rural living – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xiii. **Community recreation buildings – very limited** landscape capacity for buildings that are co-located with existing activities; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character and maintain or enhance public access.
- xiv. **Jetties, boatsheds, lake structures and moorings – very limited** landscape capacity for additional moorings within the bay that are within the existing spatial extent of consented moorings. **Limited** landscape capacity for additional jetties within Marina Reserve that enhance public access. **Limited** landscape capacity for expansion of the existing marina that: integrates with existing activities within Marina Reserve and is designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character.

## PLANT PESTS

- A. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, crack willow, hawthorn, sweet briar, broom and lupin, along with the aquatic weeds lake snow algae (*Lindavia intermedia*) and *Lagarosiphon major*.

---

## 21.22.21 West Wānaka PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The West Wānaka PA extends from the Mātakitaki (Matukituki River) mouth to Damper Bay on Wānaka (Lake Wānaka). This includes Roys Peninsula ONF, the Motatapu River valley, the roche moutonnée down its eastern side, and much of the Alpha Range. It also encompasses parts of Wānaka (Lake Wānaka), including Paddock Bay, Bishops Bay, Parkins Bay, and Glendhu Bay. The Fern Burn Valley also falls within this area.

### Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

### Landforms and land types:

1. The Harris Mountains: these form the western boundary of the Fern Burn and Motatapu Valleys. These contain extremely steep and visually rugged landforms, including deeply incised gorges and canyons, extensive rock outcrops, and bluffs. Treble Cone and End Peak are prominent features along the eastern ridge of the range.
2. The Alpha Range: which defines the eastern side of the Fern Burn valley, capped by the distinctive peaks of Mt Alpha and Roys Peak.
3. A series of roche moutonnée to the north-west include:
  - a. Pt 782m between Hospital Flat and Parkins Bay and the Glendhu and Emerald Bluffs;
  - b. Rocky Mountain north of Hospital Flat; and
  - c. Roys Peninsula north of Glendhu/Parkins Bay.
4. A number of moraine outwash areas: which are located below these features, including along the western side of Fern Burn Valley. These contain material deposited by retreating ice and now have the form of long moraine ridges that are characterised by their undulating profiles, together with extensive ablation and terminal moraine material.
5. The fan of the braided Mātakitaki (Matukituki River): comprising fluvial gravels with sand and loess deposits around Paddock Bay and the base of Roys Peninsula. The river flats, delta, and fluvial terraces of the Mātakitaki (Matukituki River) include that system's valley floors and floodplains.
6. The western Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) shoreline: comprising the indented bays of Parkins, Paddock and Glendhu Bays, which are separated from the main lake by Roys Peninsula. A gravel foreshore and low-lying lake and river terraces, resulting from both lake shore deposits and post-glacial river alluvium, are apparent towards the south, interspersed with distinctive steep banks and escarpments. The outwash material of the Fern Burn Fan separates Glendhu Bay from Parkins Bay.

## Hydrological features:

7. The western arm of Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) notable for its scale, largely undeveloped mountain context, intricate patterning, unmanaged lake level, high water quality and clarity, and attractive water colour.
8. The Mātakitaki (Matukituki River). Corresponds to the lower reaches of a largely glacier-fed braided river system draining broadly south eastwards from the Main Divide in Mt Aspiring National Park to Wānaka (Lake Wānaka). Subject to periodic flooding and inundation of the adjacent floodplain.
9. The Motatapu River is part of the lower reaches of a larger river system draining north eastwards from Roses Saddle to Wānaka (Lake Wānaka). Consists of comparatively narrow riverbeds, with extensive fluvial terraces. Subject to periodic flooding and inundation of the adjacent floodplain.
10. The Fern Burn and Alpha Burn rivers which comprise comparatively narrow riverbeds, with extensive fluvial terraces. Subject to periodic flooding and inundation of the adjacent floodplain.
11. Wetland to the west of Damper Bay.

## Ecological features and vegetation types:

12. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. The stands of beech forest through the steeply incised gullies on the western side of the Alpha Range.
  - b. The subalpine and alpine vegetation across the Alpha Range, including snow tussocklands, cushionfields and herbfields.
  - c. The diverse broadleaved shrublands throughout the roche moutonnée west of Fern Burn, the steep north-eastern slopes of the Glendhu Bluff Conservation Area, the bluffs and slopes of Roys Peninsula, in gullies around Rocky Mountain and across the Emerald Bluff. The shrublands occur in association with large areas of bracken fernland and to a lesser extent matagouri-mingimingi dominant shrublands. It is noted that fernland and shrubland signal early successional stages of native regeneration.
13. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. Grazed pasture with shelterbelts and clusters of shade trees typical of the Fern Burn valley floor, the Fern Burn fan, the Alpha Burn, Motatapu River, Fern Burn and the flats either side of Buchanan Road leading out to Roys Peninsula. Willows line much of the Alpha Burn and Fern Burn and parts of the Motatapu River.
  - b. The grazed and gently flat river terraces behind Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay.
  - c. The willows and poplars that dominate the majority of the lake shore between Damper Bay and Roys Peninsula.
14. High value wetlands (sedgeland) are located in natural depressions bordering the roche moutonnée west of Damper Bay.
15. The PA possesses a diverse range of valued habitats from the lake to the mountain tops for New Zealand falcon, Australasian harrier, kea, tui, bellbird, New Zealand pipit, grey warbler, fantail, tomtit, NZ New Zealand shoveler, paradise shelduck, grey teal, crested grebe, black shag, little shag and New Zealand scaup. Kea are nationally threatened with a threat status of nationally endangered.
16. The lower braided reach of the Mātakitaki (Matukituki River) north of Roys Peninsula is likely to provide favoured feeding and nesting habitat for the nationally threatened black-fronted tern (nationally endangered) and banded dotterel (nationally vulnerable).

17. Valued habitats for koaro, brown trout, rainbow trout, Chinook salmon, common bully, brook char, banded kokopu and long-finned eels.
18. High indigenous invertebrate values associated with high alpine and tussock areas, including a potentially new species of weevil. Aquatic invertebrate communities throughout the high alpine areas are healthy and consistent with a pristine environment.
19. Valued habitat for skink and gecko, particularly in the rock outcrops, boulderfields and rock strewn tussock and exotic grasslands. This includes the nationally threatened Roys Peak (*Haplodactylus* sp. "Roys Peak") and Cromwell geckos (*Hoplodactylis* aff. *maculatus* "Cromwell"). Both species are classified as At-Risk Declining.

#### **Land-use patterns and features:**

20. Human modification, which is currently concentrated around Glendhu Bay and Parkins Bay, with its existing campground, woolshed wedding/events venue, Bike Glendhu development (including bike trails, pump park, bike hub facility), farmhouses (and associated curtilages), driveways/tracks, airstrip and farm buildings, as well as Parkins Bay with its consented golf resort/ homesite development, jetty and associated restoration planting strategy.
21. Throughout the remainder of the area, development is largely restricted to isolated farm buildings and a scattering of rural residential dwellings around Emerald Bluff (associated with the pocket of Rural Lifestyle zoned land) and Roys Peninsula. Generally, such development is characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways, and infrastructure, which is subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Typically this sees buildings well integrated by existing landform features and a mix of established and more recent vegetation features. In addition, new development is typically accompanied by appreciable landscape enhancement in the form of native restoration plantings and / or improvements to public access.
22. Several moorings at Glendhu Bay and along the western side of Paddock Bay. Marked water ski lanes to the northwest of Parkins Bay.

#### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

23. Sites associated with historic farming in the area. For example, the remains of the Motatapu homestead site (including archaeological sites F40/121-123).
24. Māori archaeological sites (e.g. F40/3 and F40/5).

#### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

25. 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.
26. Much of the ONL is mapped within the wāhi tūpuna: Wānaka (Lake Wānaka), Mātakitaki (Matukituki River), or Area surrounding Te Poutu Te Raki.
27. Lake Wānaka is highly significant to Kāi Tahu and is a Statutory Acknowledgement under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.

## 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:

28. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
29. Wānaka is one of the lakes referred to in the tradition of “Ngā Puna Wai Karikari o Rākaihautū” which tells how the principal lakes of Te Wai Pounamu were dug by the rangatira (chief) Rākaihautū. Through these pūrakau (stories), this area holds a deep spiritual significance both traditionally and for Kāi Tahu today.
30. The mapped area covers a vast area with kaika mahika kai which were once part of the extensive mahika kai network in the area. Tuna (eels), kāuru (cabbage tree root), weka, kākāpō and aruhe (fern root) were gathered throughout the area.
31. The mana whenua values associated with this area include, but may not be limited to, wāhi taoka, mahika kai, ara tawhito, urupā, kāika and nohoaka.

### Historic attributes and values:

32. Early Māori occupation associated with the lakeshore and local rivers.
33. Historic farming patterns, especially early pastoralism.
34. Historic recreational use of the lake and lakeshore.

### Shared and recognised attributes and values:

35. The photographic references and descriptions of the area in tourism publications.
36. The very high popularity of Roys Peak Track (noting that most of the track is in Mount Alpha PA) but parts of it afford views out over the eastern portion of West Wānaka PA).
37. The very high popularity of the Roys Peak Track Lookout as a vantage point for social media photographs.
38. The high popularity of the biking routes, walking trails and camping grounds/spots in the area.
39. The importance of the natural heritage area to the local community as evidenced by the efforts of Wai Wanaka in the area.
40. The impression of the Fern Burn valley as the entrance to the Motatapu Valley that displays a more structured appearance as a consequence of the pastoral landuse and patterning of shelterbelts, hedges and small conifer plantations.

### Recreation attributes and values:

41. Aotearoa’s National Walkway, the Te Araroa Trail runs along the lakeshore between Damper Bay and Glendhu Bay, Motatapu Road, and the Motatapu Track (adjacent Fern Burn).
42. The highly popular walking trail of Roys Peak Track.
43. Wānaka Mt Aspiring Road as a key scenic route providing access to Treble Cone ski field and Mt Aspiring National Park.

44. Popular walking trails including: Spotts Creek Track; Roys Peak Track; the Motatapu River track; the northern flanks of Pt 782 (Main Wall Track and Little Big Wall Track); the trail to the crest of Pt 442 (to the east of Paddock Bay); and the trail to the crest of Roys Peninsula.
45. Boating, water skiing, kayaking, fishing, and swimming at Wānaka (Lake Wānaka).
46. Trails, open space, jetty and (consented but largely unbuilt) golf course amenities at Parkins Bay.
47. Nationally significant fishery at Wānaka (Lake Wānaka), sports fishing spawning habitat in the Fern Burn, recreational angling in the Motatapu River and game bird habitat at Paddock Bay.
48. Picnicking around the lake shoreline.
49. Highly popular mountain and road biking routes throughout the area, including at Bike Glendhu, along the Glendhu Bay Track, and along Wānaka Mt Aspiring Road.
50. Highly popular public campground at Glendhu Bay.
51. Fishing and duck shooting on the Mātakitaki (Matukituki River).
52. Canoeing, tubing, rock climbing, and informal camping on the Motatapu River.
53. Extensive rock climbing at Hospital Flat and Diamond Lake Conservation Area.

### **Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

#### **Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

54. The area's natural landforms, land type and hydrological features (described above) which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative processes and in particular, the distinction between bedrock and deposition country.
55. Indigenous gully and stream plantings reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values in places.
56. More generally the vegetation cover and land uses found within the area reinforce the landform differences throughout the ONL, with more cultural vegetation patterns and human modification evident on the lower-lying areas and natural vegetation cover apparent across more elevated areas.

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

57. The sequence of highly attractive, frequently dramatic, and varied views from Wanaka-Mt Aspiring Road between Damper Bay and Emerald Bluff of the lake and mountain context.
58. The striking mid and long-range views from Glendhu Bluff lookout (layby on Wanaka-Mt Aspiring Road) out over the lake, Roys Peninsula, Paddock Bay, Parkins Bay, Glendhu Bay, Roys Peak, and the Alpha Range.
59. A series of highly attractive close to long-range views from the Glendhu Bay Track along the largely undeveloped lake margins and across Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) to the surrounding mountain context.
60. The series of appealing views from the 'inland' sections of the Te Araroa Trail across the open pastoral river terraces backdropped by the Alpha Range and the Harri s Mountains.
61. Views from Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) within Glendhu / Parkins / Paddock Bays.



62. The expansive long-range views from the Roys Peak lookout and track over almost the entire area.
63. In many of the views there is an awareness of the Glendhu Bay campground, and to a far lesser degree, development associated with the Parkins Bay development and Bike Glendhu. However, the visual dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes along with the generally subservient nature of built development underpins the high quality of the outlook.

#### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

64. Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) as a central feature of the ONL.
65. The mountains framing the ONL are an important feature in their own right and as a counterpart to the lake.
66. The Fern Burn valley floor and parts of the Glendhu Bay lake margins are the least natural parts of the ONL because of the presence of the campground and pastoral farming activities. The campground, with its high level of development, contrasts with the rural character of the farmland on the southern side of the road, notwithstanding the presence of scattered farm buildings and dwellings.
67. Parkins Bay which conveys a sense of transition, away from the rural environs of Glendhu Bay and the lake margins: in particular, the managed pasture across the Fern Burn fan and lower terraces at Glendhu Bay transitions into the more vegetated and hummocky terrain around the base of the roche moutonnée in Parkins Bay. This culminates in the natural shrubland and roche moutonnée landforms of Pt 782m, Glendhu Bluff and Emerald Bluff. The vegetation within this area of transition includes the shrubland revegetation that has occurred as part of the Parkins Bay development and the Bike Glendhu development (at Glendhu Bay). It also encompasses the development consented by the Environment Court, including:
  - a. the golf course;
  - b. a jetty;
  - c. a clubhouse and visitor accommodation, which is carefully sited amongst existing mature vegetation, set back from the lakefront, and constrained with respect to its height and extent so that it is visually recessive in views from the lakeshore, lake, and road; and
  - d. residential homesites that are subject to specific controls in relation to their location, integration with natural landforms, and related mounding, building height, roof materials, building extent, curtilage, and native restoration planting, to ensure built development is 'difficult to see' from external locations.
68. Overall, the area displays naturalness values that rate towards the moderate to higher end of the spectrum as a consequence of the dominance of the more natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes. The relatively confined extent of built development and its predominantly visually recessive, modest, and/or relatively low-key character plays an important role in this regard.

#### **Memorability attributes and values:**

69. The highly memorable views of the lake and its surrounding mountain frame.

#### **Transient attributes and values:**

70. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain slopes and surface of the lake.
71. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation (lake edge poplars and willows in particular).

### Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

72. The parts of the PA that are set apart from the more developed lake shore and immediate hinterland at Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay (which includes the lower reaches of the Fern Burn, and the Bike Glendhu area) display an impression of wildness, with a distinctly increasing impression of remoteness as one travels westwards along Wānaka – Mount Aspiring Road.
73. A localised sense of remoteness along the Parkins Bay lakeshore, where the landform and/or vegetation serves to obscure views of (land based) built development.
74. The dark night sky (i.e. lack of light pollution), contributes to the impression of wildness and remoteness.

### Aesthetic attributes and values:

75. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
76. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. The highly attractive and striking composition created by the arrangement of the natural waters of the lake framed by the complex and dramatic mountain setting.
  - b. The continuous and large-scale patterning of the alpine ridges and peaks together with the expanse of the lake which form a bold contrast to the more modified and 'tamed' low-lying land at Paddock Bay, Parkins Bay, the Fern Burn Valley and Glendhu Bay that is engaging and appealing.
  - c. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. the bold bluffs and rock outcrops set within a native vegetation context;
    - ii. the indigenous vegetation covered hummocky moraine;
    - iii. the relatively low-key and 'rural vernacular' or visually discreet style of the majority of built development;
    - iv. the contrasting columnar forms of Lombardy poplars at Parkins Bay; and
    - v. the willows and poplars along the lake shore and the Fern Burn, including its delta, which contribute to the scenic appeal despite not being native.

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

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for the West Wānaka PA can be summarised as follows:

77. **High physical values** due to the proliferation of high-value and large-scale landforms, landforms reflecting the interaction of a range of geomorphic processes, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features throughout the area.

78. **High associative values** relating to:

- a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
- b. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
- c. The popularity of the area for a wide range of recreational activities.

79. **High perceptual values** relating to:

- a. The legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of biophysical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
- b. The aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its often dramatic and highly appealing visual character. The attractive composition of both natural and rural/farmed landscapes, with a strong focus on the mountains and lake, are critical features of the area. The public accessibility of much of the area which allows the experience of these values along with the area's transient values also play a role in this regard.
- c. A moderate to high impression of naturalness arising from the dominance of the natural landscape and the generally relatively modest or visually recessive nature of built development.
- d. A sense of remoteness and wildness in places, particularly away from the lake shore and hinterland at Parkins Bay and Glendhu Bay, and where the landform and/or vegetation obscures views of built development.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the West Wānaka PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that: integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale and have a low-key rural character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** (including campgrounds) – **very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation and tourism related activities that: are co-located with existing consented facilities; are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be visually recessive, of a modest scale and have a low-key rural character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity unless it is very discreetly located so that it is reasonably difficult to see from outside the site and has a rural character.
- v. **Earthworks – limited** landscape capacity for earthworks that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns. **Some** landscape capacity for tracks and trails for recreational use that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, **limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character.

- vii. **Mineral extraction – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for extraction larger than farm-scale quarries. **Limited** capacity for farm-scale quarries and gravel extraction in riverbeds that protects the naturalness and aesthetic attributes and values of the ONL.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low-key rural roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, **limited** landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation unless it is very discreetly located so that it is reasonably difficult to see from outside the site. **Limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for exotic forestry.
- xii. **Rural living – very limited** landscape capacity for rural living development located on lower-lying terrain and sited so that it is contained by landforms and vegetation – with the location, scale, and design of any proposal ensuring that it is reasonably difficult to see from external viewpoints. The exception to this is views from Roys Peak, where rural living development should be extremely visually recessive. Developments should be of a modest scale; have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- xiii. **Jetties, Boatsheds, lake Structures and moorings - extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Animal pest species include red deer, chamois, feral goats, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, hares, rabbits, possums, rats and mice.
- B. Plant pest species include sweet briar, broom, gorse and wilding pines.

---

## 21.22.22 Dublin Bay PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

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

There are four sub areas within the PA:

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

### Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Mana whenua •

### Landforms and land types:

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

### Hydrological features:

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

## Ecological features and vegetation types:

8. Particularly noteworthy vegetation types include:
  - a. Regenerating kānuka to natural forest successional processes with kōhūhū dominant shrubland and bracken on the south-western flanks of Mount Brown;
  - b. Regenerating kānuka, with kōwhai, kōhūhū, matagouri, mingimingi and tī kōuka (cabbage tree) and other indigenous shrubs, on the lake edges, in the DOC-managed Dublin Bay-Outlet-Albert Town Recreation Reserve, and around the Outlet Motor Camp.
9. Other characteristic vegetation types (which are present in the PA, but which may not contribute to its outstanding natural values) are:
  - a. Domestic garden vegetation on rural living properties;
  - b. Wilding radiata pine and Douglas fir, particularly on the headland within the reserve.
  - c. Plantation conifer forest at Sticky Forest.
10. Potential for enhancement of ecological attributes through control of wilding conifers and other exotic weeds and/or through ongoing indigenous regeneration.
11. Regenerating kānuka shrubland and broadleaf shrubland successional to native forest provide important feeding and nesting habitat for small insectivorous native birds such as South Island tomtit, grey warbler, fantail, and silvereve.

## Land use patterns and features:

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

## Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

13. Māori use or occupation of the land around the lake foreshore and outlet (archaeological site F40/11).
14. Mature exotic trees within the bay and along the lakeshore relate to the history of pastoral farming.
15. Lombardy poplars and willows around the lake edges, particularly at Dublin Bay.

## Mana whenua features and their locations:

16. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
17. The ONL overlaps with mapped areas within wāhi tūpuna 34 and 41: Wānaka (Lake Wānaka) and Lake Wānaka (Dublin Bay) (Nohoanga).

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

### **Associative Attributes and Values**

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

### **Mana whenua associations and experience:**

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

### **Historic attributes and values:**

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

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

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

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

27. Highly valued as locations for swimming (safe shallow beach at Dublin Bay), picnicking, boating, water skiing, walking and mountain biking, including along the lake shore, and camping at The Outlet. Lake Wanaka is classified as a Nationally Significant Fishery due to both its physical and recreational significance. Tracks along the lakeshore and river outlet, including the Outlet Track and Dublin Bay Track (linked by the Deans Bank Track outside PA), the East Dublin Bay Track and Sticky Forest tracks are all valued for mountain biking. Sticky Forest is currently accessible at the discretion of the landowners. Tracks extend both inside and outside of the PA although as discussed in paragraph 20 above, public access to this area may change in the future. Future planned connections in the tracks network include a bridge

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

across the Clutha Mata-au at the Outlet and an extension of East Dublin Bay Track through to Maungawera Road.

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

### **Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

#### **Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

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

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

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

#### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

34. Overall, a moderate-high level of perceived naturalness. However, rural living, plantation forestry and wilding conifer spread are apparent within the PA and do not contribute to naturalness attributes or values. Harvesting processes serves to (temporarily) further reduce the perception of naturalness in this part of the PA. In addition, inconsistent land use and vegetation patterns across the southern face of Mount Brown detract from the naturalness and coherence in this part of the PA. Perceptions of naturalness are higher on the lake waters and foreshore, where natural elements and processes of indigenous regeneration are dominant.

#### **Memorability attributes and values:**

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

#### **Transient attributes and values:**

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



### Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:

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

### Aesthetic attributes and values:

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

## Summary of Landscape Values

Physical • Associative • Perceptual (Sensory)

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

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

The physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for the Dublin Bay PA come together and can be summarised as follows:

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

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

## Landscape Capacity

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

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – **some** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that do not require permanent built infrastructure or are co-located with existing development; complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation on the south-western flanks of Mount Brown, the headland north of the Outlet and the land south of the Outlet (apart from at the motor camp). **Some** landscape capacity within the rural living area at Dublin Bay for visitor accommodation activities and **extremely limited** landscape capacity for tourism related activities that are co-located with existing consented facilities, are located to optimise the screening and/or camouflaging benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement and enhance public access.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **limited** landscape capacity in the rural living area within Dublin Bay (excluding the south-western flanks of Mount Brown).
- v. **Earthworks** – **limited** landscape capacity for earthworks and **some** capacity for tracks and trails for recreational use subject to protecting naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and those activities being sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – **limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character and maintain the openness and legibility attributes and values of mountain slopes and moraines.
- vii. **Mineral extraction** – **very limited** landscape capacity for small scale extraction.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure** – **very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low key 'rural' roading in the rural living area of Dublin Bay that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is co-located with existing facilities, buried, or located such that it is screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, **limited** landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- x. **Renewable energy generation** – **extremely limited** landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation in the rural living area of Dublin Bay (excluding the south-western flanks of Mount Brown) that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns and is reasonably difficult to see from the lake or public places. **Very limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation that is reasonably difficult to see from the lake or public places.

- xi. **Forestry – very limited** landscape capacity for small scale production forestry. **Extremely limited or no** capacity for establishing new exotic forestry.
- xii. **Rural living – very limited** landscape capacity for additional development in the rural living area of Dublin Bay itself – with the location, scale and design of any proposal ensuring that it is generally difficult to see from external viewpoints. Developments should be of a modest-scale; have a low key 'rural' character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement and enhance public access.

## **PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS**

- A. Plant pest species include radiata pine and Douglas fir wildings.
- B. Animal pest species include rabbits, stoats, possums, rats, and mice.

---

## 21.22.23 Hāwea South North Grandview PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Hāwea South North Grandview PA takes in the ONL of the eastern slopes of Mt Maude, the south end of Lake Hāwea (including the undeveloped lake shore), the lake terrace in the vicinity of Bushy Creek (on the eastern side of the lake) and the western faces of the range of mountains approximately extending from Pt 1359 in the north, to Lagoon Valley in the south (and including Pt 1316, Breast Peak, Pt1453, Pt 1414, Pt 916, and Pt 812).

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. The line of mountains along the western side of Lake Hāwea in which Mt Maude is located at the southern end. These steep foliated schist landforms separate Lake Hāwea from Lake Wanaka and are capped by the distinctive peaks of Mt Maude, Mt Burke, and Isthmus Peak (latter two peaks are outside the PA). Extensive rocky areas.
2. The Grandview Range, which defines the eastern side of the southern end of Lake Hāwea and the Upper Clutha valley, capped by the distinctive peaks of Breast Hill, Grandview Mountain and Trig Hill (the latter is outside PA). These landforms comprise a dissected pattern of rugged and very steep schist slopes, bluffs and sculpted spurs; and form part of the steep and broken headwall of the Hāwea glacier. Slumps, sheet wash and gully erosion are features on the upper slopes. Extensive rocky areas, rock bluffs, prominent spurs, and sheer rock faces and buttresses shaped by ice action.
3. Colluvial slopes and fans extending from the mountain 'walls' on either side of the lake to the water edge to create lake-edge terraces.
4. Two rocky glacial knolls on the western side of the lake (Pt 414 and Pt 412, Round Hill) separated by a narrow terrace (noting that Round Hill is subject to a QE II Covenant).
5. The terminal moraine at the southern end of the lake deposited by the glacier that formed the depression now occupied by the lake.
6. Varying wide to narrow stony beaches of greywacke and schist around the lake edge which contain a range of 'coastal' wave-generated landforms.
7. The Grandview Fault which is parallel to the lake and is active.

### Hydrological features:

8. The southern portion of Lake Hāwea notable for its scale, largely undeveloped mountain context, high water quality, clear visibility, and attractive water colour. The lake outlet was dammed in the 1950s as part of the Roxburgh hydroelectric scheme, which raised the lake level by approximately 20m. Hence the lake

edge, shoreline and proximity of the lake to the surrounding terraces are relatively recent artifacts of lake level management.

9. The several unnamed, steeply incised streams draining the eastern slopes of Mt Maude.
10. The network of deeply incised streams draining the mountains on the eastern side of the lake including: the lower reaches of Bushy Creek, Johns Creek, Grandview Creek, Drakes Creek, Cameron Gully, Hospital Creek and numerous unnamed streams and tributaries.

### **Ecological features and vegetation types:**

11. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Slim snow tussock grassland (*Chionochloa macra*) and herbfields dominated by false Spaniard (*Celmisia lyallii*) on the mountain tops.
  - b. Remnant isolated (fire relic) stands of mountain beech (*Fuscospora cliffortioides*) forest in Grandview catchments.
  - c. The subalpine and alpine vegetation across the mountains to the west and east of the lake, featuring short fescue tussocklands, narrow leaved snow tussocklands (*Chionochloa rigida*), patches of Dracophyllum dominant shrub or woodland and herbfields.
  - d. Swathes and patches of regenerating kānuka, mānuka, coprosma sp, matagouri and grey shrubland across the lower and mid slopes and spurs of the mountains on either side of the PA.
  - e. Bracken, matagouri and kānuka and mānuka woodlands throughout rocky slopes of mountains on either side of the PA.
  - f. Kānuka woodlands, manuka woodlands, grey shrubland and bracken cover large parts of the lower slopes of the glacial knolls on the western side of the lake.
  - g. The grey shrubland on a rocky outcrop on Kane Road, near Hāwea Back Road that is identified as an SNA in the District Plan. Species include: *Coprosma intertexta*, *Coprosma propinqua*, *Coprosma tayloriae*, *Coprosma rigida*, *Coprosma crassifolius*, *Carmichaelia petriei*, *Melicytus alpinus*, *Discaria toumatou*, *Pteridium esculentum*, *Muehlenbeckia complexa* and *Cordyline australis*.
  - h. A woodland on the eastern slopes of Mt Maude that is an SNA in the District Plan. Dominated by halls totara (*Podocarpus cunninghamii*) and mountain toatoa (*Phyllocladus alpinus*).
  - i. Areas of regenerating matagouri, grey *Coprosma sp.* dominant shrublands, kānuka and bracken fernland in places across the fans and lake terraces.
  - j. Species listed as at risk/declining status include native broom (*Carmichaelia petriei*), matagouri. Threatened - Nationally vulnerable species include: small leaved tree daisy (*Oleraia fimbriata*). Also present: alpine wineberry, *Corokia cotoneaster* and *Kowhai microphylla*.
  - k. Many of the communities identified above comprise early successional stages to podocarp / beech forest (specifically (d), (e), (f) and (i)).
12. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. Grazed pasture with shelterbelts and clusters of shade trees throughout the fans and terraces on the western and eastern sides of the lake.
  - b. The mixed plantings of exotic evergreen and deciduous species around rural homesteads and buildings, throughout The Camp and throughout the southern lake margins.

- c. Exotic grasses and herbs mixed with short tussock grassland throughout the slopes below approximately 1,000m.
  - d. Wilding conifers and *Betula sp.* across the mountain slopes.
13. The Hāwea area is generally regarded as a transition zone between the wetter Wanaka ecological district and the drier Central Otago ecological district.
  14. Valued habitat for New Zealand falcon, New Zealand pipit, bellbird, grey warbler, fantail, tomtits, tui, shining cuckoo, Australasian crested grebe, Southern Alps gecko and McCann's skinks and silvereys.

**Land-use patterns and features:**

15. Built modification which is currently generally concentrated around the Glen Dene homestead (western side of the lake and including the improved pasture of the home paddocks), The Camp (including a nearby boat ramp and jetty/pontoon), a cluster of rural living buildings on the mountain slopes near the control dam, and the modest cluster of dwellings at the end of Nook Road.
16. Modifications at Lake Hāwea Station which includes farm buildings, farming and farm tracks within the ONL as well as accommodation, recreation activities (mountain biking, hunting) and event services outside of but on the boundary of the ONL.
17. Pastoral farming throughout much of the remainder of the PA, and associated farm tracks, fencing, dams, farm buildings and rural dwellings.
18. Throughout the remainder of the area, built development is largely restricted to a scattering of rural residential dwellings on the eastern side of Cameron Hill, and two rural residential dwellings along the southern margins of the lake.
19. Generally, built development is characterised by very carefully located and designed buildings, accessways and infrastructure, which is subservient to the 'natural' landscape patterns. Typically, buildings are well integrated by existing landform features and a mix of established and more recent vegetation features. In addition, new development is typically accompanied by appreciable landscape enhancement in the form of native restoration plantings and / or improvements to public access.
20. SH 6 Makarora Lake Hāwea Road which is roughly along the base of the Mt Maude slopes.
21. The reserve land along much of the lake margins adjoining Hāwea township (and which coincide with Te Araroa, a network of trails and picnic spots).
22. The network of rural roads (generally single-lane and formed in metal) that coincide with the eastern side of the PA.
23. The boat ramp and pontoon at the southern end of the Lake Hāwea Holiday Park.
24. The Camp to Round Hill Track, the Te Araroa Trail, the John Creek track, the Gladstone Track, the Grandview Creek track, the Grandview Ridge, and the unnamed loop track around the west side of Pt 812 that links to Lagoon Creek. Associated with these tracks are signage, stiles, and seating, typically of a modest scale and low-key character.
25. Recreational uses associated with the lake including swimming, fishing, paddle boarding, boating, water skiing, jet skiing, kite boarding and kayaking.
26. Infrastructure is evident within the eastern portion of the area and includes power and telephone lines along the highway and local road network and a farm quarry on the west side of SH6 near Pt 414.
27. Neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include: the very close proximity of Hāwea township which extends along the

south-western margins of the lake and abuts the PA; the cluster of dwellings at John Creek; and the Control Dam (booms, dam wall, etc.) at the start of the Hāwea River.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

28. The protected exotic *Eucalyptus sp* (gum) specimen trees throughout the lake margin adjacent Hāwea township.
29. Early survey marks on Mt Grandview (archaeological sites G40/215 and FG0/216).
30. Māori occupation around lake foreshore (archaeological sites G40/2, G40/64, G40/208).

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

31. 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.
32. The ONL overlaps with the Hāwea (Lake Hāwea) and Paetarariki and Timaru wāhi tūpuna.
33. Lake Hāwea is highly significant to Kāi Tahu and is a Statutory Acknowledgement under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.
34. A contemporary nohoaka (camping site to support traditional mahika kai activities provided as a redress under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlements Act 1998) is located at The Camp.

### **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:**

35. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
36. Hāwea is one of the lakes referred to in the tradition of “Ngā Puna Wai Karikari o Rākaihautū” which tells how the principal lakes of Te Wai Pounamu were dug by the rangatira (chief) Rākaihautū. Through these pūrakau (stories), this area holds a deep spiritual significance both traditionally and for Kāi Tahu today.
37. The Lake was traditionally considered rich with tuna (eel) that were caught, preserved, and transported to kāiika nohoaka of coastal Otago. The knowledge of whakapapa, traditional trails, tauraka waka, mahika kai and other taoka associated with Lake Hāwea remain important to Kāi Tahu today.
38. Several sites within this area such as Kokotane and Pakituhi were known as rich kāiika mahika kai. Kokotane is an old hāpua (lagoon) where pūtakitaki (paradise duck), pārera (duck sp.) and turnips were gathered. Te Whakapapa is also considered a pā site.
39. The mana whenua values associated with this area include, but may not be limited to, wāhi taoka, mahika kai, ara tawhito, kāiika, nohoaka.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

40. Contextual significance as a key reference point within the early survey of the area.
41. Hydro engineering work that led to the artificial raising of the lake surface in the 1950s.

42. Association with early pastoral farming.

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

43. The descriptions of the area in tourism publications.
44. The very high profile and popularity of Te Araroa Trail.
45. The postcard views available from the reserve area and Hāwea township at the southern end of the lake and SH6 Makarora Lake Hāwea Road.
46. The high popularity of the biking routes, walking trails, and holiday park in the area.
47. The local popularity of the lake as a peaceful swimming, kayaking, boating, and fishing spot.
48. The interest of the area as part of a large-scale hydroelectricity development.
49. The critical role in the outlook northwards across Lake Hāwea to the surrounding mountains in shaping the identity of Lake Hāwea township.
50. The identity of the south-western portion of the PA as the entrance or gateway to the relatively low-key lakeside settlement of Lake Hāwea township.

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

51. The popular and nationally important Te Araroa Trail that is along the southern and south-eastern edges of the lake beyond John Creek, via the Gladstone to Wānaka Track, where it veers eastwards to climb a ridge to the Pakituhi Hut (near Pt 1316).
52. The popular walking/biking trails, including: The Camp to Round Hill Track; the reserve tracks along the southern edge of the lake adjacent Hāwea township; the John's Creek track; the Grandview Creek track; the Grandview Ridge; and the unnamed loop track around the west side of Pt 812 that links to Lagoon Creek.
53. SH6 Makarora Lake Hāwea Road as a key scenic route providing access between the West Coast and the Otago Lakes.
54. Boating, kayaking, fishing, and swimming at Lake Hāwea. Nationally significant fishery.
55. Picnicking along the lake shoreline.
56. The highly popular campground at The Camp.
57. Hunting throughout the mountains.

### **Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

### **Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

58. The area's natural landforms, land type, and hydrological features (described above) which are highly legible and highly expressive of the landscape's formative processes acknowledging that the level and extent of Lake Hāwea is the result of human modification).
59. Indigenous gully and stream vegetation which reinforce the legibility and expressiveness values in places.



60. More generally, the vegetation cover and land uses found within the area reinforce the landform differences throughout the ONL, with more cultural vegetation patterns evident on the lower-lying (depositional) areas and more natural vegetation cover apparent across more elevated (bedrock) areas.

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

61. The sequence of highly attractive, frequently dramatic and varied views from SH6 Makarora Lake Hāwea Road between the entrance to Hāwea township/the Control Dam area and the lake terrace north of the Glen Dene homestead of: the dynamic waters of the lake; the glacial knolls along the western side of the lake; the distinctive transition between the mountains, lake terraces and waters of the lake; and the broader undeveloped and open mountain context framing the lake.
62. The striking close to long-range views from the lake margins (including the Te Araroa Trail, reserve land and Lake Hāwea township at the southern end of the lake) out over the lake, framed by the Mt Burke range to the west, the wall of sharply dissected mountains to the east, and the distant often snow-capped mountain range to the north including Sentinel Peak and Terrace Peak. The openness of the surrounding mountain context makes an important contribution to the quality of the outlook.
63. The series of highly appealing and memorable mid and longer-range views from the various trails in the area that, in many instances, afford expansive views across the dynamic waters of the lake to the broader glacial and open mountain context. The seemingly undeveloped mountain context juxtaposed beside the relatively modest settlement of Lake Hāwea adds to the interest of the outlook from many vantage points.
64. The attractive and engaging north and south bound views from SH6 Makarora Lake Hāwea Road in the vicinity of the Control Dam, in which the road across the control dam reads as a distinctive gateway and edge to the settlement on the eastern side of the dam/Hāwea River, with the land on the western side of the control dam retaining a markedly less developed, spacious rural character.
65. The highly appealing views from the waters of Lake Hāwea to the largely undeveloped lake terrace and dramatic open mountain context. The confinement of sizeable built development to Lake Hāwea township, its generally modest appearance and the very limited visibility of other development by virtue of its scale, appearance and/or the screening by landform or vegetation (for example, Gladstone, The Camp, and the Glen Dene homestead) are of importance to the impression of Lake Hāwea as a relatively undeveloped lake.
66. In all of the views, the visual dominance of more 'natural' landscape elements, patterns, and processes along with the generally subservient nature of built development underpins the high quality of the outlook.

### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

67. Lake Hāwea as a central feature of the ONL (acknowledging that the level and extent of Lake Hāwea is the result of large-scale engineering modification as part of a hydroelectricity development).
68. The mountains framing the ONL are an important feature in their own right and as a counterpart to the lake.
69. The lake terraces on either side of the lake are the least natural parts of the ONL because of the presence of The Camp rural and rural living related development, the damming of the lake, and pastoral farming activities. The limited scale and visibility of built development within The Camp (from SH6, the lake and the township) and farm dwellings and buildings, ensures that naturalness values rate as at least moderate-high in those parts of the PA.
70. Overall, the area displays naturalness values that rate towards the higher end of the spectrum as a consequence of the dominance of the natural landscape elements, patterns, and processes. The relatively confined extent of built development and its predominantly visually recessive, modest and/or relatively low-key character plays an important role.

### **Memorability attributes and values:**

71. The highly memorable views of the lake and its surrounding mountain frame.

### **Transient attributes and values:**

72. Seasonal snowfall and the ever-changing patterning of light and weather across the mountain slopes and surface of the lake.
73. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation.
74. Human activity on the lake.

### **Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

75. A high degree of remoteness and wildness along the mountain trails towards the edges of the PA and from much of the waters of the lake where there is a strong sense of separation from Lake Hāwea township and the farmed lake terraces and the sheer scale of the natural mountain and lake setting, means that it is the dominant perception.
76. A localised sense of remoteness along the lake-edge trails and shoreline within the PA-~~ONL~~, where intervening landforms and/or vegetation screen views to nearby development and the focus is confined to the lake and broader undeveloped mountain context.

### **Aesthetic attributes and values:**

77. The experience of the values identified above from a wide range of public viewpoints.
78. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. The highly attractive and striking composition created by the arrangement of the natural waters of the lake framed by the complex and dramatic mountain setting.
  - b. The continuous and large-scale patterning of the alpine ridges and peaks together with the expanse of the lake which form a bold contrast to the more modified and 'tamed' low-lying lake terraces that is engaging and appealing.
  - c. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. The distinctive peaks, bold bluffs, rock outcrops, and sculpted spurs of the surrounding mountain ranges.
    - ii. The two glacial knolls on the western side of the lake.
    - iii. The transition of vegetation patterns from exotic to indigenous across the PA.
    - iv. The terminal moraine landform at the southern end of the lake.
    - v. The relatively low-key and 'rural vernacular' or visually discreet style of the majority of built development within the PA.
    - vi. The highly dynamic qualities of the lake waters in terms of natural processes (wind and wave action, etc.) and human activity.
    - vii. The general absence of structures and dominance of natural landscape elements along the western and eastern lake edges.
    - viii. The limited level of built modification evident within the landward parts of the PA, which forms a marked contrast to the Lake Hāwea settlement context and imbues an impression of a natural landscape context.
    - ix. The mature trees throughout the area which contribute to the scenic appeal.

## 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 combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for the Hāwea South North Grandview PA can be summarised as follows:

79. **High physical values** because of the assemblages of landforms, at a range of scales and formed by a range of interacting geomorphic processes, vegetation features, habitats, species, hydrological features and mana whenua features throughout the area.
80. **High associative values** relating to
  - a. The mana whenua associations of the area.
  - b. The historic associations of the area.
  - c. The strong shared and recognised values associated with the area.
  - d. The popularity of the area for a wide range of recreational activities.
81. **High perceptual values** relating to:
  - a. The high legibility and expressiveness values of the area deriving from the visibility and abundance of biophysical attributes that enable a clear understanding of the landscape's formative processes.
  - b. The high aesthetic and memorability values of the area as a consequence of its often dramatic and highly appealing visual character. The attractive composition of both natural and rural/farmed landscapes, with a strong focus on the mountains and lake, are critical features of the area. The public accessibility of much of the area which allows the experience of these values along with the area's transient values and proximity to Lake Hāwea settlement, SH6 and Te Araroa Trail also play a role.
  - c. A high impression of naturalness arising from the dominance of the more natural landscape and the generally relatively modest or visually recessive nature of built development.
  - d. A strong sense of remoteness and wildness across much of the PA due to the distance from, or limited awareness of, development.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Hāwea South North Grandview PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – **some** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that: integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a low-key rural character and are difficult to see in views from the lake, lake edge, SH6 and Lake Hāwea settlement; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.

- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** (including campgrounds) – **some** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that: are co-located with existing consented facilities; are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale; have a low-key rural character and are difficult to see in views from the lake, lake edge, SH6 and Lake Hāwea settlement; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access; and protect the area’s ONL values. **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for tourism related activities in visually discreet low-lying locations, that is designed to: be small scale and have a low-key, rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity unless it is very discreetly located so that it is reasonably difficult to see from outside the site and has a rural character.
- v. **Earthworks** – **limited** landscape capacity for earthworks that protect naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values; and are sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns. **Some** landscape capacity for tracks and trails for recreational use that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement.
- vi. **Farm buildings** – in those areas of the ONL with pastoral land uses, **limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce existing rural character and maintain the openness and legibility attributes and values of ONL.
- vii. **Mineral extraction** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for extraction larger than farm-scale quarries.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure** – **very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low-key rural roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure** – **limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, **limited** landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- x. **Renewable energy generation** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for commercial-scale renewable energy generation unless it is very discreetly located so that it is reasonably difficult to see from outside the site. **Limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for exotic forestry.
- xii. **Rural living** – **very limited** landscape capacity for activities that are located on the lower-lying terrain and are: located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a low-key rural character and are difficult to see in views from the lake, lake edge, SH6 and Lake Hāwea settlement; integrates appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhances public access.
- xiii. **Jetties, boatsheds, lake structures and moorings** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.

## **PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS**

- A. Animal pest species include chamois, red deer, fallow deer, wallabies, pigs, feral goats, hares, possums, mice, rats, stoats, ferrets, feral cats, hedgehogs and rabbits.
- B. Plant pest species include sweet briar, broom, wilding pines, hawthorn, buddleia, hawkweed, gooseberry, bittersweet, European broom, silver birch and gorse.

---

## 21.22.24 Lake McKay Station and Environs PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Lake McKay Station and Environs PA covers the ONL which is located on the northern shoulder slopes of the Pisa/Criffel Range, extending from the Criffel Diggings Track near Mount Barker to the true right bank of Sheepskin Creek in the east. The northern boundary of the PA is defined by the toe of the mountain range or the northern crest of the Luggate Creek gorge and takes in schist landforms (Knoll A3KV) north of Luggate Creek and east of Sheepskin Creek. To the south, the PA extends to landforms that visually contain the Upper Clutha Basin (at around the 700 to 1100 m contour) when viewed from proximate areas of the basin floor.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. The Pisa/Criffel Range: the westernmost and highest element of the characteristic 'basin and range' fault block landscape that stretches across Central Otago. At the northern end of the range, the PA takes in a lower ice-eroded shoulder that defines the southern enclosure of the Upper Clutha basin. Within this shoulder, moraines form smoother surfaces between rocky outcrops and hummocks, and the deeply cut gullies of Luggate, Alice Burn, Tin Hut, Dead Horse and Sheepskin creeks dissect the landscape in a south-west to north-east direction. The lower margin of the shoulder, south and east of Luggate, has ice-scoured terrain with rock exposures and fluvially formed escarpments and terraces leading down to the basin floor.
2. Knob A3KV: a low but prominent ice-scoured schist and moraine knoll with numerous rock outcrops. The smoother moraine slopes of the knoll are outside the ONL.
3. Luggate Creek gorges: steeply incised rocky gorges in the upper reaches of the creek and separating the mountain shoulder from Knob A3KV.

### Hydrological features:

4. The series of creeks flowing south-west to north-east from the Pisa/Criffel Range across the ice-eroded northern shoulder. The largest of these is Luggate Creek, with its major tributaries the Alice Burn (Fall Burn) and Tin Hut Creek. Further to the east are Dead Horse Creek and Sheepskin Creek, which join on the flats and flow directly to the Clutha River Mata-au.
5. The water courses within the valley provide habitat for longfin eels, kōaro, upland bullies and Clutha flathead galaxias (nationally critical) and spawning habitat for brown and rainbow trout.

## Ecological features and vegetation types:

6. Particularly noteworthy vegetation types include:
  - a. Shrubland and remnant forest in the lower gorge section of Luggate Creek, including remnant silver beech, Hall's totara, broadleaf and locally uncommon shrub species. Luggate Creek is an important spawning habitat hampered by the spread of willow in the lower reaches.
  - b. Dense regenerating kānuka-dominant shrubland in the Alice Burn (Fall Burn) and in the other creek gullies including matagouri, native broom, *Coprosma propinqua*, *Coprosma crassifolia* and *Olearia lineata*;
  - c. Grey shrubland, bracken and regenerating kānuka on rocky areas and escarpments adjacent to gullies, and on steeper slopes above the ice-eroded shoulder;
  - d. Scattered Significant Natural Areas protecting representative examples of the vegetation types listed above.
7. Other characteristic vegetation types are:
  - a. Small scale radiata pine plantations and wilding spread on the lower escarpments close to Luggate;
  - b. Rough low producing pasture with scattered sweet briar, matagouri and kānuka on steeper slopes and hummocky land;
  - c. Irrigated improved pasture and lucerne cropping on smoother moraine surfaces and terraces between the creek gullies;
  - d. Willows lining lower Luggate Creek closer to Luggate township.
8. Valued habitat for skinks and geckos, a wide range of invertebrate species and native birds (including New Zealand falcon, Australasian harrier, South Island tomtit, grey warbler, fantail, silveryeye and black shag).

## Land use patterns and features:

9. Predominant land use is sheep, beef and deer farming. The smoother undulating glacial till plateaus are generally irrigated and support more intensive grazing and lucerne production. Hummocky land and steeper slopes support lower intensity grazing. Mature radiata pine forestry is present on the lower escarpment faces behind Luggate township.
10. Earthworks and built modifications are generally limited to fencing, farm tracks, sheepyards and a farm airstrip. Rock outcrops have been removed in some areas to facilitate cropping. There is a consented woolshed and two consented residential building platforms on the northern part of the Tin Creek plateau, two 7-8 hectare rural living lots in the north-eastern corner of the PA and water supply tanks for Luggate immediately above the township. District electricity lines cross the eastern third of the PA.

## Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

11. Rich history of late 19<sup>th</sup> century gold mining and early European high-country farming. More than 28 archaeological sites including water races, wing dams, tailings, diggings, mine drives, hut/tent sites and rock shelters; pack tracks accessing the diggings, including the Criffel Diggings Track and an old track from Luggate between Dead Horse Creek and Alice Burn.

## Mana whenua features and their locations:

12. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.

## Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values

### Mana whenua associations and experience:

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

### Historic attributes and values:

14. Associations with late 19<sup>th</sup> century gold mining, with physical evidence of mining activities and historic diggings. Mining within the PA and on the upper Criffel Range in the 1880s and 1890s was part of the last gold rush in Otago.
15. Associations with early high country pastoral farming, including evocative place and feature names.

### Shared and recognised attributes and values:

16. Valued as an integral part of the distinctive and visually prominent southern enclosure of the Upper Clutha Basin, and for its contribution to the sense of place and identity experienced by locals and frequent visitors.

### Recreation attributes and values:

17. Farmstay, farm and gold diggings tours at Criffel Station.
18. Limited public access, except for informal access along the Luggate Creek and Alice Burn marginal strips. Potential for improved walking access along Luggate Creek to the Luggate Creek and Fall Burn reserves.

## Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values

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

### Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:

19. History of extensive pastoral farming has resulted in an open character and highly legible landform, reinforced by the pattern of deeply cut stream gullies and associated indigenous vegetation. The relative openness of the upper slopes, hummocky areas and moraine plateaus allows the processes of land formation to be easily perceived. The landscape is clearly expressive of the uplift, glacial and fluvial processes that have formed it.

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

20. Limited public accessibility means that closer views of the PA are generally limited to the lower escarpments and mountain slopes adjoining the Upper Clutha Basin floor. The PA is however widely visible from more distant vantage points across the basin, including Kane Road, Luggate-Tarras Road (SH8A), Wanaka-Luggate Highway (SH6), Mt Barker Road, Ballantyne Road and Mount Iron. The eastern part of the PA, including Criffel Station and Knob A3KV is visible from viewpoints near Wānaka, and the hummocky or craggy topography with a mosaic of patchy grey shrubland and kānuka is a coherent and highly natural mid-ground to the higher peaks of the Pisa Range. North of the Clutha River Mata-au, expansive views of the entire PA are available from Kane Road and surrounding areas. The rough vegetation-covered upper slopes, escarpments and stream gullies contrast with the colour and texture of



improved pasture on the moraine plateaus, enhancing the legibility of the landscape and providing visual complexity and interest. From these viewpoints the PA is a continuous part of the mountainous enclosure of the basin.

21. Much of the PA is also visible from parts of the Pisa Conservation Area high on the Pisa Range and from the Deep Gully and Grandview Ridge Tracks to the east across the Clutha valley.

### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

22. Overall the PA is perceived as having a high level of naturalness. There is a low level of human modification (in the form of irrigated improved pasture, fences, tracks and occasional buildings) that is largely confined to the smoother moraine plateau and alluvial terraces. Natural patterns and processes are dominant across the majority of the PA and are particularly strong in the regenerating kānuka woodland and shrubland areas, and on the steeper slopes. Rocky outcrops and spectacular rocky gorges and gullies add to perceptions of naturalness.

### **Memorability attributes and values:**

23. The memorability of the PA as part of the Pisa/Criffel range, enclosing the Upper Clutha basin to the south and contrasting strongly with the long horizontals of the basin outwash plain;
24. The spectacular rocky gorges of Luggate Creek, although these are not currently widely experienced by the public;
25. The distinctive pyramidal form of Knob A3KV, as viewed from Mount Iron and SH6, particularly on the eastern approach to Luggate;
26. Large rock outcrops adjacent to SH6 at the eastern end of Luggate are a memorable local landmark.

### **Transient attributes and values:**

27. Important transient attributes include the play of light on the open landforms, changing snow cover, the changing colour of pasture vegetation and crops across the seasons, and the presence of stock and wildlife.

### **Remoteness and wildness attributes and values:**

28. A strong sense of remoteness as a consequence of the very low level of domestication and human activity in most parts of the PA.

### **Aesthetic attributes and values:**

29. The PA is predominantly experienced from outside its boundaries (although this may change if public access to Luggate Creek and Alice Burn is improved), and its aesthetic attributes therefore mainly relate to the views available from the floor of the Upper Clutha Basin and elevated places around the basin.
30. Specific characteristics contributing to aesthetic values include:
  - a. The pattern of ice-eroded moraine plateaux dissected by deep rocky kānuka-clad gullies;
  - b. The spectacular Luggate Gorge, with its steep rough, rocky cliffs and dense kānuka woodland;
  - c. The high level of perceived naturalness and remoteness, with very little built infrastructure (other than farm roads) visible from outside the site;
  - d. At a finer scale, the following aspects contribute to the aesthetic appeal:
    - i. the predominance of regenerating vegetation;

- ii. the contrast between the colour and texture of the intensively farmed plateaux/terraces and the steeper slopes, hummocks and gullies.
- iii. the play of light and shadow on the landform.

## 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 Lake McKay Station and Environs PA can be summarised as follows:

- 31. **High physical values** as a predominantly unmodified landform shaped by uplift, glacial and fluvial processes, as part of the recognised basin and range landform sequence in Central Otago, the important and intact vegetation types and habitats, and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
- 32. **Moderate associative values** relating to the mana whenua associations of the area, the historic attributes of gold mining and high-country pastoralism, and the shared and recognised values contributing to local identity and sense of place.
- 33. **High perceptual values** relating to the open character and resulting legible and expressive display of topography, the high level of perceived naturalness, the distinctive patterns of indigenous vegetation and pasture, and the memorability of various features within the PA.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Lake McKay and Environs PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities** – **some** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that utilise existing infrastructure and enhance public access.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities** – **very limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities that are co-located with existing consented infrastructure or are temporary or seasonal in nature, and are: located and designed to be reasonably difficult to see from external viewpoints; of a sympathetic scale, appearance and character; integrate appreciable landscape restoration and enhancement; enhance public access (where appropriate) and have a low key 'rural' character. **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for tourism related activities that are: of a modest or sympathetic scale; have a low-key 'rural' or 'non-urban' character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; and enhance public access.
- iii. **Urban expansions** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **some** landscape capacity on the terraces and moraine plateaux for agriculture under irrigation that maintains the high levels of naturalness, openness and protects the legibility and ecological values of the PA.
- v. **Earthworks** – **limited** landscape capacity to absorb earthworks associated with farming and rural living / visitor accommodation / commercial recreation activities and **some** landscape capacity for tracks and trails for recreational use that maintain naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and integrate with existing natural landform patterns.

- vi. **Farm buildings – limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled recessive buildings that are reasonably difficult to see from outside the site.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – very limited** landscape capacity for farm-scale extraction.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – extremely limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low key ‘rural’ roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for infrastructure that is co-located with existing facilities, buried or located such that it is screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be co-located with existing infrastructure and designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, **limited** landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – extremely limited** landscape capacity for commercial scale renewable energy generation on the gentler, upper ‘shoulder’ landforms that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns and is reasonably difficult to see from public places. **Limited** landscape capacity for discreetly located and small-scale renewable energy generation that is not visually prominent.
- xi. **Forestry – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- xii. **Rural living – very limited** landscape capacity for rural living development that is co-located with existing built development, at lower elevations and contained by landform and/or existing vegetation – with the location scale and design of any proposal ensuring that it is reasonably difficult to see from external viewpoints. Developments should be of a modest scale have a low key ‘rural’ character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement and enhance public access (where appropriate).

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, sweet briar, tussock hawkweed (*Hieracium lepidulum*) and crack willow.
- B. Animal pest species include rabbits, hares, pigs, goats, stoats, possums, rats and mice.

# 21.23 Schedule of Landscape Values: Upper Clutha Rural Character Landscape Priority Areas – Preamble

## 1. Purpose

- 1.1 Schedule 21.23 identifies and describes 5 Priority Areas (PA) Schedules that relate to Rural Character Landscapes (RCL)<sup>1</sup>.
- 1.2 The PA Schedules are a tool to assist with the identification of the landscape values that are to be protected within each PA and related landscape capacity. They contain both factual information and evaluative content and are to inform plan development and plan implementation processes and assist technical landscape assessment.
- 1.3 The description of each PA must be read in full. Each description, as a whole, expresses PA scale, the landscape values and the attributes from which those values derive.

## 2. Application

- 2.1 The PA schedules have been prepared to reflect that the PA mapping extends beyond the Rural Zone. The application of the PA Schedules to resource consents is as follows:
  - 2.1.1 The PA Schedules apply to any proposal requiring resource consent for a restricted discretionary, discretionary or non-complying activity<sup>2</sup> in the Rural Zone, including the Rural Industrial Sub Zone.
  - 2.1.2 The PA Schedules do not apply to proposals requiring resource consent in any other zones, including Exception Zones<sup>3</sup>. They may inform landscape assessments for proposals involving any land within a PA but are not required to be considered.
- 2.2 The PA Schedules will be used where relevant for any plan development proposal.

## 3. Landscape Attributes and Values

- 3.1 The landscape attributes and values identified, are based on an assessment of the PA as a whole and are not intended to describe the relevant attributes and values of specific sites within the PA. The schedules for each PA set out the 'key' attributes and values, summarised from a wide range of information sources and knowledge about the landscape.
- 3.2 Given the PA scale of the landscape assessment underpinning the PA schedules, a finer grain proposal-specific assessment of landscape attributes and values will typically be required for plan development or plan implementation purposes (including plan changes or resource consent applications)<sup>4</sup>. Through any proposal-specific assessment, additional landscape values may be identified that are not recorded in the PA Schedules. The PA Schedules represent a point in time and are not intended to provide a complete record.
- 3.3 The PA Schedules include attributes<sup>5</sup> that contribute positively to landscape values, attributes that detract

---

<sup>1</sup> Refer to Strategic Policies 3.3.39, 3.3.40 and 3.3.41

<sup>2</sup> Refer to Strategic Policy 3.3.46

<sup>3</sup> Refer to Chapter 3 part 3.1B.5.a

<sup>4</sup> Refer to Strategic Policy 3.3.43 and Strategic Policy 3.3.45

<sup>5</sup> The identification of an attribute in the PA schedule is not confirmation or otherwise as to whether the attribute has been legally established.

from landscape values, and attributes that are neutral with respect to informing landscape values.

- 3.4 The reference to 'Other distinctive vegetation types' and the 'Land use and patterns and features' in the PA Schedules do not relate to attributes or landscape values that need to be protected. Rather, these are attributes that influence landscape values (and landscape capacity). Reference to these existing attributes is not intended to 'lock in' existing land uses.
- 3.5 The reference to 'Plant and Animal Pests' corresponds to attributes that detract from landscape values. Pest information is included at the end of the landscape capacity section of each PA Schedule. Few, if any of the District's RCLs are pristine and there are varying levels of modification evident (including plant and animal pests). This means that landscape restoration and enhancement (which can include the management of pests) is a highly desirable outcome. The reference to plant and animal pests is intended to guide appropriate future landscape management within the PA. (For example, where a resource consent or plan change is proposed within the PA, the proposal or provisions may seek to specifically address the management of pests).
- 3.6 With respect to the link between the PA RCL Schedules and Strategic Policies 3.2.5.5, 3.2.5.7, and 3.3.41, landscape character and visual amenity values are expressed through the 'three dimensioned' construct of landscape values set out in the PA RCL Schedules (i.e. physical, associative and perceptual / sensory). The concept of 'landscape character' encompasses all three dimensions of landscape values. 'Visual amenity values' typically draw from the perceptual dimension, however there is inevitably an overlap with the physical dimension.
- 3.7 The key public routes and viewpoints are typically identified in the description of the 'Land use patterns and features', with key scenic routes identified under 'Recreation attributes and values' and/or 'Particularly important views to and from the area'.
- 3.8 The relationship between the PA RCL and the wider RCL context, the Outstanding Natural Features within the Upper Clutha Basin and the Outstanding Natural Landscapes that frame the Upper Clutha Basin are typically addressed in the description of 'Land use patterns and features', 'Shared and recognised attributes and values', 'Particularly important views to and from the area', and 'Aesthetic qualities and values'.

#### **4. Landscape Capacity**

- 4.1 The landscape capacity ratings used in the PA Schedules, which are described below, are intended to reflect the capacity of the landscape or feature to accommodate various types or forms of development, without compromising the identified landscape values. The definition of landscape capacity applied in the PA Schedules is set out at Chapter 3 part 3.1B.5b.ii.
- 4.2 The capacity ratings, and associated descriptions, are based on an assessment of each PA as a whole, and are not intended to describe the relevant capacity of specific sites within a PA. The ratings of landscape capacity do not apply to activities within any Exception Zone<sup>6</sup> that is located within a PA.
- 4.3 The landscape capacity ratings and qualifying comments in the PA Schedules are 'high level' and focus on describing potential outcomes that would likely be appropriate within each PA. These descriptions are not a replacement for any relevant policies, rules or standards in the District Plan, and are intended to provide guidance only.
- 4.4 Landscape capacity is not a fixed concept and it may change over time as development occurs or landscape characteristics change. In addition, across each PA there is likely to be variation in landscape capacity, which will require detailed consideration and assessment through future plan changes or resource consent applications.
- 4.5 For the purposes of the PA Schedules, landscape capacity is described using the following five terms:

---

<sup>6</sup> Refer to Chapter 3 part 3.1B.5(a)

**Some landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which a careful or measured amount of some sensitively located and designed development of this type is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is near its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values and where only a limited amount of sensitively located and designed development is unlikely to materially compromise the identified landscape values.

**Very limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is very close to its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only a very limited amount of sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

**Extremely limited landscape capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is extremely close to its capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where only an extremely limited amount of very sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

**Extremely limited or no capacity:** typically this corresponds to a situation in which the landscape is extremely close to, or already at, capacity to accommodate development of this type without material compromise of its identified landscape values, and where either no, or an extremely limited amount of very sensitively located and designed development is likely to be appropriate.

- 4.6 It is intended that the use of this five-tier landscape capacity terminology, along with a description of the characteristics that are likely to frame development that is appropriate (from a landscape perspective), and the description of the landscape attributes and values of the PA will assist in providing high level guidance with respect to the scale, location and characteristics of each land use type that will maintain and/or enhance landscape values in each PA that relate to RCLs.

## 5. Meaning of activities for the purpose of the PA Schedules

- 5.1 For the purpose of the PA schedules, activities listed have the following meanings:

- **Commercial recreational activities:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Visitor accommodation:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Tourism related activities:** has the same meaning as Resort in Chapter 2.
- **Urban expansions means:**
  - a change from a rural activity to urban development; or
  - a change (including any proposed change) in zoning to an urban zone, including any change to the urban growth boundary or any other zone changes (or proposed changes) that would provide for urban development.
- **Intensive agriculture:** has the same meaning as Factory Farming in Chapter 2.
- **Earthworks:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Farm buildings:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Mineral extraction:** has the same meaning as Mining Activity in Chapter 2.
- **Transport infrastructure:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Utilities:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Regionally significant infrastructure:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2
- **Farm scale quarries:** means mining of aggregate for farming activities on the same site.
- **Renewable energy generation:** has the same meaning as Renewable Electricity Generation and Renewable Electricity Generation Activities in Chapter 2.
- **Forestry:** has the same meaning as Forestry Activity in Chapter 2.
- **Rural living:** has the same meaning as rural living in Chapter 3 section 3.1B.5.
- **Rural industrial activities:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2.
- **Passenger lift systems:** has the same meaning as Chapter 2 except that for the purposes of the PA schedules it includes base and terminal buildings and stations.
- **Jetties, lake structures, moorings, boat sheds:** have their plain meaning (and may be used interchangeably).

- 5.2 The range of land use activities addressed in the capacity section of the PA Schedules includes the

activities prescribed by SP 3.3.41. It is acknowledged that this does not span the full array of land use activities that may be contemplated in the PAs over time. In the case of a future application for a land use activity that is not addressed in a PA Schedule, an assessment applying the principles set out in 3.3.43, 3.3.45 and 3.3.46 is required.

---

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

### General Description of the Area

The Cardrona River / Mount Barker Road PA is a triangle of rural RCL 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 includes the summit and slopes of the hill located between Mount Barker, Boundary and Maxwell Roads, near the toe of the Criffel Range. Schedule 21.22.10 covers the Mount Barker PA, which sits as an island within this PA Schedule.

### 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

### 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.

### 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.

### **Ecological features and vegetation types:**

8. Shelter belts throughout the PA and scattered woodlots generally around 1-3ha in size.
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.

### **Land use patterns and features:**

13. 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.
14. 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 20 hectares 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.
15. 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.
16. 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. The Halliday Road PA to the north across the Wānaka-Luggate Highway, which has a pattern of rural living and working farmland similar to that of the Cardrona River / Mount Barker Road PA 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.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

17. 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).

18. 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:**

19. 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.
20. 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:**

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

### **Historic attributes and values:**

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

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

26. 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.
27. Valued as a pleasant rural living location close to Wānaka, with spacious pastoral surrounds and a high level of visual and rural amenity.

### **Recreation attributes and values:**

28. 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:

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

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

32. 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.
33. 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.
34. 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:

35. 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:

36. 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:

37. 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 hobby farming and low-density rural living (on lots of 4ha and greater).

## Aesthetic attributes and values

38. The experience of the values identified above from public and private viewpoints.
39. 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 the Cardrona River / Mount Barker Road PA can be summarised as follows:

40. **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.
41. **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.
42. **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 Cardrona River / Mount Barker Road PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- 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.

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

- 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** – **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture** – **some** landscape capacity 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 tracks and trails for recreational use that maintain naturalness and expressiveness 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. **Extremely limited or 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. **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.

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, hawthorn, crack willow, broom, and lupin.
- B. Animal pest species include rabbits, stoats, possums, rats, and mice.

---

## 21.23.2 Halliday Road / Corbridge PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Halliday Road / Corbridge PA is an area of rural RCL land bounded by the Wanaka – Luggate Highway (SH6), the Cardrona River and the Clutha River Mata-au on its southern, western and northern sides, respectively. To the east it extends to the escarpment between rolling glacial moraine and the flatter series of outwash terraces. The rolling moraine downlands include a 322 hectare site (approximately 234 hectares of which is within the PA) to the west of Wānaka airport where a film studio and associated activities has been recently consented.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. A series of alluvially formed terraces, with well-formed treads and risers, stepping down to the west to the Cardrona River.
2. A clearly defined scarp at the eastern edge of the terraces of up to 60 metres in height.
3. The sequence of landforms:
  - a. the alluvial bed of the Cardrona River;
  - b. an obvious series of terraces stepping down to the river, where fluvial erosion has cut into the glacial outwash gravels;
  - c. a clearly defined prominent scarp of about 60 metres in height at the eastern edge of the terraces, with a sizeable basin within gently rolling glacial moraine downlands extending eastwards from the scarp.
4. The relatively free-draining brown and pallic soils with reasonable fertility, making the area suitable for pastoral farming and more intensive farming under irrigation.
5. 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.

### Hydrological features:

6. The Ōrau (Cardrona River), a habitat for longfin eels, kōaro, upland bullies and Clutha flathead galaxias (nationally critical) and brown and rainbow trout. The lower reaches of the river adjacent to the PA have poor water quality (nitrogen enrichment from contaminated groundwater).
7. Irrigation reservoirs/ponds albeit of lesser importance than natural water bodies within the rolling glacial till downlands, with varying levels of permanent water.

8. The Wanaka Basin Cardrona riparian gravel aquifer, which underlies the PA and Wānaka township. Water abstraction from the aquifer is currently over-allocated.

### **Ecological features and vegetation types:**

9. Conifer (mainly radiata pine) and eucalypt shelter belts, generally oriented north-south or west-east, and a few small conifer woodlots of around 1-6ha in size.
10. Large patch of kanuka near the junction of the Mata-au (Clutha River) and the Ōrau (Cardrona River) and scattered regenerating kānuka and grey shrubland on bordering scarps, between the PA and the Mata-au.
11. Vegetation associated with rural living and hobby farming on the alluvial terraces, including roadside hedges and shelterbelts, driveway avenues, shelter trees around dwellings, orchards, and large gardens.

### **Land use patterns and features:**

12. A combination of pastoral farming or cropping and latterly, commercial activity, particularly on the rolling moraine downlands. The alluvial terraces support mainly hobby farming or more intensive farming, with vineyards, orchards and a plant nursery. A 322 hectare site on the rolling moraine downlands, includes land that comprises over one third of the Halliday Road / Corbridge PA, and includes a recently consented film studio and associated activities. Events such as weddings and concerts have been held at Corbridge Estate.
13. Established rural living and visitor accommodation is common on the alluvial terraces, mainly on lots of between 4 and 10 hectares in size. Only one dwelling is present on the escarpment. There are a few, both smaller and larger lots in this western area of the PA. Four lots of around 20ha in size, created as part of the Poplar Beach Subdivision, are present at the eastern edge of the PA, but only two have been developed for rural living. An extensive film studio and tourism complex has been consented at Corbridge, located around the lake and screened from Wanaka Luggate Highway by topography. The development includes a film studio complex including sound stages, film location sets, buildings for post-production facilities, film school, screening theatre, film exhibition centre and supporting facilities along with associated infrastructure for the film studio.
14. The land use context of the PA includes:
  - a. RCL land within the Ōrau (Cardrona River) floodplains (including some commercial recreation activities), developed Rural Residential zoning and urban Albert Town to the west.
  - b. The Mata-au (Clutha River) ONF immediately adjoining the PA to the north.
  - c. Open pastoral RCL and Wānaka airport to the east.
  - d. Cardrona River / Mount Barker Road PA across the Wānaka Luggate Highway to the south, which has a pattern of rural living and working farmland similar to that of the western half of the Halliday Road / Corbridge PA.

### **Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:**

15. The 1927 Halliday Homestead at 85 Halliday Road (QLDC Ref. 522).

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

16. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.
17. The 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:

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

### Historic attributes and values:

22. The associations of the area with early European settlement and pastoral activities.

### Shared and recognised attributes and values:

23. Valued as the scenic rural enclosure of Wānaka/Albert Town to the east. The Ōrau (Cardrona River) forms a natural boundary to the spread of urban or rural residential development to the east from Albert Town.
24. Valued as part of the rural approach to Wānaka from the east on Wanaka Luggate Highway, with open views across rolling or level pasture and cropping land. This may change slightly following consented development of the film studios site; however visual amenity will be maintained.

### Recreation attributes and values:

25. Recreational use of the Upper Clutha River walking and cycling track from the end of Halliday Road and from Albert Town across Pawsons Crossing bridge.

## 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:

26. The series of terraces leading down to the Ōrau (Cardrona River), which express the fluvial processes of river erosion. In particular the prominent highest escarpment, which is visible from many parts of the surrounding landscape and from the summit of Mount Iron.
27. The gently rolling open landform of the glacial till moraine, appreciated from Mount Iron and Wanaka Luggate Highway, however from the highway this appreciation may alter slightly if the consented development at the film studios site is implemented.



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

28. Highly attractive views from Wanaka Luggate Highway across open pasture or cropping land to the hills and mountainous ONL of the Upper Clutha Basin, or to rising moraine landform and shelterbelts. The highly coherent pattern of large open paddocks alternating with linear shelterbelts across the majority of the PA, together with the undulating nature of the terrain, general lack of visible dwellings and changing pasture/crop colours across the seasons add to the pleasantness and strong rural character of the views. These views may change slightly if the consented development at the film studios site is implemented, however visual amenity will be maintained.
29. Views from Halliday Road and the Upper Clutha River Track connection, enclosed by the prominent escarpment to the east but open to the Upper Clutha Basin mountains and hills to the north and west. Views characterised by rural living and farming, with sequential enclosure by roadside vegetation.
30. Views from the summit of Mount Iron, where the panoramic vistas available to the east take in the Cardrona River, the river terraces and prominent escarpment, and the undulating pastoral moraine land and shelterbelts extending to the east. If implemented, the consented film studios site will become part of these views.

### **Naturalness attributes and values**

31. Perceptions of naturalness and of pastoral and working farm rural character are largely maintained for people passing adjacent to the PA on Wanaka Luggate Highway. The river terraces accessed from Halliday Road are more domesticated by rural living and have a lower level of perceived naturalness. Overall, there is a moderate level of naturalness, with a predominance of natural rather than built elements, but human intervention as managed farmland, rural living and following construction, the consented film studios (if implemented), will be increasingly evident.

### **Transient attributes and values**

32. Transient attributes of the landscape include seasonal foliage and pasture or crop colours, the changing shadow patterns from shelter belts, and the presence of stock and wildlife such as hawks.

### **Remoteness/wildness attributes and values**

33. Rural tranquillity and quietness are currently experienced in those parts of the PA away from Wānaka Luggate Highway, where there are low traffic volumes and the levels of activity are consistent with working farmland, hobby farming and low-density rural living. This may alter slightly at part of the PA if the consented development at the film studios site is implemented.

### **Aesthetic attributes and values**

34. The experience of all of the values identified above from public and private viewpoints.
35. More specifically, this includes:
  - a. Highly attractive views across large open paddocks to the mountains and hills of the Upper Clutha Basin or to moraine landforms and shelterbelts.
  - b. Strong rural character, with large areas of open space – either pastoral or cropping – retained adjacent to Wanaka Luggate Highway, a sense of spaciousness, with existing rural living and consented film studios development generally integrated by topography and/or vegetation.
  - c. Aesthetic appeal of the prominent escarpment and the gently undulating 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
----------	-----	---------	----------	----------	------	-----------

These various combined physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for the Halliday Road / Corbridge PA can be summarised as follows:

36. **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 rolling moraines and water bodies, and the strong patterns of rural shelterbelts framing large open areas of pastoral land.
37. **Moderate associative values** relating to the historic heritage of European pastoral farming, the recreational use of the Upper Clutha River Track and the shared and recognised values of the area as a rural edge to Wānaka/Albert Town and as the rural approach to the township on Wanaka Luggate Highway.
38. **Moderate-high perceptual values** relating to the expressiveness of the terrace, escarpment and moraine downland landforms, the coherence of vegetation and land use patterns, the strong rural character, the scenic views across open pasture, the low-key rural tranquillity and quietness in places, and the moderate level of naturalness with rural living remaining subordinate to pasture/cropping and vegetation. Recently consented activities may alter this for parts of the PA.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Halliday Road / Corbridge PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – some** landscape capacity for small scale and low-key activities that are: located where they are screened from Wanaka Luggate Highway by topography or existing vegetation; designed to be of sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; have a low key 'rural' character; and that maintain or enhance the PA's landscape values.
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – limited** landscape capacity for rural farmstay/visitor accommodation or tourism related activities that are: either co-located with existing development or located where they are screened from Wanaka-Luggate Highway by topography or existing vegetation; designed to be of a sympathetic scale, appearance, and character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement; have a low key 'rural' character; and that maintain or enhance the PA's landscape values.
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – some** landscape capacity where expressiveness and scenic attributes and values are maintained.
- v. **Earthworks – limited** landscape capacity for earthworks and **some** capacity for tracks and trails for recreational use associated with farming and rural living / visitor accommodation / commercial recreation activities, subject to protecting naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and those activities being sympathetically designed to integrate with existing natural landform patterns.

- vi. **Farm buildings – some** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce the rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – very limited** landscape capacity for farm-scale quarries that maintain or enhance the PA's landscape character and visual amenity values.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure** – outside the state highway corridor, **limited** 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 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** capacity for small scale wind or solar generation located where topography ensures it is not visible from public places. **Limited** capacity for larger scale commercial renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry – limited** landscape capacity for scattered small woodlots of up to 2 hectares in area.
- xii. **Rural living – very limited** landscape capacity to absorb additional rural living without cumulative adverse effects on naturalness, aesthetic and rural character values. The rural character of the PA is vulnerable to fragmentation and domestication through rural living development, and its value as a rural edge to Wānaka/Albert Town could be undermined by increased densities of rural living on the river terraces. Any additional rural living should be set well back from roads and public trails, 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.

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Plant pest species include wilding conifers, hawthorn, crack willow, broom, gorse and lupin.
- B. Animal pest species include rabbits, feral cats, ferrets, stoats, weasels, possums, rats and mice.

---

## 21.23.3 West of Hāwea River PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The West of Hāwea River PA takes in the RCL comprising river terraces on the true right (i.e. west) of the Hāwea River, extending from approximately Horseshoe Bend in the south to Hāwea settlement in the north. SH6 Lake Hāwea Albert Town Road forms the western boundary except—at the northern end, where the PA extends westwards from the road to encompass the low-lying land along the toe of the south-eastern flanks of Mount Maude.

### Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

### Landforms and land types:

1. The flat glacial outwash plain of the historic Hāwea Glacier, modified by the fluvial erosion and sedimentation of the Hāwea River that characterises the general area.
2. Maungawera Hill, roughly in the centre of the PA, separates the area into a northern and southern terrace. The hill itself comprises a terminal moraine of the Hāwea Glacier and extends broadly south-westwards from the south end of Mount Maude.
3. The patterning of shallow scarps and paleochannels throughout the northern terrace.

### Hydrological features:

4. The ephemeral water courses from the mountains to the northwest, which flow only after prolonged or intense rainfall, that are artificially channelled in places and discharge to the Hāwea River.

### Ecological features and vegetation types:

5. Particularly noteworthy indigenous vegetation features include:
  - a. Swathes and patches of regenerating kanuka, manuka, grey shrubland and bracken fernland across the lower slopes of Mount Maude.
  - b. Localised patches of kanuka and grey shrubland along with wilding conifers occupy the river terraces and escarpments bordering the Hāwea River.
  - c. Localised stands of kanuka and patches of short tussock grassland and matagouri shrubland occur on the expansive terraces between SH6 and the Hāwea River.
  - d. SNAs near edge of river terrace at end of Te Awa Road encompass small kanuka stands and patches of short tussock grassland and matagouri shrubland.

6. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. Grazed and cropped pasture with conifer and poplar shelterbelts. The latter are predominantly aligned west to east, perpendicular to the prevailing winds, and can be very long.
  - b. Forestry blocks throughout the sloping land in the centre of the PA, on the lower-lying gravel soils on the southern terrace adjacent the river and at the toe of Mount Maude.
  - c. Amenity plantings around rural and rural living dwellings and farm buildings.
  - d. Wilding conifers in places, particularly throughout areas of regenerating scrub.

### **Land-use patterns and features:**

7. Low-density rural living, and hobby farming dominate land use throughout the PA. Rural living/hobby farming lots are generally between 4ha and 20ha in size, with a few larger lots greater than 50ha.
8. Throughout the northern terrace, dwellings are set back from SH6, exploiting the integrating benefits of the low terrace riser extending throughout the area or configured along the true right bank of the river. Many of the consented building platforms in this area are yet to be built on. There is a relatively consistent patterning of rural living lots adjacent the river; and throughout which there has been extensive use of shelterbelt and specimen tree plantings to achieve visual integration and privacy. While this area is not visible from the highway, it forms a contrasting and more finely grained character to the more open and pastoral land to the west.
9. Built development throughout the gentle slopes flanking Mount Maude and the central moraine area are generally well integrated by the hummocky topography and/or existing vegetation; comprise a distinctly working rural character; and/or are not prominent in views from the road. The area of elevated moraine on the eastern side of SH6 is predominantly in pastoral and forestry use.
10. Across the southern terrace, a more working rural landscape prevails, with pastoral, cropping, and forestry evident. Rural lifestyle lots are clustered towards the north-eastern edge of the terrace adjacent the river (accessed via Camp Hill Road) and throughout the south-western quadrant (accessed via Kennels Lane). Many of the consented building platforms in this area are yet to be built on.
11. The Maungawera Rural Visitor Zone throughout the elevated central area of moraine on the east side of SH6. This provides for carefully located and visually discreet pods of visitor focussed development including hot tubs, motorhome sites and cycle trails. Future plans include other developments such as hospitality venues.
12. The Hāwea Flat Whitewater Park (The Wave) is a popular surfing, kayaking, swimming, and picnicking spot adjacent the PA and accessed via the PA (Camp Hill Road).
13. The margins of the Hāwea River along the eastern edge of the PA which are identified as a Marginal Strip.
14. The Hāwea River track on the opposite (true left) side of the river.
15. The Hāwea River ONL notation that applies to the stretch of the river adjoining the southern part of the PA.
16. SH6 which passes through the western side of the PA.
17. Other neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include:
  - a. The generally open and flat expanse of the intensively farmed Hāwea Flats on the eastern side of the Hāwea River.
  - b. The reasonably close proximity of Hāwea settlement to the northern end of the PA.

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

18. 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.
19. The RCL overlaps the mapped wāhi tūpuna Hāwea River (including Camp Hill). overlay which applies to the Hāwea River and its margins.

### **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 experiences:**

20. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
21. The Hāwea was part of a traditional mahika kai network.
22. The mana whenua values associated with this area include, but may not be limited to, awa, nohoaka and ara tawhito.

### **Historic attributes and values:**

23. The historical and contextual association of the river as a landscape feature, which shaped the development of early local infrastructure and acted as a natural boundary.

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

24. The identity of the area as 'breathing space' or a somewhat untamed 'green belt' between Albert Town and Hāwea settlement.
25. The popularity of the Hāwea River Track, The (Hāwea River) Wave, and SH6.

### **Recreation attributes and values**

26. Recreational angling on the Hāwea River.

### **Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

### **Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

27. The flat expanse of the outwash plain and river terraces, along with the hummocky moraine, are expressive of the interaction of the glacial and fluvial processes that have shaped the Upper Clutha valley.

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

28. The sequence of attractive and varied 'rural' views from SH6 across the PA. In places (and particularly towards the southern end of the PA), the seemingly untamed or rough appearance of vegetation throughout the area contributes the impression of a spacious and relatively undeveloped rural landscape.

Elsewhere (and towards the northern end of the PA), the more open pastoral character of the PA enables views westwards to the proximate lower flanks of Mount Maude and the peaks beyond (ONL), and eastwards across the open expanse of the PA and Hāwea Flats beyond, to the Grandview Range (ONL), including Breast Hill and Corner Peak. However, such views are intermittent due to the screening effect of the frequent shelterbelts across the terraces along the eastern side of the highway. The shelterbelts and pastoral land of the PA contributes a strong 'working farm' rural character, with most built development displaying a distinctly working rural character or obscured by vegetation in views from public places. The localised openness of the rural landscape to the east of the highway confers a memorable sense of a 'big sky' landscape.

29. Views to the PA from the Hāwea River track along its eastern edge (noting that the river corridor adjoining the southern end of the PA is ONL).

#### **Naturalness attributes and values:**

30. Perceptions of naturalness and of working rural character are largely maintained for people visiting the landscape, although this is undermined to some extent by the number of partially visible houses.
31. Overall, there is a moderate level of naturalness with a predominance of natural, rather than built, elements; but human intervention as managed farmland and rural living is evident.

#### **Memorability attributes and values:**

32. Memorable to residents and locals as a 'green belt' between Albert Town and Hāwea settlement.

#### **Transient attributes and values:**

33. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation.
34. Seasonal pasture colours.
35. The changing shadow patterns from shelter belts and the presence of stock and wildlife such as hawks.

#### **Remoteness/wildness attributes and values:**

36. Impressions of rural tranquillity and quietness are localised to parts of Camp Hill Road and environs away from rural living uses.
37. A dark night sky impression contributes to feelings of wildness.

#### **Aesthetic qualities and values:**

38. The attractive and distinctly rural views to the (ONL) mountain ranges surrounding the Upper Clutha Basin. The dominance of natural elements in the form of pasture and tree, and subservience of built elements, play an important role in shaping the quality of these views.
39. Visual connection with the Hāwea River corridor along the eastern side of the PA.
40. Juxtaposition between the tamed rural land, the rougher rural character in places and the urban grain of Hāwea settlement (and the golf course) and Albert Town further afield.

### **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 West of Hāwea River PA can be summarised as follows:

41. **Moderate physical values** relating to the glacially formed outwash plain/alluvial fans of the valley floor, being continually reworked by the Hāwea River, the strong patterns of rural land use and the mana whenua features of the area.
42. **Moderate associative values** relating the mana whenua associations of the area, and the shared and recognised values of the area for residents and locals as a spacious 'green belt' between Albert Town and Lake Hāwea settlement.
43. **Moderate perceptual values** relating to the expressiveness of the moraine, river terraces (including both their treads and risers), the coherent rural character, the scenic rural views across pasture to the surrounding mountain context, and the moderate level of naturalness, with built development remaining subservient to natural landscape elements and patterns.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the West of Hāwea River PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** capacity for small-scale and low-key activities that: integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale; have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – limited** landscape capacity for activities that are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale; have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for tourism related activities unless such activities are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – some** landscape capacity where the quality of views 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 activities that maintain naturalness and expressiveness values and integrate with existing natural landform patterns. **Limited** capacity for tracks and trails for recreational use that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement.
- vi. **Farm buildings – some** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce the existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – very limited** landscape capacity for farm scale quarries that maintain or enhance the quality of views, naturalness values and aesthetic values.



- viii. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** landscape capacity for modestly scaled and low-key rural roading that is positioned to optimise the integrating benefits of landform and vegetation patterns.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for additional district-scale infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, **limited** landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks. **Very limited** capacity for other larger-scale regionally significant infrastructure.
- x. **Renewable energy generation – some** landscape capacity for small-scale wind or solar generation located where topography ensures it is not highly visible from public places. **Very limited** landscape capacity for larger-scale commercial renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry – limited** landscape capacity for scattered woodlots of up to 2 hectares in area.
- xii. **Rural living – very limited** landscape capacity to absorb additional rural living without cumulative adverse effects on associative and perceptual values. The rural character of the PA is vulnerable to fragmentation and 'domestication' through rural living development. Any additional rural living should be: set well back from roads and public tracks; co-located with existing development; located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; 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 the impression of expansive rural views from public vantage points.

## PLANT AND ANIMAL PESTS

- A. Plant pest species include wilding conifers.

---

## 21.23.4 Church Road – Shortcut Road PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Church Road – Shortcut Road PA generally takes in the RCL area known as the Clutha Triangle immediately to the north of Luggate and defined by SH6, Church Road, and Shortcut Road. The mapped extent of the PA also includes the flat land on the west side of SH6 and the rural land to the east of Church Road adjoining the Clutha River.

### Physical Attributes and Values

Geology and Geomorphology • Topography and Landforms • Climate and Soils • Hydrology • Vegetation • Ecology • Settlement • Development and Land Use • Archaeology and Heritage • Tāngata whenua

### Landforms and land types:

1. The flat terraced glacial outwash plain with a patterning of shallow scarps which collectively form a series of degradational river terraces stepping down from the west to the east.
2. Sandy areas, boulder rises and shallow dry swales of former paleochannels in places.
3. An area where more recent fluvial processes of erosion and sedimentation have reworked older alluvium associated with historic glaciations affecting the landscape.

### Hydrological features:

4. Luggate Creek, which is a complex winding channel along the south-eastern edge of the PA (to the east of Church Road).
5. The ephemeral water courses draining from the mountains to the south across and around the terrace edges that are artificially channelled in places and discharge to the Clutha River. These channels tend to flow only during prolonged rainfall.

### Ecological features and vegetation types:

6. Other distinctive vegetation types include:
  - a. Grazing and cropping with scattered exotic shelterbelts throughout the land straddling SH6.
  - b. Tree crops, flower crops and orchards on the lower terrace.
  - c. Amenity and shelter plantings around rural and rural living dwellings and farm buildings.
  - d. Poplar and willow plantings across terraces bordering the true right bank of Luggate Creek.
  - e. Mature crack willow and broom along the margins of Luggate Creek.

### **Land-use patterns and features:**

7. Low-density rural living, horticultural and hobby farming dominate land use throughout the PA. Lot sizes are generally between 2ha and 20ha in size.
8. Church Road and Shortcut Road as local rural roads.
9. The margins of the Luggate Creek along the south-eastern edge of the PA which are identified as a Marginal Strip.
10. SH6 which passes through the western side of the PA.
11. An area of rural industrial type land-use with large scale buildings extending along the east side of Church Road to near the Grandview Bridge.
12. Neighbouring land uses which have an influence on the landscape character of the area due to their scale, character, and/or proximity include:
  - a. The very close proximity of Luggate settlement which extends across the river terraces to the southeast of the PA, with some of the more elevated terraces having a visual connection to the PA.
  - b. The Te Rua Tupāpaku (Clutha River near Luggate) ONL and associated DoC Reserve and river track extending along the eastern side of the PA.
  - c. The Luggate River Track along the south (true right) side of Luggate Creek extending along the south-eastern side of the PA.
  - d. The open and flat expanse of the intensively farmed Hāwea Flats to the north of the PA.
  - e. The forestry plantings throughout the terrace escarpment along the western side of the PA.

### **Mana whenua features and their locations:**

13. 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.
14. Parts of the RCL overlap with the mapped wāhi tūpuna Mata-au (Clutha River) and Te Rua Tūpāpaku.
15. The Mata-au (Clutha River) is a Statutory Acknowledgement under the Ngāi Tahu Claims Settlement Act 1998.
16. Te Rua Tūpāpaku is recorded as a fortified permanent pā.

### **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 experiences are:**

17. Kāi Tahu whakapapa connections to whenua and wai generate a kaitiaki duty to uphold the mauri of all important landscape areas.
18. The Mata-au (Clutha River) takes its name from a Kāi Tahu whakapapa that traces the genealogy of water. On that basis, the Mata-au is seen as a descendant of the creation traditions.

19. The Mata-au was part of inland mahika kai trails and was also a key transportation route for pounamu from inland areas to settlements on the coast.
20. Te Rua Tūpāpaku is a kāika mahika kai located on the Mata-au where weka, tuna (eels) and kauru (cabbage tree root) were gathered. It is also recorded as a fortified permanent pā.
21. The mana whenua values associated with this area include, but may not be limited to, wāhi taoka, ara tawhito, mahika kai, nohoaka, urupā, pā, wāhi tapu.

#### **Historic attributes and values:**

22. Association with early pastoral land-use and gold mining.

#### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

23. The identity of the area as a green edge to Luggate and, in the case of the land to the east of Church Road, an established rural industry area supporting the adjacent settlement.
24. The popularity of the area as an entry/exit point on the Upper Clutha River Track.
25. The close proximity of the PA to the Grandview Bridge (or the 'red bridge') to the north of the PA (which is described as one of the most attractively proportioned steel bridges in Aotearoa).

#### **Recreation attributes and values:**

26. SH6 Wanaka Luggate Highway as a key scenic route linking between Wanaka and Cromwell.
27. Shortcut Road as a key scenic route linking between Wanaka (and the West Coast) and the Lindis Pass.
28. The Upper Clutha River Track in close proximity to the PA.

#### **Perceptual (Sensory) Attributes and Values**

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

#### **Legibility and expressiveness attributes and values:**

29. The flat expanse of the outwash plain and river terraces are expressive of the interaction of the glacial and fluvial processes that have shaped, and are continuing to shape, the Upper Clutha valley.

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

30. The sequence of attractive long-range and expansive rural views from SH6, parts of Church Road and Shortcut Road across the PA to the northern end of the Pisa Range and across to the Grandview Range. In views east from Church Road, the established rural industry area contributes to the outlook. The cropping and pastoral land of the majority of the PA contributes a strong 'working farm' rural character, with most built development displaying a distinctly working rural character or obscured by vegetation. The appearance of an almost continuous patterning of rural land-use across the PA and beyond to the north and west reinforces the coherence of the underlying river terrace landforms. The openness of the rural landscape to the east of the highway confers a memorable sense of a 'big sky' landscape.
31. The expansive very long-range, predominantly rural views from the elevated urban areas of Luggate to the southeast, in which the PA forms part of the broad sweep of the Upper Clutha Basin rural plains, framed by a continuous circle of dramatic mountains (ONL). The large scale buildings associated with the established rural industry east of Church Road also contributes to the character of these views.

- 32. Attractive rural views to the PA from the river tracks (ONL) around its eastern and south-eastern edges. These include localised views of the established rural industry area east of Church Road.

**Naturalness attributes and values:**

- 33. Perceptions of naturalness and of a working rural character are largely maintained for people visiting the landscape, although this is compromised to some extent by the number of partially visible houses and the large scale buildings associated with rural industry (to the east of Church Road).
- 34. Overall, there is a moderate level of naturalness with a predominance of natural, rather than built, elements; but human intervention as managed farmland, horticultural blocks, rural industry with large scale buildings, and rural living is evident.

**Memorability attributes and values:**

- 35. Memorable to residents and locals as a ‘green edge’ to Luggate.

**Transient attributes and values:**

- 36. Autumn leaf colour and seasonal loss of leaves associated with the exotic vegetation.
- 37. Seasonal horticultural crop foliage and pasture colours.
- 38. The changing shadow patterns from shelter belts and the presence of stock and wildlife such as hawks.

**Remoteness/wildness attributes and values:**

- 39. Impressions of rural tranquillity and quietness which are localised to stretches of the river edge tracks adjoining the PA where intervening landform and vegetation patterns screen views to buildings within the PA and further afield in Luggate.

**Aesthetic qualities and values:**

- 40. The attractive and distinctly rural ‘big sky’ views to the mountain ranges surrounding the Upper Clutha Basin. The dominance of natural elements including pasture, crops, and trees and the subservience of built elements play an important role in shaping the quality of these views.
- 41. The juxtaposition between the tamed rural land, the rougher character along the river and creek corridors and the urban grain of Luggate further afield.

**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 the Church Road – Shortcut Road PA can be summarised as follows:

- 42. **Moderate physical values** relating to the productive soils and associated agricultural and horticultural land uses, the glacially formed outwash plain/alluvial fans of the valley floor that have subsequently been reworked, the mana whenua features in the area and the strong patterns of rural land use and, to a lesser degree, rural industry land-use.

43. **Moderate associative values** relating to the mana whenua associations of the area, the recreational use of Te Rua Tupāpaku (Clutha River near Luggate) and Luggate Creek, and the shared and recognised values of the area for residents and locals as a green edge to Luggate.
44. **Moderate perceptual values** relating to the expressiveness of the river terrace ‘tread and riser’ landforms, the coherence of land use patterns, the strong rural character, the expansive and scenic rural views, and the moderate level of naturalness, with built development, other than some existing large scale building development, remaining subservient to more natural landscape elements and patterns.

## Landscape Capacity

The landscape capacity of the Church Road – Shortcut Road PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very limited** landscape capacity for small-scale and low-key activities that: integrate with and complement/enhance existing recreation features; are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).
- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – limited** capacity for activities that are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate). **Extremely limited** landscape capacity for tourism related activities unless such activities are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale, have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited** landscape capacity unless such development can: integrate a strong defensible boundary to avoid the potential future risk of settlement sprawl; is located and designed to connect with the existing settlement; maintains / enhances identified landscape values; and complements the existing character of Luggate.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – extremely limited** landscape capacity where aesthetic attributes and values are maintained.
- v. **Earthworks – limited** landscape capacity to absorb earthworks associated with farming and rural living/visitor accommodation activities that maintain naturalness and expressiveness values and integrate with existing natural landform patterns. **Some** landscape capacity for trails that are: located to integrate with existing networks; designed to be of a sympathetic appearance and character; and integrate landscape restoration and enhancement.
- vi. **Farm buildings – some** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that reinforce the existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – very limited** landscape capacity for farm-scale quarries that maintain or enhance the quality of views, naturalness values and aesthetic values.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – extremely limited** landscape capacity.
- ix. **Utilities and regionally significant infrastructure – limited** landscape capacity for additional district-scale infrastructure that is buried or located such that they are screened from external view. In the case of utilities such as overhead lines or cell phone towers which cannot be screened, these should be designed and located so that they are not visually prominent. In the case of the National Grid, **limited** landscape capacity in circumstances where there is a functional or operational need for its location and

structures are designed and located to limit their visual prominence, including associated earthworks. **Very limited** capacity for other larger-scale regionally significant infrastructure.

- x. **Renewable energy generation** – **some** landscape capacity for small-scale wind or solar generation located where topography ensures it is not highly visible from public places. **Very limited** landscape capacity for larger-scale commercial renewable energy generation.
- xi. **Forestry** – **very limited** landscape capacity for scattered small woodlots of up to 2 hectares in area.
- xii. **Rural living** – **very limited** landscape capacity to absorb additional rural living without cumulative adverse effects on associative and perceptual values. The rural character of the PA is vulnerable to fragmentation and ‘domestication’ through rural living development. Any additional rural living should be set well back from roads and public tracks; co-located with existing development; located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; 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 the impression of expansive rural views from public vantage points.
- xiii. **Rural Industrial Activity** – **extremely limited** landscape capacity for rural industry that is: co-located with existing rural industry development and includes appropriately scaled buildings; avoids the impression of development sprawl; maintains / enhances identified landscape values; maintains the quality of views and aesthetic values; and complements the existing character of Luggate.

## PLANT PESTS

- A. Plant pest species include crack willow and broom.

---

## 21.23.5 Maungawera Valley PA: Schedule of Landscape Values

### General Description of the Area

The Maungawera Valley PA is a rural RCL valley about 6km north of urban Wānaka enclosed by Mount Brown to the south and Mount Maude to the north. The PA includes the northern flanks of Mount Brown and most of the valley floor extending towards Mount Maude/Mount Gold/Mount Burke ONL to the north, the hummocky moraine and Rods Creek catchment to the west, and the protruding moraine of Maungawera Hill to the east. The strip of land between Mount Brown and the Lake Hāwea - Albert Town Road (SH6) is also included.

There are two sub areas within the PA:

- The northern flanks of Mount Brown;
- The floor of the valley.

### 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

### Landforms and land types:

1. Mount Brown: an elongated roche moutonnée landform that has been overridden by valley glaciers and smoothed by a veneer of glacial till deposits from successive glaciations. On the moderate to gently sloping northern flanks, the underlying schist bedrock has been overlain with till deposits from successive glaciations and eroded by subsequent fluvial action.
2. The valley floor: originally formed by a glacial tongue and overlain with glacial outwash gravels and more recent alluvial fan materials from the mountains to the north.
3. The relatively free-draining soils of the valley floor, making the area suitable for pastoral farming and cropping under irrigation.

### Hydrological features:

4. Ephemeral water courses from the northern mountains that are artificially channelled across the valley floor and join to form Wai-utu-utu (Speargrass Creek) at the eastern end of the valley, flowing to the Hāwea River.

### Ecological features and vegetation types:

5. Scattered regenerating kānuka forest on the northern flanks of Mount Brown, particularly on the steeper slopes, amongst rough and semi-improved pasture and pine woodlots.
6. Conifer and poplar shelter belts, generally oriented north-south across the valley to mitigate the wind tunnel effect created by Waiariki (Stevensons Arm) and the enclosing landforms.
7. A few small (1-4ha) forestry woodlots on the lower flanks of Mount Brown.



## Land use patterns and features:

8. Distinctive and coherent pattern of cropping and pastoral farming on the valley floor, with large landholdings, regular but widely spaced shelterbelts, farm infrastructure such as tracks, irrigation systems and a few sporadic farm buildings, and dwellings/homestead clusters (some of which provide visitor accommodation and event facilities).
9. Low density rural living and hobby farming on the lower flanks or toe of Mount Brown and adjacent to Lake Hawea - Albert Town Road. Mt Maude vineyard is also located on the lower Mount Brown slopes. Rural living/hobby farming lots are generally between 2ha and 9ha in size, with a few larger lots greater than 50ha. Dwellings are set back to varying degrees from Maungawera Valley Road. Some dwellings are close to the road. However, all existing dwellings are generally well integrated by the hummocky topography of the mountain flanks or by existing vegetation and as such are not visually prominent from the road.
10. The land use context of the PA includes:
  - a. RCL open working farmland or kānuka-lined stream courses to the west as far as Waiariki (Stevensons Arm), including the distinctive Maungawera fan.
  - b. RCL open pastoral farming on foothills and terraces/alluvial fans at the base of the Mount Maude/Mount Gold/Mount Burke ONL to the north.
  - c. Pastoral farming, forestry, and a small amount of rural living in the Maungawera Hill RCL to the north-east, and the West of Hawea River PA to the east across SH6, where rural living development is largely set back from the highway and/or screened by vegetation.
  - d. The Dublin Bay PA extending to the ridge of Mount Brown, and the RCL on the eastern part of Mount Brown to the south. These areas have open working farmland with a very low density of built development and contain sensitive ridgelines that are visible from Lake Wānaka, Mount Iron and public places on the Upper Clutha Basin floor.

## Archaeological and heritage features and their locations:

11. Fork Farm Homestead at 100-152 Maungawera Valley Road constructed in 1910, with a surrounding garden designed by Alfred Buxton in 1937.
12. Māori occupation or use of the area (for example, archaeological sites F40/12 and F40/13).

## Mana whenua features and their locations:

13. The entire area is ancestral land to Kāi Tahu whānui and, as such, all landscape is significant, given that whakapapa, whenua and wai are all intertwined in te ao Māori.

### Associative Attributes and Values

Mana whenua creation and origin traditions • Mana whenua associations and experience • Mana whenua metaphysical aspects such as mauri and wairua • Historic values • Shared and recognised values • Recreation and scenic values •

## Mana whenua associations and experience:

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

### **Historic attributes and values:**

15. Associations of the area with early European settlement and farming, including Fork Farm (formerly part of Wanaka Station and later the Forks Run).

### **Shared and recognised attributes and values:**

16. The low population density and infrequent through traffic mean that the valley is not a significant component of the shared and recognised landscape values of the Upper Clutha. However, Maungawera Valley is valued by local residents as part of their sense of place. While the valley includes infrequent through-traffic, to visitors passing through, the valley is generally recognised as sparsely populated where legible landform processes, rural open space and natural land cover patterns predominate, underpinning the high quality of the outlook.

### **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:**

17. The open flat expanse of the valley floor and the elongated and hummocky flanks of Mount Brown are expressive of the interaction of the glacial and fluvial processes that have shaped the valley.

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

18. Highly scenic views from Maungawera Valley Road across open farmland to the northern mountainous ONL and to the southern flank of Mount Brown, which is somewhat foreshortened as a result of the proximity of the road to the mountain toe. Views have a strong working farm rural character, with most rural living activity obscured by topography or vegetation.
19. The highly coherent pattern of large open paddocks alternating with north-south shelterbelts across the valley floor contributes strongly to the scenic values of the valley and allows unobstructed sequential views to the surrounding ONL and RCL landscapes.
20. Views from Lake Hāwea - Albert Town Road to the alluvially truncated escarpments at the eastern end of Mount Brown and to the eastern mouth of the Maungawera Valley at the road intersection. The farmed and managed flats contrast with the unmodified slopes of Mount Brown and more distant mountains in these views and the scattered patterns of regenerating kanuka on the escarpment contribute to perceptions of naturalness. Highly visible dwellings, domestication and earth mounding between the road and Mount Brown somewhat compromise the pleasantness, coherence, and rural character of the views.

### **Naturalness attributes and values**

21. There is a moderate level of naturalness with a predominance of natural rather than built elements, but human intervention as managed farmland and rural living is evident. The variable but coherent patterns of rougher pasture and regenerating kānuka on the upper slopes of Mount Brown contribute to perceptions of naturalness.

### **Memorability attributes and values**

22. Memorable to residents and locals as an enclosed valley with a strong rural character.

### **Transient attributes and values**

23. Transient attributes of the landscape include seasonal foliage and pasture or crop colours, the changing shadow patterns from shelter belts and the presence of stock and wildlife such as hawks.

## Remoteness/wildness attributes and values

24. The lack of through traffic and easy access to the lake, together with a low population density, give the valley a very strong sense of rural tranquillity, quietness, and remoteness.

## Aesthetic attributes and values

25. Strong aesthetic attributes as a result of:
  - a. the highly legible geomorphological processes evident in the glacially formed Mount Brown bedrock roche moutonnée landform contrasted with the depositional nature of the valley floor.
  - b. the highly attractive rural views across open pastoral/cropping land to the dramatic and sublime landforms of the Mount Maude/Mount Gold/Mount Burke range and to the elongated form of Mount Brown, with its regenerating kānuka cover;
  - c. the coherent patterns of open farmland and shelterbelts;
  - d. the spacious and tranquil working farm rural character;
  - e. the low density of domestication, particularly on the valley floor;
  - f. the effective integration of dwellings by landform or vegetation.

## 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 physical, associative, and perceptual attributes and values described above for Maungawera Valley PA can be summarised as follows:

26. **Moderate-high physical values** relating to the agricultural and horticultural land uses, the glacially formed roche moutonnée landform of Mount Brown, and outwash plain/alluvial fans of the valley floor, the strong patterns of rural land use, and the mana whenua features associated with the area.
27. **Low-moderate associative values** relating to the mana whenua associations of the area, the historic heritage of European pastoral farming, and the shared and recognised values of the area for residents and locals.
28. **Moderate-high perceptual values** relating to the expressiveness of the underlying glacial landforms, terrace, escarpment and downlands, the coherence of vegetation and land use patterns, the strong rural character, the 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 Maungawera Valley PA for a range of activities is set out below.

- i. **Commercial recreational activities – very 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 character and visual amenity values.

- ii. **Visitor accommodation and tourism related activities – limited** landscape capacity for visitor accommodation activities and **extremely limited or no** landscape capacity for tourism related activities unless such activities are located to optimise the screening and/or filtering benefit of natural landscape elements; designed to be of a modest scale and have a low-key rural character; integrate landscape restoration and enhancement (where appropriate); and enhance public access (where appropriate).
- iii. **Urban expansions – extremely limited or no** landscape capacity.
- iv. **Intensive agriculture – some** landscape capacity 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 activities maintain naturalness and expressiveness attributes and values and integrate with existing natural landform patterns. **Some** landscape capacity for tracks and trails for recreational use that are sympathetically designed.
- vi. **Farm buildings – some** landscape capacity for modestly scaled buildings that are discreetly located and reinforce the existing rural character.
- vii. **Mineral extraction – very limited** landscape capacity for farm-scale quarries that maintain or enhance the PA's landscape character and visual amenity values.
- viii. **Transport infrastructure – very limited** 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 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 generation. **Limited** landscape capacity for larger scale commercial renewable energy generation that is discreetly located and screened from view.
- xi. **Forestry – limited** landscape capacity for carefully-sited small woodlots of up to 2 hectares in area to maintain the existing landscape character and visual amenity of the valley including its geomorphic legibility, natural elements, patterns, and processes.
- xii. **Rural living – very limited** landscape capacity to absorb additional rural living without cumulative adverse effects on naturalness, aesthetic, remoteness and landscape character and visual amenity values including its geomorphic legibility, natural elements, patterns, and processes. The rural character of the PA is vulnerable to fragmentation and domestication through rural living development. 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.

## **Appendix 5**

### **Table of Accept/Reject Submissions**

<b>Original Submission No</b>	<b>Further Submission No</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Provision</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>Submission Summary</b>	<b>Panel Recommendation</b>
OS94.1		Brett Giddens on behalf of Cardrona Cattle Company Ltd	Landscape Schedules	Oppose	That the variation be rejected.	Reject
OS94.2		Brett Giddens on behalf of Cardrona Cattle Company Ltd	Landscape Schedules > 21.22 Schedule of Landscape Values - ONF ONL Priority Areas	Oppose	That 21.22 be rejected.	Reject
OS94.3		Brett Giddens on behalf of Cardrona Cattle Company Ltd	Landscape Schedules > 21.22 Schedule of Landscape Values - ONF ONL Priority Areas > 21.22.17 Victoria Flats PA ONL Schedule	Oppose	That 21.22.17 be rejected.	Reject
OS94.4		Brett Giddens on behalf of Cardrona Cattle Company Ltd	Landscape Schedules > 21.22 Schedule of Landscape Values - ONF ONL Priority Areas > 21.22.17 Victoria Flats PA ONL Schedule	Oppose	That the Gibbston Character Zone be excluded from the variation.	Reject
OS94.5		Brett Giddens on behalf of Cardrona Cattle Company Ltd	Landscape Schedules > 21.22 Schedule of Landscape Values - ONF ONL Priority Areas > 21.22.17 Victoria Flats PA ONL Schedule	Oppose	That the Victoria Flats Priority Area be removed from the submitter's property, including land zoned Gibbston Character Zone (or any future zone that may arise from appeals).	Reject
OS94.6		Brett Giddens on behalf of Cardrona Cattle Company Ltd	Landscape Schedules > 21.22 Schedule of Landscape Values - ONF ONL Priority Areas > 21.22.17 Victoria Flats PA ONL Schedule	Oppose	That the extent of the Victoria Flats Priority Area is clarified in relation to the Outstanding Natural Landscape boundary.	Accept in part
OS94.7		Brett Giddens on behalf of Cardrona Cattle Company Ltd	Landscape Schedules > 21.22 Schedule of Landscape Values - ONF ONL Priority Areas > 21.22.17 Victoria Flats PA ONL Schedule	Oppose	That the values and attributes in the 21.22.17 are updated to reflect that the flats can absorb development.	Accept in part