

Section 5

Concluding Remarks

5.1 Introduction

The case studies present a challenge: that is to consider how we in Aotearoa/New Zealand currently manage the development and peopling of our land. Extracting lessons from the case studies is somewhat risky, because the authors have not visited the areas first hand. However, the extensive research (published and unpublished) for both *Managing Change in Paradise* and this report, presents a clear picture of key issues; and corresponding 'lessons' from the case studies emerge. These key lessons are listed below. Core aspects of the various governance and planning approaches that relate to these lessons, and the questions raised in *Managing Change in Paradise*, are also explored.

Table 5.1 at the end of the chapter provides a summary of the characteristics of the different planning approaches.

We strongly recommend further research, including study tours to the regions, should any methods and approaches warrant further consideration in the New Zealand context - which we believe they do. Because the case studies examine areas that are overseas, decision makers and their advisors need to consider if the approaches, or aspects or methods to management from them, suit the New Zealand cultural and geographical context.

5.1.1 Key lessons

The three case studies offer valuable lessons for sustaining critical values in icon landscapes. These include:

- Management of land-use change is challenging in areas of high landscape value. People are drawn to these places in increasing numbers. The more people present, the more the values of the area risk being compromised.
- The values in icon landscapes that are not well protected by the market and that require government intervention in order to be

maintained fall into the following categories:

- Ecological - including, but not limited to, habitat for plant and animal species, maintenance of ecological integrity and functioning, maintenance of the provision of ecological services to people, including supply of potable water.
- Aesthetic - maintaining what makes the place look, feel, smell, and sound beautiful, outstanding, awe inspiring and so forth.
- Open space.
- Opportunities for low-impact recreational activities.
- Access to the landscape.
- Cultural heritage.
- Environmental and cultural sustainability are the primary management goals for icon landscapes.
- The need for a long-term strategic vision for the area, that is community owned.
- A stable foundation for planning and management requires a common recognition amongst the community of what is to be protected and why. A strategic vision can then be established, setting aims that planning will try to achieve. This may be referred to as a 'bottom-up' approach. As such, political leaders need to 'buy-in' to the community vision. With political endorsement the planning approach then combines a 'top-down' approach to the development of the planning framework and its implementation.
- Where land is in private ownership, strategic management, via strong planning controls, is required to prevent the deterioration of ecological and human experience values that are compromised by the cumulative effects of development.
- The common approach to planning is a prescriptive and directive graduated protection system, based on zoning of key areas. As such, the landscape is a lived in, working environment with core areas or features protected.
- Planning that is prescriptive in its zoning and protection can assist in achieving continuity in the planning process, and the achievement of environmental goals over the long term.
- Planning based on zoning and protection of key areas will result in pressure at the zone boundaries. Limits will come under considerable pressure - the maximum limit to development becomes the minimum that a developer or population will pursue, the minimum requirements for development to take place become the maximum aimed for.
- Review of the planning approach can take place either incrementally or periodically - the planning approach needs to include mechanisms to protect the community's vision from political whims but allow for evolving societal values.
- Planning requires high-quality information and substantial resourcing.
- National assistance is important - particularly in the form of guidance, information and funding to complement and assist implementation of the planning approach. This is especially so where implementation is the responsibility of smaller territorial authorities.
- A prescriptive planning approach is only part of the management framework. It needs to be supported by: initiatives such as non-profit corporations assisting in achieving the strategic vision; flexible contractual arrangements for public-private partnerships; incentives for private landowners where public values of significance warrant protection or enhancement; and public education.
- The management framework needs to integrate across local authority boundaries, across agency responsibilities and areas of expertise.

5.2 Strategic management of change

The difficulty of the task before governments in establishing systems for governance and management of peri-urban areas is clearly illustrated in the case studies. These systems need to provide for and balance the requirements of increasing population pressures and demands (including places for settlement, commerce, recreation and tourism), with requirements for a good quality of life, and ecological sustainability.

Managing Change in Paradise concluded that the key challenge in the management of peri-urban areas is “to allow for development and change without relinquishing the physical attributes and values of landscapes that are cherished by the community ...”.¹ This section explores how the various case studies aim to meet such a challenge.

5.2.1 Significance and protection

5.2.1.1 *Recognising and agreeing upon the significant values of a landscape*

The Peak District National Park in the United Kingdom, a modified rural environment, is recognised as a national asset of ecological, social, economic and cultural significance. There is cross-community support for the measures taken to protect the area. The character of the Peak District National Park reflects the long, and ongoing, human habitation of the area. One of the key objectives of the Park is to meet the desire for public access to the area while protecting the full range of values that are present.

The significance of the Oak Ridges Moraine in Canada has also been recognised by the community and government. The values associated with the Moraine, such as clean water supply, habitat for rare and endangered species, and open space have been protected in the new planning approach.

The Cape Peninsula in South Africa is recognised internationally for the high biodiversity and endemism of its flora and fauna. Once the land consolidation process is completed, most of the non-urbanised areas of the Peninsula will be protected within the Cape Peninsula National Park.

5.2.1.2 *Protecting significant values*

All three case studies take an approach of graduated levels of protection depending on the significance of the ecological values, and the long-term environmental outcomes sought (for example, see section 2.6.2, Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, Table 2.2, section 3.5.2.1, Use

Zones, section 4.3.4, Green Belts).

The Peak District and Oak Ridges Moraine case studies both illustrate the use of national instruments to protect sensitive and ecologically valuable systems.² Regional and local government agencies then have responsibility for implementing the national guidance or planning documents.

5.2.2 Prescribing the what, where and how

The Resource Management Act 1991, as the primary statute for land-use planning in New Zealand, is “largely a reactive tool. The focus is primarily on management of environmental effects rather than on proactive strategic environmental management”.³

The strategic environmental management undertaken in the case studies uses an approach that is focused on prescribing the type of land-use activities permitted. The Resource Management Act 1991, in comparison, focuses more on the control of environmental effects arising from land-use activities. The English and Canadian case studies prescribe the application of zoning and the identification and protection of specific heritage, landscape and ecological features of value.

In Ontario, the uncertainty in decision making (which was mainly effects-based) and inconsistency in regional approaches led to a much more prescriptive approach to managing development. The new planning approach for the Oak Ridges Moraine is prescriptive in establishing the presumption that no person can use land or undertake development unless permitted to do so by the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. Such a presumption is the opposite of that contained in the Resource Management Act, 1991 in New Zealand.

Likewise, in the Peak District, planning at the local level is very directive in comparison with New Zealand. In the United Kingdom, there appears to be an acceptance across the political spectrum that government can and should place strong

restrictions on certain types of development. The implementation of protection involves central government providing a legislative framework, guidance and financial support. The regional government undertakes the coordination role through the provision of the Regional Policy Guidance. Local authorities (including the Peak District National Park) are responsible for implementation, and the community provides input through participation at central, regional and local levels.

In the Peak District, despite the Planning Policy Guidance notes that clearly place an emphasis (60 percent) on using brownfield sites for development, there is still provision for 40 percent of growth to occur in greenfield sites. However, the Planning Policy Guidance notes (especially PPG 1 and 3) do set out principles for sustainable development, that provide non-governmental organisations with the ammunition to (often successfully) contest proposed greenfield developments. This point illustrates that even with prescriptive measures that have a conservation bias, the pressure to develop still exists. However, the prescriptive approach removes ambiguity and places the 'burden of proof' on the developer.

On the Cape Peninsula the City of Cape Town (metropolitan council) has defined an urban edge line, which indicates the maximum extent of urban development for the next 20 years, and has proposed management strategies for the land on either side of the line. Within the Cape Peninsula National Park, there is strong demand for sites along the edge of the Park, which impact on its aesthetic qualities. Both formal and informal settlements create edge-effect problems such as invasive plants and an increased fire risk.

In all three case studies, land management appears to be conservation oriented, within an environmental and cultural sustainability context. There is an emphasis on preserving remaining habitats and ecosystem linkages, open space, heritage features and valued landscapes through

the exclusion of all but low-impact human activities in key areas. Defined areas are managed to maintain or ecologically enhance the status quo, whilst provision for change (for example, tourism/residential development) is accommodated in other areas subject to prescriptive controls.

5.2.3 Cumulative effects

The management of cumulative effects is a critical issue that the Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment has discussed at length in commentary on the management of peri-urban areas in New Zealand.

Where land is in private ownership, strategic management of cumulative effects via planning controls is required, otherwise development pressures result in the deterioration of ecological and human experience values. In the case studies profiled here the strategic management of cumulative effects has essentially been achieved through 'drawing a line in the sand'; through the establishment of fully or partially protected zones or areas, and boundaries for human settlements. The mechanisms for protecting certain areas vary from the national parks and green belts of the United Kingdom, to the use of zoning in all of the case study areas.

In the Peak District, there is still a problem with controlling cumulative effects, especially in green belt areas that adjoin the Park, as a result of cumulative changes in rural land-use patterns (traditional rural farming is being replaced by more intensive rural recreational uses), and pressure for housing development (both for affordable/social housing and entrepreneurial housing development) (see section 4.6.2, Key Pressures on the Peak District Landscape).

In addition to planning controls, a range of tools are used to manage cumulative effects. These vary from public ownership of key land areas, through to public-private partnerships for land remaining in private ownership (see section 5.5).

In the case of the Oak Ridges Moraine, in order to secure ecological integrity in the face of development pressure, land swaps to secure non-developable land in public ownership (for a park) took place. The private owners are to be compensated with developable lands off the Moraine. Other land was secured in a park through dedication of Natural Core Areas to public ownership, in exchange for the redesignation of land owned by the private developer from Countryside Area to Settlement Area (see also section 5.5.1.)

Ecological deterioration is also arrested through offering incentives such as compensation where income may be lost as a result of environmental protection measures, which is the case with England's rural development schemes (see section 5.5.1, and section 4.3.5, England Rural Development Programme). The Commissioner has previously investigated efforts to enhance ecological integrity on private land in New Zealand, and recommended that:

Where native plants on working lands provide both private and public benefits, ... the role and potential of cost sharing between public agencies and landowners [be assessed].⁴

5.2.4 An area-specific approach

The legislation and corresponding Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan are drafted to manage the specific values of that landscape. The Moraine Plan is based on the watershed and ecological boundaries of the Moraine and has a substantial focus on protecting the watershed and the many ecological services it provides, including drinking water to residents and surrounding human settlements. Because it is a new plan, it will be some time before its effectiveness and actual outcomes are known.

5.2.5 Questions

- How can the significant values associated with a particular landscape be determined and agreed?

- Would an area-specific approach be suitable for certain New Zealand landscapes - where the area includes key areas for protection and areas deemed appropriate for settlement or higher intensity recreation?
- Does planning in New Zealand need to be more directive? Should New Zealand use a planning framework based on zoning? How acceptable would zoning be?
- Would the potential long-term benefits of a more directive approach outweigh the initial costs of transition and opposition from some sectors of society?
- Would a more directive approach from central government be acceptable at a regional level?
- Change will take place, but what type of change and to what extent does the community want change?
- To what degree should change be permitted, through, for example, having more people living and accessing these landscapes, when it:
 - diminishes the valued experiences of many people across the community;
 - is likely to undermine the ecological functioning and integrity of New Zealand's unique ecosystems;
 - impacts on the quality and access to opportunities for 'wilderness experience'; and
 - changes how the landscape looks in such a way as to detract from what is either awesome, amazing, unique, special, outstanding, or beautiful (we do have these words in the English language to give explanation to how we regard something)?
- What tools, in addition to planning, could be used in New Zealand to manage cumulative effects strategically?

5.3 Governance and planning processes

5.3.1 Input from national agencies

The PCE's investigation of peri-urban development in New Zealand noted "a relative lack of leadership and guidance from national agencies in the early stages of the implementation of the RMA".⁵ National guidance is an important part of

the land-use management and planning processes in the international case studies.

A key aspect of the English planning system is the active role of central government. The government gives clear leadership through the various policy guidance documents.

Implementation at a regional level occurs through the regional government offices. Planning authorities do have discretion not to follow the guidance but, if this discretion is used, it must be justified or the plans can be overturned by central government (see section 4.3.2, Local Government Organisation).

The area-specific legislation that enacts the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan is established at the provincial level by the Ontario Legislature (equivalent of New Zealand national level). The Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing, in conjunction with four other government ministries, have completed training sessions for provincial staff, municipalities, and development and environmental stakeholders in relation to the newly established legislation. The ministries will also supply technical training on technical guidance documents that cover topics such as water, natural heritage, aggregates and landform. This training is intended to assist municipalities in bringing their local plans into conformity with the Moraine Plan, and in preparing their watershed, water budget and water conservation plans.

5.3.2 Local authority issues

5.3.2.1 Capacity and capability of small territorial authorities

The capability and capacity of small territorial authorities to deal with legislative and land-use management requirements is an issue in New Zealand. Similar concerns have surfaced in the Ontario case study. These concerns relate primarily to the ability of lower-tier municipalities (who lack resources and expertise) to carry out the studies and evaluations required by the Moraine Plan. In this case, the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario has urged the provincial government to

assist municipalities through the provision of baseline information, mapping, technical and policy guidelines, identification of performance indicators and monitoring and evaluation systems.

5.3.2.2 Cross-boundary issues

In Ontario, the area-specific nature of the new Moraine Plan aims to address cross-boundary issues by establishing a management framework that is consistent for the entire geographical feature, and that all municipalities must conform with.

The achievement of an integrated planning vision at the regional level and a coordinated effort between the various planning authorities has been a problem in England, including the Peak District. It is hoped this will be addressed through the establishment and increased role of regional government offices, which may eventually take over many of the county councils' planning roles such as the preparation of the Structure Plan. The Peak District National Park falls geographically within four regional government areas. To avoid conflict, three of the government offices have delegated their regional responsibility for the National Park to the East Midlands Government Office.

Likewise, in South Africa the Cape Peninsula National Park is managed solely by SANParks, the national park agency, to ensure consistent management of protected areas on the Cape Peninsula.

5.3.3 Questions

- What guidance and assistance should central government in New Zealand provide to local authorities?
- Do smaller councils require extra support?
- What degree of compliance with national guidance should be required?

5.4 Sustaining visions - continuity and community involvement

5.4.1 Continuity in the planning process

In *Managing Change in Paradise* we found that, despite good planning, there are various points where the process can break down. For example, changes in political leadership can produce a discontinuity in advancing planning for long-term outcomes.⁶ “It is a challenge to maintain an environmental strategy long enough to see the outcomes on the ground.”⁷

This is also clearly reflected in the length of time taken to secure changes in the management of the Oak Ridges Moraine (see sections 2.4, Putting the Moraine on the Political Agenda and 2.5, Pre-2001 Legislative and Planning Framework and appendix 2A, Timeline of Significant Events and Reports Leading to Change of Planning Approach). However, focused attention on the management of the Moraine by environmental non-government organisations, city councillors, opposition parties, Moraine residents, the media, the Environmental Commissioner of Ontario, scientists and regional level municipalities provided a strong platform for securing planning to address long-term environmental outcomes.

The new Moraine-specific legislation and corresponding Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan provides for both the evolution of the Plan through the required ten-year review, and for continuity and long-term outcomes by securing significant areas of land - that cannot be reduced in size over time - as Natural Core and Natural Linkage Areas. These areas provide an unbroken ecological corridor the length of the Moraine, and opportunities for passive recreation.

In England, continuity in the planning approach is provided through the Planning Policy Guidance notes (see section 4.3.3, Central Government Leadership). These are refined on an ongoing basis to reflect evolving societal values. This approach allows for the planning process to be influenced but not captured by changing political agendas.

Whilst the political process, particularly at a local government level, will always influence planning, policy guidance provided at a national level creates the opportunity for more stability and continuity. Structure Plans are intended to be evolving documents with different aspects coming up for review at different times (see section 4.3.1, Control of Development).

The Peak District National Park and Oak Ridges Moraine case studies illustrate clearly the need for a long-term future focus, where what is to be achieved is clearly articulated, then planned for.

The establishment of the Cape Peninsula National Park provides continuity for the management of this area.

5.4.2 Community consensus

The importance of community involvement in the planning process is demonstrated in the three case studies.

In the Cape Peninsula, community consensus is important because of the need to consolidate privately owned land into the Park. Also, because the Park is so accessible to a large local community, people become unhappy if they think restrictions might be placed on their use of the Park, so consultation and information sharing are important parts of the planning process.

For the Peak District National Park, community consensus is critical, because the land within the Park is privately owned. Both the Management and Development Plans have been developed with extensive and ongoing community input.

In the case of the Oak Ridges Moraine, collective community concerns about the impacts of proposed developments, were an important catalyst to changing the planning approach. The community, through environmental non-government organisations, demonstrated significant leadership in expressing its vision for the Moraine and working towards securing its ecological sustainability. The Government consulted widely with the community throughout

the process of introducing the new Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan, and continues to keep people involved through public education activities.

5.4.3 Strategic vision

The case studies highlight that the vision for management can be regional, national or international. The ecological importance of the Cape Peninsula is recognised at an international level, with it being within the Cape Floral Kingdom, and having high biodiversity and endemism relative to the size of the area. A vision for management of the Cape Peninsula National Park has been developed, which is required to be in keeping with the vision of the national park agency, SANParks. In the Peak District, whilst the vision for countryside management is applied at the regional level, it is widely supported at the national level. In Ontario, the vision is one for the region. If the planning is successful in sustaining the vision for the Oak Ridges Moraine, the approach may be applied across Ontario to support the visions for other ecological catchments.

The Oak Ridges Moraine case study illustrates how a strategic vision can be developed from the 'bottom-up' - that is, from community leadership. The commitment to the vision from the community, can motivate the politicians to buy-in to the vision, and then build the infrastructure to support it from the 'top-down' - the national level agencies lead the policy and guideline process, and technical implementation is undertaken by local government.

5.4.4 Questions

- How could better continuity be achieved in the planning process in New Zealand?
- Will the provisions of the new Local Government Act 2002 be sufficient to address the issues discussed above?
- How can local and central government agencies work with communities to articulate an agreed vision?

- How can the vision and corresponding management strategy be sustained long enough to see action and outcomes on the ground?

5.5 Package of tools additional to statutory planning

In all three case studies a range of methods, in addition to statutory planning, are used to achieve desired outcomes. For example:

Peak District

- Designation of national parks under the National Parks and Access to the Countryside Act 1949.
- Provision of information through State of the Park reporting (required under the Environment Act 1995).
- Development of a community-based strategic vision for the Park under the Environment Act 1995 (National Park Management Plan).
- Landscape Guidance and Landscape Assessment provided by the Countryside Agency through the Countryside Character Initiative (see section 4.3.6).
- Special assistance funding for desired land-management outcomes through the England Rural Development Programme primarily the Countryside Stewardship Scheme and the Environmental Sensitive Areas Scheme.

Cape Peninsula

- Use Zones: indicate desirable management approach for areas within and around the Cape Peninsula National Park. Also provides the Park management with a platform on which to oppose developments.
- Environmental management contracts between the Park management and private landowner, which provide a range of options and incentives for landowners (see section 3.6, Process for Acquiring Private Land to Incorporate into the Park).
- Partnerships between Park management and impoverished communities near the Park to improve their circumstances and reduce pressure on the Park from unauthorised resource use.

- ‘Go Green’ card: to provide a source of funding - gives card holders access to Park ‘Pay Entry Points’ and discounts at Park facilities and attractions.

Oak Ridges Moraine

- Establishment of a non-profit corporation (the Oak Ridges Moraine Foundation) to fund and support activities such as land securement, monitoring, scientific research, public education, private lands stewardship and provision of low-impact recreation.
- Land swaps (see 5.2.3 and 2.6.4, Securing Private Land Proposed for Development as a Protected Publicly Owned Park).
- A six-month moratorium on development whilst government consulted with the community on management options for this significant landscape.
- Use of studies, strategies and programmes to inform and support planning. For example, Growth Management Study, Rural Economic Development Strategy, water-use strategies and programmes to reduce pesticide use and manage use of road salt.

The case studies also highlight the need for effective communication, training and education across the community in relation to planning requirements (see the discussion above in section 5.3.1, Input from National Agencies).

5.5.1 Cost-sharing and public-private partnerships

In *Managing Change in Paradise* we noted that the majority of land in peri-urban areas of significant landscape value is in private ownership. However,

... the significant values attached to these areas result in the public taking an active interest in how these values are managed. Disagreement over how that private/public conflict can be resolved is a barrier to [New Zealand's] capacity to move forward.⁸

Where strong environmental protection is seen to be required and the land is in private ownership, the sharing of costs with public agencies is a common feature amongst the case studies.

In the United Kingdom, the expropriation of property rights 53 years ago, to develop rural areas, has been accepted and does not now appear to be a major political issue. With a strong planning regime accepted by the community, ownership of land by the Crown is not seen as necessary to control land-use outcomes. Where planning law is proving to be less effective, various rural development schemes aim to compensate landowners for any income lost from establishing or improving environmental outcomes on farmland. Landowners are provided with incentives through public funds to carry out activities, such as reverting to, or retaining more traditional farming practices that will protect ecologically sensitive areas on farms (see section 4.3.5, England Rural Development Programme). Public funding of private landowners is an accepted practice in the United Kingdom and European Community as a means of achieving public benefits.

In the Cape Peninsula there are a range of options for working with private landowners to achieve a coordinated approach to a geographical, ecological or landscape area across individual property boundaries. This is achieved by offering to assist private landowners with meeting legal requirements for specific environmental standards. Options range from contracting land management to the government park agency, donation of parts of the land, or outright purchase of the land. A land negotiator is employed to liaise with landowners over the options for including their land in the Cape Peninsula National Park.

5.5.2 Questions

- Should New Zealand be considering opportunities for cost sharing and compensation as illustrated in the case studies?
- Under what circumstances would it be suitable to trade different pieces of land between private and public ownership?
- Is purchase of key areas necessary, or is it more effective for land to be retained in

private ownership and the ecological and societal values maintained or enhanced through other means? Or is a mixture of these the best approach?

- How does the sharing of costs to achieve certain environmental outcomes compare with an approach that requires personal responsibility for the costs of having an adverse impact on the environment?
- What incentives can be used to motivate private owners to contribute to an agreed community agenda?

5.6 Knowledge base

Managing Change in Paradise concluded that:

The current environmental and planning management system is information hungry. We need better baseline resource information and monitoring information. The fragmented nature of research associated with the development and functioning of urban and peri-urban systems in New Zealand is a major strategic weakness.

In Ontario, Canada, the development of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan has been informed by a substantial amount of information, primarily based on the three-year planning study commenced in 1991. This was a strategically focused study specific to the Moraine area. It involved 15 coordinated background studies (see appendix 2B, Pre-2001 Legislative and Planning Framework, for details). The information gained from this research has raised understanding of, for example, hydrological system function, urban growth design, water supply and sewage systems, landform conservation, and the important ecological and cultural heritage sites requiring protection measures.

The Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan has many planning requirements that will need a considerable amount of supporting information. For example, comprehensive growth management studies that need to include a rural economic development strategy; watershed plans that include requirements for a water budget and

conservation plan, land- and water-use management strategies, an environmental monitoring plan, criteria for evaluating the protection of water quality and quantity, and hydrological features and functions. The Ontario Government, in consultation with municipalities, is to identify performance indicators for monitoring the effectiveness of the Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. In addition, the recently established Oak Ridges Moraine Foundation has responsibility for funding ongoing research and monitoring.

In England, in addition to the information provided by the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister on the planning process (discussed in section 5.3), a key source of information to planners is the Countryside Agency's Countryside Character Initiative. This Initiative has resulted in guidance documents for planning authorities on how to undertake more detailed local character assessments.

5.6.1 Questions

- What role should central government and research agencies have in providing information to planners, the community and decision makers involved in the management of icon landscapes?
- What questions do people responsible for managing icon landscapes need to be asking and seeking information about? Here are some ideas:
 - What are community responses to change in the landscape from increased tourism, residential development and intensification of land uses?
 - What are the significant ecological features and processes of a particular landscape?
 - What are the cultural heritage features of the landscape?
 - Is the landscape valued as a lived-in landscape or as a wild landscape - can it be both?
 - What understanding do people have of the relationship between what they value in a landscape and how their activities impact on those values?

- What kind of economic framework is required to support the maintenance of the values associated with this landscape?

This report has presented many options to consider in progressing management of icon landscapes in Aotearoa/New Zealand. You can visit our website at www.pce.govt.nz for links to websites in Canada, South Africa and England that contain information referenced in this report.

- ¹ Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment. 2001. *Managing Change in Paradise: sustainable development in peri-urban areas*, p. 94.
- ² The overarching planning instrument in the Canadian case study is provincial - this would be the equivalent of national level legislation for area specific planning in the New Zealand context. Federal government in Canada does not concern itself directly with land-use management.
- ³ Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 2001, p. 95.
- ⁴ Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment. 2002. *Weaving Resilience into our Working Lands: recommendations for the future roles of native plants*, p. 34.
- ⁵ Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 2001, p. 92.
- ⁶ Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 2001, p. 92.
- ⁷ Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 2001, p. 96.
- ⁸ Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment, 2001, p. 92.

Table 5.1: Comparison of management approaches between the case studies and New Zealand

Policy and Planning	Oak Ridges Moraine	Cape Peninsula	Peak District	New Zealand
Central government role	Federal - No. Provincial: Ontario - Yes. Established area-specific legislation and Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. To provide implementation guidance to local authorities.	National - No. Provincial: Western Cape - support, monitor and regulate development planning at provincial and local government levels.	National - Yes. Provision of guidance and general legislation (e.g., Town and Country Planning Act 1990).	Resource Management Act 1991. No specific guidance for landscape issues or related national policies.
Local government role	Multiple local authorities responsible for implementation of the Plan in their area.	Cape Town - work with park authority to integrate plans and define urban edge.	The Park Authority is the local planning authority - implements planning process.	Local government implements Resource Management Act 1991 through regional and district policy and planning. Landscape policies vary.
Information to inform planning	Substantial.	Good.	Substantial.	Variable.
Prescriptive approach	Yes.	No.	Yes.	No.
Effective control of cumulative effects	Previously no - new plan intended to manage effectively.	Intended, but boundaries under significant pressure.	In most cases yes.	No.
Use of zoning	Yes - fundamental core approach.	Yes - core protected, for other areas guidelines only.	Yes - fundamental approach.	Variable - region specific.
Involvement of non-government organisations	High.	Some.	High.	High.
Cross-boundary issues	Yes - many municipalities (all have to comply with the Conservation Plan for Oak Ridges Moraine). Three regions in Greater Toronto Area have worked together on Oak Ridges Moraine issues.	No - one authority.	Yes - to avoid conflict at a regional level, one of the four regional councils with jurisdiction in the National Park has been delegated responsibility across the four regions.	Some, localised.

Policy and Planning	Oak Ridges Moraine	Cape Peninsula	Peak District	New Zealand
Use of public-private partnerships (including subsidies)	Not a major component.	Yes - significant.	Yes - significant.	Some.
Securing land in public ownership - Land Exchange - Purchase	Yes. No.	No. Yes (limited).	No. No.	Limited. Yes.
Key drivers for protection	Hydrology. Ecological integrity and function. Limiting urban sprawl.	Indigenous biodiversity. Maintaining quality of human experience.	Public access. Landscape. Traditional use patterns.	Preservation/protection of natural character, features, landscapes significant vegetation and habitat, Maori cultural associations ... (as per the Resource Management Act 1991).
Current key pressures	Population growth. Aggregate extraction. Subdivisions/lifestyle blocks.	Population growth. Tourism - visitor numbers. Poverty - unauthorised resource use.	Tourism. Recreational use - visitor numbers.	Lifestyle blocks/subdivisions. Tourism/recreation. Intensified/changing land use.

References

Chapter 1

Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment. 2001. *Managing Change in Paradise: sustainable development in peri-urban areas*. Wellington: Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment.

Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment. 2002. *Creating our Future: Sustainable Development for New Zealand*. Wellington: Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment.

Chapter 2

Adams, John and Miller, David. 2000. Letter from Councillors Adams and Miller to Mr Gordon Miller, Environmental Commissioner of Ontario. 23 March 2000. Part of the *Application for a review of the need for a new policy, act or regulation. Subsection 61(2) environmental Bill of Rights, 1992*. Volume 1 (Application).

Ernie Eves, Premier Ontario Government. 2002. Oak Ridges Moraine Foundation will receive \$15 million to preserve Moraine for future generations: Eves. 24 May. Ontario. <http://www.premier.gov.on.ca/english/news/Moraine052402.htm> [Accessed 22 August 2002].

Environmental Commissioner of Ontario. 2002. *2001–2002 Annual Report Supplement – Developing Sustainability*. Ontario: Environmental Commissioner of Ontario. <http://www.wco.on.ca/english/publicat/ar2001su.pdf>.

Environmental Commissioner of Ontario. (Date unknown.) Review of Applications R99011–16: Oak Ridges Moraine Review Denied by MMAH, MOE and MNR. Received via email from Environmental Commissioner of Ontario.

Kanter, Ron. 1990. *Space For All: Options for a Greater Toronto Area Greenlands Strategy*. Ontario: The Ontario Environmental Assessment Advisory Committee.

Letter to the applicants from the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Minister of Natural Resources, Minister of the Environment responding to the application for review. 29 May 2000.

Ministry of Natural Resources, Ministry of the Environment, Ministry of Municipal Affairs. 1991. *Implementation Guidelines: provincial interest on the Oak Ridges Moraine Area of the Greater Toronto Area*.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2001a. The Proposed Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. 1 November. (With note that the information continues to reflect the policies in the final plan.) <http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/inthnews/backgrnd/20020422-4e.asp> [Accessed 22 August 2002].

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2001b. Moraine policies would protect water resources and natural features. 1 November. (With note that these comments reflect policies in final plan.) <http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/inthnews/backgrnd/20020422-5e.asp> [Accessed 22 August 2002].

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2001c. *Share Your Vision for the Oak Ridges Moraine*. Canada: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2002a. Richmond Hill agreement protects vital corridor. 22 April. <http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/inthnews/backgrnd/20020422-3e.asp> [Accessed 22 August 2002].

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2002b. Province Release Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. 22 April. <http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/inthnews/releases/20020422-1e.asp> [Accessed 22 August 2002].

Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 2002c. Refinements Clarify Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. 22 April. <http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/inthnews/backgrnd/20020422-2e.asp> [Accessed 22 August 2002].

Oak Ridges Moraine Conservation Plan. <http://www.mah.gov.on.ca/>.

Oak Ridges Moraine Technical Working Committee. 1994. *The Oak Ridges Moraine Strategy for the Greater Toronto Area: an ecosystem approach for long-term protection and management*. Prepared for the Minister of Natural Resources

by the Oak Ridges Moraine Technical Working Committee. Canada: Queen's Printer for Ontario.

Ontario (1996 revised 1997). *Provincial Policy Statement*. Approved by the Lieutenant Governor in Council, Order in Council No 764–96: 102–97.

Pim, Linda and Beck, Gregor. 2002. Saving the Moraine. *Seasons*. Spring. Federation of Ontario Naturalists.

<http://www.unesco.org/mab/nutshell.htm> – Man and the Biosphere Programme – World Biosphere Reserves.

<http://learnet.gc.ca/eng/lrncentr/online/hgw/structure1.htm> [Accessed 14 February 2002].

<http://www.natureconservancy.ca> [Accessed August 2002].

http://www.livinglegacytrust.org/about_03.html [Accessed August 2002].

<http://www.cloca.com/> [Accessed August 2002].

www.stormco.org [Accessed February 2002].

Chapter 3

Bell, Gavin. 2002. Report on Trappieskop Prescribed Burn. <http://www.cpnpc.co.za/archive.html> [Accessed 15 July 2002].

Cape Metropolitan Tourism. 2000. *Cape Town*. Cape Metropolitan Tourism. <http://www.gocapetown.co.za/statsguide.pdf> [Accessed 12 August 2002].

Cape Peninsula National Park. 1999. *Management Policy*. Cape Peninsula National Park. <http://www.cpnpc.co.za/downloads.html> [Accessed 21 March 2002].

Cape Peninsula National Park. 2001a. *Conservation Development Framework for the Cape Peninsula National Park*. Cape Peninsula National Park. <http://www.cpnpc.co.za/downloads.html> [Accessed 4 November 2002].

Cape Peninsula National Park. 2001b. *Strategic Management Plan*. Cape Peninsula National Park. <http://www.cpnpc.co.za/downloads.html> [Accessed 21 March 2002].

Cape Peninsula National Park. 2001c. *Managing the CPPNE: A strategy for private land consolidation*. Cape Peninsula National Park. <http://www.cpnpc.co.za/downloads.html> [Accessed 31 July 2002].

City of Cape Town. 2000. *Defining and Mapping MOSS in the CMA: Phase One*. City of Cape Town.

City of Cape Town. 2001a. *Peninsula Urban Edge Report*. City of Cape Town.

City of Cape Town. 2001b. *The Environmental Policy of the City of Cape Town*. City of Cape Town. <http://www.capetown.gov.za/imep/Downloads.asp> [Accessed 6 October 2002].

City of Cape Town. 2001c. *CMOSS Phase II: Mapping: Pilot Project Summary Report*. City of Cape Town.

Cowling, R.M., MacDonald, I.A.W., and Simmons, M.T. 1996. The Cape Peninsula, South Africa: physiological, biological and historical background to an extraordinary hot-spot of biodiversity. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 5: 527–550.

Heydenrych B.J., Cowling R.M., and Lombard A.T. 1999. Strategic conservation interventions in a region of high biodiversity and high vulnerability: a case study from the Agulhas Plain at the southern tip of Africa. *Oryx* 33, 256–269. <http://fred.csir.co.za/extra/cape/reports/agulpap.rtf> [Accessed 15 August 2002].

McNeely, J.A. 2001. Globally significant biodiversity within city limits: the case of South Africa's Cape. *Parks*, 11 (3): 44–47.

Shroyer, M., Kilian, D., and Jackelman, J. 1999. A wilderness in an urban setting: planning and management of the Cape Peninsula National Park, Cape Town, South Africa. In Watson, Alan E.; Aplet, Greg. 1999. *Personal Societal, and Ecological Values of Wilderness: Sixth World Wilderness Congress Proceedings on Research, Management, and Allocation*, Volume. II, Proc. RMRS-P-000. Ogden, UT: US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Rocky Mountain Research Station. <http://www.mcsa.org.za/www6.html> [Accessed 16 July 2002].

Trinder-Smith, T.H., Cowling, R.M., and Linder, H.P. 1996. Profiling a besieged flora: endemic and threatened plants of the Cape Peninsula, South Africa. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 5: 575–589.

Unicity Commission. 2000. *Discussion Document: Developing the future City of Cape Town*. Unicity Commission.

- <http://www.cosatu.org.za/samwu/unicomdoc.htm> [Accessed 21 August 2002].
- van Wilgen, B.W. 1996. Management of the natural ecosystems of the Cape Peninsula: current status and future prospects. *Biodiversity and Conservation*, 5: 671–684.
- Younge, A. 2000. A biodiversity strategy and action plan for the Cape Floral Kingdom. South Africa, Cape Town: World Wide Fund for Nature. <http://www.panda.org.za/cape/Younge, A et al CAPE Summary Report/Younge, A et al CAPE Summary Report.doc> [Accessed 1 August 2002].

Chapter 4

- Blundell, J. 1993. *Labour's Flawed Land Acts –1976*. Economic and Social Science Research Association, 177 Vauxhall Bridge Road London. <http://www.landvaluetax.org.uk/labour01.htm> [Accessed July 2002].
- Cullingworth, J. and Nadin, V. 1997. *Town and Country Planning in the UK*. (12th edition). England: Routledge.
- Confederation of Business Industry. 2001. *Planning for Productivity: A ten-point plan*. Confederation of Business Industry. http://www.cbi.org.uk/pdf/The_planning_system.pdf [Accessed August 2002].
- Farmer, A., Skinner, I., and Wilkinson, D. 1999. *Environmental Planning in the United Kingdom: A Background Paper for the Royal Commission on Environmental Pollution*. <http://www.rcep.org.uk/pdf/ieep.pdf> [Accessed June 2002].
- Government Office of East Midlands. 2002. *Regional Planning Guidance for the East Midlands (RPG 8)*. Government Office of East Midlands. <http://www.go-em.gov.uk/planningandtransport/dtlr-regplanning-html/261-00.htm> [Accessed June 2002].
- High Peak Borough Council. 2002. *High Peak Local Plan, Deposit Draft 2002*. High Peak Borough Council. <http://www.highpeak.gov.uk> [Accessed July 2002].
- Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. 1995. *Planning Policy Guidance Note 2: Green Belts*. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. <http://www.planning.odpm.gov.uk/ppg/ppg2/index.htm> [Accessed June 2002].
- Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. 1997. *Planning Policy Guidance Note: General Policy and Principles*. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. <http://www.planning.odpm.gov.uk/ppg/ppg1/02.htm> [Accessed June 2002].

Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. 2000. *Planning Policy Guidance Note 12: Development Plans*. Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. <http://www.planning.odpm.gov.uk/ppg12/1.htm> [Accessed June 2002].

Peak District National Park Authority. 2000a. *Peak District National Park: State of the Park Report*. Bakewell. Peak District National Park Authority. <http://www.peakdistrict-npa.gov.uk/pubs/sopr/cont.htm> [Accessed June 2002].

Peak District National Park Authority. 2000b. *National Park Management Plan: Strategy 2000–2005*. Bakewell. Peak District National Park Authority. <http://www.peakdistrict-npa.gov.uk/pubs/manplan.pdf> [Accessed June 2002].

Peak District National Park Authority. 2001. *Peak District National Park Local Plan, Adopted Version March 2001*. Bakewell. Peak District National Park Authority. <http://www.peakdistrict-npa.gov.uk/pubs/publications.htm> - lp [Accessed June 2002].

Peak Park Joint Planning Board. 1994. *Peak National Park Structure Plan, Adopted Replacement, Final Edition*. Peak Park Joint Planning Board. <http://www.peakdistrict-npa.gov.uk/pubs/structure/contents.htm> [Accessed 28 January 2003].

Sheffield City Council. 1998. *Sheffield Unitary Development Plan*. Sheffield City Council. http://www.sheffield.gov.uk/documents/docu_full.asp?theID=9&Corp=&WhatsNew [Accessed July 2002].

Staffordshire Moorlands District Council. 2001. *Staffordshire Moorlands Local Plan – Consultation Draft: Summary, March 2001*. Staffordshire Moorlands District Council. <http://www.staffs Moorlands.gov.uk/planning/localplan.html> [Accessed June 2002].

Swanwick, C. 2002. *Landscape Character Assessment Guidance for England and Scotland: Prepared on behalf of the Countryside Agency and Scottish Natural Heritage*. University of Sheffield and Land Use Consultants. <http://www.countryside.gov.uk/cc/guidance/Main/Content.htm> [Accessed May 2002].

Chapter 5

- Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment. 2001. *Managing Change in Paradise: sustainable development in peri-urban areas*. Wellington: Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment.
- Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment. 2002. *Weaving Resilience into our Working Lands: recommendations for the future roles of native plants*. Wellington: Parliamentary Commissioner for the Environment

