



Friends of Baring Head  
P O Box 38 706  
Te Puni Mail Centre  
Lower Hutt

The Greater Wellington Regional Council  
Wellington

BY EMAIL

22 August 2011

*Submission from the Friends of Baring Head on the content of the Baring Head Management Plan*

Attached please find our submission on what should be in the the Baring Head management plan.

Thank you again for giving us an extended time to draw up this submission.

Paula Warren  
For the Trustees

## **Submission from the Friends of Baring Head on the Baring Head management plan**

---

### **About the Friends of Baring Head**

Friends of Baring Head has been established to be a leading contributor to the protection, enhancement and public enjoyment of Baring Head and its environs, and to assist the Council in its stewardship of the area.

The primary purposes of the Trust are:

1. to support and promote the protection, maintenance, enhancement and restoration of the values of Baring Head and its environs, including its natural, historic, landscape, scientific, recreational and cultural values, for the benefit of current and future generations; and
2. to disseminate information about the features and values of Baring Head and its environs to increase public understanding, enjoyment and stewardship of the area.

### **Content, form, and structure of a management plan**

In preparing this submission we have looked at the Reserves Act, and some examples of reserve management plans. We consider that the management plan should:

1. be short and concise. Resource assessments and other details could be in separate documents
2. contain
  - objectives for management
  - statements of priorities for GWRC management actions, to recognise that management resources are likely to be short. These priorities should be indicative priorities. GWRC should encourage community groups to contribute to projects envisaged within of the management plan, but may also include priorities within complex programmes. However, the plan should not constrain work by community groups on lower priority activities that are a priority for their members and contribute to the objectives in the plan
  - policies to guide decisions and set a general direction for the type of management actions that would be appropriate
  - guidance on the relative weighting to be given to objectives or policies where there are potential conflicts between them. For instance, where objectives for the area compete, the particular values of the area under consideration should prevail e.g. where a site is notable primarily for its heritage/historic/technological values that revegetation, for instance, would be diminished, historic/heritage values should prevail
  - clear prohibitions on activities that would be inconsistent with the values or objectives

3. not contain detailed asset management provisions, which can be in a separate non-statutory document.

We have made our comments on what should be in the management in light of that approach. We have also assumed that:

- the management plan will cover both the main Baring Head block and the lighthouse complex, thus providing a unified approach to the overall area
- that the main block will be scenic reserve
- the lighthouse complex will be managed for its historic values, preferably becoming an historic reserve with the New Zealand Historic Places Trust Category One status.

### **Actions that do not require to be delayed until a management plan is in place**

A management plan needs to be approved before significant work is undertaken. However, we do not consider that all work has to stop until one is approved. There are, for instance, many activities that do not need to be guided by a management plan – they are below the threshold in terms of the Reserves Act; they should be urgently attended to, to maintain future options (e.g. to prevent loss of historic structures); they would enhance immediate public use, are easily reversible or can be easily adjusted in future (e.g. location of signage, stock exclusion).

The following matters in particular do not need management plan approval to act, and we should like to see prompt action on them:

1. weed control – urgent work needs to occur to eliminate any biodiversity weeds that have been identified as being capable of removal and could potentially spread rapidly across the area
2. stabilising lighthouse complex buildings – subject to Historic Places Act requirements any actions to stop these buildings from deteriorating further should be taken – the Trust is ready and resourced to stabilise the pumphouse building and would like to move on the remainder of the buildings immediately
3. fencing. Some internal fences require only minor work to retire significant regenerating areas from grazing. For instance, there are two areas along the river valley which would provide immediate riparian protection gains. The Trust is prepared to assist Council to bring these fences up to standard immediately
4. signage. The public have demanded adequate signage. The Trust is prepared to assist Council to bring these facilities up to standard immediately to utilise the trails that we have.

### **Content of the management plan**

We comment below on the topics and issues that should be included in the management plan.

## **Scenic and related geological values**

The management plan needs to recognise the geological values of Baring Head. These are a significant element in its scenic values.

Baring Head is recognised in the Geopreservation Inventory as follows:

*Baring Head marine terraces. Map: R28; Classification: B3. Significance: A series of at least two distinctive uplifted marine terraces – the largest and most distinctive set in the Wellington area. Classified as an extremely well defined landform of scientific/educational and scenic value.*

The GWRC landscape assessment notes that one of the factors that contributes to the visibility of the uplifted terraces is that they are in exotic pasture, which contrasts visually with the native vegetation of the hills behind.

A key issue that needs to be addressed in the management plan is how the scenic and geopreservation values will be maintained, given the potential conflict between them and other values (e.g. revegetation with native species could adversely affect landscape values). We discuss below the sort of approach we should like to see adopted in relation to the content areas on which we have commented.

The management plan also needs to provide for potential further study of the geological values and their interpretation.

We do not believe that the management plan has to resolve all potential conflicts, but we would like to see the management plan provide a clear weight for the geopreservation values.

### *Recommended inclusions*

We recommend including the following scenic and related geological values:

1. this statement of geopreservation values:

*The Baring Head series of uplifted marine terraces are the largest and most distinctive set in the Wellington area, and classified in the Geopreservation Inventory as an extremely well defined landform of scientific/educational and scenic value (nationally significant).*

2. this objective, which is related to that value:

*Retention of the geopreservation values of the uplifted marine terraces at Baring Head.*

3. these provisions, which are related to the geopreservation and landscape values:

*The visibility of the Baring Head landforms, particularly the marine terraces, from other parts of the area (e.g. Wellington City, the harbour entrance) will be an important consideration in any management decision, including decisions relating to vegetation management.*

*No structures will be located on the terraces within the scenic reserve (i.e. outside the lighthouse complex) where these would affect the landscape or geopreservation values of the terraces, unless such structures are essential and cannot reasonably be located elsewhere.*

*No significant works, including excavation and earthworks, will be undertaken that would affect the form or integrity of the terraces and other geological features of the reserve.*

*Activities and interpretation that would improve appreciation by visitors and the wider public of the geological and geomorphological values of the reserve will be encouraged and (where possible) supported.*

### **Historic and cultural values**

The Heritage Report and the Cultural Values report describes in detail the significant Maori cultural landscape in and about the Baring Head side, as well as the technological, social and historical values of the World War II military installations and the NIWA installation. It is, therefore, a remarkable asset in terms of allowing visitors to re-imagine the past, and appreciate the technological developments, as well as the aesthetics that the great open sweep of headland provide – a feature that gives it its observational (and from a military perspective, its strategic) value.

The management plan needs to indicate how these important features can be protected, developed and managed to enlarge visitor experience.

#### *Recommended objectives*

We recommend the following objectives be included in the management plan in relation to the historic and cultural values:

1. *The listing of all features at Baring Head, as a matter of urgency, in the Heritage Schedule attached to the regional plan.*
2. *The recognition of the lighthouse and all the remaining associated lighthouse buildings as nationally significant.*
3. *The work in and about the site retains the sites' observational and strategic values that are central to the observational (and from a military perspective, strategic) value identified in the Heritage report e.g. the open coastal tops that were/are essential to the light's visibility from the sea and the tower's visibility as a daymark are retained.*
4. *No work will be undertaken on the military structures until a plan on their preservation or restoration has been done, and because the structures may be deteriorating badly, this work will be done subject to Historic Places Act requirements to prevent further deterioration.*
5. *An appropriate approach for the NIWA and Police installation, developed by work with interested parties.*
6. *Timeframes for undertaking planning and urgent work in place and regularly reviewed.*

### ***Maori heritage***

The Cultural Values report identifies ‘[a] significant Maori cultural landscape’<sup>1</sup> both within the management plan area and in its environs – the pa site, a shelter cave and midden, a stone wall sheltering a garden, and a burial cave (all just beyond the park boundaries), archaeological sites within the park itself, and ‘cultural sites known through oral traditions’.<sup>2</sup> In one of a number of such statements, it notes that a key objective in managing Baring Head/Parangarahu should be recognising and maintaining this cultural landscape.<sup>3</sup>

### ***Recommended objectives***

We recommend the following objectives be included in the management plan in relation to Maori heritage:

1. *Sites related to Maori cultural values in and about the site are given their appropriate protection in the regional plan.*
2. *If and when new sites are discovered, the council’s commitment to work with local iwi and hapu, and relevant government agencies, to determine appropriate treatment of those sites (under the relevant legislation).*
3. *The development of policies and approaches to elements within this landscape, in association with the local iwi/hapu, New Zealand Historic Places Trust and any other interested parties. (These elements – as noted on p. 4 of Orua-Pona-Nui Baring Head Cultural Values Report – cover the planting of Karaka, the management of access issues round particularly the Wainuiomata River mouth, fencing along common boundaries, policies round the discovery of Maori cultural material and human remains).*
4. *Priorities for addressing cultural values, developed in association with interested parties.*

### ***The lighthouse complex***

The Baring Head lighthouse complex is one of very few lighthouse sites where a sufficient number of buildings remain to enable visitors to appreciate something of the nature of a lighthouse station. This, and its ease of access, make it almost unique in New Zealand. Only by looking at where other sites with some buildings are and at their ease of access, is it possible to appreciate the asset GWRC has in the Baring Head station:

There are twelve sites where some lighthouse buildings remain. For most of those stations, access is difficult, almost impossible or, for most people, is only available by paying a not insignificant sum. :

- 1) Cuvier Island, Stephens Island, The Brothers are DOC reserves where permission is needed to land and all landings are weather-dependent
- 2) Dog and particularly Centre Island, both in Foveaux Strait, are inaccessible except by privately arranged transport and are highly weather dependent

---

<sup>1</sup> *Orua-Pona-Nui Baring Head Cultural Values Report*, Ruakura Consultants, February 2011, p. 3

<sup>2</sup> Ibid

<sup>3</sup> Ibid

- 3) Farewell Spit houses are now being done up but access is limited to a paying tour
- 4) Cape Campbell station is remarkably intact, but is on private land. Along the coast public access is tide-dependent. Overland, it is part of a private, paying two or three-day tramp
- 5) access to Tiritiri Matangi by other than by private boat is not uncostly (and has very few buildings remaining)
- 6) Godley Head has easy access if visitors have a car but provides relatively little in terms of a lighthouse experience. The two 1865 tower, keepers' homes and outhouses were demolished in 1939 to make room for the military installation. Today, the site's primary value is relates to the military structures – apart from the 1940s new (and largely invisible) tower halfway down the cliff, there remains only the 1940s home to remind visitors of the station's original use
- 7) Cape Brett, which DoC is doing up as a 'visitor experience' has only one dwelling, and this can only be reached by private boat, commercial vessels, or by what DoC describes as an eight-hour tramp
- 8) Kahurangi Point, where the principal keeper's house and a couple of outbuildings remain. This can only be accessed by a two-day tramp across very tidal, and potentially dangerous, rivers that are also prone to flooding
- 9) Cape Palliser can be reached by road and foot, but only two keepers' homes (now done up as baches and privately owned) remain

Buildings, including dwellings and outhouses, at all other lighthouse stations were removed, left to decay, or were destroyed. At Mokonināu, for instance, the structures were torched; at Puysegur Point (expensive and difficult to access except by private boat) they were burnt, and the remains pushed over the cliffs; the old wooden lighthouse at Cape Saunders lies, partly rotting, close to the ca.1950s homes that themselves are now in a considerable disrepair.

That decay and destruction happened in an environment where appreciation of historic and other values was less than today. Today, such a site has national protection and needs specific protection as a whole so that selective determining that some structures should not remain an option.

#### *Recommended objectives*

We recommend the following objectives be included in the management plan in relation to the lighthouse complex:

1. *Retention, maintenance and management of the lighthouse complex as a single entity.*
2. *A proposal to the Historic Places Trust (as a top priority) to register the whole of the Baring Head lighthouse site as Category One. This categorisation would include the lighthouse, the dwellings, the tower, and any other buildings associated with the lighthouse.*
3. *The retention and maintenance of existing cultural planting within and around the complex (subject to the provisions relating to exotic species).*

4. *Initiatives to ensure that visitors are able to appreciate all elements of the complex.*

### ***The lighthouse***

The Heritage Report comments on the significance of the equipment within the tower and on the tower's aesthetics both in relation to its construction and its placement within the landscape. The plan needs to identify a commitment to securing the tower's future and identify additional ways in which the tower might be incorporated into the visitor experience.

#### *Recommended objectives*

We recommend the following objectives be developed in relation to the lighthouse

1. *The retention of the lighthouse structure in situ, whatever the future of its role as a navigational aid.*
2. *Work with Maritime New Zealand to develop means to provide visitors with access to the lighthouse tower, to enlarge the visitor experience (generally or on specific days).*

### ***The lighthouse dwellings***

An accredited heritage specialist has developed a lengthy and detailed report on how the lighthouse dwellings might be renovated and used to enhance visitor experience.

#### *Recommended objective*

*Minimal or no changes to the dwellings, and only essential maintenance to prevent their deterioration, until a full adaptive reuse plan, which takes heritage values into account, has been developed and approved.*

### ***The bridge and lighthouse road***

The Heritage Report discussed in detail the historical detail associated with bridge and road to the lighthouse complex.

#### *Recommended objective*

*The treatment of the lighthouse road and bridge as part of the historic context of the lighthouse complex, in both management and interpretation.*

### ***Signage and interpretation***

We have commented above on the need for appropriate signage to inform visitors and enhance their experience of the area.

#### *Recommended objective*

*The development and positioning of appropriate signage, interpretation panels and/or other resources on historic values so as to contextualise and enhance the visitor experience.*

### ***Small, short-term management projects***

As indicated above, in our discussion of what should not be in the management plan, the plan needs to indicate how short-term, inexpensive projects, which come within the areas indicated by the plan but are not worthy of being formally notified within it, can be progressed. In relation to the lighthouse complex, instances are the pump house and activities such as cleaning up the lighthouse reserve and securing the exterior of any buildings against further deterioration.

#### *Recommended objective*

*Projects that are necessary to maintain historic structures or prevent possible damage to them, or that have low impacts and contribute to the achievement of objectives, are rapidly progressed, without needing approval through expensive processes.*

### ***Managing conflict of possibly competing management objectives***

We recognise that the lighthouse complex is one where there is potential for competing management objectives to emerge. In relation to the principle we proposed earlier, we recommend:

*Where objectives for the area might compete, historic/heritage values should prevail.*

### ***Indigenous flora and fauna, ecological associations, and the natural environment***

We are comfortable with the description of ecological values contained in the paper prepared by GWRC.

#### *Recommended objective*

We would recommend the following objective be included in the management plan:

*The indigenous biodiversity at genetic, species and ecosystem levels, and the natural geological and ecological processes affecting that biodiversity, are maintained and, where appropriate, enhanced.*

We have used the term “where appropriate” in recognition of the potential conflicts between ecological restoration and other objectives (e.g. historic heritage and recreation objectives). Given that, it is vital that the management plan provide some guidance on weighting between objectives. We suggest:

- 1. The priority within the lighthouse complex and at other defined historic sites shall be the retention of historic and cultural heritage values. Any ecological restoration shall be designed to complement rather than adversely affect those values.*
- 2. The priority in areas that are currently dominated by indigenous vegetation shall be the retention and restoration of that vegetation and other indigenous biodiversity values.*
- 3. Ecological restoration is appropriate where it would not adversely affect other significant values identified in this management plan, would not*

*unduly impede public enjoyment of the values of the reserve, and would not create significant management liabilities.*

4. *An ecological restoration plan shall be prepared, which will set out those areas in which ecological restoration is appropriate, and the restoration objectives for each area in which restoration is to be undertaken (or for each landform).*
5. *Restoration shall seek to restore those ecosystems which were most likely to have been present in the absence of human modifications, and shall use locally-sourced genetic material.*

### **Exotic flora and fauna**

We consider that the management plan should include the following provisions relating to introduced species:

*Species of flora and fauna which are not native to the Baring Head area shall be eradicated where that is practicable and affordable, except:*

1. *any plants associated with the lighthouse complex where:
  - 1) they contribute to the historic values and setting of the site (e.g. the macrocarpa windbreak plantings); and
  - 2) they are unlikely to be a source of significant invasion of natural areas within the reserves.*

*Those plants should be managed as part of the management of the historic integrity and context of the complex.*

2. *pasture and similar vegetation where that is the best way to:
  - 1) maintain the scenic values of the site; or
  - 2) maintain specific recreational values; or
  - 3) maintain historic or cultural values including cultural landscape values.*
3. *animals required for management purposes.*

### **Recreation**

In our view, one of the main reasons that the public resoundingly supported the purchase of this land was because of its passive recreation values – it provides opportunities for walking, cycling and exploring the coastline in an outstanding river and coastal landscape with a true sense of open space. Related to these is the public desire to visit the lighthouse complex and stay there, as a destination in itself, or as a stopover on our Big Coast.

We commend the Tourism Resource Consultants report *Baring Head – Recreation and Tourism Options Study* and its recommendations as providing a sound basis on which to address recreation opportunities offered by this land and its relationship with other recreational opportunities.

The Trust is committed to assisting Council in developing and maintaining any of the recreational opportunities, by way of raising resources, providing volunteers, involving the community, and running the lighthouse complex as accommodation.

The Trust is willing, in principle, to develop and run an accommodation business using the lighthouse keepers houses, *as long as* the Trust is satisfied that its involvement would be financially sound and acceptable arrangements with the Council had been negotiated.

Any such commercial venture should, as we have noted above, be seen as contributing not only to the public enjoyment of the area, but also the full lighthouse complex being retained and maintained. While only the houses may be useful for such a purpose, that should not result in only those buildings being kept. In addition, it would be important that any changes to the buildings to facilitate commercial uses should not damage their historic integrity and the overall integrity of the complex.

The list of opportunities that the land offers is extensive and the management plan should be developed to ensure these opportunities are realised:

- extensive walking and cycling in a quiet outstanding coastal and river open space and in an extensive natural environment.
- wheelchair access adjoining any carparks and the lighthouse complex.
- accessible and high-quality rock climbing
- river kayaking
- picnicking
- camping in the vicinity of the lighthouse and somewhere along the river.
- beaching – off the Coast Road beside the Wainuiomata River, and in Fitzroy Bay north of the lighthouse
- sea fishing and diving off the coast
- parasailing
- four-wheel and horseriding on designated roads at limited times.
- interpretation of the historic, cultural, geopreservation and ecological values of this land
- it is the eastern entrance and beginning of the Great Harbour Way along this outstanding coast and a critical portion of the Big Coast walking and cycling trail, already a regular activity
- an overnight stay in an accessible authentic lighthouse complex with an outstanding coastal setting
- a new carpark
- a new footbridge near the coast that better serves the beach, and gives better access to the land, and the lighthouse complex.
- upgrading of the steep walking/cycle track to the lighthouse is a key precondition for the development of a raft of recreational opportunities, and would considerably enhance the likelihood that a sustainable accommodation enterprise can be realised.

Overall, we have the opportunity to have the community actively contributing to, and valuing the land. Such an outcome would see a wide range of Wellingtonians using the area, and viewing it as an accessible destination. The beach/rivermouth is already a popular vehicular destination, the new entrance

is encouraging a wider range of visitors to explore beyond the area around the carpark, and the proposed walking entrance nearer the beach would further encourage exploration. Allowing limited access for visitors by vehicle or use the area for four wheel drive, trail bike or horse-based recreation will deliver a rich range of opportunities without generating conflicts with other users or damage of values or facilities. The site's natural and historic character should be a vital part of the experience, with the lighthouse complex being actively used, and those uses contributing to its retention and value (e.g. through providing a human presence to reduce the risk of vandalism, payment of fees, and volunteer efforts to maintain the structures, vegetation, etc).

There are, however, several threats to our maximising these opportunities:

- inappropriate, unconstrained or illegal four-wheel and trailbikes' use of the area. This would detract from its natural quiet and character, as well as compromising several of the values that make the property so unique
- wildfires destroying the site's natural character
- lack of resourcing to develop the opportunities
- inability to develop the lighthouse complex to a sustainable operation.

#### *Recommended objectives*

1. *The primarily recreational focus is passive recreation on foot or by mountain bike so as to enjoy the open space, natural and historic values of the area. Other recreational activities will be managed to ensure they did not significantly impact on this primary focus.*
2. *The lighthouse complex is developed for interpretation and overnight stays.*
3. *The open space and geopreservation character of the marine terraces is maintained.*
4. *Limited vehicular and other non-passive recreation at designated times, in designated areas/routes is facilitated, to allow access for people with low mobility, and to encourage enjoyment of the area by a wider range of visitors. The restrictions will be designed to minimise conflicts with passive recreation.*
5. *The community is involved through the Trust.*

Realising these objectives demands careful prioritising of the work that will be needed. The priorities we recommend are set out below:

#### *Recommended priorities*

1. *Where possible (and with the exception of new facilities identified in this plan), visitor facilities (e.g. signage, interpretation, track quality, toilets) should be provided by developing existing facilities or providing new facilities in already developed areas (e.g. the carpark)*
2. *A new carpark and footbridge and related tracks should be developed near the coast, to improve access, particularly for rock climbing and*

*walking to the lighthouse complex, and to allow overnight visitors' access to the lighthouse complex.*

3. *A management plan for the use of the lighthouse complex, including as overnight accommodation, for camping, and in terms of interpretation of its values, should be developed as a priority.*
4. *Develop cost-effective mechanisms to control illegal four-wheel drive and trail bike activities.*
5. *Identify areas where public access should be prevented or discouraged, to protect natural or historic values, or for health and safety reasons.*
6. *Enhance the rock climbing experience and ensure it is compatible with the natural values of the area.*
7. *Develop walking access from Lake Kohangatera/Eastbourne along the unformed legal road and foreshore past the mining area.*

#### ***A note on vehicle access***

Our suggestions above reflect our view that:

- vehicle access will continue to be necessary for management purposes
- vehicle use will enhance the ability to have the lighthouse complex used commercially. That may increase the range of uses of the area, and provide needed income to pay for maintenance of historic buildings. While creating a carpark near the coast and a walking track from there to the lighthouse would reduce the need for vehicle access for those using the area for overnight accommodation, being able to park vehicles in a more secure location within the area (e.g. on the edge of the terraces at the end of the formed road) and to unload food and luggage closer to the buildings would greatly increase the attractiveness and range of uses of the complex
- provision for vehicle access would also open up the area to a wider range of opportunities for commercial tourism (e.g. it could be included in a four-wheel drive tour of the wider area)
- vehicle use can increase the number and range of visitors, particularly by providing for access to the lighthouse complex and terraces to people with low mobility who might otherwise be restricted to the coastal/river flats, and attract the four-wheel drive community
- vehicle use will reduce the natural quiet/open space values for other users. That conflict can be reduced if vehicle use is restricted in both where vehicles can go and the days or hours of vehicle operation, and if those times/days known by other visitors
- unrestrained vehicle use is incompatible with maintaining natural and historic values. In general, vehicles should be restricted to formed roads. The only exception would be allowing use on designated and marked routes that have been assessed to ensure such activities would not cause damage (e.g. limited vehicle use or parking on the marine terraces may be appropriate)
- allowing controlled access by the four-wheel drive, trail bike and horse riding community will reduce to some extent illegal access, and ensure that the responsible parts of those communities will not support illegal access.

## **General Land Management**

The following land management issues need to be undertaken, and should be identified as necessary in the management plan:

1. *Classify the land as a Scenic Reserve under the Reserves Act – this is a condition of purchase required by the various parties to the funding, and the community expectation of the legal protection that this land deserves, due to its outstanding coastal scenery.*
2. *Add the rectangular area of Recreation Reserve near the Para trig to the Scenic Reserve. The current Recreation Reserve status is inappropriate.*
3. *Add the cliffs and raised beach portion of the lighthouse Recreation Reserve to the scenic reserve. The current Recreation Reserve status is inappropriate.*
4. *Provide appropriate legal protection under the Historic Places and Resource Management Acts for historic sites (as set out in the historic heritage section of this submission).*
5. *Change the terrace portion of the lighthouse complex Recreation Reserve to an Historic Reserve in recognition of its historic values. The current Recreation Reserve status is inappropriate.*
6. *Extinguish the profit a prendre over the land around the Wainuiomata River mouth. This could be mined at any time if the holder of the rights is able to obtain resource consent that they do not currently have.*
7. *Require that Horokiwi Quarries restore the northwest corner of the land that has been removed by their mining, unless they can show that they did so with appropriate landowner authority. This has diminished coastal walking access along the unformed legal road and damaged the land.*
8. *Seek the cessation of mining on public land in Fitzroy Bay as it is eroding the public access along the unformed legal road from Lake Kohangatera to this land.*
9. *Restore the area modified by the Pacific Charger stranding – namely earthworks, leftover machinery, and the “temporary” roadway formed.*
10. *Purchase any adjoining land that is available to add to the land, particularly the block adjoining the lighthouse.*
11. *Restrict use of the internal road and vehicle bridge to only those right-of-way parties that have equitably contributed to the maintenance. If necessary, relocate any new vehicle bridge off the right of way to avoid future freeloading.*
12. *Ensure that adjoining owners have adequately fenced in the stock on their*

*own land, particularly Orongorongo Station who have no fence to the east.*

### **Fencing**

We accept that the existing fencing reflects past land management and is in a general state of disrepair. It requires a significant sum to bring up to standard, particularly as it is in a coastal zone that rapidly rusts fencing. The questions are which areas are appropriate to continue grazing in order to maintain landscape and recreational values and control fire and weed risks, and whether permanent fencing is needed to achieve those outcome, or whether periodic grazing with temporary fencing would be effective, particularly if combined with dense “hedge” plantings of divaricating shrubs along the edges of the terrace.

In the meantime, Council moves to remove cattle and horses from the land are welcomed as we consider that sheep have low effect on remaining biodiversity, and they place little pressure on remaining expensive fences.

Trust members attended the workshop on biodiversity restoration and clearly heard our fellow biodiversity supporters’ desire to retire appropriate areas from grazing.

We are mindful however that there is a need to maintain the open space and geopreservation values of the marine terraces, and that any removal of stock can increase the wildfire risk to any biodiversity values.

The area of the lighthouse complex requires ongoing grazing to minimise any wildfire threat and keep the grass down. As discussed above, there is scope for selected fencing of areas that warrant planting as part of any historic precinct plan, or of the use of temporary fencing to control stock movements during episodic grazing.

The Trust will do what it can to assist Council in resourcing appropriate fencing, particularly to retire areas suitable for regeneration.

### *Recommended objectives*

We recommend the following objectives in relation to fencing to ensure that fencing is only retained where necessary to maintain open space and wildfire threat management.

- 1. Maintain the marine terraces as grazed open space and geopreservation site.*
- 2. Maintain the lighthouse complex largely as grazed grass to maintain the historic context and minimise wildfire threat.*
- 3. Graze only sheep.*
- 4. Retire areas that warrant revegetation, where natural revegetation is likely to occur and wildfire/weed threats can be managed, or as resources become available for active replanting.*

### *Recommended priorities*

1. *Retire areas initially that are not a high wildfire risk – along the river valley.*
2. *Retire areas around the coast when illegal four-wheel-based activities have been controlled.*

### **Scientific values**

Baring Head has significant actual and potential scientific values, including:

- as an important geological site
- for NIWA atmospheric work
- because it has one of the few rivers in the region that has not been subject to significant channel alterations
- because it has significant biodiversity values.

We recommend that these values be recognised in the management plan, by including the following objective:

*The scientific and related educational values of Baring Head (where this does not materially conflict with other objectives) are maintained and enhanced*

The plan should contain the following provisions to support that objective:

1. *Baring Head is currently used for research of international significance. That research will be appropriately facilitated (e.g. by providing vehicle access, approvals to upgrade research facilities) but where the impact of such approvals conflict with other objectives in this management plan, the facilities would have to be essential and unable to be reasonably located elsewhere.*
2. *Baring Head has significant potential to be the site for future research, including:*
  - *ecological research associated with restoring and managing its values*
  - *geological research related to its geopreservation values*
3. *Such research will be encouraged where it does not damage the historic and heritage values or significantly conflict with other objectives in this plan. Researchers will be encouraged to design their research to provide information that will be of value in the management and restoration of Baring Head.*