

To:	Luke Faithfull Partner – Mitchell Daysh	Date:	Thursday, May 15, 2025
From:	Brad Coombs, Isthmus Group Ltd (IGL)	Job No:	5034
Subject:	Glen Isla Place Society (GIPS) Coastal Protection Structure second s92 Draft Response		

Introduction and Overview

1. Glen Isla Place Protection Society Incorporated (GIPS) have applied for resource consent to build a coastal protection structure within the Three Mile Creek Reserve,¹ seaward of properties 9, 11, 13, 15, 16, 14 and 12 Glen Isla Place at Waihi Beach.
2. Isthmus prepared a Landscape and Visual Assessment Report dated 11 October 2024, which formed part of the Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) accompanying the application. Western Bay of Plenty District Council (WBOPDC) issued a Section 92 request for further information in November 2024. Isthmus provided a response to that request which was included in the overall response to the request for further information. A second s92 request for further information has been issued by WBOPDC dated 25 March 2025. That request includes the following comments and requests for clarifications²:

Landscape Architect

The conclusions of the Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment (LVA) seem overly optimistic, and the methodology lacks sufficient detail and justification for the assumptions made to reach credible findings. The conclusions and scale of effects should be reviewed in light of the clarifications sought:

1. Update the LVA to include a description and assessment of effects on associative values. Additionally, provide an assessment of effects on landscape values derived from the interplay of physical, associative, and perceptual dimensions, as outlined in paragraphs 6.19 and 8.07 of Te Tangi a te Manu.
2. Detail your understanding of the specific characteristics and values of District Plan Outstanding Landscape Feature S24 to justify the conclusion that the proposal will avoid adverse effects on the characteristics contributing to the values of this overlay.
3. The landscape effects related to potential public access are assessed as "*high positive*" based on the proposal's protection of

¹ The Reserve is managed by the Three Mile Creek Reserve Management Plan, administered by the Western Bay of Plenty District Council.

² The numbering and formatting have been kept consistent with the s92 Further Information Request letter.

public land that could potentially be used for public access in the future. However, this scenario of public access is speculative, as there are no current plans to implement such an access route. Additionally, creating such access would require further disturbance of dunes, which conflicts with the LVA's conclusions and scale of effects on Natural Character. Provide further justification for the validity of this public access scenario, considering the likelihood of it happening and the implications in terms of landscape and visual effects or other consenting issues. Alternatively, remove it from the assessment and review the conclusions and scale of effects in light of this omission.

4. The visual amenity effects are rated as "moderate-high positive" compared to a "likely edge" from future climate change impacts. However, the assessment lacks details on the anticipated "likely edge," including the recovery timeline through natural sand movement, manual replenishment, or dune planting. The comparison between the proposal and an eroded coastal edge versus a restored one should account for varying effects. Provide further detail and assumptions regarding the anticipated "*likely edge*" condition, including consideration of effects across the construction, medium, and long-term timeframes from when an erosion event occurs, through its recovery.

5. The assessment of natural character effects emphasises the historical modification of the dune landform due to past erosion protection works. While this context is relevant, on-site observations indicate that this area does not appear to be entirely modified. Coastal engineers have identified that the dune, in its current state, is recovering with vegetation cover.

Update the assessment of natural character effects over the construction, medium, and long term, taking into account the current recovering condition. In the updated assessment, compare this with the alternative scenario where the proposal is not implemented. Consider the recovery measures that can reasonably be expected to be implemented in response to future erosion events, as described in 4. above, including natural sand movement, manual sand replenishment, and dune planting. Additionally, consider District Plan Rule 6.6.1.3 regarding the anticipated loss of dune landform and vegetation within Outstanding Landscape Feature S24 as a result of the proposal.

6. In relation to comments made on cumulative effects, provide additional commentary on whether the increase in rock walls proposed will contribute to reaching a tipping point in the landscape's capacity to accommodate change along this stretch of coastline, as outlined in paragraph 6.48 of Te Tangi a te Manu.

7. The recommendation to use rock of "various sizes" for the rock revetment may not meet engineering requirements. Since the LVA effects ratings assume this, please confirm if varying rock sizes will be used. If not, remove this recommendation and update the LVA conclusions and effect scale.
 8. Update the design drawings to show that the sand crest at the north end of the seawall is retained and fenced off with temporary fencing, consistent with other protected dune vegetation areas on the drawings. This will clearly indicate that this area of dune vegetation is to be protected during the works. Additionally, provide confirmation on when it will be appropriate to remove this temporary fencing.
3. Each of the requests for clarification are responded to in order below.
 4. The following clarifications provide additional information and understanding to assist the reviewer.
 5. The Methodology and Approach are set out at Section 3 and in Appendix A of the Assessment and are commensurate with other assessments for similar projects which have been peer reviewed and successfully consented. Overall, there is more than six pages in the Assessment describing the Methodology used. The Methodology and Approach section references the national guidance in Te Tangi a te Manu, the Aotearoa New Zealand Landscape Assessment Guidelines (2022) (TTatM) which have been used to frame the Assessment. The work undertaken to complete the assessment is described further under each of the headings in the Assessment. In my opinion the Methodology used and the description in the Assessment are appropriate for the project, however further information and justification can be provided beyond the clarifications below.
1. Update the LVA to include a description and assessment of effects on associative values. Additionally, provide an assessment of effects on landscape values derived from the interplay of physical, associative, and perceptual dimensions, as outlined in paragraphs 6.19 and 8.07 of Te Tangi a te Manu.

Response:

6. TTatM describes Associative values on page 79:
'Associative' means intangible things that influence how places are perceived – such as history, identity, customs, laws, narratives, creations stories, and activities specifically associated with the qualities of a landscape. Such associations typically arise over time and out of the relationship between people and place...

7. The typical factors that contribute to physical, associative and perceptual dimensions (as listed on pages 83 and 84 of TTatM) are described and assessed in so far as they are relevant to the project in sections 8 (natural character effects), 9 (landscape effects), 10 (visual amenity effects) and 11 (construction effects) in the Assessment.
8. Section 4 of the Assessment – Existing Environment describes the physical, associative and perceptual dimensions of the landscape Context (Waihi Beach settlement) and the project site itself, including the pattern of residential development, the relationship between the settlement and the beach and sea, the history and need for coastal protection structures at Waihi Beach and around the Three Mile Creek mouth, including the rock revetment seawall to the north of the creek mouth and the sandbag training groynes. Specific to the location of the proposed coastal protection structure, the Assessment describes and illustrates (through photos, maps and plans) the project site and its’ surroundings.
9. Further to the descriptions of the physical, associative and perceptual values provided in the Assessment, the following associative values are also present within the wider environment of Waihi Beach:
 - i. The name “Waihi” (Rising Water) is said to come from a stream which flows into the beach (believed to be at the North end of the beach – source: <https://www.taongatauranga.net/waihi-beach---bowentown.html>), the later town of Waihi taking its’ name from the beach³.
 - ii. The Otāwhiwhi Marae is located at Bowentown, approximately 5km southeast of the project site, and is of the Ngāi Te Rangi tribe and Ngāi Tauwhao sub-tribe⁴.
 - iii. Several historic pā sites are located within a few kilometres of the nine kilometre stretch of Waihi Beach. Waihi Beach and its’ surrounding context is relatively rich with cultural sites and narratives, however none are known at or close to the coastal protection structure site.
 - iv. Waihi Beach is a popular beach town and holiday destination which swells in size over the summer months, with a high proportion of holiday homes and baches.
 - v. Waihi Beach includes several holiday parks, accommodation providers, eateries and restaurants and a busy town centre to service the local resident and holiday maker community.
 - vi. While there isn’t a strong organised tourism services industry based at Waihi Beach, surfing, swimming, fishing and other beach and water-based activities are popular and are serviced by the local township, mainly accessed from the beach.

³ ["History of Waihi Beach"](#). *Ohinemuri Regional History Journal* 9, May 1968. Retrieved 6 September 2014

⁴ [tkm.govt.nz. Te Puni Kōkiri](#).

10. The associative values described above relate to the wider Waihi Beach landscape context, however other than being a relatively small part of the beach environment in front of Glen Isla Place and adjacent to Three Mile Creek there do not appear to be any specific associative values that relate to the site of the coastal protection structure.
11. The scale and location of the coastal erosion protection structure is sufficiently discrete to ensure that it would not have any adverse effects on the associative values of the wider Waihi Beach environment.
2. Detail your understanding of the specific characteristics and values of District Plan Outstanding Landscape Feature S24 to justify the conclusion that the proposal will avoid adverse effects on the characteristics contributing to the values of this overlay.

Response:

12. Appendix 2 to the WBOP District Plan is the schedule of identified Outstanding Landscape features – Natural Features and landscapes. The schedule identifies S24:

S24 - Open Coastal Landscape Landward Edge Protection Yard

The area identified contains all land adjoining the open coastline, zoned Rural and within 100m of [*MHWS*](#).

13. As summarised in Section 6.3 of the GIPS Assessment of Environmental Effects and paragraphs 4.27 – 4.28 of the LVA, the schedule of identified outstanding landscape features does not provide any further description or detail of the characteristics and values of S24 other than the succinct description of the area that it includes (an offset of land adjoining the open coastline).
14. S24 is a generic coastal offset line which includes the area from MHWS back to the top of the beach or the dune, dependent on the adjacent landuse and landform to the beach up to a maximum distance of 100m. In this part of Waihi Beach where the adjacent landuse is residential or urban there is a hard line at the top of the beach at the property boundary, regardless of the level of modification on the coastal side of the line. This includes the beach and the dune (if there is one) and coastal protection structures (where they are present). The area is shown on the map on Page 14 of the **Graphic Attachments** to the Assessment.
15. The map illustrates that the landward edge of the S24 outstanding landscape feature line is at the boundary with the adjacent residential land. The S24 feature includes the existing rock revetment seawalls north of Three Mile Creek, the sandbag training groynes on the beach, dune protection fences, access steps and other structures which are not natural, but are none the less part of the beach and dune environment. South of Glen Isla Place the landward boundary S24 moves further inland into the adjacent Island View Reserve land to capture the 100m offset from MHWS as described in the schedule. The 100m offset line

remains generic. There is no difference in the values on either side of the inland boundary line at Island View Reserve.

16. The broad and generic offset nature of the S24 landscape feature, including the presence of existing coastal protection structures which are similar in nature, but much more expansive, exposed and intrusive than the proposed structure at Glen Isla Place illustrates the ability for such structures to be within or form part of the edge of the S24 landscape feature, without affecting the characteristics and values that led to the identification of the landscape feature in the first place (the open beach and coastline, setback to the first dune, or to the residential land boundary). The open beach and coastline characteristics and values are not affected by the GIPS coastal protection structure after construction is complete.
 17. The GIPS coastal protection structure will be consistent but less intrusive than other structures on the beach and the dune and will be consistent (but less obtrusive) than the beach and dune/seawall profile that is part of the S24 landscape feature
 18. The GIPS coastal protection structure will not adversely affect the values of the S24 landscape feature. See further detail on cumulative effects below.
-
3. The landscape effects related to potential public access are assessed as *"high positive"* based on the proposal's protection of public land that could potentially be used for public access in the future. However, this scenario of public access is speculative, as there are no current plans to implement such an access route. Additionally, creating such access would require further disturbance of dunes, which conflicts with the LVA's conclusions and scale of effects on Natural Character. Provide further justification for the validity of this public access scenario, considering the likelihood of it happening and the implications in terms of landscape and visual effects or other consenting issues. Alternatively, remove it from the assessment and review the conclusions and scale of effects in light of this omission.

Response:

19. The location of the GIPS coastal protection structure will protect part of the existing dune environment and public land behind the structure from erosion, including the adjacent private properties and a mature Norfolk Pine tree. That is the purpose of the project. By protecting that dune environment and land, if future coastal erosion was to remove the sand dune on the seaward side of the structure and it became exposed, then there will be sufficient room behind the structure to provide public access at full tide conditions, when the beach may not be navigable. Without the protection structure, the dune could be eroded back to the property boundaries (or further) at which point there could be no provision of public access along the coastal edge under full tide conditions. In the meantime,

with the beach profile as it is, people walking past the seaward side of Glen Isla Place are walking along the beach.

20. If an access track was required in the future due to erosion, then a walking track would be likely to be consistent with other non-formed, but foot worn access tracks which tend to provide access to the beach, perpendicular to the alignment of the beach and the coastal edge. Such tracks are generally 300-500mm wide and are created by foot track through a relatively easy part of the dune. Should additional tracks be formed, then the vegetation could be fenced in the future to protect it from foot traffic. No such tracks currently exist parallel to the coastal edge, south of the site (at Island View Reserve) and there is insufficient room for such a track at the top of the seawall in some locations north of Three and Two Mile Creeks outside of the private property boundaries. If access along the dune becomes necessary in the future due to erosion, then rationalisation of access along the beach would need to be considered on the protected side of the structure however, this would be a matter from WBOPDC consideration given they are the land owners of the reserve in which any access way would be located in the future

4. The visual amenity effects are rated as "moderate-high positive" compared to a "likely edge" from future climate change impacts. However, the assessment lacks details on the anticipated "likely edge," including the recovery timeline through natural sand movement, manual replenishment, or dune planting. The comparison between the proposal and an eroded coastal edge versus a restored one should account for varying effects. Provide further detail and assumptions regarding the anticipated "likely edge" condition, including consideration of effects across the construction, medium, and long-term timeframes from when an erosion event occurs, through its recovery.

Response:

21. The photographs on Pages 5 and 6 of the **Graphic Attachments** illustrate the condition of the site. Photographs on Page 6 illustrate the eroded edge of the dune after Cyclone Gabrielle in February 2023. The eroded edge includes remnants of historic seawall structures – exposed rocks and a vertical edge to the face which is impossible to negotiate, limiting access to the coastal edge. The adjacent photograph taken in July 2024 shows that 18 months after Cyclone Gabrielle in July 2024 the sand had started to accrete and had covered the rocks and the vertical face.
22. Prior to the WBOPDC seawall and dune enhancement coastal protection works constructed at the Glen Isla Place dune in 2010/2011, remnant coastal protection was present in front of the Glen Isla Place properties. These protection structures were an engineered, Ohinemuri Council constructed barrier consisting of vertical steel posts and timber boards retaining a rock carpet behind and large gabion basket groynes at approximately 40m

Isthmus.

centres perpendicular to the wall. By 2010 these barriers (shown below in Figure 1 and 2) which were located approximately 20m from the GIPS property boundaries, had fallen into a state of disrepair, however, these barriers protected the dune with the dune having extended out since these barriers were installed in the early 1980's. Since the removal of these barriers and the implementation of the unsuccessful 2010/2011 dune enhancement works, several metres of dune have been lost from the depth of the sand covered dunes adjacent to Glen Isla Place, with the narrowest dune area down to a minimum of 4.5m from the private property boundary. The history of coastal protection structures on the site and the effects of Three Mile Creek, climate change and sea level rise indicates ongoing erosion and the need for a coastal protection structure as proposed in this application.



Figure 1: Remnant seawall prior to the 2010/2011 coastal protection works.



Figure 2: Remnant seawall prior to the 2010/2011 coastal protection works.

23. The steel posts and rocks underlying the sand covered dune that were exposed by Cyclone Gabrielle in 2023 were likely remnants of previous protection barriers from prior to the Ohinemuri barriers and these remain a part of the post-storm existing environment.
24. The proposal includes active management of sand conditions by covering the coastal protection structure with sand and planting of the dune with indigenous coastal species. These measures are all designed to hasten the stabilisation of the dune and promote accretion of sand as happened naturally between February 2023 and July 2024 as illustrated in the photographs after Cyclone Gabrielle.
25. Left unprotected it is feasible that the entire dune and underlying historic structures could be eroded back to and including the adjacent properties. This would see rocks, boundary walls, potentially a swimming pool and private residential properties exposed and eroded into the sea without any protection. It is likely that the erosive power of the sea will increase with climate change, sea level rise and increased peak flow from Three Mile Creek, so this scenario is a realistic possibility in the medium to long term.
26. The location and design of a buried protection structure, the recontouring of the dunes and the active indigenous coastal planting are measures that are designed to integrate the structure into the natural environment. Such active mitigation tactics were not designed into or implemented for the rock revetment and groyne structures northwest of the site.
27. Under the current circumstances the GIPs coastal protection structure strikes a balance between the protection of landscape and natural character values of the beach environment at Waihi Beach and the protection of the Glen Isla Place residences, consistent with the protection provided to other residential land north of the Three Mile Creek mouth.

5. The assessment of natural character effects emphasises the historical modification of the dune landform due to past erosion protection works. While this context is relevant, on-site observations indicate that this area does not appear to be entirely modified. Coastal engineers have identified that the dune, in its current state, is recovering with vegetation cover. Update the assessment of natural character effects over the construction, medium, and long term, taking into account the current recovering condition. In the updated assessment, compare this with the alternative scenario where the proposal is not implemented. Consider the recovery measures that can reasonably be expected to be implemented in response to future erosion events, as described in 4. above, including natural sand movement, manual sand replenishment, and dune planting. Additionally, consider District Plan Rule 6.6.1.3 regarding the anticipated loss of dune landform and vegetation within Outstanding Landscape Feature S24 as a result of the proposal.

Response

28. The area around the Three Mile Creek mouth has been actively managed and modified to mitigate the effects of coastal erosion and land drainage over many years. The creek itself has been straightened and adjacent land has been drained to make it suitable for residential development. In 2010 and 2011, significant coastal erosion protection works were constructed over a significant area from the Three Mile Creek mouth to the northwest. Prior to the construction of those works there was evidence of ad hoc seawall construction along the foot of the dunes using concrete telephone poles, old railway irons and wooden walls, broken concrete, wooden poles concreted into the top of the beach and other unconsented efforts at erosion protection by well-meaning adjacent landowners⁵. See the description and photographs in response to 4, above.
29. The erosion from the adjacent Three Mile Creek is a contributing factor to erosion in front of Glen Isla Place. The photographs on Page 6 of the **Graphic Attachments** to the Assessment show that the existing dune edge in front of Glen Isla Place is built up on similar remnant coastal erosion works, which would be likely to fail during an erosive cycle, as they did in February 2023.
30. There is a stark contrast between the open coastal seascape and beach, which are highly natural and the land at the top of the beach, including the existing seawalls and groynes, residential development and urban patterns, which are highly modified. The site of the

⁵ The author of this response named below provided landscape and natural character assessment services to the WBOPDC for the Three Mile Creek and Waihi Beach erosion protection works, including the presentation of evidence to the Environment Court in 2007 which ultimately consented the works. Photographs from 2007 are available to show the nature of coastal erosion at Waihi Beach prior to the construction of the coordinated and holistically-designed protection structures.

project is highly modified in comparison to the beach and the seascape, which is the area that is intended to be protected by the identification of Landscape Feature S24.

31. The active recovery measures incorporated into the project include the burying of the coastal protection structure, recontouring the dune and the planting of indigenous sand dune species which will assist in integrating the structure into the environment at the top of the beach.

6. In relation to comments made on cumulative effects, provide additional commentary on whether the increase in rock walls proposed will contribute to reaching a tipping point in the landscape's capacity to accommodate change along this stretch of coastline, as outlined in paragraph 6.48 of Te Tangi a te Manu.

Response:

32. The rock revetment seawall structures northwest of Glen Isla Place include large sand bag training groynes at Three Mile Creek and exposed rock revetment seawall stretching over a distance of some 1,300m in length. Further northwest where there is more room available and less apparent erosion, for example around the Flat White Café frontage, more natural efforts at erosion control, including planting and sand trap fences are being used to hasten the accretion of sand. Coastal protection structures and efforts are common at Waihi Beach from Bowentown through to the Esplanade at the North End, over 8.5km. Where there are suitable conditions including being able to achieve a suitable dune mass, coastal protection is encouraged through the management of natural dunes with planting and the protection of vegetation by restricting access to the dunes. Where there isn't sufficient room for dunes and planting or the conditions are not suitable, harder protection measures are required and have been implemented. Dune enhancement has been tried in front of Glen Isla Place and this was unsuccessful confirming that Glen Isla Place is not suitable for dune enhancement and requires a rock protection structure.
33. The GIPS coastal protection structure is 200m long and is comparatively subtle and sympathetic in its' design, providing sufficient room for future public access, should it be required and includes the burying of the structure, dune recontouring and planting. The dog leg arrangement of the wall which steps back away from the sea at the north end ensures that most of the wall will remain buried and only a portion (less than 100m) could be intermittently exposed.



Figure 3: Examples of Glen Isla Place post-storm dune scouring and natural dune accretion

34. Waihi Beach is not reaching a tipping point in terms of the cumulative effects of rock walls on the existing landscape. The identification of landscape feature S24 including areas of rock walls illustrates this point. The landscape at Waihi Beach will continue to change. In some places it will be eroded. In others, more protection structures are likely to be built. Some areas will build out with deeper dunes through sand accretion. As the landscape at Waihi Beach evolves and changes, the GIPS buried coastal protection structure will be a very small and subtle part of that change. For the most part the dune planting will be positive to those passing on the beach and any length of the structure that is exposed will be less than 100m in length (due to the dog leg design) and likely be only the face exposed.

7. The recommendation to use rock of "various sizes" for the rock revetment may not meet engineering requirements. Since the LVA effects ratings assume this, please confirm if varying rock sizes will be used. If not, remove this recommendation and update the LVA conclusions and effect scale.

Response:

35. The recommendation to use rocks of 'a variety of sizes' merely reflects the organic nature of the rocks themselves. They will naturally be a variety of sizes and shapes. It is not intended that rocks would be selected for landscape reasons leading to them being unsuitable for the purpose of the construction of the wall. Ultimately the engineering requirement for the selection of certain sized rocks for the seawall construction will prevail, as is the case for other coastal protection structures at Waihi Beach.

8. Update the design drawings to show that the sand crest at the north end of the seawall is retained and fenced off with temporary fencing, consistent with other protected dune vegetation areas on the drawings. This will clearly indicate that this area of dune vegetation is to be protected during the works. Additionally, provide confirmation on when it will be appropriate to remove this temporary fencing.

Response:

36. The construction drawings (Attachment G to the first WBOPDC s92 response) by Davis Coastal Consultants have been updated to pull the north end of the wall back from the groynes, following the initial s92 Request for Further information. Based on the revised extent of the wall at the north end, the sand crest parallel to the groyne will be retained and will not be excavated to build the structures. In the event that excavation happens in this area it would be a compliance issue. The adjacent access way parallel to the groynes will be required to be kept open for public access to the beach.
37. Should fencing be required then it can be undertaken at the time of the confirmation of the location of the fence for the protection of the seaward area of the north end of the dune, as shown on the Davis Coastal Consultants drawings. Such a fence could be installed during the construction phase to demarcate the boundaries of the area to be excavated and to protect the higher part of the dune create and the walkway access.

Concluding Response to Request to Update the Assessment

38. The WBOPDC landscape advisor asked for the Landscape Assessment to be updated to provide clarifications and to revise the conclusions. The preparation of an addendum (this response) to be read in conjunction with the original Assessment and the commentary in the first WBOPDC s92 response, is the tidiest way to provide clarifications and updates.
39. The theme of the clarifications indicates that the reviewer considers that the site of the coastal protection structure has elevated landscape and natural character values associated with a lack of modification and the identification of the S24 landscape feature in the WBOP District Plan. Clarifications have been provided in relation to each of the queries above.
40. The landscape, visual and natural character effects of the proposal are summarised as being largely positive in the Assessment. The (temporary) effects during construction are assessed as low adverse. Given that the construction of the wall is a necessary step towards the completed project and the subsequent positive effects, the project is appropriate in the context of the existing environment of the site and the wider landscape of Waihi Beach for the following reasons:
 - i. The open beach and seascape of Waihi Beach (including areas of existing coastal protection structures and groynes) identified within landscape feature S24 will not be adversely affected by the GIPS structure due to the limited scale and the proactive

mitigation measures, including the design and location of the structure, burying the structure, the recontouring of the dune and the indigenous coastal planting.

- ii. The landward side of the beach (the upper beach, dunes, seawall structures, groynes and adjacent residential development) is a combination of largely natural in some places (for example at the Island View Reserve) and highly modified in others (for example in front of Glen Isla Place, at the Three Mile Creek mouth and for a distance of some 1.5km to the northwest of the project site. The project site is in the modified part of the dune backdrop to the beach and will be consistent with other parts of the beach profile.
- iii. The elevated landscape and natural character values of Waihi Beach and the adjacent seascape will not be adversely affected by the construction of the structure (other than temporarily) and will ultimately be protected and enhanced with mitigation measures that are more sympathetic and effective than other public coastal protection structures at Waihi Beach, that is, the proposed GIPS structure is a better outcome from a landscape and natural character perspective.

41. I hope this response assists with the reviewers understanding of the potential landscape and natural character effects of the project. I will be happy to discuss, as required.

Yours sincerely



BRAD COOMBS

Principal Landscape Architect – Isthmus

Fellow and Registered NZILA TPO