

Feedback From Golden Bay Landscapes Consultation – December 2010

The following table is a summary of feedback about Golden Bay Landscapes from a meeting with the Golden Bay community on 9 December 2010, and subsequent responses. (note: some contributors completed the feedback form but did not attend the meeting)

No.	
1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Outstanding landscapes and features are the contrast between blue sky and the mountains; and the contrast between the farmland and forest. ▪ Threats are risk to farming through obstacles that require reversion to indigenous vegetation eg manmade landscapes are often outstanding (Cobb Hydro development); the Takaka Hill landscape reversion now masks the outstanding landscape features; the west coast is similar.
2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Likes the idea of Golden Bay being regarded in total as an ‘Outstanding Landscape Area’. Then no particular sector need feel threatened; all residents need to know and respect that they live in a special place that can be spoiled if not cared for. ▪ Specific comments as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subdivision: Coastal farm properties are over-valued because of subdivision potential. Farmers pay high rates and need different rules to ensure their productivity (eg chance to sell a small lot for viability). Agrees with no subdivision in 200m Coastal Environment Area; Rural Residential at Rangihaeata might be suitable because of proximity to Takaka. ▪ Land use: Need to be aware of responsibilities for land management adjacent to the Conservation Estate. ▪ Buildings and dwellings: Supports requiring resource consent for dwellings above a certain contour and gradient, plus stricter activity status for second dwelling in Rural 2. Also building location plans for subdivision on karst landscape. ▪ Indigenous vegetation and forest removal: Weed incursion into areas of natural vegetation can soon change it to exotic. Need management of ‘landscape sensitive’ or ‘vegetation sensitive’ areas. Query re any reference in the TRMP to the Forest Amendment Act 1993 which has strict rules for forest clearing. Should still be able to clear for access, house site and fire breaks. ▪ Quarrying: Notes that the area of quarrying on Mt Burnett is home to more endemic species than exist in the whole UK. ▪ Land disturbance: Query 50m setback for excavation by the Whanganui Inlet only. Parapara, Ruataniwha and Motupipi are also regarded as being of national importance. Concern over excavation for rubbish disposal. How is this controlled? ▪ Earlier notes presented at meeting on 9 December: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Golden Bay is referred to as the ‘heart of the parks’ being bounded east and west by National Parks. ▪ Also described as the ‘jewel in the crown of north west Nelson’. ▪ Aquaculture Inquiry found that ‘Golden Bay has natural character values that are of national importance; and Golden Bay is an outstanding natural landscape / natural feature which is of national importance and is to be noted as such’.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The document prepared by the community through the Golden Bay Work Centre 'Golden Bay in 2022' is a mandate for continuing Golden Bay strategic planning work. ▪ TDC is required to consider visual interfaces such as skylines, ridgelines and shorelines; required to avoid development and activity which significantly alters the visual character of land in an outstanding landscape. This is also required by the 2010 Coastal Policy Statement.
3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Note that a large proportion of land in Golden Bay is under DoC control; the remainder covered by rules for land disturbance, coastal margin restrictions, other zoning restrictions and QEII covenants. ▪ Query the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What further protection is required? What are implications for land owners? ▪ Will any working group give adequate weight and balance to the interests of land owners? ▪ Is a more stringent approach moving away from the 'effects-based' process of the RMA? ▪ Is there a move to establish national guidelines for protecting outstanding natural areas / landscapes? ▪ Farmers have recognised and valued the landscape for generations. On the western coast the balance of farmland and bush is an 'outstanding landscape value'. ▪ There are outstanding vistas and landscapes throughout the whole area, but to blanket them under a layer of additional zoning rules would be an imposition and unjustified.
4	<p>Concerned that proposals will prevent development and job opportunities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned that developers have not been consulted; wishes to be kept informed.
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Task One – Identifying what is exceptional – Considers the whole of Golden Bay exceptional. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Heavily control subdivision. ▪ Keep buildings (settlement) only in or around existing rural settlements. ▪ Ban the breakup of good agricultural land. ▪ Encourage second-class land into production – pasture, horticulture, forestry. ▪ Disallow 'ribbon' development away from existing settlements. ▪ Vigorously protect and encourage the protection of bush areas. ▪ Vigorously protect the coastline from further development. ▪ Resource consent decisions should be made by an independent panel or tribunal. ▪ Task Two – Protecting these areas – Considers that the present rules are pretty good and may just need firming up, as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subdivision – keep further development within existing rural residential and settlement areas (remove 12ha and 50ha minimum areas); and do not reinstate the creation of a smaller lot in Rural 2 – this was abused previously. ▪ Ridgeline development – ban with no exceptions. ▪ Land use – strict subdivision control needs to ensure more farms stay productive otherwise there is a risk the dairy factory may not be viable ▪ Land disturbance – current rules good; suggest clearer definitions and tougher penalties for enforcement.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Coastal Environment Area – avoid further development along the coastline.
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Only include private land in ONFL area with agreement of owners. ▪ Support simplifying the Tasman Resource Management Plan. ▪ Most of the private land recommended for inclusion in ONFLs has been modified by farming; restrictions already apply along the 200m coastal margin; pollution may be caused by non-compliant tourists and freedom campers. ▪ Have no issue with visible tracking and visible buildings – a right to enjoy views. ▪ Opposed to restrictions on coastal subdivision and elevated structures. ▪ Opposed to any change to TRMP rules – selected ‘No change’ option for all sections of feedback document. ▪ Appreciate summary of rules to assist in feedback, and keen to participate in a working group.
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ONFL identification – suggests using ‘physiography’ rather than a contour line or R2 zone boundary to define an outstanding ‘natural’ landscape. Relatively easy to draw lines on a map in the major valleys. ▪ Also could consider the ‘man-made’ landscape patterns within the major valley bottoms.
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ONFL identification – notes that all four Frank Boffa options show the entire Golden Bay (out to 12 nautical miles) as an Outstanding Seascape. Reminds Council that the Tasman Coastal Plan (signed off in 2006 by the Minister of Conservation) was the result of a 17 year and \$20million hearing and Environment Court process, and evidence presented by every landscape architect of note in NZ. ▪ Seeking legal advice. <p><i>Comment: The extent of ONFL on Northwest Coast and within Golden Bay has not been finalised. The evidence presented in the Aquaculture Inquiry suggested 3 nautical miles from MHWS would protect views. The ‘centre’ of Golden Bay is approximately 4.3 nautical miles, therefore it is logical to include the whole Bay within an ONFL. While much of the area allocated for Aquaculture Management Areas (AMAs) is within 3 nautical miles, the parts for potential fin-fish farming are outside 3 nautical miles. (Approximately 750ha inside, and 1600ha outside.)</i></p>
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about a lack of consultation with aquaculture and fishery industries – more time required. ▪ Identification of outstanding landscapes must be rigorous to avoid unnecessary costs for industry, landowners and the public generally; also to ensure community confidence ▪ Concerned about additional costs for a resource consent if an area is outstanding. ▪ Reverse sensitivity issues are a big concern for the marine farm industry where new residential and lifestyle interests perceive incompatibility. ▪ Section 5 of the RMA calls for sustainable management of resources to enable people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural wellbeing. This needs to be balanced with Section 6 matters of national importance.
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports the views expressed at a meeting of business interested parties at the Pohara Boat Club on Tuesday 11 January 2011.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ As key stakeholders in the Golden Bay economy, the Marine Farming Association is concerned at lack of inclusion in the earlier round of consultation.
11	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about lack of consultation. ▪ RMA has sustainable management principles, covering social and economic wellbeing; economic growth is needed and food producing soils need to be protected. ▪ Oppose any options for change. ▪ Drew attention to earlier Environment Court decision W181/96 on the landscape value of the Motupipi hill and surrounds.
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Want recompense for any constraint on farming activity (eg rate relief). Putting covenants in place is costly. ▪ Need flexibility to respond to future farming styles. ▪ Outstanding features / landscapes are there because of sustainable farming practices. ▪ Want proper representation of landowner interests on any working group. ▪ Already 75% of Golden Bay is in conservation land.
13	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ All DoC areas should be included – adequate justification for this. ▪ Refer three pages ‘The Sea – An Epilogue’ in Abel Tasman book regarding the outstanding value of the Abel Tasman coast extending at least 2 nautical miles from shore. ▪ Two additional aspects of the coast that have high credentials for outstanding consideration are (1) the sequence of barrier enclosed lagoons and estuaries; and (2) the large areas of sandy open coast ‘intertidal landscape’ at the mouths of rivers as well as Wainui Bay, Tata and especially Farewell Spit. ▪ The earlier Frank Boffa 2005 recommendations deserve support, including estuaries, lagoons and open coast landscapes. ▪ The requirement to recognise and provide for the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes has been an RMA requirement since 1991. ▪ Living in or close to an outstanding natural feature or landscape is something to be proud of, not to fear. ▪ Hope that the 9 December 2010 meeting has shifted community attitude in this regard.
14	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about ensuring access to the beaches and seafront.
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Supports the whole of Golden Bay as an ONFL.
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Convened and chaired a meeting on Tuesday 11 January of landowners and business people. ▪ Suggests a blanket coverage of all Golden Bay and coastal waters may be detrimental to future needs and development. ▪ Protection of certain landscape features needs to be considered. ▪ Objects to four options presented by Frank Boffa, and the consultation process to date. ▪ Wishes to convene a meeting in February of business people / landowners with Mayor, CEO, Ward Councillors, Community Board Chair and staff – this occurred on Monday 7 February 2011.

17	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposes the proposal.
18	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concerned about the inclusion of business interests in the process to date. ▪ Identifying and protecting outstanding natural features and landscapes might be a worthy consideration. ▪ Talley's are committed to the needs of the district. ▪ Declines to provide specific comment because of tight time frames; consequently opposes the proposal.
19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Main interest is that Council meet functions and powers in s6 of the RMA; interests also focus on the Coastal Marine Area and the interfaces between the land and sea. ▪ Concerned that Council meet its commitment to the 'Friends' group, both in Golden Bay and Tasman Bay. ▪ Happy to participate in any working groups. ▪ Unclear about WHAT is to be identified as having landscape and natural feature values, what ranking will apply, whether there will be Landscape Priority Areas, and what rule changes will be made to preserve and protect such areas. ▪ Threats or Risks: 1. Consider visual amenity (important) landscapes as well as ONFLs (outstanding); 2. Consider the relationship between ONFLs and the natural character of the coastal wetlands and their margins (Note that the 'natural character' Objectives and Policies in the TRMP relate only to Urban Environmental Effects and are not covered in the Rural chapter); and 3. The Coastal Marine Area needs careful attention as public open space – it was overlooked in the comment sheet. ▪ Further suggestions: (i). Have regard to the 2010 NZ Coastal Policy Statement and 'amended Pigeon Bay criteria'; and (ii) identify the values of the entire Golden Bay area against the requirements of the Act. ▪ Comments on feedback form: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subdivision – Support identifying 'building location areas' on subdivision plans (option 3); and preventing further subdivision in Rural Residential zones that are not contiguous with settlement areas (option 4). Comment on NZCPS Policy 15(b) which requires consideration of significant effects on ALL natural features and natural landscapes, not just outstanding. ▪ Land Use / Buildings and Dwellings – Support the location of ALL buildings below ALL ridgelines. Comment that current rules not always effective, and some existing uses may have undesirable effects. ▪ Indigenous vegetation and indigenous forest removal – Oppose any removal of forest in an ONFL, and any removal of indigenous vegetation adjacent to the Conservation Estate. ▪ Plantation Forestry – Options 2 and 3 may have merit (requiring resource consents on unsuitable soil / substrate; and within 200m of MHWS). ▪ Land Disturbance – Needs more discussion. Concern about the removal of sand from Wainui Bay. <p><i>Comment: The extent of the Landscape Project has been defined by the Memorandum of Understanding with Friends of Nelson Haven & Tasman Bay. Other matters of national importance in the RMA and the broader requirements of the NZ Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS) will be addressed in the subsequent settlement work in Golden Bay and the Rural Policy Review, and other policy projects. The outcomes of the Landscape Project will be consistent with s6 & s7 of RMA and the NZCPS.</i></p>

20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subdivision – Agree with the current rules; believe that they protect from inappropriate subdivision. ▪ Land use – The current rules seem to imply that current farming activities can continue in their current form, but there are so many ‘ifs’, ‘ors’ and appendices that contradict something being permitted. Resource consents seem to be required for almost everything. ▪ Buildings and dwellings – Farms must be able to build more sheds and workers accommodation if necessary. Most farmers don’t want to building lots of houses on a farm and then ‘split it up’. ▪ Removal of indigenous vegetation and indigenous forest – Weeds and scrub need to be cleared to maintain grazing pasture; most farmers would not want to remove native forest. Rules seem rather general. ▪ Quarrying – Need to keep the local quarry open otherwise would have to source product from outside the Bay; this would not be environmentally sustainable. ▪ Land disturbance – Farmers are conscious to cause minimum visual and physical disturbance. Rules seem to cover earthworks ok. ▪ Allow farmers to continue to maintain the land which is considered to be so beautiful. ▪ Concerned about the complexity of the TRMP. Would not be considered acceptable in the UK.
21	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Opposes all policy options; Tasman District Plan sufficient; no additional rules required. ▪ Already Golden Bay has 78.3% of total area in conservation reserve.
22	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Consultation process has been flawed; the meeting on 9 December was not representative; extension of feedback period requested until 30 April 2011. ▪ Opposes the proposal in its entirety. ▪ The Environment Court has already heard from many landscape architects on this subject and during the aquaculture hearings – have these been considered? <p><i>Comment: The process is just commencing; an additional meeting with a business group was held in February. There will be further opportunity for comment once Council has approved a policy direction. Further feedback is quite acceptable in this ‘pre-consultation’ phase.</i></p>
23	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The outcomes and ‘policy options’ of 9 December meeting just brought to attention. Wishes more time to respond.
24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Thanks for meeting on 9 December. Please send further information to Patons Rock Beach Society address.
25	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please also refer to submission on Frank Boffa’s earlier report. ▪ Task One – Identifying what areas are exceptional. Consider the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ What criteria were used to make the assessment? ▪ Greater clarification of boundaries to be drawn, eg the seaward boundaries. ▪ The implications of more broadly defining outstanding landscapes. ▪ Decisions surrounding clarity of defined boundaries. ▪ Robustness of final result. ▪ How will ‘visual amenity landscapes’ be provided for (ie important landscapes that don’t meet the criteria for outstanding)? ▪ Concern that by applying a broadbrush approach to ‘outstanding’ will lead to a policy response that is ‘less stringent’ than might be required for ‘higher order’ protection.

- **Task Two – Protecting these areas.** This involves identifying threats to identified areas, and then looking at policies and rules that need to be applied.
- F&B wants policies and rules that provide certainty about what CAN take place, and what requires protection. Rules should be necessary and efficient. There is value in prohibiting certain activities in certain locations.
- Ongoing degradation is often incremental, eg gradual reduction of mature indigenous forest, and incremental build up of buildings.
- Also consider protecting natural character and visual amenity. Note that natural character features are not adequately catered for in the Rural Effects part of the Tasman Resource Management Plan.
- Suggest that an overview of the requirements of the 2010 NZ Coastal Policy Statement be covered in the working group meeting.
 - **Subdivision** – F & B support identifying ‘building location areas’ on subdivision plans (option 3); and preventing further subdivision in Rural Residential zones that are not contiguous with settlement areas (option 4). Identify areas where subdivision may occur, and where it may be restricted.
 - **Land use** – a number of landscapes have been negatively modified by inappropriate land use. While respecting existing use rights, undertake reparation where possible, and review consents where they may come up for renewal.
 - **Buildings and dwellings** – consider buildings subject to conditions suggested to ensure location is appropriate (option 2).
 - **Indigenous vegetation and indigenous forest** – current rules were established through an extensive court mediation process. Increased protection may be needed in an outstanding landscape.
 - **Quarrying** – no comment at this stage.
 - **Land disturbance** – consider exploring option 4; quantity not the only factor, also need to consider slope, site visibility, soil type and structure, and surrounding environment.

26 ▪ Support ‘no change’ as a policy response.

27 ▪ Supports ‘no change’ as a policy response.

28 ▪ Policies protecting ONFLs (s6(b) of the RMA) must be compatible with those affording protection to natural character (s6(c)) and indigenous flora and fauna (s6(c)).

- **Subdivision** – no change would not address risks and threats. Should have more non-complying status for subdivision less than the zone minimum everywhere, not just ONFLs. Building locations should be specified on subdivision plans (option 3). Agree no further subdivision in Rural Residential zones not contiguous with settlement areas. Disagree with option 5 (reinstating creation of one additional smaller lot). This leads to land fragmentation. Additional farm worker accommodation or granny flat should be managed through ‘numbers of dwellings per title’, not subdivision. Limit boundary adjustments where change in size allows for an additional dwelling on a title.
- **Land use** – notes that existing use rights do not apply in certain circumstances (s30(1)(c)), and there are special provisions for the Coastal Marine Area and the beds of lakes and rivers (s12 and s13)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Buildings and dwellings – Agree with locating structures below ridgelines, and softening the effects of existing structures in an ONFL. Ridgelines are mapped in the TRMP but not west of Collingwood. Need consistency. ▪ Indigenous vegetation and forest removal – Concerned that naturally occurring wetlands continue to be grazed and degraded. Few additions to Schedule 18.1A in recent times. Need to be consistent where areas may have value under a range of criteria.
29	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Farmed on the coast for 55 years. Concerned that a label of ‘outstanding’ would attract more people, and detract from its naturalness. Need to be able to undertake normal farming practices such as burning, spraying, aerial topdressing, scrub clearing and topdressing without stringent rules.
30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Frank Boffa options: private farmland should be exempt from ‘outstanding’ classification. ▪ No further restrictions wanted. Already difficult to farm on the coast with problems of distance, freight costs, rust from salt winds, drought, narrow gravel roads, building and fire permits, roading restrictions.
31	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Please no more restrictions on farmers, and if possible remove some. ▪ Accept that we live in an area of ‘outstanding landscapes’ and feel there are adequate rules in the place to ensure protection. Normal farming practices must be allowed to continue. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subdivision – agree building locations should be shown on subdivision plans in certain circumstances or locations; option 4 (preventing further subdivision in Rural Residential zones not contiguous with settlement areas) – there may be exceptions; and option 5 (reinstating the creation of one additional smaller lot in the Rural 2 zone) is a maybe? ▪ Land use – agree with no change. ▪ Buildings and dwellings – restrictions about ridgelines needs careful consideration eg Westhaven Retreat at Te Hapu is on a ridgeline yet is not highly visible from accessible public viewing areas and enables visitors to have an excellent view of the inlet. Consider on a case by case basis. ▪ Indigenous vegetation and forest removal – agree with no change option. Need to be able to remove scrub on farmland to allow for productive farmland. ▪ Quarrying and land disturbance – agree with no change option.
32	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Biggest threat is coastal ribbon development. ▪ Access to the beach for the public is not always protected, eg Tukurua campground. ▪ Make sure social and cultural values, and sensitive ecological factors are included in identifying ‘outstanding’ natural features. ▪ Rules should be area-specific to an ONFL, otherwise too gross and insensitive. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Subdivision: – all subdivisions within 200m of MHSW should show building locations and have a landscape plan. ▪ Buildings and dwellings – a landscape plan should define ridgelines and other sensitive area. Suggest pole house construction (no excavation and fill) on slopes greater than 15 degrees. ▪ Indigenous vegetation and forest removal – no removal of riparian indigenous vegetation; and any indigenous forest removal should be subject to a long-term harvesting plan.

- **Quarrying** – any applications need to consider the sensitivity of the landscape and ecological conditions; also need to address rehabilitation.
- **Land disturbance** – rules are too complex and breaches are not enforced.
- Council has too much discretion in deciding applications; NZ planning system very permissive.

33

- Appreciates the spirit of cooperation between all parties.
- Want the whole of Golden Bay recognised as important until more detailed examination is completed.
- **Questions:**
 - How do we protect the margins of areas that are identified?
 - How can landowners be compensated if there is a ‘devaluing’ of property as a result of protection proposed?
 - What has been done so far to implement the 2010 Coastal Policy? Coastline is biologically and aesthetically important; places like the Tarakohe cliffs need special landscape recognition.
 - Recognise that places with special importance for Maori also need protection.
 - How does Council intend to plan for coastal erosion caused by climate change over the next 100 years, and avoid financial responsibility eg the proposed Pakawau motor camp development?
 - How is TDC identifying areas for protection of rare, endangered and other species required by RMA, NZCPS and international obligations?
 - Could NZCPS Policy 20, calling for unnecessary vehicle access to the coast, be addressed in this project?
 - Concerned about adverse effects of logging and forestry eg Parapara estuary and future logging at Ligar Bay. Will steep land areas be identified where certain land uses are unsuitable?
 - Will natural areas be large enough or flexible enough to take coastal processes into consideration?
 - Will additional areas be identified for remediation or rehabilitation, such as stream care initiatives that have already commenced?
 - Will areas around Awaroa be considered; and when?

34

- Concerned that the earlier 2008 Golden Bay strategic work considered ‘natural character’ as well as ‘outstanding natural features and landscapes’; and the current project is silent with regard to section 6(a) matters.

Comment: replied by separate email on this matter.

- Primary concern of the Department is not visual amenity but rather how natural processes and functioning are being affected by human activities.
- Key areas of interest to DoC are the natural values associated with coastal waters, estuaries and intertidal areas, freshwaters (especially the more intact coastal rivers and streams), and lowland and coastal remnant vegetation.
- Northwest Coast has special qualities and less ability to assimilate new development; needs different management approaches to the more modified Golden Bay.
- Supports the identification of the coastal waters of both Golden Bay and the western exposed coastline as being outstanding land/seascapes.
- Consider NZ Coastal Policy Statement 2010 Policies 13–15 together.

- **Protection from inappropriate subdivision, use and development:** consider the areas need to be identified first, and then rules adjusted. Notes that Frank Boffa suggested different treatments for forestry and buildings in the Northwest Coast to how they might be managed in Golden Bay. Supports the 2005 Boffa report and recommendations.

Extracts from 2008 questionnaire:

Threats to landscapes and features:

- Two main threats are subdivision / development, and changing rural land use (intensive dairying and forestry). Can address through non-statutory means but may need rules for certain land uses such as forestry.
- Pest plants and animals can also be a problem
- Seawalls and other 'hard' coastal protection devices are an issue.
- Agree with consolidating development at Pohara / Ligar Bay / Tata Beach but with recognition of features and landscapes within this area.
- Estuaries are a special feature – need to keep any subdivision, development etc away from the margins especially as the margins may move with sea level rise.
- Important to manage the lands that border conservation lands eg at Wainui Bay, the base of the Mount Burnett range and around Whanganui Inlet. This doesn't mean no development, just that development that does occur is well designed and in the right places.

35

- Would like more consideration of the views of scientists and academics concerning the discussion of outstanding landscapes.
- Three domains that deserve special attention:
 - At one extreme, pure transience and fluidity eg Puppu Springs – the freshwater resource and catchment area of Golden Bay.
 - At the other extreme, complete stability and immobility of which a few outcrops can be noted eg Tarakohe.
 - Between we have the muddy ooze, the semi-solid area between land and sea, between freshwater and saltwater. Contrast between the wild waters of the west coast and the calm waters of the Bay is outstanding.
- Further points regarding the intermeshing of systems:
 - The changing flora and fauna with altitude;
 - The interaction of the water systems in the Bay (surface, artesian and salt).

36

- The human imprint should sit lightly on the environment, in design, colour, traffic effect etc.

37

- Beauty is in the eye of the beholder. What is there now is because the owners of the land left it or grew it. Leave things alone with private land.
- Further comments on feedback sheet:
 - **Subdivision:** No change. Existing rules adequate. Leave boundary adjustment definition alone.
 - **Buildings and dwellings:** Require that roofs on ridgelines be of a colour so that the roof line blends in.
 - **Indigenous vegetation and forest removal:** No change required.
 - **Quarrying:** Already covered.
 - **Land disturbance:** Enough rules in place.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes that all DoC land should be classified outstanding. This would cover TDC's RMA responsibilities.
38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Agree with Frank Boffa's vision and sensible approach. Avoid over-regulating. Keep a watchful eye on unsuitable development and minimise anything that changes the landscape. Main concern is with fragmentation and loss of unique ambience of Golden Bay. Progress should happen with careful planning. Lifestyle blocks don't enhance a community (see Redwood Valley).
39	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about karst areas in general, and in particular the coastal limestone cliffs around Tarakohe, from Pohara to Ligar Bay.
40	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The whole of Golden Bay is an 'outstanding natural landscape' ... a hugely varied and largely unmodified piece of New Zealand contained within a small area. Also significant for the specialised flora and fauna that live within them (Rawhiti cave spider, giant snails everywhere and unique skink at Pohara). Concerned that consents for land disturbance only apply to streams over 3m wide ... should apply to all waterways. Specific concerns as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subdivision: agree with building location plans (and limit quantity of earthworks – build around the rocks). Agree with Option 4 preventing further subdivision in Rural Residential Zones not contiguous with settlement areas, and Option 5 allowing an additional smaller lot where balance is over 50ha. Land use: existing uses still have to take resource management into account eg draining wetlands. Buildings and dwellings: definition of 'visible ridgeline' should be that which is against the sky. However buildings on a ridgeline can be made invisible by planting native trees. Don't agree with Option 3 needing 100ha rather than 50 for a second dwelling in Rural 2. Indigenous vegetation and forest removal: control the removal of all indigenous vegetation. Refer to 'Opportunities for Ecological Restoration in the Takaka Catchment' by Philip Simpson. Quarrying: should require screening for all quarrying eg Tarakohe. Below Mt Burnett very visible in the landscape. Land disturbance: agree with options presented.
41	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leave land owners to manage their land – pay enough rates. No change option selected. People have a right to a good view.
42	<p>A meeting was convened on behalf of a number of business and industry groups, including fishing, tourism, land development, transport, aquaculture, quarrying, farming, forestry and real estate. Attended by the Mayor, Cr Bouillir, GBCB Chair Carolyn McLellan and Council staff.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The group recognises that Council has an obligation to identify outstanding natural features and landscapes. Feels that undue weight has been given to environmental interest groups. Aquaculture group had not been consulted at all.

- Landscape project needs to slow down and consult widely. An extended timeline that achieves a harmonious response is better than facing a new legal challenge.
- Concern that Council will use the opportunity to put in another layer of rules and regulations. These are not considered necessary. The existing Plan works well.
- Amazed that there is not a clear definition of an outstanding landscape.
- Consider that Tasman Bay should have been considered first as that is where the development is happening.
- Farmers want recognition that their care of the land contributes to the landscapes special features.
- Another layer of regulation would make it harder and more costly to develop land. More people are needed in Golden Bay as well as affordable housing and employment.
- Would like the working group to be more balanced, and better represent business interests. Many industries need their own voice.
- Financial pressure can cause farms to be fragmented through the selling of existing titles.
- Need to engage one-on-one with landowners, and hold future consultation meetings in Golden Bay.
- The meeting expressed a wish that the timeframe be adjusted and flexible to ensure a harmonious outcome.