# BEFORE THE ENVIRONMENT COURT AT CHRISTCHURCH I MUA I TE KOOTI TAIAO O AOTEAROA ŌTAUTAHI ROHE

ENV-2020-CHC-

**IN THE MATTER** of the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND** 

IN THE MATTER of appeals under clause 14(1) of the First Schedule

of the Act in relation to the proposed Marlborough

**Environment Plan** 

BETWEEN MINISTER OF CONSERVATION

**Appellant** 

AND THE APPELLANTS LISTED IN PARAGRAPH 1

**Appellant** 

AND MARLBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

Respondent

## SECTION 274 NOTICE BY THE ROYAL FOREST AND BIRD PROTECTION SOCIETY

#### OF NEW ZEALAND INCORPORATED

8 June 2020

#### **SECTION 274 NOTICE**

TO: The Registrar
Environment Court
CHRISTCHURCH

- 1. The Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Incorporated (Forest & Bird) wishes to be a party to the following appeals in respect of the Marlborough District Council's ("MDC") decision on the proposed Marlborough Environment Plan:
  - a. Minister of Conservation v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-42);
  - b. Aroma v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-45);
  - c. Te Rūnanga o Kaikōura and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-46);
  - d. Federated Farmers of NZ Inc. v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-58);
  - e. Nelson-Marlborough Fish and Game Council v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-35);
  - f. McGuinness Institute v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-48);
  - g. Port Marlborough New Zealand Ltd v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-49);
  - h. Trustpower Ltd v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-50);
  - i. The New Zealand King Salmon Co. Ltd. v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-51);
  - j. One Forty One (previously knowns as Nelson Forests Ltd) v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-54);
  - k. New Zealand Transport Agency v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-56);
  - I. Transpower v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-68);
  - m. Horticulture New Zealand v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-72);
  - n. Minister of Defence v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-76);
  - o. Environmental Defence Society Inc. v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-67);
  - p. Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Inc (ENV-2020-CHC-33); and
  - q. Marine Farming Association Inc. v MDC (ENV-2020-CHC-74).

## 2. Forest and Bird:

- a. made a submission and further submissions on the proposed Marlborough Environment Plan; or
- b. has an interest greater than the public generally as an incorporated society with a well known role in the protection of indigenous biodiversity (see Marlborough District Council v Burkhart Fisheries Ltd [2018] NZEnvC 26 at [31]); or
- c. Both.
- 3. Forest and Bird is not a trade competitor for the purposes of section 308C or 308D of the Resource Management Act 1991.
- 4. Forest and Bird's interest, position and reasons are set out in Table 1 below.
- 5. Forest and Bird agrees to participate in mediation or other alternative dispute resolution of the proceedings.

Dated 8 June 2020

William Jennings

Counsel for Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.

## Address for service of person wishing to be a party:

William Jennings / Peter Anderson Forest and Bird PO Box 2516 Christchurch 8140 Ph. 03 9405525

w.jennings@forestandbird.org.nz / p.anderson@forestandbird.org.nz

#### Advice

If you have any questions about this notice, contact the Environment Court in Auckland, Wellington or Christchurch

Table 1 – Details of section 274 party interest

Appellant	Provision	Oppose/ Support <sup>1</sup>	reasons
Minister of Conservation	All parts of the appeal except Appendix 2 and rule 2.9.1	Support	The amendments sought provide for protection and maintenance of indigenous biodiversity, align with provisions of the plan (including as sought by Forest & Bird's appeal) NZCPS
Aroma	Appendix 27	Neutral	Maintain a watching brief because there is the potential relief sought may not give effect to the NZCPS or Part 2
Te Rūnanga o Kaikōura and Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	-Chapter 5, Vol 1 -Rules 2.6.5 & 2.11.1	Generally support ch 5 relief, oppose rule relief	Ch 5 relief provides consistency with the NPSFM and RMA and gives effect to them and goes someway to protecting and maintaining indigenous biodiversity.  The relief sought in the rules contravenes Part 2
Federated Farmers of NZ Inc.	-All parts of the appeal except: definitions of computer register, minor upgrading, worker accomodation; Rules 2.3.16, 2.9.5, 3.2.1.3, 3.2.1.7, 3.3.52.2, 3.3.52.3, 3.7.13, 4.2.1.6, 4.3.49.23; policies 4.1.2, 14.4.2 - 14.4.7, 15.11 - 16.1.1	Oppose	Does not promote the purpose of the RMA
Nelson- Marlborough Fish and Game Council	-Terms – "natural and human use values" and "life supporting capacity, ecosystem processes and indigenous species of freshwater resources" and	Support	The amendments sought provide for protection and maintenance of indigenous biodiversity, align with provisions of the plan (including as sought by Forest & Bird's appeal) NZCPS

-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Opposition or support is qualified by Forest & Bird's appeal and where there is an inconsistency between the Forest &Bird appeal and the opposition or support in the s 274 notices, the appeal prevails.

	"management flow" -Chapter 5, Vol 1		
McGuinness Institute	All parts of the appeal	Support	Goes some way towards protecting and maintaining indigenous biodiversity
Port Marlborough New Zealand Ltd	-Chapter 8 Vol 1 -Chapter 13 Vol 1, except 13.11.2; 13.18.4; 13.8.5; 13.8.6 -New Rule 15.1.38 and 15.3.25 et seqZone Map 138 – W991 -Threatened Environment Overlay -W991 – Shakespeare Bay -ESMS 4.10	Oppose	The relief sought runs counter to Part 2 and the NZCPS
Trustpower Ltd	-Chapter 5 Vol 1 -Chapter 8 Vol 1 -New Rule Chapter 2 vegetation clearance -New controlled activity rule Chapter 2 -Standards 3.3.12.2 & 19.3.3.2	oppose	The relief sought runs counter to Part 2 and the NZCPS
The New Zealand King Salmon Co. Ltd.	-Chapter 6 Vol 1 -Chapter 7 Vol 1 -Rule 16.6.6 & 16.7.7 -Chapter 8 Vol 1 -Appendix 3 -Appendix 27 -Policy 13.10.3 -Policy 7.2.7 -Policy 13.2.3	Oppose	Is not consistent with the requirements of the NZCPS and Part 2 of the RMA and s 30
One Forty One (previously knowns as Nelson Forests Ltd)	-Rules 3.4 and 3.5 weeled or tracked machinery for harvesting within 8 m of significant wetland discretionary activity -Rules 4.3.13.13 and	Oppose but support the relief for mapping of significant indigenous	Is not consistent with Part 2 of the RMA

	4.3.15.12 - Forestry excavation, filling, in coastal environment zone -New permitted rule for harvesting existing forestry in Coastal Environment Zone -Significant indigenous biodivserity provisions	biodiversity	
New Zealand Transport Agency	-Policy 5.2.3 -Policy 8.3.8 -Rule 2.7 -Rule 16.1.26 -Definition of damming	Neutral	Some of the relief sought may not give effect to the NPS FM and may run counter to the requirements of Part 2
Transpower	-Policy 4.2.3 -Policy 6.2.1, 6.2.2 & 6.2.3 -New National Grid policy -Policies 7.2.5 & 7.2.6 -Policy 8.3.8 -Policy 13.1.1	Oppose	Is inconsistent with Part 2 of the RMA
Horticulture New Zealand	-Policy 5.2.4 -Policy 5.2.11 -Policy 5.2.13 -Policy 5.3.1 Definition of farming -Objective 15.1a -Rule 3.3.24.4; 3.3.25.2 (?3.3.26.2 new); 3.3.27.7 Rules 3.3.14	Oppose	Does not give effect to NPSFM and Part 2 of the RMA
Minister of Defence	-New Rule 2.7 and standard 2.9 Temporary dams	Oppose	Does not give effect to NPSFM and Part 2, requires further standards
Environmental Defence Society Inc.	-All parts of the appeal	Support	Is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, the NZCPS, the NPS FM and provides for ss30 and 31 of the RMA. Additionally the amendments sought provide for protection and

			maintenance of indigenous biodiversity, align with provisions of the plan (including as sought by Forest & Bird's appeal) NZCPS
Friends of Nelson Haven	-All parts of the appeal except	Support	Is consistent with Part 2 of the RMA, the NZCPS, and provides for ss30
and Tasman	Appendices 1, 2		and 31 of the RMA
Bay Inc			
Marine	-Chapter 6 & 7	Oppose in	Is inconsistent with Part 2 of the
Farming	Volume 1 provisions	general but	RMA and the NZCPS
Association	-Chapter 8 Vol 1	partially	
Inc.	provisions	support	
	-Rules in Chapter 16	13.2.1	
	Vol 2		
	-Policy 13.2.1		
	-Policy 13.2.3,		
	13.10.3		
	-Marine Mammal		
	distribution map		
	-Appendix 27		
	-ESMS maps		