

Went over the agenda and the notes from the last meeting. It was mentioned that it would be good to have a revisit of the original purpose of the reference group and what was to be achieved.

1. The 3 core points that were intended were landscape criteria, landscape rule framework and landscape mapping options.
2. Question raised about the adoption of SALs. Is it “all or nothing”, i.e.: can some areas be added to the drafted mapping, or can they be removed? If it is decided that SALs are to be added to the district plan, it will be all included. It will be very hard to justify the addition or removal of certain areas as they are all based on the same qualifying criteria.
3. In the last meeting there was some apprehension around national regulations that could affect the SAL areas if they are identified. Explained that SALs are at the lower end of the spectrum and don’t generally get picked up by national standards (it is Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Features that are generally more relevant).
  - a. Summarised the NPS (National Policy Statements) and NES (National Environmental Standards) hierarchy.
  - b. NPS – there are 5 of these – Freshwater Management, Renewable Electricity Generation, Electricity Transmission, Urban Development and NZ Coastal Policy Statement. These are policy documents and don’t include rules. These are high up the order. There is one that mentions Landscapes which is the Electricity Transmission statement. Therefore, landscapes would need to be balanced with this policy statement and has to be accommodated for.
  - c. NES – there are 9 of these. There are 2 that would be relevant to Landscapes. Plantation and Forestry and Telecommunication Facilities. In the plantation forestry NES, clause 13 uses the term “visual amenity landscape” and refers back to the local district plan for the rules. In the telecommunications NES, clause 47 also uses the term “visual amenity landscape” and again refers back to the local district plan for rules. However, these are only relevant if rules are imposed in the district plan for SALs.
4. Question raised about what is currently in place to address unnecessary development. There is the District Plan with the rules, standards and overlays (such as the Southern Hills overlay).
5. Update on the Guildford block of land. There is currently no SAL or ONFL on this land but there are some that believe it should be. This area currently has the underlying zoning for Rural Hill and Residential Conservation. There is information on the council’s website regarding the Guildford Timber Company MoU.

### **The way forward**

There are some mixed opinions within the group on the way forward with implementing the SALs into the district plan. There is a general consensus that the group feel these areas are special and should be recognised to some extent, but the “how” is the main issue.

If SALs are not to be included, and the underlying zone is relied upon, the special character and values of that area will not be recognised and the rules for the zone will apply. Some feel that this could leave the area unprotected from unnecessary development.

If SALs are to be included the supporting rules and policies will be added as an overlay. Most of the group feel that this is unnecessary as the district plan rules are enough and there is no need for undue regulation and potential added cost and time to the consent process.

The other option is to note the SAL areas with overlay maps, a description of landscape character and policy that recognises the SAL but the rules will essentially be for the underlying zone, eg: rural hill. The pattern of development and character will need to be considered with any consents.

Each group member that was present at the meeting has expressed where they sit with the options above:

Main options discussed:

1. No SALs, no rules, no policies (just let the zone manage development)
2. Only include SAL overlay maps, a description of landscape character with a policy recognising SALs
3. Include SAL overlay maps, a description of landscape character, with supporting policies and rules (e.g draft PC48 landscape chapter) with some edits (such as colour and number of buildings as previously discussed).

Member	Location	Position	Comment
1	Akatarawa	Prefer 1, but open to Option 2	"Not a hard no" for option 2, subject to further details.
2	Akatarawa	Prefer 1, but open to Option 2	"Not a hard no" for option 2, subject to further details. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Remove rules</li> <li>• Make changes to boundary of the Akatarawa SAL.</li> </ul>
3	Pinehaven	Prefer 1, but open to Option 2	"Not a hard no" for option 2, subject to further details. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Does not want extra legislation for people wanting to make changes to their property</li> </ul>
4	Akatarawa	Prefer 1, but open to Option 2	"Not a hard no" for option 2, subject to further details.
5	Akatarawa	Prefer 1, but open to Option 2	"Not a hard no" for option 2, subject to further details. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policy detail will need some work</li> </ul>
6	Mangaroa	Option 3	All overlays and policies included to manage future development
7	Akatarawa	Prefer 1, but open to Option 2	"Not a hard no" for option 2, subject to further details. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SAL methodology – only include qualifying land that can be seen from public viewpoints (e.g. roads and public reserves)</li> <li>• Rules would disadvantage large lot landowners.</li> <li>• Colour restrictions should be removed.</li> </ul>
8	Moonshine	Prefer 1, but open to Option 2	"Not a hard no" for option 2, subject to further details. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Can see the benefit of overlays but not sure on the rules.</li> </ul>

Landscape Specialist is to look at the suggested changes to the boundary of the Akatarawa SAL. It has also been mentioned that the land cover has changed since the last assessment. Site visit is due to be done on Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> April.

There are 2 other areas to be visited – Mangaroa/Whitemans Valley and the Silverstream Spur. Landscape Specialist is going to contact Cr Angela McLeod for some background information around the Whitemans Valley area. Reminder that if the decision is made to amend the boundaries, the tests in the RPS will need to be met. There will need to be a case made about what will be gained or lost with this decision.

### **Outstanding issue**

An issue was raised that the reference group included at least one member who was not an affected landowner. The group sought clarification on the selection criteria as it was believed that all group members should be affected landowners. The group sought further clarification on this from the Councils Policy Manager.