



## STAFF REPORT

**TO:** Environment & Planning Committee

**FROM:** Sonya Leusink-Sladen, Policy Planner

**REFERENCE:** L333

**SUBJECT:** **TAKAKA EAST GOLDEN BAY GROWTH PROJECT – DRAFT VARIATION - REPORT EP07/03/10** - Report Prepared for 28 March 2007 Meeting

---

### 1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

The purpose of this report is gain Committee approval to release a draft proposed Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Variation for community input.

The Policy Planner will present an overview of the proposed draft Variation at the meeting.

### 2. BACKGROUND

The project team, Team Golden Bay<sup>1</sup>, has taken the following steps so far:

- March 2005 – project initiated. The purpose of the project was to investigate the long term future for residential development in the Takaka Valley lowland area, from Tata Beach in the east to Rangihaeata in the west.
- July 2005 - “Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Urban Growth Issues and Options” paper was released (referred to as “Part I” consultation document). This paper articulated issues facing growth in the study area, and suggest possible options for the purpose of stimulating discussion. All Councillors received a copy of it.
- August to October 2005 – Phase I Consultation. A public meeting was held, and written feedback was encouraged. Copies of all written submissions were made available to Councillors in November 2005.
- November 2005 to April 2006 - Further information gathered. Following the first round of consultation, staff assessed the written feedback and worked towards completing the information requirements to take the project to the next stage. This involved gathering and incorporating new information into the project, including key work undertaken by Dr Iain Campbell relating to land productivity, “*Soils of the Lower Takaka Valley*” (released May 2006)

---

<sup>1</sup> Team Golden Bay comprises the Golden Bay Community Board members, ward Councillors, service centre staff, and Richmond based engineering and policy planning staff.

- July 2006 - "Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Growth Strategy: Phase II Community Discussion Paper" released. All information, especially written submissions from the community, was compiled and the second consultation document was drafted. This document took the next process step by articulating principles for growth.

The Phase II document was made available to the community and Councillors at the end of July 2006. Feedback was reported to Council at the 22 November 2006 EPC.

### **3. THE DRAFT VARIATION**

The policy paper attached to this report articulates all of the issues, values, options and alternatives considered throughout the process of drafting a Variation (see Attachment 2). The following briefly summarises the proposed Variation, its purpose and the changes it will introduce.

The Council proposes to amend the Proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan (the "Plan") by inserting policies and objectives that articulate a future growth (settlement) vision for the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area.

The proposed Variation will insert new policies into Chapters 6, 7, 9 and 10 of the TRMP, relating to urban, rural, landscape and heritage issues. The Variation has been intentionally drafted to provide a "policy overview" of future growth and settlement. As such, it does not go as far as making any recommended changes to zones, rules or standards within rules.

The purpose of this is to provide a much broader overarching vision for growth into the long term. Once this vision has been accepted by the community and Council into the Plan (following necessary changes), it can be used to Guide all future growth and settlement decisions, whether they are proposed new zones or rules for development, or resource consent applications within the current framework.

In short, the proposed Variation will provide a framework for all future settlement planning in the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area.

The main issues that the Variation attempts to address are the protection of landscape values, both rural and coastal, and the protection of land that has high productive potential (Class A and B lands). Other issues that are important are avoiding flood risk, and ensuring that settlements are efficiently and effectively serviced. The Variation will provide a policy framework for all of the issues and many others.

In the process of developing the proposed Variation, Council has considered Section 32 requirements to address all costs, benefits and risks of alternative options for achieving the sustainable management of resources.

### **4. PROCESS**

The draft proposed Variation will be made available to the community for comment, and discussion. Following this consultation, any necessary changes will be made before being reported back to the Committee for approval to notify as a Plan Variation under the Resource Management Act.

## 5. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that the Committee:

**Receive** this report.

**Adopt** the draft proposed Variation for Takaka Eastern Golden Bay for community consultation.

Sonya Leusink-Sladen  
**Policy Planner**

**TASMAN DISTRICT COUNCIL****PROPOSED TASMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN****PROPOSED VARIATION<sup>1</sup> (DRAFT)****EXPLANATORY STATEMENT**

The Council proposes to amend the Proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan (the "Plan") by inserting policies and objectives that articulate a future settlement growth vision for the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area.

The proposed Variation will insert new policies into Chapters 6, 7, 9 and 10 of the TRMP, relating to urban, rural, landscape and heritage issues. The Variation intentionally provides a "policy overview" of future settlement growth. As such, it does not go as far as making any changes to zones, rules or standards within rules.

The purpose of this is to provide a broad, overarching vision for settlement growth into the long term. Once this vision has been accepted by the community and Council, it can be used to guide all future growth and settlement decisions, whether they are proposed new zones or rules for development, or resource consent applications within the current framework.

In short, the proposed Variation provides a framework for all future settlement planning in the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area.

The main issues that the Variation seeks to address are the protection of landscape values, both rural and coastal, and the protection of land that has high productive value (Class A and B soils). Other issues that are important are avoiding flood risk, and ensuring that settlements are efficiently and effectively serviced. The Variation provides a policy framework for all of the issues and many others.

In the process of developing the proposed Variation, Council has considered the duties under Section 32 of the RMA to address all costs, benefits and risks of alternative options for achieving the sustainable management of resources.

Key Section 32 reference documents are:

- Part I Community Discussion Paper – Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Urban Growth – Issues and Options (July 2005)
- Part II Community Discussion Paper – Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Growth Strategy (July 2006)
- Takaka Eastern Golden Bay – Strategic Growth Options Policy Paper (March 2007)

**AMMENDMENTS**

The proposed Variation affects the following objectives and policies sections of the Tasman Resource Management Plan:

- Chapter 6 - Urban Environment Effects: Proposed changes introduce provisions that give a clear vision for settlement planning and growth, including Takaka Eastern Golden Bay-specific provisions.
- Chapter 7- Rural Environment Effects: Settlement matters in relation rural values, including landscape and productivity, are articulated here
- Chapter 9 – Landscape: Provisions, specific to the study area are articulated here.
- Chapter 10 – Significant Natural Values and Cultural Heritage: Takaka Eastern Golden Bay specific provisions, that acknowledge the importance of heritage values, both natural and cultural.

## **AMENDMENTS**

The Proposed Tasman Resource Management Plan is amended in accordance with the following:

### **Add to 6.1, new policies that relate specifically to settlement growth in the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area (TEGBA):**

*Policy 6.1.6:*

*To prevent the expansion of existing residential settlement areas in the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area where the land is of high productive value (Class A and B lands).*

*[suggest this formula, as high productive value more or less equates with classes A and B]*

*Policy 6.1.7:*

*To prevent the further expansion of the existing Takaka urban area, where this land is affected by flood hazard potential.*

*[suggest include commercial and residential expansion*

*Note: Takaka-specific policies are set out in 6.9*

### **Add to 6.1.30 explanation, a paragraph outlining the issue of settlement growth on Class A and B land in the TEGBA:**

*The loss of land of high productive value, namely Class A and B soils, to residential development in the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area is an issue that must be addressed in relation to the expansion of settlement areas. Many existing settlement areas such as Takaka, Clifton and Motupipi are located on such land, and further expansion of them should be avoided.*

*In the case of the existing Takaka Township, as well as being located on Class A and B soils the land is also prone to flooding. It is therefore doubly important to ensure that Takaka is not allowed to expand beyond the current developed area.*

### **Add to 6.2, new policies relating to settlement expansion and the provision of infrastructure services:**

*Policy 6.2.6:*

*For all settlement growth and residential development in the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, to ensure that:*

- (a). *Settlement objectives, policies and residential location options inform Long Term Council Community Plan servicing decisions.*
- (b). *Wastewater, water supply, stormwater management, transportation networks, and parks and reserves issues and options are addressed before land is zoned for residential settlement.*
- (c). *Minimum standards for human health and safety, long term cost effectiveness and environmental quality, are met or bettered for any alternative wastewater management and water supply options, such as de-centralised and independent solutions.*
- (d). *Where on-site wastewater treatment and disposal solutions are used, the standard of management avoids remedies or mitigates adverse effects on water quality and that long-term management and maintenance responsibilities are clearly defined.*
- (e). *Structure planning with the local community is undertaken where appropriate and necessary to achieve comprehensive infrastructure planning.*

*Policy 6.2.7*

*In the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, to ensure that:*

- (a) *New residential development consolidates around existing residential development in defined locations;*
- (b) *Settlement areas are well connected, with safe and efficient roads, safe and pleasant walkways, cycle lanes and bridle-paths.*
- (c) *Appropriate residential settlement opportunity is provided for in a location that is within walking and biking distance to the existing Takaka township.*
- (d) *Appropriate residential settlement opportunities are provided for in locations that are in proximity to reticulated wastewater treatment and disposal facilities.*
- (e) *Opportunities for light industrial and commercial activity are provided for in appropriate locations and within proximity to existing settlement areas and transport nodes;*

*Policy 6.2.8*

*In the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, to ensure that:*

- (a) *Local communities are involved in determining appropriate development standards for built development and infrastructure prior to the re-zoning of land for residential development;*

- (b) The character of development and built infrastructure is in keeping with the character and amenity values of the surrounding environment, without compromising human health and safety;*
- (c) Landowners and developers are encouraged to use the New Zealand Standards Handbook of Subdivision for People and the Environment (SNZ HB44:2001), in the design of future subdivision and development where appropriate.*

**Add to 6.2.30 explanation, a paragraph relating to infrastructure services matters that are relevant to the TEGBA:**

*In the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, it is important that issues and options for efficient and effective infrastructure services provision are discussed with the local community, and that this occurs prior to the re-zoning of land for settlement purposes.*

*This may occur in the form of a structure planning exercise or through an integrated approach to Long Term Council Community Plan and resource management planning discussions.*

*All policies and objectives, and location options should be used to inform other Council processes, such as the Tasman District Engineering Standards and the Long Term Council Community Plan*

**Add policies to 6.3, relating specifically to the protection of unspoilt coastal areas in the TEGBA:**

*Policy 6.3.4*

*In the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, to ensure that coastal landscapes, the natural character of coastal environments and natural coastal heritage values are enhanced or maintained through residential settlement, in the following ways:*

- (a) Concentrate new coastal development within and inland of existing coastal settlement areas to avoid coastal ribbon development;*
- (b) Define and then protect the long-term limits of coastal settlement areas, in any direction, to prevent inappropriate sprawl;*
- (c) Consider alternative solutions, such as more compact forms of low impact design housing, for addressing the demand to live in proximity to the coast;*
- (d) Prevent new residential settlement in low-lying coastal areas at risk from coastal hazards;*
- (e) Protect outstanding coastal landscapes from inappropriate built development and land uses;*
- (f) Use low impact design solutions for all built development within the coastal environment;*

- (g) *Encourage the legal and physical protection of the margins of coastal landscapes that have high natural heritage values, such as estuaries and coastal wetland environments.*
- (h) *Consider opportunities for low density, low impact, landscape sensitive development of land that is of low productive value (Class D lands or poorer), and where there may be net gains for the coastal environment, such as public access opportunities, natural heritage protection and restoration.*

## **Add new policies to 6.5**

### *Policy 6.5.7*

*In the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, to ensure that:*

- (a) *Defined commercial and service centres such as Takaka are the hub of the community, providing goods and services, community amenities, sustainable economic opportunities and social interaction;*
- (b) *De-centralised business opportunities in other established locations, such as Tarakohe and Pohara are provided for to service those communities;*
- (c) *Commercial centres are safe, high amenity areas that people and communities can use and enjoy for a range of service and social activities;*

## **Delete policy 6.9.1 and replace with the following, relating specifically to the review of Takaka zoning, as relating to flood hazard:**

### *Policy 6.9.1:*

*To ensure that land that is made available for residential settlement, is not at risk from flooding.*

## **Add new policy 6.9.1A**

### *Policy 6.9.1A*

*Where land is zoned residential, is affected by flood risk, but is not yet developed, to consider a review of that zoning and more appropriate land use for the long term.*

## **Amend heading 6.10 by deleting specific reference to Pohara/Tarakohe/Ligar Bay, and replace with:**

*Issues – Takaka Eastern Golden Bay (Tata Beach/Ligar Bay/Pohara)*

## **Add issues relating to settlement in the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay area:**

*Key issues for residential settlement planning in the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area are:*



- (f) *How to ensure that land of high productive value (Class A or B lands), are retained for current or future use in rural production;*
- (g) *How to discourage dispersed settlement and ribbon development along roads and/or the coastline;*
- (h) *How to avoid risks associated with development in areas that are flood prone or low lying;*
- (i) *How to make sure that coastal values, including natural, landscape and heritage values, are not adversely affected by settlement;*
- (j) *How to protect rural open space, green space areas and rural landscapes from expanding settlement;*

### **Add new policies**

#### *Policy 6.10.6*

*In the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, to provide appropriate opportunities that can enable:*

- (a) *The community to choose from a variety of defined coastal and inland locations and different density and character areas for living within the Takaka Valley lowland and coastal environment;*
- (b) *Residential settlement opportunity in a variety of different locations, including coastal and inland locations is provided for;*
- (c) *Choices in development density and character in appropriate locations has been provided for including rural-residential development and more dense residential development.*

#### *Policy 6.10.7*

*To use clearly defined locations for settlement in the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, and to:*

- (a) *Provide for more dense residential development at Rangihaeata, subject to appropriate wastewater management, management of airfield cross-boundary effects and consideration of coastal values;*
- (b) *Provide for a residential settlement area centred at the existing Park Avenue location, subject to particular consideration of appropriate residential development standards; safe car, pedestrian and cycleway access to Takaka, energy efficient design solutions, infrastructure services provision, community amenities and possible future commercial development opportunity.*
- (c) *Provide for some more development opportunity in the Pohara area, subject to a comprehensive structure planning exercise with the local*

*community, that takes into account character and amenity values, infrastructure servicing requirements, access and roads, commercial development, parks and reserves and landscape protection;*

- (d) Consider more development opportunity in Ligar Bay and Tata Beach areas, subject to a comprehensive structure planning exercise with the local community, that takes into account coastal character, amenity values, infrastructure servicing requirements, access and roads, commercial development, parks and reserves, and landscape character protection;*
- (e) Consider low impact, low density rural-residential development at the Motupipi Hill location, subject to the long-term protection and restoration of coastal values, including sensitive estuarine margins, public access opportunities and significant landforms and appropriate infrastructure services including suitable access;*
- (f) Consider mixed use development opportunities at Tarakohe, subject to particular consideration of the proximity of Port Tarakohe, potential for adverse cross boundary effects, the protection and enhancement of landscape values and appropriate infrastructure servicing;*
- (g) Consider low density residential development of the eastern flank of the Rototai Hill – Hambrook road landform, subject to particular consideration of landscape values, ridgeline protection and the management of karst terrain;*

**Add to 6.10.30, paragraph to the explanation:**

*In the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, requiring that settlement take place in defined locations can prevent dispersed, and inappropriate development. This can help in avoiding adverse effects on rural values, coastal values and productive land resources, as well as establishing settlements that are more cost-effective to service and less dependent on private vehicles for transport.*

*A range of locations and different densities of development can ensure that the lifestyle demands of different people can be met, and can help to ensure that more affordable locations are provided for.*

**Add to issue 7.1, issue statements that are specific to productive land fragmentation and development in the TEGBA:**

*(d) In the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, how to avoid the loss of productive potential through land fragmentation and inappropriate built development, especially the further fragmentation of land of high productive value (Class A and B lands)*

**Add policies to 7.1, relating specifically to the issue of Class A and B land fragmentation in the TEGBA:**

*Policy 7.1.6*

*In the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, to ensure that:*

- (a) Subdivision and development of land that is of high productive value (Class A or B lands) is actively discouraged.*
- (b) Opportunities for title amalgamation and boundary adjustment are provided, to enable small landholdings to rationalise boundaries around existing dwellings without further fragmenting land of high productive value.*

**Add to Objective 9.2, new policies relating to rural landscape protection in the TEGBA:**

*Policy 9.2.6*

*In the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, to ensure that:*

- (a) Rural amenity values, rural landscapes and un-built green-space areas, including open space between neighbouring settlement areas, are protected from inappropriate residential development;*
- (b) Any new development consolidates within and around areas where there is already an enclave of residential development and community amenities such as schools, churches, playing fields or clubrooms.*
- (c) Greenbelts and open-space areas in between every settlement area are protected.*
- (d) All built development on highly visible rural landscapes, especially ridgelines and hilltops, is prevented.*
- (e) High and medium density residential development on karst terrain is avoided.*

**Add to 10.1A, new policies that are particular to natural heritage in the TEGBA:**

*Policy 10.1A.5*

*In the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, to ensure that:*

- (a) Settlement patterns and land use activities do not adversely affect natural heritage values;*
- (b) Areas that have high natural heritage values are protected from inappropriate development.*
- (c) Residential development opportunities are considered where there may be net gains for the environment, such as permanent land covenants, legal protection notices, esplanade reserves and native bush re-vegetation programmes.*

**Add to 10.1, new policies that are particular to natural heritage in the TEGBA:**

*In the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Area, to ensure that*

- (a) Settlement patterns and land use activities do not adversely affect cultural heritage values, including sites that have archaeological significance to both Maori and Pakeha occupation.*
- (b) Areas that have cultural heritage values are physically and legally protected from inappropriate development.*

**Phase III Takaka Eastern Golden Bay  
Strategic Growth Options Policy Paper – Section 32 Analysis of Policy Options for  
Settlement Planning**

## 1. WHAT IS THIS PROJECT ALL ABOUT?

*This section introduces the project, the background and context of it, and the purpose of this report.*

### 1.1 Introduction

The aim of the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Strategic Growth project is to understand and appropriately address issues relating to urban development in the study area. The Takaka Eastern Golden Bay area is defined as the coastal and low-land area spanning from Tata Beach in the East, Rangihaeata in the West (see Map 1) and Upper Takaka to the South.

### 1.2 Background

The project was initiated in March 2005. The need for it was initially prompted by issues associated with high demand for coastal living opportunities, particularly lifestyle and holiday accommodation, and the flow on effects of this on all residential living options in the Bay.

The Community requested that Council look at these issues with a view to determining an appropriate strategic framework for the long-term, in terms of residential growth and development. Issues relating to growth, such as rural land fragmentation, coastal ribbon development and reduced housing affordability, are key issues of particular concern expressed by the Community.

Since the project was initiated, the pressure on real estate has dropped, with less demand and more available sections. While this means that the pressure on coastal and rural land resources is also less significant, the need for a clear urban growth strategy has not diminished. Council has recognised the importance of looking ahead to manage development in a way that will not compromise coastal and rural environmental values. Project milestones are set out in Table 1

**Table 1 – Project Milestones to date**

<b>Milestone</b>	<b>Comment</b>
March 2005 – project initiated.	The purpose of the project was to investigate the long term future for residential development in the Takaka Valley lowland area, from Tata Beach in the east to Rangihaeata in the west.
July 2005 - “Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Urban Growth Issues and Options” paper was released.	This paper articulated issues facing growth in the study area, and suggested possible options for the purpose of stimulating discussion.
August to October 2005 – Phase I Consultation.	A public meeting was held, and written feedback was encouraged. Copies of all written submissions were made available to Councillors in November 2005.
November 2005 to April 2006 - Further information gathered.	Following the first round of consultation, staff assessed the written feedback and worked towards completing the information requirements to take the project to the next stage. This involved gathering and incorporating new information into the project, including key work undertaken by Dr Iain Campbell relating to land productivity, “ <i>Soils of the Lower Takaka Valley</i> ” (released May 2006)

July 2006 - "Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Growth Strategy: Phase II Community Discussion Paper" released.	All information, especially written submissions from the community, was compiled and the second consultation document was drafted. This document took the next process step by articulating principles for growth.
--	--

This report takes the project to the next phase, providing a policy framework for the drafting of possible objectives and policies to include in the Tasman Resource Management Plan.

### 1.3 Key Documents & References

It is important to be aware of the information contributions to the project so far. Table 2 summarises the main contributing documents. These sources of information are important to acknowledge because they:

- provide a context for the issues that are described in brief in key planning documents;
- establish background information, from which key decisions may be made and supported; and,
- set out a paper trail of thinking behind some of the ideas that will be articulated in this document.

In addition to these references, Community discussion, anecdotal evidence, Council planning and engineering management files, historical archives and previous reports (including planning studies) have also contributed to the process.

**Table 2** – Key document and references

Report Title	Comment
Golden Bay Vision 2022 (2002)	This document sets out ideals for the future of Golden Bay including natural resource management, buildings and development and social and economic wellbeing The vision statement of a community driven process.
Soils of the Lower Takaka Valley (2005)	Detailed assessment of soil types and values for the land within the study area. Land classification (A – H) is given to all soils within the area.
Tasman District Coastal Landscape Character Assessment (2005)	This reports provides an assessment of the coastal landscape values throughout the Tasman District, including Golden Bay from Wainui in the East to the North West Coast.
Golden Bay Social Report (2005)	Provides a statistical snapshot of people in the study area, including population statistics, employment and household make-up. Data used was from the 2001 census. Detailed 2006 census data is not expected to be available until mid 2007.
Phase I Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Urban Growth Issues and Options – Community Consultation Discussion Paper (2005)	Sets out the main issues and possible options for addressing them for the purpose of discussion and consultation. It includes a bibliography of information sources, including flood hazard documentation.
Phase II Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Growth Strategy – Community Discussion Paper (2006)	Responds to feedback from the Phase I paper and uses more up to date information such as soils assessment information. This paper also suggests growth principles that may guide future development as a means to focusing discussions.

### 1.4 New Information

New information has been gathered since July 2006 when the Phase II discussion paper was written. Population statistics, a "walkability/accessibility" assessment and site specific flood information, have been gathered and contribute to this discussion paper.

## Census 2006

Council now have updated statistics from Statistics New Zealand from the 2006 census. At the time of writing only key statistics were available, and are shown in Table 3. More detailed information is due to be released later in 2007.

**Table 3 – Golden bay usually resident census night population**

Area Unit	1996	2001	2006
581601 Golden Bay	4,056	4,554	4,300
581602 Takaka	1,224	1,251	1,160

It is interesting to note the decline in permanent population, which reflects the high level of “second home” holiday accommodation in the region. While at face value this may indicate a drop in urgency for growth-related planning work, it does not reduce the need to articulate a long term vision for settlement into the short to medium term future, nor does it reflect the demand for coastal-holiday lifestyle accommodation.

## Settlement walkability

Council has also gathered more information about settlement “walkability” with a view to include walk and cycle friendly environments in future settlement areas. The memo, from Council’s Road Safety Coordinator is appended to this report (see Appendix 1). The conclusion of this memo is as follows:

*“Data and research around travel behaviour and walking/cycling is mostly limited to urban areas. While Golden Bay is largely rural, it is also an area in transition. Having services 2 kms away from home is viewed as an ideal distance to enable people to access it by foot/cycle if that journey is also considered to be safe and pleasant. Having alternatives to using the car not only takes the pressure off the local road network, it impacts on personal health, has a positive affect on the environment and helps to create more cohesive communities by connecting people to their immediate area. Given the anecdotal information I receive from Golden Bay residents, the growing awareness of public and personal health and ever increasing fuel prices, there is good indication that there is high suppressed demand for walking and cycling in the Golden Bay area. There are limited opportunities to leave the car at home, partly because of its large geographical area and partly because of the limited road network and facilities for walking/cycling separately from traffic. Creating an environment where residential areas and services/recreational spaces are in close proximity to each other brings about opportunities for this to happen, but a facility would need to make this a safe and enjoyable experience. I believe there would be widespread community support to create safe and enjoyable links over short distances given the information I have received both over the time in this role and given the information gathered for this brief report”. (Kirsty Barr, Road Safety Coordinator, Tasman District Council January 2007)*

In summary, a distance of no greater than two kilometres and the creation of safe, pleasant walkways, would encourage people to walk to Takaka instead of taking their vehicles.

## Area specific flood hazard

Further information has been sought in relation to the flood hazard risk of land within the existing Takaka urban area. Both the developed area and undeveloped locations remain at risk from significant sized flood events. Further built development will exacerbate flooding effects. A specific example is the land cornering Rototai and Meihana Streets, legally described as Lot 1 DP 14587, currently zoned Residential but not yet been subdivided or developed for residential purposes.

One of the issues relating to its development potential is that it is located within the Takaka Valley flood plain. Further information about this was sought from Council’s rivers and flood hazard specialist. A copy of the memorandum is attached (Appendix 2).

In brief, the subject property is at risk from future flood events. The effect of development on the site would have off-site/downstream effects on existing development, even if development itself were raised above the estimated acceptable flood hazard level. For this reason, it is considered inappropriate to recommend anything other than that residential development on the site should be discouraged.

## 1.5 This Report

This report does three key things:

1. It sets out a revised set of community identified issues, values and principles based on what the Golden Bay community have told Council through the Phase II discussion;
2. Using these revised issues, values and principles as a guide, it reviews the various location options and assesses the costs, benefits, risks, effectiveness, efficiency and appropriateness of each to meeting the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (a requirement of Section 32 of the Act).
3. Finally, it takes the important next step in the planning process towards articulating the issues and values of the local community, into planning issue statements, objectives and policies for the sustainable management of resources in the Bay.

The draft new provisions will be introduced into the Tasman Resource Management Plan as a Plan Variation, and set the scene for further Plan changes, including possible re-zoning of land and changes to Plan rules. The report therefore represents a very important process step, and will contribute to the reporting requirements of Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act).

It is important to note that, although recommendations will be made by Council staff as a means to progressing matters to the next stage, the proposed objectives and policies are still in a draft form. This means they are open to further refinement, discussion and input, from the community directly and community elected representatives.

## 2. WHAT ARE THE ISSUES?

*This section explains the main issues affecting residential settlement and building development in the study area.*

*In this context, "issues" are defined as those resource management matters that affect or will be most affected by residential and other urban development. There may be negative consequences for the environment if they are managed inappropriately.*

### 2.1 Growing Pains

One of the reasons that Council is looking at long-term growth options in the study area, is the effect of development pressure on land use management.

Average real estate sales figures increased dramatically in the years from 2000 to 2005, and these changes affected housing affordability for many residents who live and work in the Bay. High demand for land also led to increased pressure to make more land available for living purposes.

Interestingly preliminary 2006 census data indicates that the apparent high growth rate is not related to permanent resident population. This supports the idea that much of the demand has been for holiday accommodation, being a non-resident population that puts the Golden Bay housing economy in a national or global market affecting the affordability of housing for permanent residents who live and work locally.

While "affordability" of real estate is not something that Council is directly responsible for, the flow-on effects of high demand in terms of land use are. The increased number of subdivision applications to create residential titles on rural zoned land, especially in proximity to the coast, threatened to affect rural values, coastal landscape values and threatened the long-term ability of the land to be used in rural productive ways.

While demand for real estate in itself did not prompt Council to "make more land available" through resource management planning processes, the associated pressures of the demand led to an acknowledgement of the need to have a stronger, clearer vision for the long term future of coastal and rural land resources.

The Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Growth Strategy project was born out of the need to define that long term vision for the management of land and control of development demands and then articulate them into appropriate Tasman Resource Management Plan provisions.



## 2.2 Fragmentation of highly productive land

Demand for coastal living and rural lifestyle opportunities, has placed increased pressure on land that has good productive value. In particular, much of the existing development in the Takaka, Motupipi, Clifton and Pohara areas are located on or adjacent to Class A or B land (see Figure x).

Class A and B soils can be used for a range of productive purposes. They are highly versatile. As a percentage of all land resources, they are rare – just 5% of soils in the Tasman District fall into the Class A and B rating.

Fragmentation of them, through subdivision, reduces the size of land parcels and this reduction in size limits the range of uses in terms of economic viability. Dwellings, driveways, gardens and accessory buildings physically remove land from future use for productive purposes. Subdivision and building development on Class A and B soils reduces the ability of it to be used now and in the future.

For these reasons, subdivision and development of Class A and B land, is one of the key issues that is relevant to planning in the study area. Addressing this issue appropriately is one of the most important aims of the project.

The recent study *Soils in the Lower Takaka Valley* by Dr. Iain Campbell was undertaken to gain more detailed, accurate information about the location and quality of different soil type in the study area. This document makes an important contribution to the study, providing detailed information about high productive soils.

## 2.3 Coastal landscape effects

Alongside rural land fragmentation, the loss of coastal landscape values is another key issue that arises from increased development pressure.

Buildings in the coastal landscape detract from the natural and visual amenity values that people associate with the largely un-built coastline within Golden Bay.

While preventing residential development within the coastal environment is the most direct way that this issue can be addressed, other factors are also relevant.

The style of buildings, location of building sites, location of accessways, vegetation plantings and/or removal, and the conservation of estuarine margins are examples of development considerations that may have a greater or lesser effect on coastal landscapes. Managed carefully there are many things that can be done to reduce the visual effect of development on coastal character and amenity values.

In some cases there may be net benefits from allowing some appropriate development, that is sensitive to coastal values, and enables highly sensitive coastal areas to be better protected, maintained and enhanced for future generations.

## 2.4 Flood hazard<sup>2</sup>

The issue of flooding is particular to the Takaka Valley lowland, and it affects the existing Takaka township. The last major flood (in 1983) caused significant damage to the township and surrounding landscape. At its height it rose to a level of one metre within the township itself.

Since then no flood waters have reached the same level. Some residents of Golden Bay believe that the flood risk has been significantly reduced by channel works and stop-bank protection. However, this view is not shared by flood risk experts and rivers engineers.

The channel works and changes within the flood plain may have altered the way in which water flows during a flood. However they are considered to have little or no bearing on reducing the flood hazard potential of a flood that is the same size or greater than the one that occurred in 1983. No expert evidence has been presented to Council to support claims that flooding will not occur again.

---

<sup>2</sup> More detail about flood issues is set out in the Phase 1 discussion paper. This includes a bibliography of key references.

For this reason, it would be inappropriate for Council to allow the continued expansion of the Takaka township. Peoples' homes and livelihoods, if not lives, are at risk.

Parts of Takaka that are currently zoned residential were affected by floodwaters in 1983. The likelihood of this land being affected by a future flood is great. For this reason, Council is reconsidering the zoning where the land has not yet been built upon (also see Appendix 2).

## **2.5 Infrastructure and services**

One of the important issues relevant to residential development is the availability and management of infrastructure servicing. Key services are wastewater treatment and disposal, roads, and water supply. Stormwater management and the provision of public access, reserves and facilities are also important.

Providing these services comes at a cost to developers, the Council, and the community. Providing them in the most efficient way - whilst meeting human health, safety and environmental standards - is therefore the key challenge.

One of the variables affecting cost and efficiency of providing services is the location of future potential development. As a general rule of thumb, compact, centralised forms of development and associated services are more efficient than dispersed settlement over a wider area.

Locations in close proximity to key systems, such as treatment and disposal facilities and water supply sources, are more cost effective to service. For people and communities, more compact and centralised forms of living can also reduce costs of transportation, lessen their dependence on cars, and can help to facilitate a stronger sense of community.

In the case of settlement planning within the study area, an important consideration is the location of future growth areas in relation to the existing Takaka township. Takaka is the largest centre for community services, business, and facilities. Also relevant is the location of centralised wastewater treatment and disposal facilities, which is one of the more efficient methods of wastewater management for medium density residential development. The Takaka treatment and disposal facilities are located adjoining the Takaka River approximately three kilometres from the township.

The issue of providing efficient and effective services is therefore a very relevant one when considering both the location and form of development within the study area.

## **2.6 Landowner interest**

Potential location options may not be feasible in practice where there are barriers to that land from being made available. The most relevant of these is landownership. Where the ownership structure prevents the land from being developed, or where a landowner is not interested in developing the land, such locations are not able to be considered as growth options as long as that ownership remains.

## **3. WHAT DO THE COMMUNITY VALUE?**

*This section sets out the predominant values held by people in Golden Bay, sourced from consultation feedback to both Phase I and II discussion documents of this study, and previous work such as Golden Bay Vision 2022.*

*“Values” are defined as matters that people and communities regard as important for their social and economic well-being and the values that they place on the natural environment and resources.*

### **3.1 Coastal values and landscapes**

Golden Bay residents love their coastline. They cherish the fact that it is relatively unspoiled.

They love the beaches, wildlife and marine resources. They share a love for natural landscapes, including beaches that are largely free of built development, estuaries that are thriving with birdlife, and bush-clad hills and mountains that serve as an unspoiled backdrop.

Preventing ribbon development along the coastline, high density “city” style development in proximity to beaches and estuaries, and visually prominent housing on coastal landscapes are some of concerns raised

by people living in the study area. All of them arise from placing a high value on “un-spoiled coastal landscapes”.

While most people accept that some development will occur in the future, there is a strong desire to see that it occurs in a way that will not spoil the coastline and coastal landscapes. There is also a sense that at some point in time there may be an upper limit to development, above which coastal values will begin to be significantly reduced.

### **3.2 Rural open-space**

A second common theme emerging from consultation is the desire to protect the overall open space values that give the Bay a largely rural, un-built flavour.

This means that in addition to the protection of the coastline from inappropriate development, inland open-space areas should also be managed carefully. Ribbon development, “ad-hoc” development and sporadic, dispersed patterns of settlement have been identified as being undesirable forms of growth.

Retaining wide open green-spaces between areas of settlement has been clearly identified as being important to most people in the study area. Implicit in this is the desire to consolidate settlement in and around areas where there is already some development.

As well as the general desire to retain green-space areas, the community also values its unspoilt rural landscapes as a backdrop to the Takaka Valley. This includes protecting rural areas from highly visible development, such as houses on ridges and hillslopes where they can be easily seen from public spaces.

Related to this issue is of course the desire of rural landowners to be able to continue to use the land for rural productive purposes, without the pressure of high land valuation affecting rates, and problems associated with cross boundary conflict with residential settlement. High quality class A and B soils may be threatened if settlements continue to expand unchecked.

Incremental rural land fragmentation through subdivision has also been identified as being an insidious threat to the quality of the rural landscape. While not directly related to residential settlement, the effect of the Rural 1 Zone, Controlled Activity, 12 hectare minimum allotment size was identified as a factor contributing to changes in the rural landscape.

### **3.3 Access to services without dependence on cars**

Golden Bay residents are aware of the effect of increased petrol prices on the cost of living. There is also recognition of the need to be more energy efficient and reduce dependence on cars for access to services and daily living.

A key value therefore is ensuring that future development and settlement is energy conscious, consolidating around existing service centres and providing some de-centralised services to existing settlements that are more distant from Takaka. Providing living opportunities in close proximity to Takaka, schools and the Hospital is relevant to this and can ensure that the existing Takaka business centre remains economically vibrant and sustainable.

However, some residents have also identified the need to allow some small businesses to locate locally, to service their local communities and reduce travel costs for workers.

A strong, re-occurring theme is to ensure safe and efficient alternative access that encourages alternative means of transportation. Safe, pleasant, walkways, bike paths and bridleways have been identified as being important to Golden Bay residents.

### **3.4 Choice of lifestyle options and economic opportunities**

The Takaka - Eastern Golden Bay community is a diverse one. Lifestyle demands are similarly varied.

Therefore, a range of options and choices for living were seen as important by people in the Bay. A single location for all new growth was not well supported, and there was a recognition that both “more affordable” and “coastal lifestyle” options for living needed to be included in any long-term strategy for settlement.

It was noted that providing “more affordable” housing was a function of satisfying all sectors of the market. This would ensure that affordable locations remained affordable and did not inflate as a flow-on effect of limited supply of “high end” coastal properties. Some people raised the need to also cater for rural-residential lifestyle options on less productive land.

### **3.5 Social and economic well-being**

As an outsider, one must observe that despite the social and cultural diversity that exists in the Golden Bay region, there is also a strong sense of community. Differences between people are generally put aside in support of common values, such as the ones mentioned above.

People enjoy getting together socially, through sports activities, supporting schools, families and child-care, caring for the elderly and supporting community events. In addition to this, most people in Golden Bay acknowledge the importance of sustainable economic development. They value and support local business and industries that enable people to continue to work and live in the Bay.

One of the key social-economic challenges facing the Bay is the disparity between average income and the cost of living, including housing. The lack of affordable housing for young people and families is the most obvious example of this issue. The high percentage of non-resident ownership of property indicates that the housing market is within a national and increasingly global economy. This has made it more difficult for permanent residents working within the local economy to afford property.

While this project was not initiated to directly address the social and economic issues facing local communities, it is important to acknowledge the role of land use management and planning, in supporting a sustainable economy. This includes using rural land wisely to ensure that rural productive activities can continue, as well as providing places for businesses and industry to locate.

Social well-being and economic sustainability can be enhanced by good planning decisions. Good planning should take into account the need for people to work, and live affordably, in the Bay. In terms of Council’s obligations under the Resource Management Act (1991), Council must ensure the sustainable management of resources, while at the same time enabling people and communities to provide for their social and economic well-being.

For these reasons planning decisions relating to land use and management, must also enable the community to provide for its present and future social and economic needs.

## **4. WHAT ARE THE OPTIONS?**

*This section sets out basic principles and location options for future settlement. The principles have been revised following community feedback to the Phase II document.*

### **4.1 Principles**

Based on community feedback to the issues and options discussion of the Phase I consultation document, a set of strategic principles were described in the second public discussion document. The principles were written with a view to providing a way forward for settlement planning, and stimulating further discussion about the best way to achieving that.

One or two of the principles suggested an option or options about how Council could address the particular issue. Again, this was intended to stimulate further discussion about a more specific issue.

Table 3 (see page xx) sets out the principles in the form that they appeared in the Phase II discussion document, and provides a brief summary of community feedback. The principles and the feedback were presented to the Resource Management Policy Committee on 22 November 2006. They can be used to assess the various options for locating growth, as well as consider a combination of locations for the purpose of addressing a range of values.

## **5. LOCATION ASSESSMENT**

*This section assesses each location option against the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Growth principles from Section 4.1, Table 3, and terms of the requirements of Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991.*

## 5.1 Location Options

The previous Phase I & II discussion documents described and assessed different locations for growth in terms of key issues. For the purpose of this assessment, the same set of locations will be assessed.

- Upper Takaka
- Central Takaka – Park Avenue
- Central Takaka – Glenview Road
- Hambrook Road – Rototai Hill
- Motupipi Hill
- Motupipi
- Rangihaeata
- Clifton – Pohara
- Pohara – Tata (excluding Tarakohe)
- Tarakohe

These are shown in Map 1. Appendix 4 of this document sets out the assessment table that was presented in the Phase II document. This assessment was provided for the purpose of discussion, however remains current and relevant.

## 5.2 Section 32 Assessment

The assessment framework will be based on the requirements of Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991. This section requires that an evaluation must be undertaken and that Council examine the extent to which an objective is the most appropriate, efficient and effective way to achieve the purpose of the Act. The evaluation must also consider the benefits, costs and risks associated with a particular option. All of the locations are set out in Map x.

## 5.3 Upper Takaka

*Benefits and opportunities* – A benefit of settlement at Upper Takaka is that it is flood free and will not have any adverse effects on coastal landscape, or rural landscape amenity values, provided that development is confined within and around the existing village area. The location is likely to remain affordable, due to low demand for living in that location. While more distant from Takaka, Upper Takaka is located on the main highway enroute to Motueka. This means it is an ideal location to make use of any public transport options to and from Takaka and the Bay.

*Costs and constraints* – A cost of this location is its distance from Takaka. This means that new development in this location would rely on vehicles for access to services. A significant cost to development in this location would be wastewater treatment and disposal services. The current system would need to be upgraded, and this would be relatively costly on a cost per household basis.

*Risks and uncertainties* – A dependence on vehicles for access to services is an issue that will become more significant as petrol prices rise. The long-term cost and efficiency of servicing settlement in the location is also questionable.

*Appropriate, effective and efficient?* This location does not address some of the key issues, nor deliver a living solution that is consistent with community identified values, such as proximity to Takaka. It may however be an affordable option for people working in the valley, and public transport options could be investigated to reduce a reliance on private cars for transport.

*Upper Takaka may be suitable as part of bundle of location options (to be consistent with the value of community choice and affordability), provided that wastewater management matters are addressed.*

## 5.4 Central Takaka – Park Avenue

*Benefits and opportunities* – The main advantage of development in this location is the proximity of it to the existing Takaka township. The land is flood free. The location already has a cluster of at least fifteen

dwellings and some community amenities (north of State Highway 60), such as community playing fields and club rooms. The current Hospital is about 700 metres of this location.

The soil classification is Class C, due to drainage constraints. There are advantages to future residential communities of using land that does have some good productive qualities. Domestic and community gardens may be possible, provided that the constraints are addressed.

The location is not in close proximity to the coastline therefore would not affect coastal values. The land is flat and not visually prominent. These same features also mean that it is likely to remain more affordable as one of a number of locations for residential settlement. It is both less desirable than coastal locations, and cost effective to develop. Another benefit associated with this location is landownership. Both key landowners are supportive of development in this location.

*Costs and constraints* – An upgrade to the existing wastewater infrastructure network would be required. A reticulated water supply would likely also be required. Much of the costs associated with development in this location would be borne by the developer and future landowners. Development in this location will remove from future potential productive use Class C land. While not the best land in the Takaka Valley, this land does have good fertility and it is flat meaning it has potential for a range of productive uses.

*Risks and uncertainties* – There is a risk associated with developing land that has good natural fertility albeit with poor drainage. This land will be lost for future use in production.

*Appropriate, effective and efficient?* Overall, the Park Avenue location has many benefits and few disadvantages that are of a high significance. Development will not be flood prone nor located on Class A and B soils. Being close to Takaka means that future communities will not need to be dependent on cars for access to key services located at Takaka.

*As one of a number of locations, the Park Avenue area can provide for efficient and effective settlement option that can help to address the community's desire to provide for "more affordable" housing opportunities within 2km of Takaka.*

## **5.5 Central Takaka – Glenview Road**

*Benefits and opportunities* – This location is flood free and the soils are generally poor.

*Costs and constraints* – Currently there is no residential settlement in this location. This does not address the issue of limiting the spread of further residential development and protecting existing rural landscapes from built development. The land is also relatively visible, being elevated and overlooking the Takaka Valley. Being further away from Takaka also means there will be greater costs to development, associated with servicing, affecting affordability.

*Risks and uncertainties* – A key risk of development in this location is rural landscape and amenity values. The long term sustainability of this location is also questionable, due to the greater distance from Takaka and higher cost of providing services.

*Appropriate, effective and efficient?* This location would not address key issues, nor protect values in a way that would provide net benefits to the community. This makes it an ineffective and inefficient location to provide a residential settlement.

*The Glenview Road location is not a recommended site for future residential development, being currently un-developed, more distant from Takaka, and visually prominent.*

## **5.6 Hambrook Road – Rototai Hill**

*Benefits and opportunities* – A key benefit of this location is its elevation above the flood plain and close proximity to Takaka. Parts of this area especially on the eastern flank of the hillside, have poor productive qualities due to karst terrain. Being located closer to Takaka has advantages for energy efficiency and more cost effective delivery of infrastructure services.

*Costs and constraints* – A significant constraint is the karst terrain to the south and east of the hill. Some people in the community value these landforms in their own right and do not wish to see built development in the area. Either way, this land is less suitable for more dense residential settlement, due to drainage issues and building constraints.

The land to the north and west of the hill, fronting Rototai Road is currently not available for development due to landownership.

Being raised above the flood plain, the land is visually prominent, meaning that residential settlement has the potential to have more significant landscape effects. The ridgeline along the top of the hill area would need to be carefully managed to prevent adverse visual amenity effects from occurring.

*Risks and uncertainties* – Development here could possible in the long term, however potential adverse effects on landscape amenity and drainage effects on karst terrain, would have to be very carefully managed.

*Appropriate, effective and efficient?* In the short to medium term, land to the north and west of the hill is not available due to landownership. Land to the south and east may be developed, provided that the karst landscape is managed carefully. The matter of development on karst terrain would need further investigation before any decision was made to re-zone this land.

*The Hambrook Road - Rototai Hill eastern flank may be suitable for some additional low density development, subject to closer investigation of issues associated with development on karst terrain.*

## **5.7 Motupipi Hill**

*Benefits and opportunities* – This land is made up of mostly poor quality land that is not affected by flood hazard. It is currently used for pastoral farming and forestry and there is no physical protection of land at the coastal margin from livestock and vegetation removal, nor protection of cultural heritage values (archaeological sites of importance to Tangata Whenua and Pakeha settlements). The long term protection of these sites and restoration of landscapes at the coastal margin could be achieved through a trade-off with some form of low density, low impact rural-residential development. On-site solutions for wastewater and water supply could address servicing requirements in a cost effective way. However, such solutions would need to achieve a high standard of treatment and disposal to avoid potential adverse effects on water quality affecting the nearby estuary. The site is within cycle distance of Takaka and Pohara.

*Costs and constraints* – Development on a coastal landform could affect coastal landscape values and other ecological values that are related to the estuary. This headland was identified in the Tasman District Council coastal landscape assessment report as being significant and having high landscape and coastal values.

There would a cost associated with providing a safe and efficient access from Abel Tasman Drive. Because of its proximity to the Motupipi estuary and coastal margin, a key constraint would be ensuring the protection of coastal values. Development in this location would be relatively more expensive than other locations, therefore not address the issue of “affordability”.

*Risks and uncertainties* – On-site wastewater treatment and disposal would have to be managed to a high standard to reduce the risk of estuarine contamination. Landscape amenity would also need to be managed carefully, to avoid the potential for adverse effects of coastal amenity values. Low impact, low density design with high development standards would need to be imposed on any development in this location

*Appropriate, effective and efficient?* Medium to high density development, and even a low density residential development, would not be appropriate in this location, due to the coastal landscape and estuary values associated with this site. However, low density rural-residential development that included strict design requirements for low impact design, could address the potential for these adverse effects.

Natural heritage and cultural heritage protection and restoration initiatives could be required as part of the re-zoning and/or resource consent process. Esplanade reserves and conservation areas would provide long-

term legal and physical protection of highly sensitive areas from the effects of development. The potential net gains for the environment could be said to outweigh the costs and potential risks.

*Development at the Motupipi Hill location would most likely form part of a package of location options being less “affordable”, due to its cost of development, highly sensitive coastal environment (with low allotment yield), and high demand. Conservation and heritage protection benefits could be a benefit of some low density development in this location.*

## **5.8 Motupipi**

*Benefits and opportunities* – This land is not affected by flood hazard. It is within cycle distance of Takaka and Pohara. The land is not highly visible and there is a small settlement already in existence. Being distant from the coast and without significant views, this would be relatively more affordable than a coastal location would.

*Costs and constraints* – The primary constraint of development on this land is the Class A soils assessment rating. This soil is deemed to be the most valuable soil class in the District, prized for its high versatility and productive potential. Developing this land would cost Council and community in terms of loss of future productive potential. Even though Motupipi is within biking distance to Takaka, it is not close enough to encourage pedestrian access, therefore a reliance of cars for transport to services would remain.

*Risks and uncertainties* – Productive land losses is a key risk associated with the development of land in this location.

*Appropriate, effective and efficient?* Residential settlement is not deemed to be an appropriate land-use activity for this location due to the Class A soil rating. The long-term protection of rural productive activities is something valued by the Golden Bay community. Planning provisions that reflect this are important.

*An emphasis on the protection of class A soils means that Motupipi expansion is not suitable.*

## **5.9 Rangihaeata**

*Benefits and opportunities* – This location is already developed in a low density pattern of residential development. Further development within and around this site would therefore not have a significant adverse effect on coastal values, although it would change the current character that many residents enjoy. The land is not highly productive and it is not affected by flood hazard.

*Costs and constraints* – The site is in a coastal location, therefore development at the margin must be carefully managed to avoid coastal amenity effects. Being distant from Takaka means a reliance on car transport for access to services. A significant issue that would also need to be addressed appropriately is the current intersection to the State Highway from Rangihaeata Road. Visibility is poor and access would need to be upgraded to address traffic safety concerns.

Cross boundary conflict with the adjoining airfield would also have to be very carefully managed, by ensuring that the ability of the airfield to continue to operate is retained. The location is unlikely to be as “affordable” as some of the other location options, being in a high amenity coastal environment. Currently the land is not reticulated for wastewater. On-site disposal is constrained by soil drainage issues.

*Risks and uncertainties* – Part of the Rangihaeata coastal margin is affected by coastal hazard (erosion). This risk must be addressed. Land at the margin must be carefully managed to avoid long term risk to people and property. Landscape matters along the coastal margin would also need to be carefully considered or otherwise risk adverse effects on coastal values.

*Appropriate, effective and efficient?* Provided that the matters of coastal values, airfield cross-boundary effects, wastewater disposal and traffic safety are addressed, this location could be suitable for more intensive development. The local community would need to be involved in determining the most appropriate form and density of development that would maintain a high level of amenity. Being already partly settled, the effects on coastal landscape values will be minimal. The soil is relatively poor and there is no flood risk.



As part of a long-term vision for settlement in the Bay, this location could be one of a bundle of location options for growth.

*Subject to wastewater management issues being satisfactorily addressed, development in this location is deemed suitable. A structure planning exercise with the local community would also be required.*

### **5.10 Clifton**

*Benefits and opportunities* – This location is already partly settled, and it is flood free. It is in close proximity to Pohara, although without significant coastal views and being more distant from the coast, it would more likely remain relatively more affordable.

*Costs and constraints* - The land is classed Class A. This is a significant constraint, being highly prized soil that the community have identified as being a key value. Being adjacent to Pohara, the extent of development to the north east would have to be very carefully constrained to maintain a green belt between the two settlement areas.

*Risks and uncertainties* – The loss of high quality soil is a key risk, as is the perception of residential “sprawl” joining to existing settlement at Pohara.

*Appropriate, effective and efficient?* Due to the class A soils, this location is not an appropriate option for further residential settlement. To promote a better use of the land, boundary relocation and amalgamation initiatives could be encouraged.

*Clifton is not an appropriate option for further residential settlement, due to class A soils. To promote a better use of the land, boundary relocation and title amalgamation initiatives could be encouraged.*

### **5.11 Pohara – Tata (excluding Tarakohe)**

*Benefits and opportunities* – This location is already a well developed coastal location. Future land development sites are flood free and while there are some pockets of good soil, this has already been built on and is already largely fragmented. There is a high demand for living opportunities in the location, particularly holiday accommodation for non-resident landowners or lifestyle choice for retired people.

*Costs and constraints* – A key constraint is the threat to coastal and landscape amenity. Although already developed, there is a risk of further loss of land that is highly visible and/or development that is not in keeping with coastal amenity values. Parts of the areas are affected by geological constraints, such as limestone formations and Separation point granite. Being located further from Takaka, there is the added cost (and matter of long term sustainability) of wastewater servicing, and a dependence of cars for access to key services.

Not everyone in the community was supportive of intensification of existing development. While this type of development might help to address demand, and therefore avoid further expansion into other coastal areas, the community expressed concern for an overall loss of amenity values. This was especially true for current residents who purchased rural-residential sized allotments to enjoy the amenity of this development density.

*Risks and uncertainties* – On-going expansion in this area could threaten landscape values, and change current amenity values. The location is more dependent on cars and distant from key services, making it a less efficient choice from the perspective of energy efficiency.

*Appropriate, effective and efficient?* Given the current level of development, some further development may not adversely affect coastal amenity values, and would meet the demand for coastal property. The location could be appropriate as one of a bundle of location options for the future settlement pattern in the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay area.

If further development were accepted as a long term option for settlement, a comprehensive structure plan, with a particular focus on residential amenity values, would need to be undertaken with the local community prior to any rule or zone map changes. This would ensure that the concerns about loss of amenity and adverse effects on landscape values were appropriately addressed.

*This location could be developed further, subject to a comprehensive structure planning exercise with the local community, ensuring landscape and amenity protection.*

## 5.12 Tarakohe

**Benefits and opportunities** – The site does not have any productive value and it flood free. Currently zoned industrial, this land has been set aside for some form of more intensive development. It is located adjoining Port Tarakohe, in between existing residential settlement areas, Pohara and Ligar Bay. Parts of the site, of former limestone works, are considerably altered and geologically stable. These parts could be suitable for some residential development.

**Costs and constraints** – If this land were developed for residential settlement it would be lost from potential use as an industrial/commercial location. If it were developed as a mixed-use environment, cross-boundary effects could become an issue, affecting the range of commercial/industrial activities possible. The site also has landscape and geological constraints where the land is affected by karst terrain, and/or is highly visible from the coastal margin. Any development would have to be sensitive to these values. The matter of wastewater management would need to be carefully considered – an upgrade of the current wastewater reticulation would be required, and being at a relatively greater distance from the existing Takaka treatment system this would be more costly than

**Risks and uncertainties** – The land has the potential to be used for a range of commercial and industrial activities. If developed for residential uses, these activities could be constrained. The potential for cross-boundary conflict arises from a commercial/industrial – residential mixed use environment.

**Appropriate, effective and efficient?** There may be the potential for some mixed development in this location. This development would need to be carefully managed to avoid cross-boundary conflict and loss of landscape amenity values.

*Tarakohe may be able to include some mixed use development, however this would need to be carefully managed to avoid cross-boundary effects.*

## 6. DRAFT TASMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLAN CHANGES

*This section translates the findings of the assessment into a draft set of objectives and policies for future growth in the Takaka Eastern Bay study area. These draft provisions will be used to guide all future residential settlement planning decisions, including possible changes to land zones and any new zone rules.*

### 6.1 Clarifying the issues

Issue statements clearly articulate the areas of concern or risk that must be addressed within the TRMP.

Using the issues set out in the third column of Table 4 – “Summary of feedback to growth principles (Phase II Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Growth Strategy”, the following statements canvas the resource management issues most important to the Golden Bay community when considering future settlement patterns.

1. Loss of rural productive potential, through land fragmentation and inappropriate built development.

This issue is about losing the best quality soils of the District, namely Class A and B soils, to residential settlement. The soils represent a relatively small percentage of land area, yet have the highest versatility for a range of highly productive land uses.

2. Loss of rural amenity values, including un-built greenspace areas and rural landscapes, to built development.

Dispersed residential settlement, especially ribbon development along the road network, threatens the rural character of landscapes. The merging of smaller settlement areas into larger ones and the loss of un-built green-space is an issue that concerns many residents in the study area. Highly visible buildings on rural landscapes are also an issue;

3. Lack of lifestyle choice, and increasingly unaffordable land and housing.

The issue is that a limited range of choices can make it more difficult for some people to be able to afford to live in the study area. Council cannot control the cost of land and housing, but can influence whether or not a range of lifestyle options are made available.

4. Adverse reverse sensitivity effects of residential settlement on commercial or rural productive activities resulting from cross boundary effects.

Residential activity can have an adverse effect on the ability of rural, commercial and industrial activities to continue to operate, through complaints about cross-boundary effects. Key complaints include noise, odour and spray drift.

5. Loss of landscape, ecological, natural heritage and amenity values associated with the coastal environment, including landforms, beaches and estuaries.

Inappropriate development can have significant adverse effects on coastal values, especially landscapes. Ecologically significant areas, such as estuaries, are particularly sensitive to disturbances from human settlement.

6. Loss of cultural heritage through inappropriate land-uses, such as intensive built development, pastoral farming and forestry on archaeological sites.

Parts of the study area, especially the coastal margin, have a long history of Maori and early Pakeha settlement. Any heritage sites that have not yet been affected by residential development need to be protected from inappropriate development and damaging land uses.

7. Inefficient energy consumption and costly infrastructure servicing, and communities that depend on cars for access to services.

Dispersed settlement that is dependent on cars for transport and access to services at key commercial and service areas, such as Takaka, contributes to inefficient energy use. Where communities are spread out, the cost of infrastructure servicing is also greater, both at the time of construction and as an on-going maintenance cost.

8. Loss of water quality, ecological values and health and safety risks, due to ineffective wastewater servicing solutions.

Where on-site wastewater management solutions are used to treat and dispose of domestic wastewater, water quality contamination issues may arise if not managed appropriately.

9. Risk to people, property and livelihoods, through inappropriate built development within high risk flood plain areas.

The Takaka Valley lowland is prone to flooding. Development in this area, including the current Takaka town centre, is at risk from flood hazard.

10. Loss of "urban" amenity values through inappropriate development standards and poor urban design.

The character of places is influenced by the standard of buildings and service infrastructure, roads, footpaths, stormwater management and street lighting. The issue of a loss of amenity arises when the character of development is not consistent with the character and amenity of the community.

## 6.2 Draft objectives and policies

Objectives are statements about what it is that the Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Community and the Council wish to achieve. Policies state how the objective is to be achieved.

These draft objectives and policies relate to the issue statements above (see 6.1), and to the sets of values and principles in the third and fourth column of Table 4 – “Summary of feedback to growth principles”. The location specific policies draw on the findings of the Location Assessment (see 4.1).

- O1. The potential of productive land, especially Class A and B soils, to be used for a variety of rural productive uses is retained.
  - P1. Actively discourage subdivision and development of land that is classified Class A or B.
  - P2. Provide opportunities for title amalgamation and boundary adjustment to enable small landholdings to rationalise boundaries around existing dwellings without further fragmenting Class A and B soils.
  - P3. Ensure that rural productive users can continue to farm and cultivate the land using accepted rural practises without being unduly affected by complaints from neighbouring residential properties.
- O2. Rural amenity values, rural landscapes and un-built green-space areas within the Takaka lowland area, including open-space between neighbouring settlement areas, are protected from inappropriate residential development.
  - P4. Consolidate new development within and around areas where there is already an enclave of residential development and community amenities such as schools, churches, playing fields or clubrooms.
  - P5. Avoid ribbon development along roads
  - P6. Protect greenbelts and open-space areas in between every settlement area.
  - P7. Prevent built development on highly visible rural landscapes, especially ridgelines and hilltops.
  - P8. Avoid residential settlement outside of defined settlement locations.
  - P9. Prevent high and medium density residential development on karst terrain.
- O3. Coastal landscape character and natural heritage values are enhanced or maintained.
  - P10. Concentrate any new coastal development within and inland of existing coastal settlement areas.
  - P11. Define and then protect the long-term limits of coastal settlement areas to prevent sprawl.
  - P12. Consider alternative solutions, such as compact density, for addressing the demand to live in proximity to the coast.
  - P13. Avoid ribbon development along the coastline.
  - P14. Prevent new residential settlement in low-lying coastal areas.
  - P15. Protect outstanding coastal landscapes from inappropriate built development and land-uses.
  - P16. Use low impact design solutions for any built development within the coastal environment.
  - P17. Consider opportunities for low density, low impact rural-residential development on land that has poor class soils (Class D or poorer), where there may be net gains for the

environment, such as land protection covenants, the creation of esplanade reserves and implementation of habitat restoration and revegetation programmes.

- O4. Settlement patterns and land-use activities do not adversely affect cultural and natural heritage values, including sites that have archaeological significance to both Maori and Pakeha occupation.
- P18. Protect areas that have high natural and/or cultural heritage values from inappropriate development.
  - P19. Consider residential development opportunities where there may be net gains for the environment, such as land covenants, protection covenants, esplanade reserves and native bush re-vegetation programmes.
- O5. Infrastructure service provision is environmentally sustainable, whilst at the same time effectively addressing the demands of people and communities for safe and cost effective delivery.
- P20. Use growth objectives and policies and residential location options to inform long term community Council servicing decisions.
  - P21. Ensure that wastewater, water supply, stormwater management, parks/reserves, and public access matters are addressed before land is zoned for residential settlement.
  - P22. Consider alternative wastewater management and water supply options, such as de-centralised and self sufficient solutions, provided that minimum standards for human health and safety, long term cost effectiveness and environmental quality, are met.
  - P23. Where on-site wastewater treatment and disposal solutions are used, the standard of management shall avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on water quality and the long-term management and maintenance responsibilities shall be clearly defined.
  - P24. Encourage the use of the New Zealand Standards Handbook of Subdivision for People and the Environment (SNZ HB44:2001) in the design of future subdivision and development.
- O6. The main settlement locations are close to key commercial centres, to reduce the dependence on private vehicles for access to services and enable more cost effective and sustainable infrastructure network provision.
- P25. Ensure that all settlement areas are well connected, with safe and efficient roads, safe and pleasant walkways, cycle lanes and bridle-paths.
  - P26. Provide an appropriate residential settlement opportunity in a location that is within walking and biking distance to the existing Takaka township.
  - P27. Provide appropriate residential settlement opportunities in locations that are in proximity to reticulated wastewater treatment and disposal facilities.
  - P28. Provide for opportunities for light industrial activity in appropriate locations.
- O7. Defined commercial and service centres are the hub of the community, providing goods and services, community amenities, sustainable economic opportunities and social interaction.
- P29. Ensure that settlement locations will not adversely affect the economic integrity of the existing Takaka commercial centre.
  - P30. Provide for some de-centralised business opportunities in other established locations, such as Tarakohe and Pohara.

- P31. Ensure that commercial centres are safe, high amenity areas that people and communities can use and enjoy for a range of service and social activities.
- O8. Residential settlement areas are developed to standards of amenity that are in keeping with the character of the area and with community expectations, whilst at the same time maintaining minimum standards for safety and efficient maintenance.
- P32. Involve local communities in determining appropriate development standards for built development and infrastructure.
- P33. Ensure that the character of development and built infrastructure is in keeping with the character and amenity values of the surrounding environment, without compromising human health and safety.
- P34. Encourage the use of the New Zealand Standards Handbook of Subdivision for People and the Environment (SNZ HB44:2001) in the design of future subdivision and development.
- O9. Places where people live are not prone to flooding.
- P35. Avoid built development in flood-prone areas
- P36. Limit the urban limits of Takaka to the current developed area, and ensure that all future infill development and re-development meets minimum standards for flood risk reduction.
- O10. The community can choose from a variety of defined coastal and inland locations and different density and character areas for living within the Takaka Valley lowland and coastal environment area.
- P37. Provide for appropriate residential settlement opportunity in a variety of different locations, including coastal and inland locations.
- P38. Provide for choices in development density and character in appropriate locations, including rural-residential development and more dense residential development.
- P39. Use zones to define a variety of settlement locations and rules to determine development density and character.
- O11. Locations that are appropriate for future residential settlement are clearly defined and managed in accordance with the main issues, objectives and policies that are relevant to that location.
- P40. Use zones to define where future residential settlement is to be located.
- P41. Provide for more dense residential development at Rangihaeata, subject to appropriate wastewater management, management of airfield cross-boundary effects and consideration of coastal values.
- P42. Provide for some more development opportunity in the Pohara, Ligar Bay and Tata Beach areas, subject to a comprehensive structure planning exercise with the local community, that takes into account character and amenity values, infrastructure servicing requirements, access and roads, commercial development, parks and reserves and landscape protection.
- P43. Provide for a residential settlement area centred at the existing Part Avenue location, subject to particular consideration of safe car, pedestrian and cycleway access to Takaka, energy efficient design solutions, service infrastructure provision, community amenities and appropriate residential development standards.
- P44. Consider low impact, low density rural-residential development at the Motupipi Hill location, subject to the long-term protection and restoration of coastal values, including

sensitive estuarine margins, and significant landforms and appropriate service infrastructure including suitable access.

P45. Consider mixed use development opportunities at Tarakohe, subject to particular consideration of the potential for adverse cross boundary effects, the protection and enhancement of landscape values and appropriate infrastructure servicing.

P46. Consider low density residential development of the eastern flank of the Rototai Hill – Hambrook road landform, subject to particular consideration of landscape values, ridgeline protection and the management of karst terrain.

### 6.3 Draft Variation

Once the issues, objectives and policies have been reviewed by the community, the Golden Bay Community Board and Council, they will be transferred into each relevant section of the Tasman Resource Management Plan as a draft Variation.

The final draft Variation will differ from the above objectives and policies, as they are worked into the existing framework of policies and objectives that relating to the whole of the Tasman District.

**Table 4** – Summary of feedback to growth principles (Phase II Takaka Eastern Golden Bay Growth Strategy).

	<b>Phase II Principles</b>  (direct reference from p17 & 18 of original report)	<b>Summary of Feedback</b>	<b>Key Value &amp; Issue</b>	<b>Revised Principle</b>
1.	The community has indicated a preference for the use of a multiple area settlement approach, using the rural village concept. This is recommended as a basic approach for considering a range of location options.	This was generally supported.  Questions were raised about what was meant by “rural villages”, the efficiency of them in providing services, and how cross-boundary effects would be managed at the periphery.	Key Value - Range of lifestyle choices.  Key Issue – Housing affordability; Lack of lifestyle choice	Provide for a variety of locations and forms of residential settlement opportunity.
2.	Consolidation of all new development around existing developed areas is also a clear directive from the community. No new area should be “opened up” without first accounting for potential development in areas that are already partly settled.	This was widely accepted.	Key Values – Future production potential; Rural amenity and greenspace.  Key Issues – Protection of Class A and B soils; Loss of rural amenity and greenspace.	Consolidate new development within and around areas where there is already a level of residential development and community amenities.
3.	The creation and long-term maintenance of the greenbelts around or in between each rural village/township can help to provide separation between each and ensure the	This was widely accepted.	Key Value – Rural landscape amenity and greenspace values;  Key Issue - Loss of rural amenity and greenspace.	Avoid ribbon development along roads and the coastline.  Create and protect greenbelts and open-space areas in between each settlement area.

	<b>Phase II Principles</b>  (direct reference from p17 & 18 of original report)	<b>Summary of Feedback</b>	<b>Key Value &amp; Issue</b>	<b>Revised Principle</b>
	long-term maintenance of green space. This approach complements the rural village concept and the idea of consolidation of existing settlements.			
4.	Careful consideration of appropriate buffers between rural village areas and land being used for productive purposes. This is to minimise the potential for adverse cross-boundary effects. This issue needs to be considered at the time that particular locations undergo structure planning, prior to re-zoning.	This was widely accepted.  As well as cross-boundary effects, some submitters noted the effect of development speculation on property prices, and the effect that this was having on rates increases (in turn affecting ability to farm economically).	Key Value – Rural production; Right to farm  Key Issue – Adverse cross-boundary effects; Land affordability (rates).	Ensure that rural productive users can continue to farm and cultivate the land without being unduly affected by complaints from neighbouring residential land users.  Protect farmers' ability to use the land for rural productive land opportunities.
5.	Generally preventing new development from occurring where the soil is classified as Class A or Class B land. Some more work is required to determine the fate of land that is held in small titles in already partly settled locations such as Clifton and Motupipi.	This was generally supported.  Some landowner submitters expressed a desire to subdivide land that they deem uneconomic. Many submitters expressed a desire to prevent further development on high class soils regardless of land parcel size.	Key Value – Future rural production opportunities.  Key Issue – Loss of Class A and B soils.	Avoid subdivision and development of land that is classified Class A or B.  Provide opportunities for small landholdings of Class A or B land to rationalise boundaries and amalgamate with adjoining land areas, to create larger more economic landholdings.
6.	Limiting the extent of residential development along the coast. Limiting new development in coastal low-lying areas (at risk from sea-level rise).  Development controls may need to be strengthened to prevent this from occurring.	This was generally supported.	Key value – Largely unspoilt coastal environment; healthy marine and estuarine environments.  Key issues – Loss of coastal landscape, ecological and amenity values.	Prevent new residential settlement along the coastline and in low-lying coastal areas.



7.	<p>Further development inland from the coast or infill development where there is existing coastal development may be acceptable in some areas e.g. Rangihaeata.</p> <p>Some very low density, low visibility rural-residential development in discrete locations such as the Motupipi Hill headland may also be acceptable.</p>	<p>This was widely accepted.</p> <p>Many submitters expressed that the Pohara to Tata beach area has already reached (if not exceeded) its development maximum.</p>	<p>Key values – Largely unspoilt coastal landscape; High amenity coastal margins; Healthy marine and estuarine environments.</p> <p>Key issues – Loss of coastal landscape values; Degradation of ecological values; Loss of natural and cultural heritage.</p>	<p>Concentrate new coastal development within and inland of existing coastal settlement areas.</p> <p>Consider opportunities for low density, low impact rural-residential development on land that has poor class soils (Class D or poorer), where there may be net gains for the environment, such as land covenants, esplanade reserves and native bush re-vegetation programmes.</p>
8.	<p>Preventing expansion of the existing Takaka urban limits. The land is flood-prone and located on Class A soils.</p>	<p>This was generally accepted.</p> <p>Some commented on the ability of Council to uplift a residential zoning and return land to Rural 1.</p>	<p>Key values – Community safety, and the long-term social and economic wellbeing of Takaka; Future productive potential</p> <p>Key issues – Flood risk; Loss of Class A and B soils</p>	<p>Limit the urban limits of Takaka to the current developed area, and ensure that all future infill development and re-development meets minimum standards for flood risk reduction.</p>
9.	<p>Review existing provision for the residential commercial and industrial development within the current Takaka township, particularly where development has not yet occurred.</p> <p>Provide opportunities for land development within the existing developed area, provided that minimum floor levels and flood sensitive building designs are used to a minimum 'flood size' standard.</p>	<p>There was no opposition to this principle.</p> <p>Some submitters questioned the need and/or urgency of addressing this. Others supported the need to consider commercial and industrial land use as part of the process of looking at the future of settlement in the study area, and encouraging economic development and opportunity.</p>	<p>Key value – Social and economic wellbeing through a sustainable economy; Energy efficiency.</p> <p>Key issue – Inefficient energy consumption; Unsustainable economic development.</p>	<p>Ensure that the economic integrity of the existing Takaka commercial centre is retained.</p> <p>Provide for some de-centralised business opportunities in other established locations, such as Tarakohe and Pohara.</p>
10.	<p>Provide for the opportunity for a new concentration of residential and possible commercial development in the south Takaka area (centred on Park Avenue) as an alternative to</p>	<p>This was generally supported.</p> <p>There was a recognition that there would never be a perfect location given the basic requirements of; close proximity to the</p>	<p>Key values – Affordable housing; Social and economic wellbeing; Energy efficiency and access to services.</p> <p>Key issues; unaffordable housing; Dependence on cars</p>	<p>Ensure that some provision is made for residential settlement in close proximity to the existing Takaka township, that is not within the flood plain or on Class A or B soils.</p>

	<p>continued expansion of the existing Takaka area.</p> <p>Most of the land is classified as Class C in the Soils report. It is already partly settled, is flood free, is flat and relatively cost effective to service and it is in proximity to the existing Takaka township.</p>	<p>existing Takaka township; flood hazard; and, avoiding development of Class A and B soils.</p> <p>However, some submitters expressed distrust of Council that the development of Park Avenue was a “done deal” and that Council was responding to developer pressures. Other submitters questioned the use of Class C land for residential development. No alternatives in lieu of this location were given that would also meet other basic requirements.</p>	<p>for access to services; High transportation costs</p>	
11.	<p>Encourage an extensive green belt over the floodplain area between the Park Avenue development area and Takaka.</p> <p>Provide walkway/bridleway/cycleway connections between the two areas. Provide for an alternative multiuse access (road, cycleway etc) to Pohara from the new Park Avenue Area and to Takaka to alleviate pressures on State Highway 60.</p>	<p>Again, comments were made by some about the area being already selected and a “done deal”.</p> <p>In general terms however, the idea of appropriate multiple use links (road, walkway, cycleway) was largely accepted. Questions were raised about the economic feasibility of alternative road links to Pohara and Takaka.</p>	<p>Key values – Community safety; Long-term social and economic wellbeing of Takaka; Future productive potential</p> <p>Key issues – Flood risk; Loss of Class A and B soils; Loss of rural landscape, greenspace and amenity values</p>	<p>Avoid built development in flood-prone areas.</p> <p>Ensure that all settlement areas are well connected, with safe and efficient roads, and safe and pleasant walkways, cycle lanes and bridle-paths.</p> <p>Provide settlement opportunities in locations that are close to the Takaka township.</p>
12.	<p>Review the existing patterns of development occurring in the Pohara to Tata Beach areas. Involve the local communities to ascertain both short term and long-term aspirations for this whole area.</p> <p>Use structure planning to manage and guide future development in the Pohara to Tata</p>	<p>This was generally supported.</p> <p>There appeared to be a “damage is done” feeling amongst some submitters. Some submitters suggested that no further or more intensive development would be appropriate in this location.</p> <p>It was noted that Wainui Bay was not included in the study</p>	<p>Key value – High quality residential living environments in keeping with character of surrounding environment</p> <p>Key issue – loss of “urban” (residential) amenity values through inappropriate development.</p>	<p>Ensure that the pattern of development and the standard of built infrastructure is consistent with community expectations without compromising health and safety</p>

	Beach areas. Address roading and access through and around the settlement area.	area, although acknowledged as not an area suitable for residential development in terms of coastal landscape values.		
13.	Consider a long-term residential limit to the inland extent (hill-slope backdrop) of the development in the Pohara to Tata Beach Area.	As above.	Key values – Coastal landscape values; Future productive potential; Loss of rural landscape greenspace and amenity values.  Key issues – Loss of coastal and rural landscape and amenity values; Loss of Class A and B Soils	Define the long-term spatial limits for the development of settlement areas, to protect landscape amenity and rural productive land values.
14.	Review current zoning of Port Tarakohe industrial are (currently Industrial with a Rural 2 buffer. Consider other urban land use options including mixed use residential and/or commercial type activities as well as industrial for this land.	There was no opposition to this idea. Cross-boundary conflict between different uses was raised as an issue that should be carefully considered and appropriately addressed.	Key values – Sustainable economic development; Energy efficiency.  Key issues – Inefficient energy use; High transportation costs; Unsustainable economic development	Provide for commercial and light industrial activity in appropriate locations.
15.	Consider alternative approaches to the management of ongoing demand for coastal land. Re-consider low density approaches to land in close proximity to the coastal provide mixed density opportunities including higher density developments that use low impact design methods in already developed areas.	Restrictions on further coastal development were widely accepted. However, at the same time, more intensive development in the future was not well supported.  In the long term future this raises this issue of how Council will respond to on-going demands for land in proximity to the coast. In the short to medium term submitters noted that this is not likely to be an issue.	Key values – Largely unspoiled coastal environments; High rural amenity values; Future productive potential.  Key issues – Loss of coastal landscape, ecological and amenity values; Loss of rural landscape and amenity values; Loss of Class A and B soils	Define and protect the long-term extent of coastal settlement areas.  Consider alternative methods for addressing the demand to live in proximity to the coast.
16.	Determine appropriate long-term management of high value productive soils held in small titles adjoining Motupipi and Clifton. If some development is	Further development in these locations was not well supported, (with the exception of some affected landowners). Submitters expressed that they wished to	Key values – Future productive potential.  Key issues – Loss of Class A and B soils.	Prevent further fragmentation of Class A and B soils.  Provide opportunities for title amalgamation and boundary adjustment to enable small landholdings to rationalise boundaries around existing

	deemed appropriate and acceptable then determine the limits and intensity.	see this land protected from any further development.  In response to the idea of “un-economic” land parcels, it was suggested by some submitters that a range of land parcel sizes should be retained across the Bay, and that these locations would provide high quality land for people who wished to grow food for themselves, their families and local community in the future.		dwellings without further fragmenting Class A and B soils.
17.	Determine network infrastructure servicing priorities for current and future potential settlement growth, including transportation, water wastewater and storm water management services.	This was widely accepted.	Key values – Efficient and effective service provision; High amenity living environments; Appropriate development standards for local communities.  Key issues – Inefficient and ineffective infrastructure servicing; Poor “urban” living environments; Inappropriate development standards for local communities.	Use strategic growth principles and location options to inform servicing decisions.  Ensure that wastewater, water supply, stormwater management, parks/reserves, and public access matters are addressed before land is zoned for residential settlement.
18.	Consider alternative approaches to the long term management of water resources both water supply and wastewater management) to ensure that development is both safe and sustainable. Take into account the diverse range of cultural values held within the community particularly those of Iwi, Manawhenua Mohua.	There was no opposition to this principle.  Questions were raised however, about what was intended with it. The principle was aimed at acknowledging that in the long term, environmentally sustainable and more self-sufficient water supply and wastewater disposal methods and solutions should be	Key values – Greater self sufficiency and sustainability in water and wastewater servicing  Key issues – High cost, dependent management of water supply and wastewater management; High environmental risk (low probability)	Consider alternative wastewater management and water supply options where appropriate, provided that minimum standards for human health and safety, and environmental quality, are met.

		encouraged.		
19.	Consider an appropriate long-term development strategy for the future of Rangihaeata, including prioritisation of wastewater management options, airfield cross-boundary issues, and timing and initiation of a structure planning exercise with local community.	This was generally accepted.	Key values – Efficient use of already developed coastal settlement areas; Continued viability of airfield; Effective and efficient wastewater management.  Key issues – Loss of coastal amenity; Airfield cross boundary effects; Expensive wastewater management or wastewater contamination risk.	Provide for more dense residential development at Rangihaeata, subject to appropriate wastewater management, management of airfield cross-boundary effects and protection of coastal values.
20.	Consider alternative locations for lifestyle development that is low density, will have minimal landscape impacts and is located on poor quality soils.  As a component of this review, look closely at existing zonings and patterns of demand to determine the best long term approach to managing rural and coastal landscape values.	No submitters addressed this particular issue in any detail, in writing.  Land productive values and visual amenity were noted in discussion as being critical considerations for any development.	Key values – Largely unspoilt rural landscape; Low visual impact development; Protection and enhancement of areas with high ecological value; Future productive potential  Key issues – Loss of rural landscape values; Loss of natural and cultural heritage; Loss of Class A and B soils	Consider low density, low impact rural-residential development on land that has poor class soils (Class D or poorer) and where there may be net gains for the environment, such as land covenants, esplanade reserves and native bush re-vegetation programmes.
21	Encourage the long-term protection of land that has particular heritage ecological cultural and/or spiritual values to both the local Iwi and the resident population of Golden Bay. This is particularly relevant to those coastal margins which are as yet largely undeveloped.	This was widely accepted.	Key value – Natural and cultural heritage.  Key issue – Loss of natural and cultural heritage through inappropriate or insensitive development and land use practises.	Protect areas that have natural and cultural heritage values from inappropriate residential settlement.