

Proposed Marlborough Environment Plan

Minute of the Hearing Panel

Minute 47

To: James Bentley, Section 42A Report Writer – Natural Character and Landscape

1. In your 2 November, 2018 response to Minute 36 of the MEP Hearing Panel, we sought your view on the possibility of an improved methodology for mapping for reasons of both accuracy and ease of reference in Appendix 2 of the PMEP.
2. However, in the course of the Panel's deliberations on your response, another separate issue has arisen as to the Key Values column in the Table relating to that recommended mapping methodology.

Key Values column in the Table to Appendix Two

3. The issue arises from the fact that at present the Key Values column does not always appear to clearly differentiate between the values identified as being 'High' and 'Very High' in the Table.
4. Area D is a good example to refer to you by way of example. The first illustrative map in your 2 November response identifies Area D as having areas of both 'High' and 'Very High' natural character, but the Key Values column only states:

"Indigenous forested peninsula at Stafford Point."

No differentiation is made as to which Key Values are rated as being 'High' and which are 'Very High'.

5. The Hearing Panel is mindful of your evidence before it as to the spectrum approach you adopted to the rating of natural character attributes, where you emphasised that some areas may well have a mixture of values rated as both, or where those attributes merged into one another in the same area.
6. However, you have now recommended a mapping methodology to the Panel which utilises specific mapping delineations between areas of 'High' and 'Very High' natural character involving lineal boundaries between the two as has occurred for Area D.

7. In Area D the Stafford Point area is shown on the enlarged third map in your response as having a 'Very High' natural character rating. That seems to be reflected in the Key Values column by the description "*Indigenous forested peninsula at Stafford Point*".
8. However, there does not appear to be any description in the Key Values column as to what are rated as the Key Values warranting the 'High' natural character rating at Miro Bay to the west of the Stafford Point area.
9. The Panel is uncertain then as to whether the lack of differentiation in the Key Values column between the 'High' and 'Very High' mapped areas in Area D was purposeful or not, with indigenous forested land being described as being at each location, or whether the lack of differentiation was an oversight.
10. Similar examples of lack of differentiation between 'High' and 'Very High' Key Values ratings exist for other areas – Areas C, E and F, for example, seem to share a similar challenge.
11. The Panel's difficulty in having clarity as to your recommended approach is not assisted by a different issue of uncertainty in respect of Area A.
12. In Area A the Table refers to only 'Very High' Key Values being rated, (the word 'High' being recommended to be deleted). However, the first and second illustrative maps attached to your response show Area A as still being mapped with distinct 'Very High' and 'High' Key ratings.

Recommended Mapping Methodology

13. The Panel can indicate for your assistance that if your recommendation is indeed to utilise a distinct mapping delineation differentiating between 'High' and 'Very High' areas of natural character, that the mapping method you have recommended would appear to be very useful in Appendix Two.
14. However, before deciding whether to adopt that mapping approach the Hearing Panel needs you to reconsider whether the spectrum approach requires delineation between 'High' and 'Very High' ratings in the mapping and relevant columns. The mapping and Key Values column ratings of 'High' and 'Very High' need to be consistently applied.
15. The Panel requests, therefore, that you review these issues and recommend a consistent method of treatment of them.

16. The Hearing Panel wishes to have those recommended amendments available to it for its consideration if possible by Friday 22 February, 2019.

Dated 12 December 2018

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'T Hook', with a small dot at the end.

Councillor Trevor Hook

Chair of the MEP Hearing Panel