

Annexure 1: Council Landscape Report



KIDSON
LANDSCAPE
CONSULTING
email: kiconsulting@xtra.co.nz
tel: 03-539 4238
fax: 03-539 4239
cell: 0275 123 885
PO Box 1527
NELSON

PEER REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON LANDSCAPE ISSUES RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS REGARDING PLAN CHANGE 21: Mooring Management Areas and Marina Zone Extension in Waikawa Bay.

INTRODUCTION

1. My name is Elizabeth Jane Kidson. I live in Nelson and am self employed as a landscape architect, working for Kidson Landscape Consulting Limited. Prior to April 2007 my landscape practice was based in Queenstown. Before this I was employed by Civic Corporation Limited from January 2000 till April 2005. I hold the qualification of a Bachelor of Landscape Architecture (Hons) from Lincoln University, a Bachelor of Arts majoring in Anthropology and a postgraduate Diploma (Distinction) in Anthropology from Otago University. I am a member of the New Zealand Institute of Landscape Architects.
2. My work involves providing landscape assessments for resource consents in the form of either subdivision consents or land use consents; landscape classification evidence; and also expert evidence regarding landscape effects associated with Plan Changes. I have provided landscape advice for the Queenstown Lakes District Council as an expert witness on issues involving the creation of new zones and have been involved in many Queenstown Lakes District Environment Court hearings associated with landscape classification. I have worked on both Council-led and private plan changes mostly in Queenstown. These include Jacks Point, Fitzpatrick Park and Mount Cardrona Station, Five Mile and most recently Shotover Country Plan Change. I have provided expert evidence for Nelson City Council for the Marsden Valley Plan re-Zoning and Structure Plan and I have provided evidence for the Marlborough District Council for Plan change 15 at Oyster Bay in the Marlborough Sounds.

SCOPE

3. I was commissioned by Marlborough District Council to:
 - a. Review plan change 21 and the associated submissions relating to landscape and visual amenity issues.
 - b. Peer review landscape report by Boffa Miskell.
 - c. Provide a professional opinion in the form of an expert statement to the hearings committee setting out:
 - i. Any technical deficiencies in the landscape report.
 - ii. A professional opinion on whether the recommendations and conclusions in the landscape report are credible.

- iii. An independent professional opinion as to the landscape and visual amenity issues raised in submissions.
4. I conducted a site visit on Wednesday 15th September 2010. This incorporated a boat site trip within Waikawa Bay, out along the northwest coastline to the tip of the Snout then across to Karaka Point and back in to the head of the Bay. I also walked along the Snout walkway and visited the Waikawa Bay Recreation Reserve owned by the Council; before driving along the Port Underwood Road. I visited some of the higher photo location and simulation points above the Port Underwood Road and also did a site assessment on the existing marina itself.

PEER REIVIEW OF LANDSCAPE REPORT

Visual Assessment

5. I consider that the findings of the landscape report are consistent with my findings in general and the conclusions reached relating to the visual effects are a good indication of the landscape effects in this regard. I consider that the simulations produced are very useful as a resource tool, however agree with the Marlborough District Councils request for further information regarding the imagery including mature vegetation¹, when there is a such restricted amount of vegetation present on the existing breakwaters, and also note that the simulations do not portray the potential for 10 metre high buildings within the new marina area.
6. In my opinion the effects of the proposal from the main recreational areas should have been included under the “Visibility” section of the report. Effects from these areas should be established in terms of landscape values. In particular, views from The Snout walkway should have been raised and discussed (and subsequently dismissed to show that while this area had been considered, no visibility can be reached of the proposed Zone area); and views from the Waikawa Bay Foreshore Reserve² – which is adjacent to the proposed Waka Mooring Management Area also should have been raised.

Natural Character

7. The loss of natural character to the foreshore along the west of Waikawa Bay could have been expanded upon. I note that the road reserve of Marina Drive appears to change in to conservation land on Map 62 of the plan; which is often the case with road reserves within the Marlborough Sounds Foreshore.
8. I note that the landscape report states the following in the visual effects section:

“The proposed rezoning is relatively remote from the most intensively developed head of

¹ See Appendix F of Planners Report.

² See figure 5, Appendix C of Planners Report.

the bay which has a distinct industrial character. The Marina zoning allows buildings up to 10m height. Therefore, any future marina development this far along the Snout needs to be designed to respect the relatively undeveloped character of the adjacent slopes and outer bay area. That is to say, a large building or tall structures established as part of a marina reclamation would be out of place in this location, and potentially visually significant. However, a sensitively designed marina extension would not have significant visual effects.”³

9. This is an important point which I consider should have been carried through into the cumulative effects assessment and in to some landscape recommendations which if included within the plan change, would reduce the potential for adverse effects at the time of resource consent. I note that buildings can be built under the current Marina Zone Plan provisions to a height of 10m as a permitted activity (see Plan Provisions section of this report below).

Other Landscape Values

10. The scope of the assessment is restricted to visual assessment and natural character and I consider these issues adequately covered, although more direction should be supplied in terms of recommendations. The report does not cover other landscape issues or cross reference other reports such as the Recreation Assessment or the Ecological Assessment. There does not appear to be any discussion on shared and recognised values or cultural values included. This relates back to the restricted scope of the report (Visibility and Natural Character values). It may be that the Planner was happy to source this from the independent reports; however it does create a simplified landscape assessment.

Plan Provisions

11. I am unclear from the Landscape report what could be built within the Marina Zone as a permitted/ controlled or discretionary activity and whether the Councils discretion covers landscape matters such as scale, bulk and external appearance. This information should form part of the assessment of what the potential effects associated with the anticipated outcome of rezoning this area could be.
12. With regard to the Marina Zone, there are a number of permitted activities which have the potential to create adverse visual effects – especially in the narrow coastal strip of the proposed Northwest Marina but also in the eastern Marina extension. These being in particular⁴:
 - Clubrooms for marine recreation groups;

³ Appendix F of Planners report; page 12

⁴ MSRMP 34.1 Permitted Activities; page 34-1

- Residential activities ancillary to marina administration;
 - Commercial activities ancillary and complementary to maritime activity;
 - Service Stations.
 - Ship building, repairs and maintenance.
13. It should be noted that all permitted buildings are allowed to be built to 10 metres in height⁵. I do not consider buildings of 10m in height and undefined bulk to be appropriate in the proposed marina extensions and will address this in the recommendations section of this report. This concern was also noted in the Boffa Miskell Landscape report as already stated.
14. I note in Rule 34.1.3.7⁶ that there is a 6 metre setback for buildings from Roads but no setback from conservation land or Sounds Residential. This may have the effect of pushing buildings further inland than would be preferred. The following rule (being Rule 34.1.3.8) would further encroach into the native bush area due to the wording that seeks to ensure outdoor storage is screened from public roads⁷. I consider these rules should be reconsidered with regard to the northwest marina extension.
15. The following rule (Rule 34.1.3.9) relates to the area required to be landscaped.

34.1.3.9 Area to be Landscaped

- a) A minimum of 5% of the site shall be set aside and landscaped;*
- b) All required landscaped areas shall be located between the road frontage and front of buildings on the site;*
- c) Any landscaped areas shall include a landscaping strip of a minimum average width of 1.5 metres and minimum width of 0.6 metres, adjacent to the road frontage, except across entranceways or on sites or parts of site on the opposite side of a road from an Urban Residential Zone or Town Commercial Zone, where the landscaping strip will be a minimum average width of 4.5 metres and a minimum width of 1.5 metres adjacent to the road frontage; and*
- d) Landscaping strips or planting protection areas shall not be covered with any impervious surfaces. Where adjacent to or within carparks, landscape strips shall be protected by wheel stop barriers to prevent damage from parked cars.*

⁵ MSRMP Conditions for Permitted Activities 34.1.3.6; page 34-5

⁶ MSRMP page 34-6

⁷ Ibid

16. This rule relates to mitigating visual effects associated with car parks and road frontage to provide street amenity – as can be seen by clause b) above that states all required landscaped areas shall be located between the road frontage and front of buildings. There is no requirement to plant breakwaters which would explain the scarcity of plants in these areas.



*Figure 1: example of planned planting and wilding species on breakwater.
(Liz Kidson Sep 2010 Cannon EOS 400D 50mm film)*

17. The landscape planting in simulations (especially Figure 6 and the day view of Figure 7) shows the use of vegetation along the breakwaters as a form of mitigation. More detail should be given in the form of recommendations on the method (i.e. rules or assessment matters) that would ensure not only that these areas are landscaped, but also the successful growth of vegetation in such an exposed and hostile environment.

Public Access

18. I note that the Marlborough Resource Management Plan emphasises public access⁸ especially in the conservation zone and in esplanade strips. It appears from the maps produced⁹ that the conservation zone has been reduced in width and is already very narrow at one point (with regard to the northwest Marina Zone extension). This could potentially prevent access through the native bush above the Marina which has the potential to form a pleasant loop track along the esplanade reserve linking with the Snout walkway in the future. I consider that it would be in the Councils interest to ensure there was sufficient width within the Foreshore Reserve to allow for this potential future use. Especially as this area is adjoining the Beech forest remnant and as the indicative marina layout¹⁰ does not appear to require the use of this part of the proposed northwest marina extension. I note that the Ecological Report, while stating that the indicative marina layout plan would only require minor modification and removal of coastal scrub, that ...

⁸ MSRMP Chapter 8

⁹ See Appendix A of Planners Report

¹⁰ See Appendix L of Planners Report and Appendix B of the Ecological Report.

- a. *"Healthy regeneration was observed within the forest understory, particularly within the beech forest remnants and the coastal broadleaved forest remnant. Given the small amount of remnant vegetation left in the inner sounds and along 'The Snout', these beech forest and coastal broadleaved forest remnants are considered to be locally significant and should not be modified".¹¹*
19. Looking at the Indicative Layout Plan (Appendix L of the Planners Report) the marina zone does not appear to need the extent of land zoned for a successful development, therefore it would be worthwhile reducing the extent of conservation land zoned for marina activity in this area (or at least not erode into existing conservation land).
20. The plan change shows in the Indicative Layout Plan (Appendix L of the Planners Report) a public beach and amenity reinstatement area at the northern end of the northwest marina extension. To give this public amenity any weight, there needs to be methods included within the proposed rules to ensure this happens. Public amenity areas such as this are often left out of resource consents if there is no directive to ensure it occurs.

LANDSCAPE AND VISUAL AMENITY VALUES RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS

21. The proposed rationalisation of mooring areas and the proposed marina extension will result in the following:
1. The Plan change provides for 200 moorings, an increase of 20 over existing moorings.
 2. The net effect is an increase in spacing between moorings and provision for an extra 20 moorings over the existing scenario (180 consented moorings).
 3. The inclusions of the northwest marina extension when added to the undeveloped eastern marina zone will effectively double the size of the marina activity within Waikawa Bay.
 4. The northwest extension will provide an additional 240 berths in a 7.9ha area and extend approximately 470m lineal metres along the coastline.¹²

Cumulative Effects, Light Pollution, Size of Marina Zone (submission points 146, 31, 12, 25)

22. I note that in terms of cumulative effects, the effects considered relate to the combined effect of the existing zoned areas and the proposed marina extension and any increase in area associated with the mooring management areas. The existing

¹¹ Appendix G of planners report; Terrestrial Ecology; page 14 – see Also Appendix B of Ecological Report for location of areas discussed by Ecologist.

¹² Appendix F of planners report; Visual and Natural Character Effects Assessment; page 5

moorings and undeveloped existing zoned areas form part of the anticipated visual character of Waikawa Bay. The extension of the marina zone to the northwest along the coastline of the Snout when combined with the visual effect of the existing developed marina and potential for the western marina to be built and the increase in size of the mooring management areas are the new effects which must be considered in combination with this anticipated character – associated with this is the concern over increasing light pollution at night.

23. I agree with the Landscape Report, that the low elevation views of the marina extension foreshorten and reduce the visual impact of the zone extension¹³. Also that the mooring management areas and marina extension are associated with urban and residential development at the head of Waikawa Bay, are enclosed by the surrounding landform, and are often viewed with existing moorings in the foreground (especially from the eastern shoreline). I also note that when viewed from Port Underwood Road, the roadside vegetation and distance between viewer and the marina allow for only intermittent glimpses until closer to the head of the bay (around Cooks Ridge). From the sea entrance to Waikawa Bay, the proposed mooring plans and marina extensions will appear well contained by the surrounding ridgelines and are co-associated with the residential and urban development. Views from residences along and above the Port Underwood Road will see the existing moorings in the foreground of any proposed marina view unless at the north eastern end of Wharetukura Bay – at this point distance between the viewer and the marina (1km) plays a part in decreasing its dominance.
24. Views from the Waikawa Bay Foreshore Reserve¹⁴, has a similar effect to that of being on the water (being only a couple of metres above sea level). From this viewing area, the moorings in the foreground provide a partial screen of the western and northern marina extensions and will lessen their impact. I note that the moorings are to be pulled away from this beach¹⁵ to provide for a greater swimming area.
25. When looking at Waikawa Bay as a whole, the natural character of the head of the bay has been compromised through urban, commercial and industrial development including the current marinas. The eastern shoreline of Waikawa Bay has its natural character compromised along its length, although this loss of natural character decreases to residences set amongst native bush, and jetties and moorings as one drives away from the marina towards Karaka Point. The northwest shoreline has a lesser amount of development with occasional jetties and residences more widely

¹³ Appendix F; Visual and Natural Character Effects Assessment; page 14.

¹⁴ See Figure 5 of Appendix C of Planners Report

¹⁵ See Appendix L of Planners Report; indicative Layout Plan.

dispersed. I agree with the Boffa Miskell landscape assessment where it states that *“concentrating the proposed marina activity to a single part of the bay immediately adjacent to the existing marina infrastructure is preferable to disbursement of marina development to other areas within Waikawa Bay and probably other parts of the sounds”*.¹⁶

26. The increase in size of the marina and mooring management areas would appear visually connected to the domesticated head of Waikawa Bay without appearing out of place as part of a cultural landscape associated with a settlement (although I acknowledge this will be an unwanted change to submitters who would prefer to maintain the more natural current vista). Views from the eastern shoreline of Waikawa Bay would currently see boats moored in the proposed northwest marina extension. The mooring management area further northwest and the proposed marina extension would be seen in conjunction with the developed marina and the Waikawa urban development and these views would be over a distance of at least 700m. Views of the ridgeline of The Snout would remain unaffected.
27. The area where the cumulative impact will be most felt is by the Sounds Residential residences situated above the northwest extension and mooring management areas – due to the increase in density and intensity of use and loss of natural character associated with the change in use from moorings to marina, and further northwest, the new mooring management area which extends moorings in to an otherwise low use area. I agree with the discussion of the effects of both the marina extension and mooring management area contained within the Boffa Miskell landscape addendum¹⁷
28. The effect of lighting on residences could be reduced if this lighting were capped to prevent unnecessary pollution of the night sky. This would particularly benefit residences that were situated above sea level and I cannot see how this would pose a safety or navigational issue.
29. A suggestion by a submitter¹⁸ that they are not supportive of the northwest extension if the undeveloped western marina zone is developed is related to the potential for the marina to double in size to what is currently built within this zone. A way of partially meeting this concern would be to defer one marina area until there was sufficient need to develop a new area. This would provide more control and certainty regarding the visual effects associated with the marina development and would concentrate effort in to one part of the marina zone rather than having the potential for a more ad-hoc approach.

¹⁶ Appendix F of Planners Report; page 14

¹⁷ See Appendix F of Planners Report: Addendum Visual and Natural Character Effects; pages 5-6

¹⁸ Submission point 31

30. Submission point 25 raises the issue of the adequacy of the MSRMP regarding planning controls which relate in part to cumulative effects. This is covered in my report below.

Visual pollution/ loss of amenity including natural character. (submission points 10, 12, 25, 31, 36, 59, 62, 63, 74, 80, 98)

31. Various submissions have raised the issue regarding the loss of amenity through visual pollution of the increased area covered by moorings and the marina extension and the loss of amenity and natural character resulting from the loss of natural character of the northwest coastline due to the northwest marina extension. There is a close relationship between these issues and the cumulative effects section of my report above.
32. I agree there will be a loss of natural character along this coastline – especially with regard to the extension of the marina zone and the effect that reclamation, roading and the breakwaters will have on the natural values of the coastline. I have read the terrestrial and benthic reports and understand that the ecologists who have written these reports can support the plan change. The loss of natural character relates to the physical changes to the foreshore area associated with reclamation which will change its current natural state, also the visual and cultural amenity values associated with this (shared and recognised values) which I consider to be the greatest landscape effect associated with the plan change. This effect will be felt most by those who either live adjoining this coastline or whom use this area for recreational purposes, and must be weighed against the benefits associated with the plan change. I agree with the landscape report (Appendix F of planners report) that it is preferable to co-locate marina activity in this area of Waikawa Bay and that visually this area can absorb the proposed level of activity when seen in the wider context, although I recognise that there will be a loss of amenity associated with this for some submitters.
33. Submission point 25 states that they are opposed to *“the objectives and policies which indicate that the Marina Zone “provides suitable locations for marina activities”* in all cases. I agree that some of the activities provided for as permitted activities within the marina zone would not be appropriate in all locations in the zone and have included recommendations to this effect. The statement that the marina development should be publically notified is not without merit and is worth further consideration. Definitely more direction regarding what is appropriate development – especially in the northwest marina extension should be provided within the objectives/policies, rules and assessment matters of the zone.

CONCLUSION

34. As previously stated, if appropriately designed (and I consider that the indicative layout is generally appropriate) then I agree with the landscape report regarding the visual and amenity effects from the eastern coastline of Waikawa Bay: that the effect would extend the area of development further northwest, but would be not too different to what currently occurs due to the existing moorings in the foreground, the distance between the viewer and the proposed new areas (700m to over 1km) and the foreshortening and condensing effects which reduce the perception of the area to be developed due to the flatness in elevation as views are generally close to sea level. The exception to this relates to residences along the Snout adjoining the northwest extension, particularly the marina extension where the effects on natural character and amenity will be significant. I note that as the western marina extension is already zoned for marina activity this forms part of the permitted baseline (although structures such as jetties, breakwaters and reclamation all require discretionary resource consent¹⁹). The visual/amenity effects that must be considered relate to some of the structures within this eastern zoned area, the new extensions of the zone (i.e. the northwest extension) and new mooring management areas which extend the anticipated level of development in to new areas. I consider that the proposed level of development can be absorbed in to this area of Waikawa Bay, if additional planning measures are put in place to prevent potential adverse effects. I have suggested below some measures which would aid in the integration of this development.

RECOMMENDATIONS.

1. **Buildings other than toilet blocks associated with parking should at first be permitted within the more extensive land area within the existing marina zone at the head of Waikawa Bay. Any buildings proposed in the northwest and eastern marina extension should be limited in size to single storey (5-6m in height) and should have controls relating to bulk, location and external appearance.**
2. **Lighting associated with the marina zone should be capped to prevent unnecessary pollution of the night sky.**
3. **Consideration should be given to the 6m setback rule and outdoor storage rule regarding buildings along the narrow strip of land associated with the northwest marina extension to consider whether it is appropriate to compromise the adjoining native bush in order to achieve these rules.**

¹⁹ MSRMP rule 34.4; page 34-17

4. It would be preferable to ensure a coastal esplanade strip is maintained (at least 5m at the narrowest point) within the adjoining conservation zone that runs on the landward side of the northwest marina extension.
 5. Limiting the extent of encroachment of the marina into this area of native bush along the foreshore (especially with regard to the remnant Beech and broadleaf forests) would be preferred – especially as the Indicative marina layout shows that the extent zoned is not required for a successful marina design.
 6. If landscaping along the breakwaters is considered viable, then more detail should be given in the form of recommendations on the method (i.e. rules or assessment matters) to ensure this eventuates and is successful. A similar amount of planting to that along the road reserve (5% of reclaimed areas) would be appropriate. The use of locally sourced robust coastal species should be emphasised. Any planting plan should include planting methodology and be approved by the Council.
 7. A planning mechanism is required to ensure that the suggested beach shown in Appendix L of the planners report - the “public beach and amenity reinstatement” does not fall by the wayside. I would suggest that this is reinstated at the same time as the outer breakwater and adjoining road is formed, and parameters regarding its general size/appearance are included as assessment matters.
-

LIZ KIDSON
DIRECTOR
KIDSON LANDSCAPE CONSULTING
30th September 2010



KIDSON
LANDSCAPE
CONSULTING
email: lkiconsulting@xtra.co.nz
tel: 03 539 4238
fax: 03-539 4238
cell: 0275 123 685
PO Box 1527
NELSON