

# Te Tai o Poutini Plan

## Introductory Planning Statement

### Natural Features and Landscapes



**Te Tai o Poutini**  
P L A N

*A combined district plan for the West Coast*

## Introduction to the Natural Features and Landscapes Topic

1. Tēnā koutou. My name is Lois Margaret Easton. I have been the principal planner during the period of development of Te Tai o Poutini Plan. I have been the lead planner for the landscape and natural features topic. My credentials are outlined in the relevant s42A reports and I will not repeat these here.
2. This topic is one of the topics within Te Tai o Poutini Plan where this matter was not well addressed in the operative plans. Neither the Westland or Buller Operative District Plans include outstanding natural features or landscapes, and the Grey District Plan identifies some outstanding natural landscapes but these were not mapped, and only triggered rule requirements when a consent was required for another reason.
3. In 2013 the three district councils, jointly with the West Coast Regional Council commissioned Stephen Brown to do a landscape assessment for the West Coast. Where outstanding natural landscapes were identified in the coastal environment, the West Coast Regional Council scheduled these in the 2016 Regional Coastal Environment Plan.
4. These outstanding natural landscapes were identified in a pdf small scale document and the West Coast Regional Council GIS team digitised them.
5. In 2021, when the Te Tai o Poutini Plan was being developed, a limited review was undertaken by Stephen Brown of some key locations and the updated information was included in the notified Plan. However when the draft went for consultation it became evident that there were further areas in need of review and Stephen Brown was commissioned to do a West Coast wide reassessment. Due to timing issues, this reassessment was not available until September 2022 and is referred to in the submission by the TTPP Committee. However the maps were still pdfs, and it was only in the last few months that these have been able to be digitised. A webviewer is now available online which compares the notified plan maps and the digitised September 2022 maps.
6. Stephen Brown was not available to assist with the s42A report, and Bridget Gilbert, a landscape architect with considerable visual assessment experience, was engaged instead. Ms Gilbert travelled to the West Coast to consider the landscapes that were subject of submissions and has also reviewed the digitised maps. I need to stress the short time that was available to do this. The digitisation was completed after I wrote my s42A report and Ms Gilbert had a very short time to review those maps before providing her report. I do note however that she considers that further refinement of the digitised maps is needed, and this has a bearing on some of the submissions in the s42A report. Unfortunately Ms Gilbert is unable to attend the hearing but I am able to seek further information from her for the panel to inform my right of reply.
7. The rules within the NFL chapter relate only to earthworks and structures. In terms of vegetation clearance within an outstanding natural landscape the rules around this can be found in the Ecosystems and Biodiversity (ECO) Chapter. Generally such clearance is a Discretionary Activity in the proposed Plan. In that regard, therefore the policies in the NFL chapter would be likely to be considered alongside the ECO Chapter policy in the assessment of any resource consent for such vegetation clearance.
8. I now turn to the written evidence provided ahead of this hearing.
9. Firstly in relation to the tabled evidence of Submitter S663 Chorus New Zealand Limited (Chorus), Spark New Zealand Trading Limited (Spark), One New Zealand Group Limited (One NZ and FortySouth). I can confirm that as per their tabled evidence there is an error in the recommended amendment to the plan in relation to Rule NFL – R8. I support submission S663.049 as is stated in the s42A report and this should be reflected in my recommended amendments. My full recommended amendments to Rule NFL – R8, including this change are shown below. I have highlighted the addition in **yellow**.

## NFL - R8

### Erection of a building or structure not otherwise provided for as a Permitted Activity within an Outstanding Natural Landscape described in Schedule Five

#### Activity Status Permitted

Where the structure is:

1. A fence; or
2. Associated with ~~støck~~ water reticulation including tanks, pipes and water troughs; or
3. For parks facilities or parks furniture in any Open Space Zone; or
4. For a network utility (including customer connections) in accordance with the Permitted Activity standards for Infrastructure in Rule INF - R7 and for energy network utilities Rule ENG – R4; or
5. For a single small-scale renewable electricity generation activity per allotment with a maximum height above ground level of 5m where;
  - a. The maximum height is 5m above ground level; and
  - b. The gross floor area of any building does not exceed 100m<sup>2</sup>
6. For agricultural, pastoral and horticultural activities and mahinga kai activities or any accessory building where:
  - a. The maximum height is 3m above ground level; and
  - b. The gross floor area of any building does not exceed 100m<sup>2</sup>;
7. A bridge constructed as part of a Temporary Military Training Activity; and
8. Underground lines or small network utility structures not exceeding 3m in height and 5m<sup>2</sup> in area

**Advice Note:** Where buildings or structures are located in the Coastal Environment, the provisions in the Coastal Environment Chapter apply.

10. In relation to the evidence of Manawa Energy I agree (as I state in my paragraph 6 above) that further refinement (eg as suggested in Mr Bentley's paragraph 5.23) , with the assistance of Ms Gilbert, of the outstanding natural landscape maps should be undertaken. In relation to the evidence of Stephanie Styles, in relation to policy NFL – P2, I support her proposal in paragraph 7.27 in relation to the term "practicable".
11. In relation to the evidence of Bathurst Resources – Claire Hunter, I support the correction of the duplication of words in my amended NFL – P1 as outlined in her paragraph 18.
12. In relation to the tabled statement from Russell Robinson and Brunner Builders Limited I find the photographs very useful in this context. I support the exclusion of the grass and shrub areas and consider that is is a location where the refinement of the boundaries as is recommended by Ms Gilbert would be appropriate.
13. There may be other changes that I agree with within this evidence that link to the discussions and submissions on the Natural Character of Waterbodies topic around policy wording, however I am yet to write my Right of Reply for that topic, and I haven't yet reached a position on those matters as I will want to take a consistent approach these two chapters.
14. At this point there are no other specific matters where I would alter my recommendations in relation to the s42A report.
15. Thank you