

## Second Minute of the Marlborough Salmon Farm Relocations Advisory Panel:

The Panel is of the view that the greatest assistance it can derive from the expert meeting process is to request the experts for and against the relocation proposal that they each provide a bullet point list of the following matters:

- (i) The relevant points upon which they agree with opposing expert views in the materials placed before the Panel.
- (ii) The relevant points upon which they differ from the opposing expert views in the materials placed before the Panel.
- (iii) Succinctly, the specific reasons why they say that the Panel should prefer their views to those of the opposing experts.

### Requested Bullet Point Response from Julia Williams, Drakeford Williams Limited

#### Terminology/acronyms

MLS: Marlborough Landscape Study

MCS: Marlborough Coastal Study

ONFL: outstanding natural feature or landscape

ONC: outstanding natural character

Issues	John Hudson		Stephen Brown		Mike Steven	
Methodology	JH Agree	JH Disagree	SB Agree	SB Disagree	MS Agree	MS Disagree
Use of MCS and MLS as basis for natural character and landscape values, particularly for Outstanding values	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with use of MCS and MLS studies as basis for ONC and ONFL values</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Is silent on the issue of methodology but disagrees with ONC and ONFL values described in these studies, particularly at a reach or channel basis</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagrees with use of these studies as basis for natural character and landscape values in particular as unreliable, invalid and untested (13.2)</li> </ul>
Best practice						<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagrees with the descriptor of 'best practice methodology' as there is not yet a best practice methodology for landscape assessment in NZ. JW notes NZILA Best Practice Note Landscape Assessment and Sustainable management 10.1</li> </ul>
Site specific assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree that this is appropriate</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree (by inference) that this is appropriate</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not agree with landscape and natural character analysis at the site specific/bay</li> </ul>

	<b>JH Agree</b>	<b>JH Disagree</b>	<b>SB Agree</b>	<b>SB Disagree</b>	<b>MS Agree</b>	<b>MS Disagree</b>
Level of Base information	Agree that additional data was required on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• farm description;</li> <li>• visibility of farms;</li> <li>• information from other relevant AEE reports;</li> <li>• clarity with regard to the factors that mitigate effects;</li> <li>• impact of mussel farm lighting on night sky values;</li> <li>• potential viewing audience.</li> </ul>	JW is of the opinion that further data is required on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• definition of 'sensitivity' including the factors that define site sensitivity</li> </ul>	There are information gaps in Hudson report: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• detail and effects generated by different farms and farm layouts;</li> <li>• the way the ratings are applied;</li> <li>• effects generated by location in context of existing farms;</li> <li>• taking views from residences into account.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further clarity required with regard to the factors that mitigate effects</li> </ul>	
Assessment Rating System		Additional data required on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• where the point of 'minor' sits on the assessment scale;</li> <li>• the way the ratings are applied;</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More information required on where the 'more than minor' threshold occurs.</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• General agreement that the scale of assessment needs to openly define where the 'more than minor' threshold occurs (by interpolation of Natural character figure 3, para 88</li> </ul>	
Characterisation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level of further characterisation provided in Dec 2106 report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hudson report requires further characterisation at 'reach' scale</li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regards Hudson methodology as inappropriate wrt definition of the spatial context.</li> </ul>
Cumulative effects		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Further evaluation of cumulative effects required</li> <li>• Existing aquaculture should be included in assessment of cumulative effects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The limited evaluation of cumulative effects</li> <li>• That existing aquaculture should be included in cumulative effects</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The limited evaluation of cumulative effects</li> <li>• That existing aquaculture should be included in cumulative effects</li> </ul>	

<b>Site specific assessments</b>	<b>JH Agree</b>	<b>JH Disagree</b>	<b>SB Agree</b>	<b>SB Disagree</b>	<b>MS Agree</b>	<b>MS Disagree</b>
<b>Waitata Reach</b>						
<i>Characterisation</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Further characterisation required and this was incorporated into final report</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>JW opinion that revised report requires yet further characterisation for Waitata Reach as a whole</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Places emphasis on concept of outer and inner sounds</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Characterisation of Reach as a working landscape</li> </ul>
<i>Blow Hole Point North</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Description of site location (whether in a side bay or in the gateway)</li> </ul>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not agree with landscape and natural character analysis at the site specific/bay scale</li> </ul>
<i>Blowhole North and South</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Scale of cumulative effects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agrees with narrative on cumulative effects and gateway location,</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagrees with rating. Cumulative effects High at site level, Very High at reach scale</li> </ul>		
<i>Waitata Reach</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sensitivity and natural character values of site.</li> <li>Methodology for natural character assessment does not accommodate mid channel site</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agrees with narrative on cumulative effects and location</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagrees with rating</li> </ul>		
<i>Richmond &amp; Horseshoe</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree with level of effects</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agrees with narrative.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree with rating of effects</li> </ul>		
<i>Cumulative effects</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disagree with revised Hudson report that the scale of cumulative effects is 'no more than minor'</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Agree that cumulative effects at a reach scale have the potential to be High to Very High</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>General agreement with narrative on cumulative effects on landscape and natural character values</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reach already reached threshold of unacceptable cumulative adverse effects on natural character and landscape</li> </ul>
<i>Waitata Reach Magnitude of effects on landscape</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Magnitude of cumulative effects – High – Very High</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rated High – there seems to be agreement</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Bases opinion on MSRMP which does not align with ONF or ONL value system</li> </ul>	
<i>Waitata Reach Magnitude of effects on natural character</i>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Magnitude of cumulative effects - High</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rated Very High</li> <li>Agree with narrative on cumulative effects on landscape character</li> </ul>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Rated Moderate – High for terrestrial</li> <li>High for marine</li> </ul>	

	<b>JH Agree</b>	<b>JH Disagree</b>	<b>SB Agree</b>	<b>SB Disagree</b>	<b>MS Agree</b>	<b>MS Disagree</b>
<i>Waitata Reach ONC status</i>	• Not Outstanding		• Not Outstanding as a whole			• Rated Waitata Reach High
<i>Waitata Reach ONFL status</i>	• Not Outstanding		• Not Outstanding as a whole			• Rated Waitata Reach Outstanding
<b><i>Tory Channel</i></b>						
<i>Characterisation</i>	• Agreed			• Tory channel – lacks overall unified character Rated Low-moderate	-	-
<i>Tio Point</i>	• Agreed		• General agreement re the magnitude of effects at a site specific scale		-	--
<i>Cumulative effects</i>	• Agreed level of effects		• General agreement		-	-
<i>Tory Channel ONC status</i>	• Agreed not Outstanding		• General agreement not Outstanding		-	-
<i>Tory Channel ONFL status</i>	• Agreed not Outstanding		• General agreement not Outstanding		-	-

- (iii) Why the Panel should prefer my views to those of the opposing experts.

**Julia Williams Expert Opinion.**

The peer review of Hudson Associates 'Review of Proposed Marine Farm Sites', undertaken for MPI in September 2016, considered the approach, methodology and conclusions of the landscape assessment. It was not designed to replicate the Hudson assessment but had a strong focus on identifying areas where additional material was required or where existing material could be reorganised to make the assessment process more explicit and transparent.

I acknowledged in the peer review that I did not have the same breadth of background knowledge of the wider landscape context as John Hudson. Having concluded the Hudson report required more detail on potential cumulative effects, I undertook a brief survey of the NZKS BOI documentation to provide direction, although the landscape assessments were undertaken prior to the introduction of Waitata and Kopaua salmon farms into the site and therefore were less helpful for evaluating the current values of Waitata Reach.

I have read the revised/final Hudson Report and the submissions of Michael Steven and Stephen Brown. The substantive issue of disagreement appears to be the landscape and natural character values of the wider Waitata Reach landscape, and the magnitude of the cumulative effects of the 5 proposed farms on these values. With the exception of Dr Steven, who states that the threshold of acceptable marine farm development has been reached, no expert opinion has been provided on whether effects would be decreased with various 'mix and match' farm location options.

On this basis, the Panel should not prefer my views to those of the opposing experts.

Julia Williams,  
Drakeford Williams Ltd  
3 May 2017