

# Proposed Marlborough Environment Plan

## Minute of the Hearing Panel

### Minute 9

1. Concerns have been made to the Hearing Panel in the course of the Topic 5: Natural Character and Landscape hearings in the week commencing 26 February, 2018 by the expert landscape witnesses Dr Michael Steven and Mr John Hudson that the one landscape utilised for the purposes of the preparation of the Overlay Map series for the Outstanding Natural Features and Landscape (ONFL) maps in Volume 4 of the MEP cannot in reality meet the description of a 'landscape' as that term is commonly used or understood.
2. The Hearing Panel understands from the s42A report that all ONFLs on the Overlay Maps in Volume 4 in the Outer Sounds area are treated as one landscape depicted and described on Map 1, Appendix 1 as 'Extent of Outer Sounds'.
3. Similar concerns were made as to the ability to properly describe the landscape depicted as 'A' on Map 4, Appendix 1 as one entity described as the 'Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape'.
4. Mr Hudson drew attention particularly to Map 2 at page 30 of Appendix One in Volume 3 which is entitled 'Landscapes of the Marlborough Sounds'. He focussed on the area depicted on that map as Landscape no.13, which is in turn described under a title of 'Mt. Stokes and surrounds' at pages 13 and 14 of Appendix 1 of Volume 3.
5. Mr Hudson made the point that it was impossible in visual terms for a particular landscape appreciation to be made of the various visual landscapes contained within Landscape no. 13. He stressed that Landscape no.13 included portions of locations as diverse as the eastern part of Beatrix Bay in Pelorus Sound, the southern part of Port Gore, and the inner parts of the northern entry to Queen Charlotte Sound. He made the equally obvious point that those locations were separated from each other by major landforms, were spread over many kilometres, and encompassed different sounds as well as parts of the Outer Sounds landscape.
6. The Panel has noted that Landscape no.13 also encompasses parts of the area depicted and described as 'The Extent of Outer Sounds' on Map 1 of Appendix 1 at page 29, Volume 3, and also parts of what is described as the 'Inner Sounds' in the s42A report - being the balance of the Sounds areas outside the Outer Sounds.
7. Dr Steven raised similar concerns of the landscape approach underlying the ONFL and ONC maps, in addition to a number of other methodological criticisms. Sophie Gilchrest also identified practical problems both identifying the outstanding landscapes and natural features at particular locations, and linking those with the particular values sought to be protected on the ONFL maps.
8. Mr Hudson made reference to the fact that he considered one possible solution to the problem would be to utilise the approach of the 'visual landscape' division of the Marlborough Sounds landscapes utilised in the 2009 Landscape Study by Boffa Miskell.
9. At the end of this hearing on Topic 5: Natural Character and Landscape, in the course of the response of the s42A report writers, the Hearing Panel seeks more information as to that 2009 'visual landscapes' approach from the s42A report writers, accompanied by a mapped representation of that approach.

10. In addition, the Hearing Panel also requests at the end of the week responses from the s42A report writers on any other issues the report writers wish to address in response to the evidence and submissions on other matters which the Hearing Panel has heard this week, with the exception of the matters which follow.
11. The Panel finally requests that the report writers provide to it, by Friday 23 March 2018, responses on the following issues:
  - (i) Advice on whether, if the Hearing Panel was to decide to adopt the 'visual landscape' approach, that would affect the outcome of the mapped depiction of outstanding landscapes with values or attributes requiring protection through the ONFL maps, or the Overlay Maps depicting the areas of Outstanding Natural Character (ONC), or would affect in any significant manner Appendices 1 or 2 of the proposed MEP, or any other aspects of the Proposed MEP.
  - (ii) Advice on whether it is possible to redraft the assessments in Appendix 1 as to the values or attributes sought to be protected within each landscape, however finally mapped, so as to:
    - (a) Identify with more precision in terms of Policy 15 of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) the particular natural landscape or natural features and their particular values or attributes sought to be protected by the ONFL depictions.
    - (b) Identify those existing uses located within the ONFL of particular landscapes which at their current scale or intensity were not considered to cause adverse effects on those values or attributes sought to be protected by the ONFL status in that landscape.
    - (c) Identify those existing uses located outside, but in close proximity to the ONFL boundaries of particular landscapes, which at their current scale or intensity were not considered to cause adverse effects on those values or attributes by the ONFL status in that landscape.
  - (iii) Whether similar steps as detailed in sub-clauses (ii) (a) to (c) inclusive are capable of being redrafted, with the necessary adaptations, as to the particular natural character values or attributes sought to be protected in terms of Policy 13 of the NZCPS and the effects of existing uses in, or in close proximity to, the ONC areas depicted in the ONC maps and described in Appendix 2.
  - (iv) If the matters in (ii) and (iii) above are capable of being redrafted, detailed advice as to how much time that task would require.

Dated 1 March 2018



Councillor Trevor Hook

Chair of the MEP Hearing Panel