

Proposed Marlborough Environment Plan

**Section 42A Hearings Report for Hearing Commencing 27
November 2017**

Report dated 16 October 2017

**Report on submissions and further submissions
Topic 1: General**

Report prepared by

Paul Whyte

Consultant Planner (Beca Ltd)

Contents

Submitters.....	iv
Others	iv
Introduction.....	1
Scope of Hearings Report.....	1
Overview of Provisions.....	2
Analysis of submissions	2
Key issues	3
Statutory Documents.....	5
Pre-hearing meetings.....	6
General Submissions on all of the MEP.....	7
Issue 1- MFA and Aquaculture NZ Submissions.....	7
Issue 2-Structure of the MEP	7
Issue 3- Miscellaneous	9
General Submissions on all of Volume 1 (Issues, objectives, policies and methods)	13
Issue 1-Non Regulatory Methods	13
Issue 2-Structure of Volume 1	13
Issue 3 - Miscellaneous	14
General Submissions on all of Volume 2 (Rules)	16
Issue 1-Structure of Rules	16
Issue 2- Marine Farms.....	17
Issue 3-Miscellaneous	17
General Submissions on all of Volume 3 (Appendices).....	20
Issue 1- Miscellaneous	20
General Submissions on all of Volume 4 (Maps).....	21
Issue 1- Miscellaneous	21
Submissions on Chapter 1 Introduction	23
Issue 1-Guiding Principles (Page 1-2).....	23
Issue 2- Structure of the MEP (Page 1-4)	24
Issue 3- Miscellaneous	24
Submissions on Chapter 2 Background.....	25
Issue 1- Identifying regionally significant Issues (page 2-1).....	25
Issue 2- Integrated Management of the Marlborough Environment (page 2-2)	26
Issue 3- Working with others to sustainably manage Marlborough’s natural and physical resources (page 2-5)	27
Issue 4- Relationship of the MEP to other policy statements, standards and strategies (page 2-6)	28
Issue 5- Issues that cross local authority boundaries (page 2-8).....	29
Issue 6 – Monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies or methods (page 2-10)	29
Issue 7 – How to use the MEP (page 2-12)	29
Issue 8 - Miscellaneous	30

Appendix 1: Common Template Submissions 32
Appendix 2: Recommended decisions on decisions requested 56

List of Abbreviations

Submitters

Submitter Number	Abbreviation	Full Name of Submitter
280	NMDHB	Nelson Marlborough District Health Board
401	Aquaculture NZ	Aquaculture New Zealand
426	MFA	Marine Farmers Association Incorporated
433	PMNZ	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited
710	FIS	The Fishing Industry Submitters
716	Friends of NH and TB	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated
768	HNZ	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga
770	House Movers	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Incorporated
922	NZDF	New Zealand Defence Force
962	MFIA	Marlborough Forestry Industry Association Incorporated
973	MPI	Ministry for Primary Industries
990	NFL	Nelson Forests Limited
1002	NZTA	New Zealand Transport Agency
1004	Oil Companies	Z Energy Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and BP Oil Limited
1044	PEL	Progressive Enterprises Limited

Others

MEP Proposed Marlborough Environment Plan

RMA Resource Management Act 1991

Introduction

My name is Paul Whyte, and I hold the qualification of a Bachelor of Town Planning from Auckland University. I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I have practised in the field of town planning/resource management since 1985, primarily working for both local government and planning consultants in Dunedin and Christchurch. Currently, I am a Senior Planner (Senior Associate) with Beca Ltd (Beca) in Christchurch. I have prepared district and regional plans and plan changes in Southland, Otago, West Coast, Marlborough, Canterbury and the Chatham Islands and I have prepared Section 42A reports for district and regional councils on plans and plan changes.

In particular I have prepared Section 42A reports for Marlborough District Council on the following plan changes- Plan Changes 26/61 Minor Amendments, Plan Changes 27/62 New Dairy Farms, Plan Change 47 Tremorne Avenue Rezoning, Plan Change 59 Colonial Vineyards, Plan Change 60 Maxwell Hills, Plan Changes 64-71 Urban Growth Areas and Plan Change 72 Marlborough Ridge Rezoning.

I was not involved with the preparation of the MEP. I was contracted by the Marlborough District Council (Council) in July 2017 (after the MEP submission period had closed) to evaluate the relief requested in submissions and to provide recommendations in the form of a Section 42A report.

Beca Ltd have prepared submissions to the MEP on behalf New Zealand Fire Service (now Fire and Emergency New Zealand) (FENZ) and Transpower New Zealand Limited (Transpower). I was not involved in the preparation of these submissions in any way. However to avoid any perception of conflict I have not made any recommendation on a submission or further submission made by FENZ or Transpower or where that recommendation is contrary to the relief sought by FENZ or Transpower. Where this situation has arisen in this report the recommendation is made by Liz White of Incite Ltd. This situation applies to Transpower submissions 1198.1, 1198.168 and further submission on EDS 698.1

Code of Conduct

I confirm that I have read the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses contained in the Environment Court Practice Note and that I agree to comply with it.

I confirm that I have considered all the material facts that I am aware of that might alter or detract from the opinions that I express, and that this evidence is within my area of expertise, except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person.

I am authorised to give this evidence on the Council's behalf.

Scope of Hearings Report

This report is prepared in accordance with section 42A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA).

In this report I assess and provide recommendations to the Hearing Panel on the following submissions under Topic 1 General¹:

¹ Submissions from Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society (715.377), NMFG (509.200) IA Esson (336.1) and the Oil Companies (1004.58) were summarised as "Volume 2 General Rules" by Council. These submissions are however dealt with in Topic 1 given their general nature, with the first two submissions dealt with under "Structure of Plan" and the latter two submissions under "Miscellaneous" in "General Submissions on all of Volume 2 (Rules)."

Submissions from NZTA (1002.278) and New Zealand Institute of Surveyors (996.36) were summarised as "Volume 4 Overlay Maps" by Council. These submissions are however dealt with in Topic 1 given their general nature, with the submissions dealt with under "Miscellaneous" in "General Submissions on all of Volume 4 (Maps)."

- General Submissions on all of the MEP
- General Submissions on all of Volume 1 (Issues, objectives, policies and methods)
- General Submissions on all of Volume 2 (Rules)
- General Submissions on all of Volume 3 (Appendices)
- General Submissions on all of Volume 4 (Maps)
- Submissions on Chapter 1 Introduction
- Submissions on Chapter 2 Background

As submitters who indicate that they wish to be heard are entitled to speak to their submissions and present evidence at the hearing, the recommendations contained within this report are preliminary, relating only to the written submissions.

For the avoidance of doubt, it should be emphasised that any conclusions reached or recommendations made in this report are not binding on the Hearing Panel. It should not be assumed that the Hearing Panel will reach the same conclusions or decisions having considered all the evidence to be brought before them by the submitters.

Overview of Provisions

This report assesses:

- (i) Submissions which are of a general nature that apply to the whole of the MEP or the individual volumes (Volumes 1-4) rather than submissions which apply to a specific provision within the MEP. Submissions also include those that cannot easily be assigned to a specific provision and;
- (ii) Submissions on Chapter 1 Introduction and Chapter 2 Background of Volume 1.

Chapter 1 sets out the purpose of the RMA; the changed resource management framework which has resulted in a single plan; a number of “guiding principles” that were used in the development of the MEP; and the structure of the plan.

Chapter 2 sets out the background to the plan including the criteria that are used for identifying regionally significant issues; the review process, the integrated management of the Marlborough environment; Council as a unitary authority, Marlborough’s tangata whenua iwi, Council working with other parties in the management of the environment; relationship of the MEP to other policy documents and strategies; cross boundary issues; monitoring; and how to use the MEP.

As indicated above the division of the submissions in this report generally reflects the manner in which the submissions have been summarised by Council.

Analysis of submissions

The number of submission points received on provisions relevant to Topic 1 are as follows.

- General Submissions on all of the MEP - **230 submission points and a 52 further submission points**
- General Submissions on Volume 1 of the MEP (Issues, objectives, policies and methods) - **197 submission points and 49 further submission points**
- General Submissions on all of Volume 2 of the MEP (Rules) - **211 submission points and 53 further submission points**
- General Submissions on all of Volume 3 of the MEP (Appendices) - **6 submission points and 4 further submission points**

- General Submissions on all of Volume 4 of the MEP (Maps) - **13 submission points and 16 further submission points**
- Submissions on Chapter 1 Introduction - **58 submission points and 58 further submission points**
- Submissions on Chapter 2 Background - **219 submission points and 69 further submission points**

A number of these submission points are in common formats.

158 submission points were in a common format in respect of the General Submissions on all of the MEP. These submissions relate to supporting MFA and Aquaculture NZ submissions.

170 submission points were in a common format in respect of the General Submissions on Volume 1 of the MEP. These submissions relate to non-regulatory methods.

173 submission points were in a common format in respect of the General Submissions on Volume 2 of the MEP. These submissions relate to marine farming.

181 submission points were in a common format in respect of the Submissions on Chapter 2 Background of the MEP. These submissions relate to a new issue recognising primary activities as regionally significant sectors.

Individual submitters who used one of the above common formats have been grouped as a single entry per relevant point in this report to avoid unnecessary repetition and duplication. See Appendix 1 to this report for a list of individual submitters who used these formats.

Key issues

The submission points have been analysed in terms of the general submissions on all of the MEP; the individual volumes; and Chapters 1 and 2. While there are some common issues across these different parts of the MEP, such as the structure of the plan, the issues have been kept separate to reflect the way in which the submission points have been summarised. Notwithstanding this, the analysis across the parts is consistent. The issues identified in Chapters 1 and 2 largely reflect the headings of the chapters.

There are also a number of submissions that are better dealt by other topics given their specificity and similarity to the submissions dealt with by those topics. The Section 42A report identifies those situations where this arises.

The assessment generally refers to submitters but not further submitters.

The following issues or themes are identified as follows:

General Submissions on all of the MEP

§ Issue 1- MFA and Aquaculture NZ Submissions

This relates to the submissions supporting the MFA and Aquaculture NZ Submissions

§ Issue 2-Structure of the MEP

This relates to the submissions on the structure and associated aspects of the MEP including enabling activities, effects based rules, references, consistency of terms, contents and rule numbering

§ Issue 3-Miscellaneous

This relates to the submissions on miscellaneous matters including scientific evidence, genetically modified organisms, agrichemicals, and Section 32 reports.

General Submissions on all of Volume 1 (Issues, objectives, policies and methods)

§ Issue 1- Non-regulatory Methods

This relates to the submissions requesting non-regulatory methods.

§ Issue 2-Structure of Volume 1

This relates to the submissions on the structure and associated aspects of Volume 1 including simplification of the plan and the layout of issues, objectives, policies etc.

§ Issue 3- Miscellaneous

This relates to the submissions on miscellaneous matters including freedom camping, use of specific terms in the plan, marine farming and the coastal environment.

General Submissions on all of Volume (Rules)

§ Issue 1- Structure of Rules

This relates to the submissions on the structure of the rules including activity status and classification, layout and legal effect of rules.

§ Issue 2- Marine Farming

This relates to the submissions on the continuance of marine farming.

§ Issue 3- Miscellaneous

This relates to submissions on miscellaneous matters including rules to address noise, open fires, cell phone towers, trees, house relocation, iwi matters and forestry matters.

General Submissions on all of Volume 3 (Appendices)

§ Issue 1- Miscellaneous

This relates to the submissions on miscellaneous matters including provisions for rivers, noise, forestry and farm plans

General Submissions on all of Volume 4 (Maps)

§ Issue 1-Miscellaneous

This relates to the submissions on miscellaneous matters including readability and index of plans, and commercial zoning.

Submissions on Chapter 1 Introduction

§ Issue 1-Guiding Principles²

This relates to the submissions to the Guiding Principles set out in the chapter.

§ Issue 2- Structure of MEP

This relates to the submissions on the Structure of the MEP set out in the chapter.

§ Issue 3- Miscellaneous

² Issues 1 and 2 are the respective headings in the Chapter

This relates to the submissions on miscellaneous matters including RMA provisions, Section 32 reports and National Policy Statements.

Submissions on Chapter 2 Background

§ Issue 1-Identifying Regionally Significant Issues³

This relates to submissions on what are the regionally significant issues.

§ Issue 2- Integrated Management of the Marlborough Environment

This relates to the submissions which generally relate to the wording of the section.

§ Issue 3- Working with others to sustainably manage Marlborough's natural and physical resources

This relates to submissions on statutory agencies and forestry and other resource users.

§ Issue 4- Relationship of the MEP to other policy statements, standards and strategies

This relates to submissions on the wording of various NPS and inclusion of other strategies.

§ Issue 5- Issues that cross local authority boundaries

This relates to a submission on Council responsibilities.

§ Issue 6- Monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies or methods

This relates to a submission on monitoring of resource consents.

§ Issue 7- How to use the MEP

This relates to the submissions on the use of RMA terms.

§ Issue 8- Miscellaneous

This relates to the submissions on miscellaneous matters including the effects of resources on one another and the term "natural and human use values".

Recommendation

Recommended amendments to the MEP are shown underlined and deleted text or provisions are shown ~~struck through~~ under the Recommendation heading in the report.

The submissions are accepted, accepted in part, rejected, deferred (in the case of submissions dealt with in other topics) or are referred to individual submissions (in the case of those submissions which support other submissions or overall submissions which support their individual submissions) in accordance with Appendix 2.

Statutory Documents

A number of statutory documents are relevant to the provisions and/or submissions within the scope of this report, including the Resource Management Act 1991(RMA), National Policy Statements and Plans and the Marlborough Region Pest Management Strategy, and are referred to where appropriate in the actual assessment.

³ Issues 1-7 are the respective headings in the Chapter

Pre-hearing meetings

There have been no pre-hearing meeting for this topic

General Submissions on all of the MEP

Issue 1- MFA and Aquaculture NZ Submissions

Submissions and Assessment

Austin Carolino (519.1) and 157 other submissions support the MFA and/or Aquaculture NZ submissions and seeks the same relief as requested by MFA and Aquaculture NZ. I understand that it was on this basis that these submissions were accepted. The respective submissions of these organisations and the relevant Section 42A reports should be referred to for an assessment.

Recommendation

Refer to the MFA and Aquaculture NZ submissions.

Issue 2-Structure of the MEP

Submissions and Assessment

A number of submissions, including those set out below, have queried the structure and other associated aspects of the MEP.

Kevin Wilson (210.1 and 2) requests a change in emphasis on enabling activities and for the beneficial effects to be stated. In respect of these matters the submitter does not identify any specific activities that should be enabled and the request would effectively require the MEP to be renotified. In my view the MEP is reasonably enabling to the extent set out in the Guiding Principles on page 1-1 and is an integrated plan that does not contain non-complying activities. The MEP does refer to benefits such as in Chapter 4 Use of Natural and Physical Resources. The plan is driven, however by Part 2 of the Act which in managing resources refers to such matters as safeguarding air, soil, water and ecosystems; avoiding, remedying, and mitigating adverse effects; and protecting the coast, rivers and landscapes. Similar comments apply to the submission of Khalid Suleiman (216.1) who requests more permitted activity scope. The submission of GR Shallgrass (185.1) who requests simplification of the plan and removal of parts of the plan lacks any specificity or detail. In these circumstances I believe the submissions should be rejected.

Beef and Lamb NZ (459.1) submits that the rules should be effects based rather than regulating actual farming activities. The submitter has made a number of submissions on detailed provisions in the plan and it is assumed that these submissions address the concerns in respect of this submission in further detail, but as indicated elsewhere in this report an “activity based” approach is not precluded by the RMA

Beef and Lamb NZ (459.11) also submits that MEP rules should be amended so that any measurements used are practical, part of the everyday vernacular, and can be interpreted by the community. Reference is made to terms such as Munsell units, water reflectance, and daily average carbonaceous BOD5. I note that the submitter has made more detailed submissions on individual rules, but in my experience the type of terms used are not uncommon in plans, particularly regional plans, and the scientific certainty they can provide are part of assessing effects on and monitoring of the environment. The methods however do need to be explicitly referenced in order to be enforceable. The methods may require farmers to engage specialist advice although I note that a number of the methods of implementation in the MEP include Liaison, Research and Information (e.g. 15.M.18, 15.M.21 and 15.M.22) which may assist farmers.

Chorus NZ Ltd (464.1) and Spark NZ Ltd (1158.78) requests the plan is amended to provide a consistency of terms and specific section detailing objectives and policies on infrastructure. Reference in the submission is made to different terms used in different sections of the plan to describe the same matters and there is confusion in Volume 2 as to the application of the Network Utilities rules.

I note that many of the issues raised are referred to in more detail in the submissions on other provisions in the MEP including Chapter 4 Use of Natural and Public Resources, Chapter 12 Urban Environments and the General Rules on Utilities and Subdivision Rules. The Section 42A reports in Topic 3 Use of Natural and

Physical Resources, Topic 17 Subdivision and Topic 20 Utilities and Designations should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

However as a general comment I do not believe there necessarily needs to be a separate section on infrastructure (for example it is not a specific Part 2 matter). Infrastructure is dealt with in a variety of ways in plans in New Zealand under different headings and in the absence of a statutory formal template (which I understand that MFE are undertaking work on at the moment) there is no right or wrong way. Reference is made to infrastructure for example in Chapter 4 Use of Natural and Physical Resources and Chapter 12 Urban Environments in relatively defined ways. Accordingly, subject to the more specific submissions on the various infrastructure/utility provisions I do not consider there is a requirement for a separate chapter.

In terms of the application of the Network Utilities Rules my reading is that the General Rules apply and zone rules only apply if a network utility is specifically identified in those rules. However I note this will be addressed in more detail in Topic 20 Utilities and Designations under Chorus NZ Ltd (464.31) and Spark NZ Ltd (1158.29).

NZDF (922.32 and .33) requests a table of contents, including page numbers and also labelling for items such as permitted activities and standards. I note that all the volumes have a table of contents and in the case of Volume 2 includes a General Rules table. I agree it will be useful to add page numbers and I understand this will occur when the MEP is finalised. Potentially a table of contents could be added at the start of each chapter but this is likely to be quite lengthy, particularly as the policy titles are relatively detailed. It is also unlikely to be such an issue for electronic copies of the MEP and accordingly I do not believe a table is required for the chapters.

In terms of labelling and cross referencing for a particular permitted activity with the applicable standards it is noted that the permitted activities have the same heading as the specific standards in order to guide readers (and which is similar to the MDC operative plans). However, I believe that further explanation should be added to the Introduction in Volume 2 to provide clarification.

NZTA (1002.289-.293) have suggested a number of changes including:

- Bundling regional rules. NZTA highlight that an activity may require resource consent under a number of rules which can be confusing. The submission states that the introduction to the rule relating to works in the riverbed in Chapter 2 on page 2-11, states that the rules do not relate to activities restricted by Section 14 of the RMA (the take, use, damming or diversion of water), but it is silent on whether the rules authorise the discharge of contaminants including sediment to water (a Section 15(1) (a) activity). It is therefore unclear whether discharges of sediment associated with instream works are authorised by Rule 2.7, or whether consent for this discharge is also needed under the "Discharges to Water" rules. NZTA understands that sediment discharges are authorised by this section because there is a permitted activity standard relating to it (2.8.1.4). However the submission states, this is not stated within the MEP and is therefore not clear.

I agree on first reading it is not entirely clear. However, I believe the reference in the Introduction to Section 14 is to remove any doubt that the rule does not cover taking, use, damming etc because of the potential overlap between the activities. 2.7 *Permitted Activities* then goes onto say:

"Unless expressly limited elsewhere by rule a in the Marlborough Environment Plan (the Plan), the following activities shall be permitted without resource consent where they comply with the applicable standards in 2.8 and 2.9:"

From this I believe that the rule is intended to say that unless the activity (including a discharge of sediment) is specifically limited elsewhere in a rule then it is permitted provided it complies with the performance standards. However given that the reference to Section 14 could cause confusion I suggest that 2.7 *Permitted Activities* is amended to refer to the discharge of sediment as a permitted activity. This appears to be the only "regional rule" that requires amendment.

- Contents at the front of each volume lacks usable detail, and there is no table of contents for individual chapters/sections, particularly as it relates to hard copies. I have addressed this matter above in NZDF (922.32 and 33).

- Extend numbering system so that the various specified activities such as Water Take, Use, Damming or Diversion are given a number e.g. 2.General Rules; 2.1 Water Take, Use, Damming or Diversion: 2.1.1 Environmental Flows and Levels. While I agree this would make the MEP easier to read it will add an additional decimal point to every rule which would result in 5 numbered standards e.g. 2.1.3.1.1 which can be difficult to reference. On balance I recommend that the status quo remain.
- Insert cross references between objectives, policies, rules, standards and maps etc. Generally I believe that additional cross references are not required. The issues, objectives, policies and methods of implementation and anticipated results follow one another. Generally the rules refer to appendices and overlays although as discussed above in terms of NZDA (922.33) I agree further explanation for the linkage between a particular permitted activity and the applicable standards should be inserted.
- Extend differentiations between district and regional activities to permitted activity standards. The submitter notes that the labels in respect of district and regional activities is useful and is supported but should be extended to permitted activity standards. I do not believe this is required as the status of the activity is the critical matter and there are standards that apply to all activities.

Aquaculture NZ (401.183) and MFA (426.191) state the MEP title should be changed to “The Sustainable Management Plan for Marlborough” as it is more consistent with the RMA. In my view this is debateable and I believe “The Marlborough Environment Plan” title is more appropriate and relevant given that it is about managing the natural and physical resources of the environment.

The Marlborough Chamber of Commerce (961.99) requests the withdrawal of the plan on the grounds of participation, consideration of those investing in the region, costs, technological /advancements and “smart and connected groups.” In my view, it appears that the plan has attempted to have regard to these matters given the Guiding Principles on page 1-1 and I believe the MEP is not so flawed as to require withdrawal, which clearly would involve considerable cost and expense. Accordingly the submission should be rejected.

Recommendation

That page numbers are added to the respective tables of contents of the respective chapters when the MEP is finalised⁴.

That the following is added to *Permitted Activities* on page 1-2 of Volume 2:

“There are standards that generally apply to all permitted activities and standards that apply to specific permitted activities and which are set out in separate lists. The standards that apply to specific permitted activities have the same headings as the permitted activities to allow for ease of identification.”⁵

That 2.7 *Permitted Activities* on page 2-11 of Volume 2 is amended by the following:

Unless expressly limited elsewhere by rule a in the Marlborough Environment Plan (the Plan), the following activities, including the discharge of sediment, shall be permitted without resource consent where they comply with the applicable standards in 2.8 and 2.9.⁶

Issue 3- Miscellaneous

Submissions and Assessment

There are a number of miscellaneous submissions which I refer to as follows.

William Scholefield (15.1 and 16.1) requests compensation be payable to landowners where MDC decisions devalue landowners’ land assets and remove all proposals that devalue land value, although the submitter

⁴ NZDF (922.32)

⁵ NZDF (922.33)

⁶ NZTA (1002.289)

has not identified or quantified the nature of the loss he perceives to have occurred. Loss of land value is generally not an RMA matter (as it is addressed in terms of effects) although Section 85 of the RMA addresses situations where land may be incapable of reasonable use. Accordingly, in my view there is no requirement to amend the plan.

Tony Mortiboy (43.4) requests a review board for the MEP. While Council could consider this suggestion it is a process matter and does not relate to the plan provisions. It also appears from the submission that the makeup and process of the board is not in accordance with the RMA and so would have a non-regulatory function.

SDO Laprida (218.15) requests the plan recognises aquaculture, farming, forestry, vineyards and tourism are regionally significant and Council needs to find ways to enable these sectors to grow. I note these activities are referred to in the plan as being of significance to the region (e.g. Objective 4.1, although aquaculture is not specifically referred to given that marine farming provisions are not included in the MEP) and the role of Council in respect of these resources is set out (e.g. Policy 4.1.1). The plan is one based on sustainable management and is not an economic document and as such, I do not believe it requires amendment in relation to this issue in the manner sought.

Marguerete Osborne (243.1 and.3) relates to the need for scientific evidence to back up claims, including forestry, beyond the evidence of staff; the requirement for further action on agrichemicals; and that terms be further defined. The submission lacks detail but I note the following:

- The Section 32 reports including documents referred to in the “Bibliography” indicate that a large number of technical and scientific papers were used in the preparation of the plan.
- There are a suite of zone based discharge rules that apply to the use of agrichemicals including Rural Zone Rules 3.3.22, 3.3. 24 and 3.3.27 and General Rules 2.16.11, 2.19, 2.21.1 and 2.23.
- In respect of terms, only one example is given (“relative proximity”) which is not referenced, but I note there is a definitions section for key terms and the rules generally appear to be precise in their meaning. In the narrative of a plan there are likely to be imprecise terms but whose meaning can be ascertained in the context of the wording.

L and K Oldham (261.1) and Wakatu Incorporation (1236.1) request that the MEP is put on hold until the aquaculture section is published. Essentially this would require a revisiting of Council’s decision to proceed without the section. While I agree it may enable a more integrated approach to be taken, I believe this is an activity that can be separated without significantly affecting the remainder of the plan. In addition, waiting for the aquaculture section will lead to further delay and expense.

McGuinness Institute (316.1) supports in part but raises concerns in respect of the removal of marine farming from the MEP and suggests MDC impose a tax on inputs such as salmon feed into the water space and for improvements in the reporting of permits to the public and better reporting by the Council on the MEP. The submission lacks detail (which the submitter has acknowledged) but the removal of marine farming from the MEP is dealt with above (L and K Oldham (261.1) and Wakatu Incorporation (1236.1)). The other matters raised are generally outside the MEP provisions and are more a matter of Council operation and as such the submission is rejected.

Beef and Lamb NZ (459.3) notes there are a number of references to pests in the plan including in the rules and Appendix 25 and that such provisions should interface better with the Marlborough Regional Pest Management Strategy (MRPMS). In particular, some rules restrict a number of conifer species, of which many are not typically considered pest species, such as Douglas Fir. None of the rules appear to reference the MRPMS. The submission notes that having pest management rules in at least three different places across at least two different planning documents is likely to cause confusion within the community, and accidental non-compliance issues.

In respect of Appendix 25 I note that the species identified relate to rules that enable the species in Significant Wetlands (Rule 3.3.27) to be sprayed for control purposes and so in my view it is appropriate. The use of rules for these purposes is referred to under Policy 14.2.2.

In respect of the conifer species such as Douglas Fir, I understand that these are included because of wilding conifer spread and their inclusion in the MEP makes them easier to manage in terms of planting, which is part of the forestry cycle. I understand that the MRPMS only contains Pinus Contorta in terms of

wildings. The MRPMS is currently being reviewed which could result in further species being included to make it more complementary with the MEP. As indicated above the MRPMS is referred to in Chapter 14 of the MEP in policies and methods of implementation, and overall I believe the two documents are able to be aligned.

It is however noted that the NES Plantation Forestry (which was only notified in July 2017) also has controls on wilding species. The plan cannot have more stringent provisions than the NES and I understand that Council will take an alignment process to remove duplication and conflict which will be completed before the NES comes into effect in May 2018.

Ron Bothwell 1054.4 states all provisions relating to forestry should be withdrawn and wait for the implementation of the NES Plantation Forestry. As indicated above, an alignment process is underway between the plan and the NES and in my view it would be premature to withdraw the forestry provisions at this stage.

Jo Kerry (811.1) submits that provisions are included in the MEP in respect of Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) including a framework to manage GMOs that are district specific. The Soil and Health Association of NZ Inc (1153.1) makes a similar submission.

It is understood that there is power under the RMA for a council to make provision for the control and use of GMOs through regional policy statements and plans (*Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc v Northland Regional Council Inc v (2016) NZHC 2036*). However GMOs are generally dealt with by the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 which is a separate act specifically designed for the management of these organisms by the Environmental Protection Agency. I understand that Council has traditionally relied on this legislation for any GMO activities. Accordingly I do not believe there is any compelling reason for a separate process to be introduced as potentially it will lead to duplication, overlap and added expense. Accordingly the submissions are rejected.

Sanford Ltd (1140.1) requests that during the officer's report on submissions that a Section 32 evaluation be undertaken of the benefits and costs across the full suite of methods ranging on the continuum of voluntary to regulatory in respect of the methods. Reference is made to landscape, ecological and natural character overlays.

I do not believe it is the role of the Section 42A officer to undertake a Section 32 evaluation as this is the role of the Council in the preparation of the MEP and in making decisions on the MEP. However from my reading of the Section 32 reports, a range of alternatives have been considered in terms of methods, including for example two non-regulatory methods (information and investigation) in the Landscape Section. The reports also contain a costs and benefits analysis. The guiding principles in the Section 32 report and the MEP itself (Page 1-3) include ensuring any regulation is in keeping with the scale of the activity and the use of non-regulatory methods where possible. A number of non-regulatory methods are included in the Methods of implementation in Chapter 6 Natural Character, Chapter 7 Landscape and Chapter 8 Indigenous Biodiversity. Accordingly, the submission is rejected.

The submission of Craig Basham (283.1) is in part support of the MEP but a number of issues are raised in terms of council operation and communication, building, HAIL areas and consultation. The submission lacks specificity and the decision requested in the submission is not clear. Accordingly at this stage the submission should be rejected.

Jessica Bagge (220.1) refers to cell phone towers but it is not clear from the submission what decision is sought other than the implication that should be further provisions. The Section 42A reports in Topic 20 Utilities and Designations potentially may address the submitter's concerns. I also note that the NES Telecommunication Facilities addresses the issue of radio frequency fields.

A number of submissions refer to support of their individual submissions (eg PMNZ 433.1; L and K Oldham 261.9, PEL 1044.24, Te Runanga o Kaikoura and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (1189.1) and NMDHB (280.1) or support all the submissions of other parties (eg G Barnett (257.1), D Hulburt (313.1), MFIA (426.192), GS.Wiffen (740.1), D Burkhart (634.1) and Hall Family Farms Ltd (141.9) which is noted. The respective submissions of these organisations and the relevant Section 42A reports should be referred to for an assessment.

There are also a number of submissions that are better dealt with in other topics given their similarity to the submissions dealt with by those topics. These include the following.

Warren Forestry Ltd (282.1) and Nelson Forests Limited (990.1) relate to forestry and are dealt with in the Section 42A reports in Topic 22 Commercial and Non-Permanent Sequestration in Forestry and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Nelson Forests Limited (990.1 and .2) requests that provisions are put in the plan dealing with applications that do not need to be notified. Reference in the submission is made to Section 94 of the RMA but this has been repealed. Given that the notification provisions are not straightforward and subject to change (a further amendment comes into force on 18 October 2017) I believe the appropriate place for such provisions is on the Council website and not in the plan.

Beef and Lamb NZ (459.2) request an alternative pathway in the MEP by the adoption of Fam Environment Plans. This is dealt with in the Section 42A report in Topic 12 Rural Environments and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Blind River Irrigation Limited (462.43) request the plan includes a method to further refine Soil Sensitive Areas and boundaries. This is dealt with in the Section 42A report in Topic 19 Soil Quality and Land Disturbance and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Chorus NZ Ltd (464.2) and Spark NZ Ltd (1158.77) have requested the term “regionally significant infrastructure” is replaced with the term “infrastructure” throughout the MEP. This matter is dealt with in the Section 42A reports in Topic 3 Use of Natural and Physical Resources and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Delegat Limited (473.75), Blind River Irrigation Limited (462.43) and Villa Maria (1218.83) submissions on further refinement of the Soil Sensitive Areas and boundaries is dealt with in the Section 42A reports in Topic 19 Soil Quality and Land Disturbance and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

NZTA (1002.270, 277, 288, 301 and 302) have submitted on renaming/replacing road hierarchy terms and transportation routes; provisions in respect of activities on roads; replace ‘the Act’ with “RMA”; and replace road reserve with legal road. All of these matters are dealt with in the Section 42A reports in Topic 15 Land Transportation, except for replacing the “Act” with “RMA”, and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

In respect of replacing “the Act” with “RMA” NZTA states various Acts are referred to in the MEP and by not distinguishing the RMA can cause confusion. I note that the Definitions in Chapter 25 defines “the Act” as “the Resource Management Act” and given this and the other acts are usually referred to in full I do not believe this change needs to be made.

Transpower (1198.168) requests that Volume 5 (inclusive of the NPSET and NESETA) of the MEP is retained. Volume 5 contains copies of national policy statements, national environmental standards and resource management regulations. While the submitter’s support is noted, I note that Volume 5 is included in the MEP for information purposes, and is not part of the statutory MEP for the purposes of the First Schedule process of the RMA. In any case, no other submitter has sought that it be deleted

Recommendation

That there is no change to the MEP.

General Submissions on all of Volume 1 (Issues, objectives, policies and methods)

Issue 1-Non Regulatory Methods

Submissions and Assessment

Anne Allison (510.6) and 169 other submissions, all in a common format, submit on non –regulatory matters. The submissions are relatively brief stating that ways should be created that encourage people and businesses to strive to be more sustainable and requesting that a wider range of non–regulatory methods are added to the MEP to build awareness.

The submissions lack specificity but I note that the MEP already contains a number of non–regulatory methods which are listed under Methods of Implementation in each of Chapters 3-19 of Volume 1. These methods include use of strategies, provision of works and services, monitoring, provision of information, funding and incentives, liaison with other agencies, advocacy and developing partnerships.

Given this and the absence of detail in the submission I consider that the submissions should be rejected.

Recommendation

That there is no change to the MEP.

Issue 2-Structure of Volume 1

Submissions and Assessment

A number of submissions have queried the structure of Volume 1 which essentially contains the issues, objectives, policies, methods of implementation and anticipated environmental results. For example the NMDHB (280.2) states that the objectives and policies should be merged and simplified to make the plan more workable and user friendly; Fulton Hogan (717.1 and.3) submits the objectives and policies be redrafted and not rely on an extensive explanatory text; NZDF (992.30 -.33) suggests a number of different changes including grouping objectives, policies and methods together or a table of contents for each chapter including page numbers and labelling); NZTA (1002.294) suggests better grouping of methods or utilisation of numbering for subsections; and Raeburn Property Partnership (1084.4) requests withdrawal of the plan and for it to be rewritten in a logical and easy to follow format respecting property rights following meaningful consultation with the Tua Marina Waikakaho Residents Association Inc.

In the absence of a statutory formal template (which as indicated above the MFE are working on) there will always be variations in the way plans are presented and is often a matter of personal preference. In this case the MEP is somewhat unique in that it combines an RPS and district and regional plan matters (including a coastal plan) in one document. The format of the plan appears to meeting all the requirements of the RMA and can be construed to be set out in a logical manner in terms of a hierarchy from Issue to Method.

I also note that the structure follows the structure of the operative plans. These have been in existence for almost 20 years and I understand that there is no evidence that the structure has caused costs to the community or that it has affected the administration of the plan provisions. While it is acknowledged some of the explanations supporting the objectives and policies are relatively lengthy this is not precluded by the RMA. The submitters have also not submitted any actual rewritten provisions and accordingly the submissions are rejected.

In respect of Raeburn Property Partnership (1084.4) the comments referred to in Marlborough Chamber of Commerce (961.99) above in General Submissions on all of the MEP under Structure of the MEP apply.

However, the matters of a table of contents/numbering for chapters and further explanation of linkages are referred to in NZDF (922.32 and .33) and considered appropriate.

Recommendation

That page numbers are added to the respective tables of contents of the respective chapters when the MEP is finalised⁷.

That the following is added to *Permitted Activities* on page 1-2 of Volume 2:

*“There are standards that generally apply to all permitted activities and standards that apply to specific permitted activities and which are set out in separate lists. The standards that apply to specific permitted activities have the same headings as the permitted activities to allow for ease of identification.”*⁸

Issue 3 - Miscellaneous

Submissions and Assessment

There are a number of miscellaneous submissions which I refer to as follows.

Totaranui Limited (233.35 &6) requests new policies relating to interpretation of “adverse effects” and use of “avoid”. Generally, in my view, the suggested policies in the submission are difficult to understand and are likely to undermine legal case law on these matters. Accordingly the submission is rejected.

Federated Farmers (425.150) seeks that any issue, objective or policy relating to coastal matters are included in Chapter 13: Use of Coastal Environment. In my view, it appears that most coastal provisions are in Chapter 13 but it is inevitable there will be some cross over with other chapters given the integrated nature of resources and activities. This is acknowledged in Chapter 13 (page 13-2) where it refers to other chapters and in these circumstances I do not believe there is a need to change.

Fulton Hogan (717.2) states the MEP objectives, policies and rules should address all activities, not just the “primary production and the tourism sector.” The submitter should clarify these comments as it appears the MEP does address other activities such as those outlined in Chapter 9 Public Access and Open Space, Chapter 12 Urban Environments and Chapter 14 Use of the Rural Environment. It is acknowledged that Objective 4.1 only refers to the primary production and tourism sectors but this appears to be in the context of the most significant activities in the region.

Keneperu and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated (870.1) requests a Freedom Camping policy. Given this issue has its own legislation (Freedom Camping Act 2011) and is dealt with by a Council bylaw (Marlborough District Council Freedom Camping Control Bylaw 2012, which I note is under review) I do not see any reason to include any provisions beyond the existing references in the MEP as it will result in overlap and confusion between the documents. No specific provisions are provided in the submission and accordingly the submission is rejected.

Moira Winter (955.5) requests that developments such as marine farms once consented, are allowed to stay as long as their owner does a good job and obeys the rules, with a rule inserted to achieve this. Leaving aside that the marine farming provisions are not in the MEP, I believe such a provision is not practical as a coastal permit for a marine farm has a maximum term of 35 years under the RMA. In any event it would be difficult to draft a provision that provides the legal certainty for an owner “who does a good job.” Accordingly the submission should be rejected.

PADD Investments Ltd (1037.5) states the plan will have significant adverse effects on the livelihoods of the people of the Marlborough region and requests “no changes to existing rights and regulations”. The submission is not clear in its meaning but it is noted that existing use rights are subject to the RMA (rather than the MEP). Clearly there will be some change to “regulations”, but in the absence of further detail in the submission it is rejected.

Raeburn Property Partnership (1084.1 and .2) requests removal of the word “prohibit” and any other word which has the same meaning as “avoid” from the plan. The submission appears to refer to these terms in

⁷ NZDF (922.32)

⁸ NZDF (922.33)

respect of the ability to develop land. Terms such as “prohibit(ed)” and “avoid” are specifically referred to in the RMA and able to be used in plans. In these circumstances and the lack of specificity the submission should be rejected.

Raeburn Property Partnership (1084.6) also requests every “taking” in the MEP is to be addressed by compensation. In this context the submitter appears to equate “taking” with a regulation which does provide for compensation. This matter is beyond the provisions of the MEP but I note that that Section 85 of the RMA generally applies to this issue. Accordingly the submission is rejected.

The Marlborough Environment Centre Inc (1193.139) have requested that consideration of the inclusion of provisions relating to Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs) are included in the MEP. The suggested provisions include identification of potential adverse effects and inclusion of policies to adopt a framework to manage GMOs that are district specific.

As indicated above in this report (Jo Kerry 811.1), it is understood that there is power under the RMA for a council to make provision for the control and use of GMOs through regional policy statements and plans (*Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc v Northland Regional Council Inc v (2016) NZHC 2036*). However GMOs are generally dealt with by the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996 which is a separate act specifically designed for the management of these organisms by the Environmental Protection Agency. I understand that Council has traditionally relied on this legislation for any GMO activities. Accordingly I do not believe there is any compelling reason for a separate process to be introduced as potentially it will lead to duplication, overlap and added expense.

Te Atiawa o Te Waka –a-Maui (1186.5, 17, and .28) requests that:

- provisions relating to cultural values/issues be included in all chapters
- provisions relating to terrestrial sedimentation on coastal water quality and benthic habitats be included
- provisions relating to the protection of significant areas of mahinga kai and traditional practices be included.

The submitter should provide more detail on the specific provisions it wishes to see included. I note that there is considerable reference to the type of matters identified in the submission in the MEP. This includes provisions in Chapter 3 Marlborough’s Tangata Whenua Iwi, Chapter 10 Heritage Resources and Resource Quality (Water, Air, Soil). While potentially these provisions could be improved more detail/clarification is required.

There are also a number of submissions that are better dealt with in other topics given their similarity to the submissions dealt with by those topics. These include the following.

Ernslaw One Limited (505.1) on forestry is dealt with in the Section 42A reports in Topic 22 Commercial and Non-Permanent Sequestration in Forestry and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

HNZ submission (768.1-4) on various heritage matters is dealt with in the Section 42A reports in Topic 8 Heritage and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

House Movers (770.19) requests that all provisions regulating the removal, resiting and relocation of buildings be deleted and rewritten to reflect the reasons in the submission. I note that the House Movers submissions on the specific zone rules in the various zones are dealt with in the Section 42A reports in Topic 10 Urban Environments, Topic 11 Coastal Environments, 12 Rural Environments Land and 21 Definitions and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation in respect of these matters. Generally there are not any specific objectives and policies relating to relocated buildings and accordingly no change is required for these provisions.

NZTA (1002.298) have requested that references to NZS 6803:1999 and a new method is added in respect of this acoustic standard. This matter is dealt with in the Section 42A report in Topic 18 Nuisance Effects and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation in respect of these matters.

Recommendation

That there is no change to the MEP.

General Submissions on all of Volume 2 (Rules)

Issue 1-Structure of Rules

Submissions and Assessment

A number of submissions have queried the structure of the rules. Federated Farmers (425.347-353) make a number of suggestions including simplification of the rules so that the permitted activity standards are provided alongside the name of the permitted activity; utilisation of all six activity classes in the RMA (ie permitted to prohibited); the permitted activity standards are revised and simplified to focus on adverse effects; prohibited activity status is only used when an activity must be avoided and a robust Section 32 analysis undertaken; the consent status of a land use activity that is not listed defaults to a permitted activity status; and the rules specify the policies that need to be referred to and there is a listed assessment criteria for all controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities; and defined terms are italicised. The Royal Forest and Bird Society (715.377) opposes the non use of non-complying activity status in the MEP.

NMFG (509.200) states the plan lists activities, and then relists the activities with the standards for each activity listed beneath which results in unnecessary repetition. DOC (479.150) requests that the rules chapters are amended to avoid duplication of rules and Fulton Hogan (717.62 and .63) has made a similar request and also for the MEP to provide for a range of activity statuses. The Royal Forest and Bird Society (715.377) opposes the non use of non-complying activity status in the MEP.

NZDF (992.34, .35, .60 and .92) requests that activity specific standards relate directly to the rule; all regional rules are provided for within the General Chapter; and identify words defined in Chapter 25 by an asterisk or similar.

NZTA (1002.295 -.297) requests a number of changes including

- § Correct the following recurrent reference in the permitted activity rule introduction statements. - *Unless expressly limited elsewhere by a rule a-in the Marlborough Environment Plan.*
- § List activity –specific standards under the rule that it relates to or use cross referencing.
- § In respect of the “Rules having immediate legal effect” tables at the beginning of chapters the submitter suggests rule headings (name) as well section headings and rule numbers are inserted to make the tables more useful or delete the summary table and identify provisions by other means such as grey highlight.

In the absence of a statutory formal template (which I note MFE are undertaking work on at the moment) there will always be variations in the way plans are presented and is often a matter of personal preference. In this case the MEP is somewhat unique in that it combines an RPS and district and regional plan matters (including a coastal plan) rather than separate plans. In respect of the issues raised in submissions:

- § Chapter 1 of Volume 2 does provide a comprehensive outline on how the plan should be read in terms of its integrated nature (including identifying district and regional rules) and rules that have immediate effect. Careful reading of this assists in the interpretation of the plan.
- § The inclusion of all rules (except for General Rules) in a zone does provide a “one stop shop” (rather than for example all the regional rules in one chapter) and reduces the need to refer to separate chapters.
- § I agree that potentially the standards could be included with the activity rather than separately stated but potentially this could lead to repetition. As discussed in NZDF (922.33) and NZTA (1002.292) above) it is recommended that further explanation is added to the Introduction in Volume 2 to better describe the linkages.

- § The plan utilises all activity classifications except for non-complying activities although it is acknowledged the majority of activities are permitted or discretionary. There is nothing in the RMA that precludes such an approach and this approach simplifies interpretation and layout. It is noted that Council retains the discretion to refuse applications under a discretionary activity status and in particular highlights the importance of the objectives and policies in the plan when determining applications.
- § The suggestion that the consent status of a land use activity that is not listed defaults to a permitted activity status would mean that Council would be unable to manage unspecified activities. Such an approach is more suitable for an effects based plans rather than activities based plan such as the MEP.
- § In terms of identifying defined words in the text I am of they view a more generic approach as discussed in Definitions on page 1-4 is appropriate.
- § The rules in respect of having immediate legal effect will be removed upon notification of decisions so there is little point in amending them.

Overall, different formats of plans will each have their own disadvantages and advantages. As indicated above, the layout of the rules is not dissimilar to the existing plans and accordingly there is some familiarity for users. In the absence of any compelling reason (and the submissions generally do not specify detailed amendments) and given the rules are in accordance with the RMA I do not consider it necessary to amend the format, although the plan is likely to benefit from cross referencing the permitted activities with the specific standards.

The incorrect reference in the permitted activity introduction statements should however be amended in respect of NZTA (1002.295) in order that the statements make sense.

Recommendation:

That the Permitted Activity introduction statements are amended by the following as appropriate:

Unless expressly limited elsewhere by a rule a in the Marlborough Environment Plan.⁹

That the following is added to *Permitted Activities* on page 1-2 of Volume 2:

“There are standards that generally apply to all permitted activities and standards that apply to specific permitted activities and which are set out in separate lists. The standards that apply to specific permitted activities have the same headings as the permitted activities to allow for ease of identification.”¹⁰

Issue 2- Marine Farms

Submissions and Assessment

Anne Alison (510.5) and 172 others request that developments such as marine farms once consented, are allowed to stay as long as their owner does a good job and obeys the rules, with a rule inserted to achieve this. As discussed in Moira Winter (955.5) above, leaving aside that the marine farming provisions are not in the MEP, I believe such a provision is not practical as a coastal permit for a marine farm has a maximum term of 35 years under the RMA. In any event it would be difficult to draft a provision that provides the legal certainty for an owner “who does a good job.” Accordingly the submission should be rejected.

Recommendation

That there is no change to the MEP.

Issue 3-Miscellaneous

Submissions and Assessment

⁹ NZTA (1002.295)

¹⁰ NZTA (1002.296)

There are a number of miscellaneous submissions which I refer to as follows.

Moira Winter (510.6) submits that a wider range of non-regulatory methods are added to the MEP to build awareness. The submission lacks specificity but I note that the MEP already contains a number of non-regulatory methods which are listed under Methods of Implementation in each of Chapters 3-19 of Volume 1. These methods include use of strategies, provision of works and services, monitoring, provision of information, funding and incentives, liaison with other agencies, advocacy and developing partnerships. Given this and the absence of detail in the submission I consider that the submission should be rejected.

Te Atiawa o Te Waka –a-Maui (1186.4, .6, 7, .18, .23, .27 and .29) requests that:

- all zones have a permitted activity rule allowing restoring and rehabilitating habitat provisions relating to cultural values/issues be included in all chapters
- provisions relating to cultural values /issues be included in all chapters
- provisions relating to terrestrial sedimentation on coastal water quality and benthic habitats be included
- all zones have a permitted activity rule in respect of pou or other structure/carving/sign
- provisions relating to restrictions on marae and papakainga which are “unnecessary hurdles” be removed
- All cultural sites of significance be protected by the plan provisions
- provisions relating to the protection of significant areas of mahinga kai and traditional practices be included

The submitter should provide more detail on the specific provisions they wish to see included and I note that from the summary of submissions more detailed submissions are made on specific parts of the plan. I also note that there is considerable reference to the type of matters identified in this submission in the MEP, including provisions in Chapter 3 Marlborough’s Tangata Whenua Iwi, Chapter 10 Heritage Resources and Chapter 15 Resource Quality (Water, Air, Soil). While potentially these provisions could be improved more detail/clarification is required.

The Oil Companies (1004.58) submit that a new section be inserted providing for temporary structures or equipment for scientific monitoring purposes within Chapter 2, or in each zone. The submitter does not specify the exact reasons for the request. I note that there is a similar provision in the Port, Marina and Coastal Marine Zones which I understand was inserted for coastal research purposes for organisations such as Cawthron and NIWA. There may be merit in extending these provisions to land based zones but further information is awaited from the submitter.

WI Esson (336.1) queries if the wording under Activity Status on page 1-2 of the MEP is correct in respect of granting consent to a controlled activity. Under Section 104A of the Act consent must be granted and accordingly the wording appears correct.

EDS (698.114) states that there is no specific chapter(s) with rules applying to the plan’s environmental overlays. While the submission states there are permitted standards or a different activity status for a particular subarea overlay or site, generally activities in the environmental overlays are not specifically addressed and refers to activities such as vegetation clearance. EDS seeks that a specific chapter(s) be included in Volume 2 setting out the rules framework for each environmental overlay addressing all relevant activities. The submitter should clarify the comments as it appears the existing rules in the chapters do refer to the respective overlays and achieves what the submitter is seeking, albeit by a different method. I note that the name of the overlay e.g. Flood Hazard Area, Ecologically Significant Marine Site, Threatened Environments –Indigenous Vegetation Site etc. is generally defined in Chapter 25 by reference to the specific overlay. For example, Rule 3.3.11.3 in the Rural Zone relating to indigenous vegetation clearance refers to the significant marine site and threatened environment overlays above and there are controls on forestry in respect of planting in relation to Outstanding Landscapes and Significant Wetlands (Rule 3.3.6.2). Accordingly, further clarification is required from the submitter, but in my view the current approach in the plan provides for a more integrated one.

David Wilson (290.10) submits that there should be rules relating to the discharge of stormwater to land given the sensitive nature of the receiving environment especially for urban areas where runoff can contain faecal coliforms. My understanding is that in urban areas stormwater generally discharges to water (rather than land) via reticulated systems. This type of discharge is subject to General Rule 2.16.3 which has a number of standards. The zone rules do contain provisions relating to the discharge of contaminants to land, including a default rule for discharges not provided for, and accordingly I believe that there are controls in place in the plan.

There are also a number of submissions that are better dealt with in other topics given their similarity to the submissions dealt with by those topics. These include the following.

Girl Guiding New Zealand (75.1), in their submission request guiding camp fires to be a permitted activity in the MEP. This matter is dealt with in the Section 42A report in Topic 13 Resource Quality (Air) and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Jessica Bagge (222.1) states that she would like to see some alternatives to LRV (light reflectance values) and will present options at the hearing. This submission is dealt with in the Section 42A report in Topic 5 Landscape and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Mark Batchelor (263.2) requests that the following rules be added to all zones relating to:

- (i) Existing trees within roads shall be retained unless they are replaced within 1 month of their removal.
- (ii) Any new subdivisions shall include trees planted within the road reserves and the applications for consent to subdivide shall include a landscape planting and land shaping plan including street trees at a minimum of one tree located within the area of the road reserve that is adjacent to each lot within the subdivision.
- (iii) Pruning or removal of any trees within street, reserves and other areas of public thoroughfare shall require resource consent.
- (iv) Any trees removed for the purpose of protecting existing lines shall be replaced by new trees.
- (v) Where any telecommunication or lines for similar purpose and electricity lines are being installed or replaced these shall be installed underground.
- (vi) Equipment, structures and containers associated with services and utilities located within roadways shall be screened by vegetation and coloured in low reflectivity colours [these will need to be specified in the rule].

Items (i) and (iii) are dealt with in the Section 42A report in Topic 10 Urban Environments and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Item (ii) is dealt with in the Section 42A report in Topic 17 Subdivision and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Items (iv-vi) are dealt with in the Section 42A report in Topic 20 Utilities and Designations and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Federated Farmers (425.375) also requests that all reference to the Munsell Scale is deleted from the plan. This submission is dealt with in the Section 42A report in Topic 13 Resource Quality (Water) and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

House Movers (770.20) requests that all provisions regulating the removal, resiting and relocation of buildings be deleted and rewritten to reflect the reasons in the submission. I note that the House Movers submissions on the specific zone rules in the various zones are dealt with in the Section 42A reports in Topic 10 Urban Environments, Topic 11 Coastal Environments, 12 Rural Environments Land and 21 Definitions and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation in respect of these matters. Generally there are not any specific objectives and policies relating to relocated buildings and accordingly no change is required for these provisions.

MPI submission (973.8) on future implementation of audited self -management programmes in the MEP is dealt with in the Section 42A reports in Topic 12 Rural Environments and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Nelson Forests Limited (990.4 and .6) submission on forestry is dealt with in the Section 42A reports in Topic 22 Commercial and Non-Permanent Sequestration in Forestry and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

NZTA (1002.179) requests new permitted activity standards and restricted discretionary rules are inserted in all zone chapters to address reverse sensitivity effects from noise sensitivity activities on state highways in accordance with an Annexure 1. This matter is dealt with in the Section 42A report in Topic 18 Nuisance Effects and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation in respect of these matters.

Recommendation

That there is no change to the MEP.

General Submissions on all of Volume 3 (Appendices)

Issue 1- Miscellaneous

Submissions and Assessment

There are a number of miscellaneous submissions which I refer to as follows.

Warwick Lissaman (255.21) submits that a new appendix is required that details rivers that are ephemeral and other rivers as defined under Section 2 of the RMA. The submission appears to request the physical identification of such rivers which in my view would be a major undertaking for Council particularly as the Section 2 definition of a river includes "*continually or intermittently flowing body of fresh water; and includes a stream and modified watercourse*" and would include unnamed tributaries etc. Rivers may also change physically over time. I consider the reference to the definition of river allows a case by case consideration of a river that is potentially affected by a provision in the MEP and a new appendix is not required in the manner sought by the submission.

There are also a number of submissions that are better dealt with in other topics given their similarity to the submissions dealt with by those topics. These include the following.

NMDHB submission (280.213) on the replacement of the term "dBA LAeq" with "(dB LAeq)" is dealt with by the Section 42A reports in Topic 18 Nuisance Effects and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

HNZ submission (768.69) on an archaeological requirements is dealt with by the Section 42A reports in Topic 8 Heritage and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Keneperu and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated submission (869.30) on a new appendix for commercial forestry replanting is dealt with by the Section 42A reports in Topic 22 Commercial and Non-Permanent Sequestration in Forestry and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Ravensdown Limited submission (1090.126) and the Fertiliser Association of New Zealand submission (1192.98) on a Farm Environment Plan/Farm Management Plan is dealt with by the Section 42A reports in Topic 12 Rural Environments and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Recommendation

That there is no change to the MEP.

General Submissions on all of Volume 4 (Maps)

Issue 1- Miscellaneous

Submissions and Assessment

There are a number of miscellaneous submissions which I refer to as follows.

Federated Farmers (425.777, .778 and .791) requests clarification that the planning maps (including demarcated landscapes and the coastal environment) have the status of “District Plan Maps” and can be amended in response to submissions; that where landowners have concerns with the accuracy of overlay maps that Council revisits these matters with the landowner; and that key stakeholders are involved in the identification of the coastal environment line.

In relation to the clarification of the maps, I do not believe it is a matter whether they are “District Plan Maps” given the document is a combined one. However all the documents in Volume 4 can be considered as maps which have the force of a provision in the plan, and which accordingly is subject to amendment by submission. The MEP makes it clear that Volume 4 forms part of the MEP (page 1-5).

In terms of accuracy of the overlay maps I anticipate this will be addressed in any individual submissions that are made on this matter. In terms of the coastal environment line it is my understanding that key stakeholders were consulted in the identification of the line (the establishment of the line is described in in Chapter 6 Natural Character (particularly Issue 6A, Objective 6.1 and Policy 6.1.1).

GDC Consulting (2010) Limited (410.1) request that the colour palette is amended to assist with zone identification. I agree that some of the shadings of the various colours such as green and brown are similar and would recommend that Council make the colours/shadings more distinctive when the maps are finalised (particularly as the zones are identified by colour only and not a notation on the plans).

Awatere Water Users Group Incorporated (548.142) submit that an index system linking individual maps to a page number is included. NZTA (100.278) state it is difficult to navigate within the hard copy of the overlay maps and suggests page numbers or sequential numbering of overlay maps.

I note there is a Table of Contents, the planning maps are in sequential order, and an index of places, roads etc is in place. In these circumstances there does not appear to be a need for a page number, although tabs for the overlays in particular, could be inserted when the plan is made operative to make the plan more user friendly.

The Marlborough Chamber of Commerce submission (961.98) makes a number of points in relation to the Maps including:

- scale of the plans of hard copy make it difficult to navigate around
- no “cross zoning” to allow growth for business growth
- no provision for “residential service retail” areas such as the new residential areas off Old Renwick Road.

In respect of these matters the scale of the maps appears to be satisfactory as individual lots are marked by cadastral boundaries. In addition, all of the zoning maps and overlay maps are available as a Council Smart Map which allows users to zoom in on each layer to any scale.

In relation to the other matters the Section 32 report on page 25 notes that *“there is sufficient land for both business and industrial development (either through infill or new development)”* and accordingly in my view it would be inefficient to rezone additional land. The MEP is informed by the Growing Marlborough Growth Strategy which critically analysed the need for additional business land.

It appears that the reference to “residential service retail” in the submission is commensurate with the Business 2 zoning in the MEP which relates to local neighbourhood shops. In this respect Policy 12.5.2 of

the MEP does recognise localised shopping and service functions that typically meet the day-to-day needs of the surrounding residential areas in Blenheim, and which typically are zoned Business 2.

In my view, the issue of whether areas for local shops should be rezoned in new residential areas should probably be market/developer lead or as part of a strategic Council process (which Council has gone through comparatively recently), in order to establish demand and location. Such development can be facilitated either by a plan change or resource consent (local shops would appear to be a discretionary activity in the residential areas) as the new areas are developed. A number of the residential growth areas are yet to be developed. However, I note that typically existing local residential strip shopping, originally established to serve residential neighbourhoods, often struggles in the face of changing consumer demand in which there is a preference for shopping at supermarkets or large scale format stores.

Local shops are therefore not precluded from establishing but any rezoning appears to be premature and potentially too directive at this stage, particularly in respect of the new residential areas. Accordingly this submission is rejected.

Clintondale Trust and Whyte Trustee Company Limited (484.77) support the retention of the Volume 4 maps, which is noted.

KR and SM Roush (845.26) submits that their decisions requested relevant to Volume 4 are included in the MEP. This is noted but depends on the outcome of the individual submissions.

New Zealand Institute of Surveyors (966.36) requests that the Overlays have place names to better orientate plan users. I understand that the ability to provide the information requested depends on the scale of the hard copy maps. For example, the flood hazard overlays which do have place names have a scale of 1:50,000 whereas providing this detail on the landscape or natural character maps which have large scale maps of 1:220,000 and 1:200,000 is more problematic. It is noted that there are Indexes which provide some assistance while the E-Plan enables users to zoom in on a property and search for information.

There are also a number of submissions that are better dealt with in other topics given their similarity to the submissions dealt with by those topics. These include the following.

Kate and Shane Ponder-West (368.8) submission on Forestry NES-ESC mapping replanting is dealt with by the Section 42A reports in Topic 22 Commercial and Non-Permanent Sequestration in Forestry and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

NZTA submission (1002.275) on designations in relation to amending the maps to take account of NZTA submissions is dealt with by the Section 42A reports in Topic 20 Utilities and Designation and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Rarangi District Residents Association submission (1089.18) on the Rarangi wetland complex is dealt with by the Section 42A reports in Topic 6 Indigenous Biodiversity and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Recommendation

That the planning maps are amended by making the colours/shadings more distinctive when the maps are finalised.¹¹

That the planning maps are amended by providing for tabs to identify overlays when the maps are finalised.¹²

¹¹ GDC Consulting (2010) Limited (410.1)

¹² NZTA (1002.278)

Submissions on Chapter 1 Introduction

Issue 1-Guiding Principles (Page 1-2)

Submissions and Assessment

Tony Mortiboy (43.1), Aquaculture NZ (401.2,.3and.4), Federated Farmers (425.2), MFA (426.2,.3,.4), T and S Culley (447.1), Chorus NZ (464.3), AJ and SA King Family Trust (514.1 and .2), Bryan Skeggs (574.1 and .2), Pinder Family Trust (578.1), EDS (698.2), The Fishing Industry Submitters (710.1), Friends of NH Haven and TB (716.1), Fulton Hogan (717.4,.5 and .60), Canantor Mussels Ltd and NI Buchanan-Brown (726.1 and .2), Guardians of the Sounds (752.1), Horticulture NZ (769.1), Jim Jessep (809.1 and .2), Kiwi Rail Holdings Ltd (873.1), Wainui Green Ltd (926.11 and .12), Michael Jessep (936.1 and .2), MFIA (962.1-.4), Marlborough Oysters Limited (964.1 and .2), Nelson Forests Ltd (990.158,.159 and .160), NZ Deer Farmers Association (991.9), NZTA (1002.1), Rodney Roberts (1077.1), Ravensdown Ltd (1090.1), Sanford Ltd (1140.2), Sea Shepherd NZ (1146.1), Southern Crown Ltd (1157.1 and .2), Spark NZ (1158.1 and the Marlborough Environment Centre Inc (1193.1) have all made submissions on the Guiding Principles (the Principles) and variously support one or more of the Principles, seek some amendments or request the principles are deleted.

The MEP notes on page 1-2 that *“The Council used guiding principles in the development of the objectives, policies and methods throughout the chapters of the MEP. These principles are the philosophy and values that underlie the content of the MEP but do not in themselves have specific objectives, policies or methods.”*

As such, this is a statement of fact describing the principles used in the development of the plan. Those submissions requesting amendment or deletion of the Principles are retrospective and accordingly difficult to give effect to. In any event, I believe that the Principles, which are somewhat generic, are generally sensible and rational and complementary with the RMA. However, the Principles do not in my view override the requirement for the plan provisions to be in accordance with the RMA. The submission of Horticulture NZ, states the respective objectives, policies and methods can be tested against the Principles, which while useful does not derogate from the RMA tests. In this respect, some of the submissions query whether the policies or rules meet the Principles (such as the commercial forestry rules). I believe this matter is best tested in assessing the respective policies and rules.

Some of the other submissions request more of an economic emphasis in the Principles and acknowledgment that in referring to the Marlborough Sounds as the District’s jewel in the crown”, reference is made to marine farming. In respect of the former matter, the reference to economic activity in the principle *“A healthy Marlborough economy requires a healthy environment”* appears appropriate in the context of the RMA and in relation to the latter point, the inclusion of marine farming does not appear appropriate given the description of physical characteristics i.e. landscape, open space, etc (and leaving aside the Council decision not to notify provisions enabling and managing marine farming activity which would make it inappropriate to include any such reference).

A number of the submissions from forestry interests such as MFIA and Nelson Forests Ltd, as part of their submissions on the Guiding Principles ask for a review of the rules in respect of forestry. This matter is dealt with by the Section 42A report in Topic 22 Commercial and Non-Permanent Sequestration in Forestry and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Overall, I am of the view that the Principles provide some useful and interesting context which can remain in the MEP without amendment, but that these provisions do not detract from the RMA tests when considering submissions.

Recommendation

That there is no change to the MEP.

Issue 2- Structure of the MEP (Page 1-4)

Submissions and Assessment

Laurence Etheredge (879.3) infers that clearer directions should be given for the use of the MEP and in particular how the volumes of the MEP correlate with one another. Notwithstanding these comments and acknowledging the concerns of laypersons, it is my view that the “*Structure of the MEP*” on page 1-4 is reasonably clear on how the plan works. The submitter has also raised the issue that the withdrawal of the marine farming provisions is not noted anywhere in the MEP and while it is noted on the MDC website, I concur it would be useful to add a reference in the MEP to this matter. This reference could be removed as part of any variation to introduce marine farming provisions.

NZTA (1002.4) states a clear statement should be added to “Structure of the MEP” (pg. 1-4) in respect of the purpose and legal weight of the “reasons” of the policies, given there is a risk that these could be interpreted as part of the policies themselves. In my view it is not necessary to take an over legalistic approach given that it is common for plans to contain reasons (given they are required for regional policy statements and are optional for other plans) and the objectives, policies and reasons should be read as set out in the plan.

Recommendation

That *Changed resource management framework* on page 1-2 is amended by adding the following statement at the end of this section

*At this time, the Plan does not include the provisions relating to marine farming, which are still subject to review.*¹³

Issue 3- Miscellaneous

Submissions and Assessment

There are a number of miscellaneous submissions which I refer to as follows.

East Coast Conservation Society (100.9) supports the MEP where it seeks to promote sustainable management and this support is noted.

Tony Mortiboy (43.2) suggests a new opening statement, which however appears to be somewhat opinionated and directive in respect of economic activities and not in an RMA context. I do not recommend its acceptance.

Aquaculture NZ (401.1) and MFA (426.1) state the Council should re-evaluate the various alternatives in accordance with Section 32. The submissions refer to making provision for aquaculture in appropriate places but as marine farming is not being considered as part of the MEP at this stage, the submitter should clarify this matter.

However from my reading of the section 32 reports a range of alternatives have been considered and the costs and benefits considered.

Nelson F and G (509.9) submit that Sections 6 and 7 of the RMA in the Introduction should be either removed or quoted in full. I tend to agree with this submission that all matters should be referred to in order to provide the appropriate context. However, in my view I suggest that the relevant matters can be included in the text of the MEP rather than quoted in full.

EDS (698.1) suggest amending paras 3 and 4 on page 1-2 to refer to NPSs and giving effect to the hierarchy of planning instruments. I note that the relationship of the MEP to other policy statements and strategies is addressed in Chapter 2 and in my view the suggested words are not required in Chapter 1.

¹³ Laurence Etheredge (879.3)

Recommendation

That 1. Introduction is amended by the following:

Section 6 requires the Council to recognise and provide for matters of national importance. These include matters in relation to:

- *the natural character of the coastal environment, wetlands, lakes and rivers;*
- *outstanding natural features and landscapes;*

...

- *the management of significant risks from natural hazards*

Section 7 contains matters to which the Council must have particular regard to. These include amenity values, kaitiakitanga, ethic of stewardship, quality of the environment, efficient use and development of natural and physical resources, intrinsic values of ecosystems, ~~and~~ efficiency of the end use of energy, the benefits from the use and development of renewable energy, finite characteristics of natural and physical resources, effects of climate change, and protection of the habitat of trout and salmon;¹⁴

Submissions on Chapter 2 Background

Issue 1- Identifying regionally significant Issues (page 2-1)

Submissions and Assessment

In respect of “Identifying Regionally Significant Issues” on page 2-1 of the MEP there are a number of submissions as follows.

JM McKee (477.1) and 180 other submissions request that a new issue be added to recognise that aquaculture, farming, forestry and vineyards are regionally significant sectors. I note this chapter refers to the criteria that were used to identify regionally significant issues rather than the issues themselves. As such I do not consider it is appropriate to add the proposed issue here. I note that the industries referred to are acknowledged in Chapter 4 Use of Natural and Physical Resources (with the exception of aquaculture). Accordingly the submissions are rejected in respect of this matter.

NFL (990.161) requests the section “Review Process” on page 2-1 is revised to reflect the history of consultation. The submitter appears to be concerned with the outcomes of consultation whereas the “Review Process” is focussed on the actual process used. I understand there was consultation with the forest industry but clearly the submitter considers the “aim ... to identify and resolve any substantive issues” as outlined on page 2-2 was not achieved in this case. However this does not make the commentary on the review process wrong. Accordingly the submission should be rejected.

EDS (698.3) requests deletion of the section on the "Review process" in its entirety and review and amend the background section to make it more streamlined and focussed. I agree that the section is not essential but it provides a useful element in respect of the Background chapter. In respect of a more and focussed streamlined process I believe the provisions are appropriate although I have recommended the “How to Use Section “ on page 2-12 is deleted further on in the report.

Friends of NH and TB (716.2) suggests some minor amendments in respect of the Issue-“*Does the issue involve a resource that is scarce, rare, unique and/or is under threat*” as set out below.

¹⁴ Nelson F and G (698.1)

This includes both natural and physical resources and ~~could~~ includes the limited availability of water in some parts of Marlborough ~~or it may~~ and include the habitats of ~~threatened~~ indigenous species.

While the suggested amendments are relatively minor it is my view the current MEP text relates better to the heading and no changes are recommended.

East Coast Conservation Society (100.10) supports the method of defining regionally significant issues, as it can be applied to East Bay and their submission seeks to address the MEP issues specific to East Bay. The support is noted.

Marlborough Roads (967.1) and NZTA (1002.2) support the criteria for determining if an issue is regionally significant which is noted.

MFIA (962.5) states that the regulation for plantation forestry be removed from the plan. This matter is dealt with by the Section 42A report in Topic 22 Commercial and Non-Permanent Sequestration in Forestry and should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

Recommendation

That there is no change to the MEP.

Issue 2- Integrated Management of the Marlborough Environment (page 2-2)

Submissions and Assessment

In respect of “Integrated Management of the Marlborough’s Environment” on page 2-2 of the MEP there are a number of submissions as follows.

NMDHB (280.4) request the addition of the words “health and safety” to the interpretation of “Integrated Management” under (d). Given Section 5 of the RMA refers to these terms I agree their inclusion is appropriate.

Fishing Industry Submitters (710.2) suggest amending point (d) and adding a new point on pages 2-2 and 2-3 as set out below, to recognise the benefits for New Zealand including social and economic benefits:

Natural and physical resources exist on different spatial scales, some of which extend well beyond Marlborough. Resources should be managed at a scale appropriate to the nature of the resource.

(d) That natural and physical resources cannot be managed without having regard to the social, economic and cultural interests of the community in Marlborough and New Zealand as a whole.

Generally I do not consider these amendments add anything to the MEP. Given the document is managing resources in the Marlborough region I consider the focus should be on the region and which is in accordance with the “regional” sections of the RMA (including the purpose of the RPS and regional plans).

Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association (504.1) requests the addition of a new point:

f) the sustainability of natural and physical resources.

In my view this amendment is not required given that the concept of sustainability in terms of section 5 of the RMA is acknowledged in Chapter 1 Introduction. In my view, this section is setting the regional context for the integration of Marlborough’s resources and the proposed amendment is superfluous.

David Walker (679.3) requests that integrated management in Marlborough accounts for all industries and infers that forestry is promoted at the expense of marine farming. No specific wording is provided and I do not believe it is appropriate to single out industries in the context of this section in the manner sought.

The Marlborough Environment Centre Inc (1193.74) requests that scientific reports, information on natural resources, compliance results and resource consents are able to be accessed more easily by the public.

This is not an MEP matter but I note that a large amount of information is included on the MDC website, including the Property Search Function which has a record of relevant resource consents and associated information held for each property

Recommendation

That “(d)” under “Integrated management of the Marlborough environment” is amended by the following:

(d) That natural and physical resources cannot be managed without having regard to the social, economic and cultural, health and safety interests of the community in Marlborough.¹⁵

Issue 3- Working with others to sustainably manage Marlborough’s natural and physical resources (page 2-5)

Submissions and Assessment

In respect of “Working with others to sustainably manage Marlborough’s natural and physical resources” on page 2-5 of the MEP there are a number of submissions as follows.

NMDHB (280.5) request the NMDHB is identified in the Statutory Agencies section on pages 2-5 and 2-6. Given that the Board does have a role to play in terms of health and safety, including drinking water quality, I consider it appropriate to add it to the identified parties in the MEP.

Fulton Hogan (717.7) requests the inclusion of an objective and policy in respect of MDC engaging with other resource users to monitor the efficiency and effectiveness of the MEP. In my view an objective and policy is not required in respect of this matter, given engagement with “resource users” is referred to on page 2-6 and monitoring of the MEP is referred to on pages 2-10 to 2-12. I note that the objectives and policies are focussed on managing resources rather than processes.

MFIA (962.6) requests that the regulations for plantation forests are a mix of regulatory and non-regulatory controls given that in the “Resource Users” section on page 2-6 there is no recognition of forestry resource users as being responsible and there are no non regulatory methods. I note that no particular industry is mentioned in the above section while non regulatory methods are proposed in the MEP such as 15.M.22 Research and M.15.24 Codes of Practice and Industry Guidelines in Chapter 15. Accordingly, the submission should be rejected.

NFL (990.162) also state there is no recognition of forestry resource users as being responsible and there are no non regulatory methods. NFL request the manner in which commercial forestry is treated is revisited to ensure equity between land users. The commercial forestry provisions have received a number of submissions and to that extent will be “revisited”, but this section of the MEP cannot give relief to the submitter’s request.

Recommendation

That the following is added to the bullet point list under “Working with others to sustainably manage Marlborough’s natural and physical resources”

- *Nelson Marlborough District Health Board¹⁶*

¹⁵ NMDHB (280.4)

¹⁶ NMDHB (280.5)

Issue 4- Relationship of the MEP to other policy statements, standards and strategies (page 2-6)

Submissions and Assessment

In respect of “Relationship of the MEP to other policy statements, standards and strategies” on pages 2-6 to 2-8 of the MEP there are a number of submissions as follows:

Transpower (1198.1) suggests a number of amendments under “National policy statements and national environmental standards”. This includes amendments intended to further clarify the relationship between national environmental standards and the MEP, to better reflect section 44A of the RMA, as well as the addition of a further paragraph summarising the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission 2008 (NPSET) and the National Environmental Standards for Electricity Transmission Activities 2009 (NESETA). It is considered that the submission helps to clarify the relationship of national environmental standards with the MEP, but the specific reference to the NPSET and NESETA appears at variance with the section, which is a generic reference to NPS and NES and does not contain further detail in relation to any specific NPS or NES. It is noted that more specific reference to these standards is made in Chapter 4 and elsewhere in the MEP.

The EDS submission (698.4) suggests a new section should be inserted on page 2-7 setting out the relationship between the different planning documents incorporated into the MEP. It is not clear as to what the “different planning documents” are. It may be that the submission is referring to the RPS, district plan etc. However this aspect is referred to in “Changed Resource Management Framework” (page 1-2), “Marlborough District Council as a unitary authority” (page 2-30) and “How to use the MEP (page 2-12).” Accordingly at this stage no change is recommended

Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association (504.2) request amendments to the final two paragraphs of “Relationship between the MEP and Long term Plan” on page 2-7 but given that the changes are not clear from the submission, the submission is rejected at this stage.

FIS submission (710.3) suggests that there should be reference to strategies prepared under the Fisheries Act 1996 under “Other strategies and plans” (page 2-8). Reference is made to this Act under Fishing on page 13-11 in which it is noted that MPI have the primary responsibility for managing fisheries. However it is considered appropriate for some reference to the Fisheries Act on page 2-8.

NZTA (1002.3) supports the “Other strategies and plans” section (page 2-8).

Recommendation

That under “National policy statements and national environmental standards” on page 2-7 the second paragraph is amended by the following:

“Central government can also prepare national environmental standards: technical standards relating to the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources. Such national standards provide an opportunity to promote nationally the use of consistent standards, requirements or practices. National standards prevails override existing provisions in plans ~~that require a lesser standard~~. A rule in a plan cannot duplicate or conflict with a provision in a national standard. National environmental standards for air quality, sources of human drinking water, telecommunications facilities, electricity transmission and managing contaminants in soil have effect.¹⁷”

That under “Other strategies and plans” the following is added at the end of the second paragraph

Strategies and plans may also be prepared under the Fisheries Act and Council will have regard to these where relevant such as in the management of marine habitats¹⁸.

¹⁷ Transpower (1198.1)

¹⁸ FIS (710.3)

Issue 5- Issues that cross local authority boundaries (page 2-8)

Submissions and Assessment

In respect of “Issues that cross local authority boundaries” on page 2-8 of the MEP there is one submission as follows.

Friends of NH and TB (716.3) suggests amendments to the third paragraph of this section as the text does not correctly describe the Council's responsibilities as a regional council under section 30 of the RMA, which according to the submission, is not to manage the coastal marine area but to promote integrated management of natural and physical resources.

This section in the MEP is about jurisdiction across boundaries and not the functions of the Council. Certainly a regional council is required to have a regional coastal plan under Section 64 of the RMA and as the section is factually correct I do not believe there is any reason to change it. Accordingly the submission should be rejected.

Recommendation

That there is no change to the MEP.

Issue 6 – Monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies or methods (page 2-10)

Submissions and Assessment

In respect of “Monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies or methods” on page 2-10 of the MEP there is one submission as follows:

Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association (504.3) request a new bullet point as follows:

Compliance monitoring of resource consents granted will take place, at the consent holders cost at least once.

This section of the MEP is referring to the monitoring of the effectiveness of the plan under Section 35 of the RMA rather than individual resource consents which the submissions appears to be referring to. I also note that monitoring conditions on resource consents will depend on the effects to be managed rather than the predetermination in the submission (“at least once”). Accordingly the submission is not accepted.

Recommendation

That there is no change to the MEP.

Issue 7 – How to use the MEP (page 2-12)

In respect of “How to use the MEP” on page 2-12 of the MEP there are a number of submissions as it relates to Use of RMA terms and in particular the following –“Enable, Avoid, Control, Manage and Protect” on pages 2-13/2-14.

Submissions in this respect have been received from Aquaculture NZ (401.5-.7), MFIA (426.6-.7) NMFG (509.10 -.12), EDS (698.5-.7), Friends of HH and TB (716.4), NZDF (992.1), NZTA (1002.299) and Sanford Ltd (1140.3) with a variety of amendments suggested.

It appears this section in the MEP is intended to provide guidance on how the relevant terms are used in the MEP i.e. ...”*the reader or decision maker can place the appropriate interpretation on the use of the word within a particular provision.*” (page 2-13) This includes advice on the relationship with classes of types or

activities (e.g. enable –Sections 9, 12-15; avoid-prohibited etc.); the term “control” in relation to rules and standards); and the necessity to read the explanations and methods to aid in interpretation.

A number of the amendments suggested in submissions appear to be based on various case law or wider philosophical interpretations of the RMA, which as indicated above does not appear to be the purpose of the section.

In respect of “Enable” the section refers to the origin of the word in terms of Section 5 and then refers to the difference between Section 9 and Sections 12-15 of the RMA. In this respect the section is factual and related to the use of “enable” rather than about Section 5 as suggested in the NMFG and EDS submissions.

In terms of “Avoid” some of the submissions suggest alignment with case law such as in the *King Salmon* case ([2014] NZCS 38) which noted that “avoid” means “not allow” or “prevent occurrence of”. However it is noted this case was specifically related to Section 5 of the RMA and the policies of the NZCPS and I understand that it is tempered by effects being able to be mitigated and/or remedied; the background against which the avoidance means to achieve; and adverse effects with minor or transitory effects may be allowed.

The inclusion of the terms in the Definitions Section as suggested by HNZ and NZTA are in my view too narrow rather than allowing interpretation through the various provisions in the plan and case law.

However, given that the terms have caused some debate and confusion and are somewhat superfluous given established case law, I do not believe their retention in the MEP is essential and could be deleted (it appears that no submission appears to have specifically requested this section to be deleted, although some submissions, such as the Marlborough Chamber of Commerce (961.99) requests withdrawal of the plan).

On the basis that the section is intended to assist the reader in interpreting the defined terms in relation to the various provisions of the MEP rather than an interpretation of case law or the wider meaning of the RMA, the section could stay. However, to avoid confusion I consider that the section can be deleted.

Recommendation

That the whole section “Use of RMA terms” under “How to use the MEP” is deleted.¹⁹

Issue 8 - Miscellaneous

Submissions and Assessment

There are a small number of miscellaneous submissions which I refer to as follows.

MFIA (426.5) states the document does not sufficiently recognise that the protection of one resource may have a positive or negative effect on another. In the absence of any specific examples I cannot comment further but I note that the objectives and policies are relatively comprehensive and the MEP notes on page 1-4 that chapters should be read in conjunction with one another.

Horticulture NZ (769.3) requests that the term “natural and human use values” is amended to “values”; “values” in the MEP to be defined as “*The worth, desirability or utility of a thing, or qualities on which these depend*”; ensure that all values that exist are included and taken into account in the MEP; and amend Appendix 5 to include and recognise values of water resource units including food production values.

In my view the term “natural and human use values” is a generic one that is relatively well understood and for example can be construed to cover matters in Appendix 1 to the NPS Freshwater. I do not believe there is a requirement for a definition and the suggested definition put forward could cause uncertainty given its generic nature.

The submission in respect of Appendix 5 is also dealt with in Horticulture NZ (769.135) and the Section 42A report in Topic 13 Resource Water Quality should be referred to for the relevant assessment and recommendation.

¹⁹ Marlborough Chamber of Commerce (961.99)

Recommendation

That there is no change to the MEP.

Appendix 1: Common Template Submissions

Submitters who submitted one or more of the following standard-text submissions are listed below in the following tables:

Table 1: List of “Marine Farmers Association and Aquaculture New Zealand” Format submitters

Submitter Number	Submitter point	Submitter Name
519	1	Austin Carolino
521	1	Audrey Craig
522	1	Alicia de Leen
525	1	Harmony Haira
527	1	Anne Greig
528	1	Allan John Climo
533	1	Hamish Harvey
537	1	Alistair Simmons
545	1	Aquaculture Direct Limited
547	1	Aroma New Zealand Limited
550	1	Belinda Allen
553	1	Brendon Carl Pedersen
554	1	Bruce Cardwell
556	1	Brad Joseph McNeill
561	1	Bruce Lock
566	1	Bevan Payton
567	1	Benjamin Per
568	1	Bevan Gordon Reid
570	1	Blair Taylor
571	1	BDM Management Limited
577	1	Carl Anthony Schluter
581	1	Campbell Bowis
585	1	Christopher Donaldson

589	1	Chase Harrison
597	1	Colin Ronald and Tom Ronald Norton
602	1	Colleen Robbins
604	1	Brian Godsiff
608	1	Beal Family Trust
609	1	Blom Ventures Limited and White Gold Enterprice
619	1	Alex Khadzhi
622	1	Christine Margret Satherley
623	1	Andrew Robertson
642	1	Daniel Boa
646	1	Dylan Goulding
647	1	Douglas Guy
648	1	D C Hemphill
650	1	Dean Higgins
652	1	Jaquery Dale
666	1	Dave Norton
670	1	Dean Reynish
671	1	Daniel Sandrey
672	1	Donald Bruce Simpson
673	1	Debbie Stone
674	1	Daryl Teale
684	1	Donaghys Limited
691	1	Emma Hunter
700	1	ENZAQ Aquaculture New Zealand Limited
714	1	Hayden Goulding
718	1	Gillian Ann Powley
725	1	Gena Cockerell
728	1	Graeme Henry Clarke
730	1	Gabrielle Jane Pooley

740	1	Geoffrey St Clair Wiffen
742	1	Gordon Smith
744	1	Taylor Partnership
747	1	GAL Partnership
754	1	Hung Nguyen
762	1	Huu Van Tang
763	1	Harman Moanoroa Wallace
765	1	Heath Webb
771	1	Ian Beer
775	1	Imelda McCarthy
780	1	John A Wilkins
782	1	James Baker
783	1	Juliet Barton
785	1	John Bloomfield
791	1	Jonathon Cameron
792	1	Joanne Rebecca Clarke
794	1	Jacob Collins
797	1	Johnathan Dean Arbuckle
798	1	Joanne Evalyn Cook
800	1	Jonathan Everett
801	1	John Gallagher
802	1	Janice Hahn
806	1	Jamie Hrstich
810	1	Jason Khon Beo
818	1	John Andrew McGregor
819	1	Jason McKay
821	1	Jo Noonan
822	1	Johanna O'Connell
823	1	John Paul Tejero

828	1	Jimmy Simpson
830	1	Julie Solly
832	1	Jerome Tejero
837	1	Jonathan William Hodges
838	1	Jim Wallace
841	1	Jacobson Marine Farms Limited
850	1	Kyle Gribben
853	1	Vanessa Hyslop
859	1	Koherangi Pui
860	1	Ku Ra
862	1	Kris Solly
880	1	Lovey Filimoeatu
882	1	Lydia B Harvey
883	1	Lavinia Holland
891	1	Lynn Scaife
893	1	Liam Solly
894	1	Lily Tamaiparea
895	1	Lisita Tangataevaha
897	1	Luom Thikim
898	1	Luke Thompson
899	1	Lin Vouch
900	1	Long Vu
913	1	Michael Bourke
920	1	Martin Cunniffe
924	1	Matthew Emms
930	1	Maria Hemara
931	1	Michael Holland
945	1	Mick Norton
954	1	Michael Wilson

956	1	Michelle Xiucin Qiu
957	1	Madsen Marine Limited
978	1	Nick Carter
979	1	Nolan Day
983	1	Nicholas James Hearn
986	1	Ngapaka P Rangitakatu
1012	1	Phillip Blaylock
1013	1	Paul Claridge
1014	1	Paul Dargan
1028	1	Phoebe Shand
1030	1	Paul Smythe
1032	1	Paul Starkey
1040	1	Port Aquaculture Limited
1046	1	Quality Equipment Nelson
1052	1	Robin Bruce and Valerie Annette Harris
1058	1	Ross MacDonald
1062	1	Rebecca Floyd
1064	1	Roger Glendenning
1065	1	Robin Harris
1078	1	Rebecca Spooner
1081	1	Rosie Turner
1092	1	REM Limited
1102	1	Scott Archer
1104	1	Simon Barnett
1106	1	Shane Bennett
1110	1	Sam Clay
1123	1	Shayne Kerr
1129	1	Steve O'Neill
1132	1	Sokhom Pich

1133	1	Simon Pooley
1134	1	Sebastian Shand
1136	1	Steven Thomas
1137	1	Sam Thompson
1141	1	Sapphire Shand
1161	1	Susan Foster
1163	1	Trevor Brian Satherley
1167	1	Tiwini Hippolite
1174	1	Trang Ngo
1176	1	Tan Pham
1180	1	Trung Nguyen
1182	1	Tim Young
1183	1	TAB Services Limited
1204	1	United Fisheries Holdings Limited
1204	2	United Fisheries Holdings Limited
1205	1	Valerie Annette Harris
1206	1	Vicky Clark
1207	1	Vicki Maree Evrard
1208	1	Vivienne Forrester
1210	1	Vaughan Hugh Ellis
1212	1	Van Nguyen
1213	1	Vaughan Paul Warburton
1215	1	Vincent Redwood
1217	1	Venture 353 Limited
1220	1	Wayne Kelvin Benny
1223	1	Wayne Herd
1229	1	Wiremu Rowberry
1256	1	Gary and Ellen Orchard

Table 2: List of “Non Regulatory” Format submitters

Submitter Number	Submitter point	Submitter Name
510	6	Anne Allison
535	6	Adele Riddle
538	6	Andre Smith
539	6	Allen Steele
540	6	Arthur Stewart
541	6	Akiwa Te Uatuku
543	6	Alistair Willis
549	6	Bryan Albrey
551	6	Ben Armstrong
555	6	Blair Glover
559	6	Belinda Jones
560	6	Brian Lee
562	6	Brendon Lucas
564	6	Belinda Materoa
565	6	Brent Mathews
576	6	Chee Ong Chin
582	6	Cory Burnett
583	6	Carmay Cheong
584	6	Corey Dixon
588	6	Christopher Hall
590	6	Cameron Harvey
593	6	Chang-Seog Jeon
595	6	Clayton McIntyre
600	6	Connor Rangi
603	6	Chee Song Chin
606	6	Cindy Steele

607	6	Cadeena Tepu
611	6	Carla Velez
620	6	Brook Lines
621	6	Becki Findlayson
624	6	Carol-Ann Herbert
625	6	Cheryl Harris
627	6	Carl Scholefield
628	6	Clinton Nott
649	6	Dave Herbert
654	6	David Jones
655	6	Dhaneshkar Karunakaran
656	6	David King
658	6	Dan Lawrence
659	6	Donald M Curie
660	6	Daniel Manson
661	6	Denis Marfell
663	6	Dion McCauley
664	6	Dellae McKenzie
665	6	Dorothy McManaway
667	6	Daniel Paget
677	6	Daniel Walker
678	6	David Horton
680	6	Delwynne Horton
694	6	Elin Shin
703	6	Faye Fosbender
704	6	Febe Jones
705	6	Fay Mathews
708	6	Filisita Tuese
709	6	Ian Dunlop

721	6	Grant Boyd
722	6	Gaik Choo Tan
729	6	Graham Hayter
731	6	Grace Jones
734	6	Gail Learmonth
737	6	Gareth McIlroy
741	6	Glen Slipper
745	6	Graeme Tregidga
753	6	Hope Lagden
756	6	Hye Sug Ha
758	6	Holly Stanford
759	6	Hudson Steele
760	6	Hui Ting Ng
761	6	Hilda Timoti
773	6	Iosua Kaisara
781	6	Johann Adam
784	6	Jackie Biggs
787	6	Jo Braven
793	6	John Cleal
796	6	John Craddock
799	6	June Ethel Epere
803	6	John Healy
804	6	Jordan Herbert
805	6	James Higgin
807	6	Jeremy Hunter
812	6	Jungmin Ko
814	6	Jeong Lye Jeon
817	6	Jemma McCowan
825	6	Jo-Ann Rickard

826	6	Jade Riri
829	6	Jason Smith
831	6	Jim Taylor
834	6	Jarod Udy
836	6	James William Epere
845	24	Kenneth R and Sara M Roush
851	6	Kevin Hawkins
856	6	Karen Mant
857	6	Kowhai Millan
863	6	Karen Soloman
877	6	Lynette Ashby
878	6	Lyndon Daymond
881	6	Laisa Gibbins
884	6	Laura Jillian Moleta-Bentham
885	6	Les McClung
886	6	Linda McGee
887	6	Lauren Mitchell
888	6	Pang Lily
889	6	Lavina Rickard
892	6	Lynda Simpson
901	6	Lo Wai Wing
902	6	Lewis Ward
912	6	Myken Augustine
914	6	Michael Burne
918	6	Maree Cleal
926	6	Wainui Green 2015 Limited
927	6	Mark Gillard
929	6	Mandy Hargood
941	6	Marion Marfell

942	6	Marie Mitchell
943	6	Martina Naplawa
948	6	Melissa Smith
951	6	Michael Wallace
953	6	Mark Whittall
976	6	Norazizah Abu Yazid
982	6	Nathan Grey
985	6	Niki McCulloch
988	6	Nathan Wallace
989	6	Natasha Watts
1008	6	Philip Anthony Hawke
1026	6	Patricia Riri
1029	6	Peter Shirley
1031	6	Peter Snape
1053	6	Roger Bee
1055	6	Rory Bryant
1057	6	Roger Dippie
1063	6	Riley George Barnes MacPherson
1067	6	Renee Heta
1072	6	Rob MacGibbon
1073	6	Robert Murdoch
1079	6	Rachel Stanford
1080	6	Rata Steele
1097	6	Sonya Ferguson
1103	6	Stuart Barnes
1108	6	Shane Bray
1113	6	Sivanathan Devaraj
1115	6	Steve Dyer
1116	6	Stuart Edward Borrie

1119	6	Sharon Hill
1120	6	Stewart Holdem
1122	6	Steven John Bickley
1127	6	Soon Ng
1128	6	Sam Oliver
1130	6	Sook Peng Lim
1131	6	Susana Pereyra
1138	6	Shane Turnbull
1139	6	Sarah Williams
1144	6	Scott Foster
1168	6	Tony Jones
1170	6	Tama Lindsay
1172	6	Tyler Materoa
1175	6	Tracy O'Grady
1177	6	Thien Soong Wong
1178	6	Teresa Shaw
1181	6	Tiare Tautari
1211	6	Vaughan Hall
1221	6	Wayne de Joux
1224	6	P Wood
1225	6	Wayne Hollis
1226	6	William Kingi
1227	6	Warwick Neame
1238	1	Windermere Forests Limited
1241	6	Yong Hee Son
1243	6	Zane Charman
1247	6	Robert Walker
1252	6	Frank Prendeville

Table 3: List of “Marine Farm” Format submitters

Submitter Number	Submitter point	Submitter Name
510	5	Anne Allison
535	5	Adele Riddle
538	5	Andre Smith
539	5	Allen Steele
540	5	Arthur Stewart
541	5	Akiwa Te Uatuku
543	5	Alistair Willis
549	5	Bryan Albrey
551	5	Ben Armstrong
555	5	Blair Glover
559	5	Belinda Jones
560	5	Brian Lee
562	5	Brendon Lucas
564	5	Belinda Materoa
565	5	Brent Mathews
576	5	Chee Ong Chin
582	5	Cory Burnett
583	5	Carmay Cheong
584	5	Corey Dixon
588	5	Christopher Hall
590	5	Cameron Harvey
593	5	Chang-Seog Jeon
595	5	Clayton McIntyre
600	5	Connor Rangi
603	5	Chee Song Chin
606	5	Cindy Steele

607	5	Cadeena Tepu
611	5	Carla Velez
618	5	Brad Lewis
620	5	Brook Lines
621	5	Becki Findlayson
624	5	Carol-Ann Herbert
625	5	Cheryl Harris
627	5	Carl Scholefield
628	5	Clinton Nott
649	5	Dave Herbert
654	5	David Jones
655	5	Dhaneshkar Karunakaran
656	5	David King
658	5	Dan Lawrence
659	5	Donald M Curie
660	5	Daniel Manson
661	5	Denis Marfell
663	5	Dion McCauley
664	5	Dellae McKenzie
665	5	Dorothy McManaway
667	5	Daniel Paget
677	5	Daniel Walker
678	5	David Horton
680	5	Delwynne Horton
694	5	Elin Shin
703	5	Faye Fosbender
704	5	Febe Jones
705	5	Fay Mathews
708	5	Filisita Tuese

709	5	Ian Dunlop
721	5	Grant Boyd
722	5	Gaik Choo Tan
729	5	Graham Hayter
731	5	Grace Jones
734	5	Gail Learmonth
737	5	Gareth McIlroy
738	1	Glenda Vera Robb
741	5	Glen Slipper
745	5	Graeme Tregidga
753	5	Hope Lagden
756	5	Hye Sug Ha
758	5	Holly Stanford
759	5	Hudson Steele
760	5	Hui Ting Ng
761	5	Hilda Timoti
773	5	Iosua Kaisara
781	5	Johann Adam
784	5	Jackie Biggs
787	5	Jo Braven
793	5	John Cleal
796	5	John Craddock
799	5	June Ethel Epere
803	5	John Healy
804	5	Jordan Herbert
805	5	James Higgin
807	5	Jeremy Hunter
812	5	Jungmin Ko
814	5	Jeong Lye Jeon

817	5	Jemma McCowan
825	5	Jo-Ann Rickard
826	5	Jade Riri
829	5	Jason Smith
831	5	Jim Taylor
834	5	Jarod Udy
836	5	James William Epere
845	25	Kenneth R and Sara M Roush
851	5	Kevin Hawkins
856	5	Karen Mant
857	5	Kowhai Millan
863	5	Karen Soloman
877	5	Lynette Ashby
878	5	Lyndon Daymond
881	5	Laisa Gibbins
884	5	Laura Jillian Moleta-Bentham
885	5	Les McClung
886	5	Linda McGee
887	5	Lauren Mitchell
888	5	Pang Lily
889	5	Lavina Rickard
892	5	Lynda Simpson
901	5	Lo Wai Wing
902	5	Lewis Ward
912	5	Myken Augustine
914	5	Michael Burne
918	5	Maree Cleal
926	5	Wainui Green 2015 Limited
927	5	Mark Gillard

929	5	Mandy Hargood
935	63	Melva Joy Robb
941	5	Marion Marfell
942	5	Marie Mitchell
943	5	Martina Naplawa
948	5	Melissa Smith
951	5	Michael Wallace
953	5	Mark Whittall
955	6	Moira Winter
976	5	Norazizah Abu Yazid
982	5	Nathan Grey
985	5	Niki McCulloch
988	5	Nathan Wallace
989	5	Natasha Watts
1008	5	Philip Anthony Hawke
1026	5	Patricia Riri
1029	5	Peter Shirley
1031	5	Peter Snape
1053	5	Roger Bee
1055	5	Rory Bryant
1057	5	Roger Dippie
1063	5	Riley George Barnes MacPherson
1067	5	Renee Heta
1072	5	Rob MacGibbon
1073	5	Robert Murdoch
1079	5	Rachel Stanford
1080	5	Rata Steele
1097	5	Sonya Ferguson
1103	5	Stuart Barnes

1108	5	Shane Bray
1113	5	Sivanathan Devaraj
1115	5	Steve Dyer
1116	5	Stuart Edward Borrie
1119	5	Sharon Hill
1120	5	Stewart Holdem
1122	5	Steven John Bickley
1127	5	Soon Ng
1128	5	Sam Oliver
1130	5	Sook Peng Lim
1131	5	Susana Pereyra
1138	5	Shane Turnbull
1139	5	Sarah Williams
1144	5	Scott Foster
1168	5	Tony Jones
1170	5	Tama Lindsay
1172	5	Tyler Materoa
1175	5	Tracy O'Grady
1177	5	Thien Soong Wong
1178	5	Teresa Shaw
1181	5	Tiare Tautari
1211	5	Vaughan Hall
1221	5	Wayne de Joux
1224	5	P Wood
1225	5	Wayne Hollis
1226	5	William Kingi
1227	5	Warwick Neame
1241	5	Yong Hee Son
1243	5	Zane Charman

1247	5	Robert Walker
1252	5	Frank Prendeville

Table 4: List of “Identifying Regionally Significant Issues” Format submitters

Submitter Number	Submitter point	Submitter Name
477	1	John Malcolm McKee
500	4	Ben Clarke
510	1	Anne Allison
535	1	Adele Riddle
538	1	Andre Smith
539	1	Allen Steele
540	1	Arthur Stewart
541	1	Akiwa Te Uatuku
543	1	Alistair Willis
549	1	Bryan Albrey
551	1	Ben Armstrong
555	1	Blair Glover
559	1	Belinda Jones
560	1	Brian Lee
562	1	Brendon Lucas
564	1	Belinda Materoa
565	1	Brent Mathews
576	1	Chee Ong Chin
582	1	Cory Burnett
583	1	Carmay Cheong
584	1	Corey Dixon
588	1	Christopher Hall
590	1	Cameron Harvey
593	1	Chang-Seog Jeon
595	1	Clayton McIntyre

600	1	Connor Rangi
603	1	Chee Song Chin
606	1	Cindy Steele
607	1	Cadeena Tepu
611	1	Carla Velez
618	1	Brad Lewis
620	1	Brook Lines
621	1	Becki Findlayson
624	1	Carol-Ann Herbert
625	1	Cheryl Harris
627	1	Carl Scholefield
628	1	Clinton Nott
641	1	Dan McCall
649	1	Dave Herbert
654	1	David Jones
655	1	Dhaneshkar Karunakaran
656	1	David King
658	1	Dan Lawrence
659	1	Donald M Curie
660	1	Daniel Manson
661	1	Denis Marfell
663	1	Dion McCauley
664	1	Dellae McKenzie
665	1	Dorothy McManaway
667	1	Daniel Paget
677	1	Daniel Walker
678	1	David Horton
680	1	Delwynne Horton
694	1	Elin Shin

703	1	Faye Fosbender
704	1	Febe Jones
705	1	Fay Mathews
708	1	Filisita Tuese
709	1	Ian Dunlop
721	1	Grant Boyd
722	1	Gaik Choo Tan
729	1	Graham Hayter
731	1	Grace Jones
734	1	Gail Learmonth
737	1	Gareth McIlroy
741	1	Glen Slipper
745	1	Graeme Tregidga
753	1	Hope Lagden
756	1	Hye Sug Ha
758	1	Holly Stanford
759	1	Hudson Steele
760	1	Hui Ting Ng
761	1	Hilda Timoti
773	1	Iosua Kaisara
781	1	Johann Adam
784	1	Jackie Biggs
787	1	Jo Braven
793	1	John Cleal
796	1	John Craddock
799	1	June Ethel Epere
803	1	John Healy
804	1	Jordan Herbert
805	1	James Higgin

807	1	Jeremy Hunter
812	1	Jungmin Ko
814	1	Jeong Lye Jeon
817	1	Jemma McCowan
825	1	Jo-Ann Rickard
826	1	Jade Riri
829	1	Jason Smith
831	1	Jim Taylor
834	1	Jarod Udy
836	1	James William Epere
851	1	Kevin Hawkins
856	1	Karen Mant
857	1	Kowhai Millan
863	1	Karen Soloman
877	1	Lynette Ashby
881	1	Laisa Gibbins
884	1	Laura Jillian Moleta-Bentham
885	1	Les McClung
886	1	Linda McGee
887	1	Lauren Mitchell
888	1	Pang Lily
889	1	Lavina Rickard
892	1	Lynda Simpson
901	1	Lo Wai Wing
902	1	Lewis Ward
912	1	Myken Augustine
914	1	Michael Burne
918	1	Maree Cleal
926	1	Wainui Green 2015 Limited

927	1	Mark Gillard
929	1	Mandy Hargood
941	1	Marion Marfell
942	1	Marie Mitchell
943	1	Martina Naplawa
948	1	Melissa Smith
951	1	Michael Wallace
953	1	Mark Whittall
955	1	Moira Winter

Appendix 2: Recommended decisions on decisions requested

Submission Number	Submission point	Submitter	Volume	Chapter	Provision	Recommendation
15	1	William Scholefield	All	All		Reject
16	1	William Scholefield	All	All		Reject
43	4	Tony Mortiboy	All	All		Reject
141	9	Hall Family Farms Ltd	All	All		Reject
185	1	George Robert Shallgrass	All	All		Reject
210	1	Kevin Wilson	All	All		Reject
210	2	Kevin Wilson	All	All		Reject
216	1	Khalid Suleiman	All	All		Reject
218	15	Salvador Delgado Oro Laprida	All	All		Reject
220	1	Jessica Bagge	All	All		Reject
243	1	Marguerete Osborne	All	All		Reject
243	3	Marguerete Osborne	All	All		Reject

257	1	Gary Barnett	All	All		Reject
261	1	Lynette and Kevin Oldham	All	All		Reject
261	9	Lynette and Kevin Oldham	All	All		Reject
280	1	Nelson Marlborough District Health Board	All	All		Reject
282	1	Warren Forestry Ltd	All	All		Accept
283	1	Craig Basham	All	All		Reject
313	1	Dale Hulburt	All	All		Reject
316	1	McGuinness Institute	All	All		Reject
401	183	Aquaculture New Zealand	All	All		Reject
426	191	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	All	All		Reject
426	192	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	All	All		Reject
433	1	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	All	All		Reject

459	1	Beef and Lamb New Zealand	All	All		Reject
459	2	Beef and Lamb New Zealand	All	All		Reject
459	3	Beef and Lamb New Zealand	All	All		Reject
459	11	Beef and Lamb New Zealand	All	All		Reject
462	43	Blind River Irrigation Limited	All	All		Reject
464	1	Chorus New Zealand limited	All	All		Reject
464	2	Chorus New Zealand limited	All	All		Reject
473	75	Delegat Limited	All	All		Reject
519	1	Austin Carolino	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
521	1	Audrey Craig	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
522	1	Alicia de Leen	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
525	1	Harmony Haira	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
527	1	Anne Greig	All	All		Refer to individual submissions

528	1	Allan John Climo	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
533	1	Hamish Harvey	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
537	1	Alistair Simmons	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
545	1	Aquaculture Direct Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
547	1	Aroma New Zealand Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
550	1	Belinda Allen	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
553	1	Brendon Carl Pedersen	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
554	1	Bruce Cardwell	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
556	1	Brad Joseph McNeill	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
561	1	Bruce Lock	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
566	1	Bevan Payton	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
567	1	Benjamin Per	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
568	1	Bevan Gordon	All	All		Refer to individual

		Reid				submissions
570	1	Blair Taylor	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
571	1	BDM Management Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
577	1	Carl Anthony Schluter	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
581	1	Campbell Bowis	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
585	1	Christopher Donaldson	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
589	1	Chase Harrison	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
597	1	Colin Ronald and Tom Ronald Norton	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
602	1	Colleen Robbins	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
604	1	Brian Godsiff	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
608	1	Beal Family Trust	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
609	1	Blom Ventures Limited and White Gold Enterprice	All	All		Refer to individual submissions

619	1	Alex Khadzhi	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
622	1	Christine Margret Satherley	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
623	1	Andrew Robertson	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
642	1	Daniel Boa	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
643	1	Dennis Burkhart	All	All		Deferred
646	1	Dylan Goulding	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
647	1	Douglas Guy	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
648	1	D C Hemphill	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
650	1	Dean Higgins	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
652	1	Jaquery Dale	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
666	1	Dave Norton	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
670	1	Dean Reynish	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
671	1	Daniel Sandrey	All	All		Refer to individual submissions

672	1	Donald Bruce Simpson	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
673	1	Debbie Stone	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
674	1	Daryl Teale	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
684	1	Donaghys Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
691	1	Emma Hunter	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
700	1	ENZAQ Aquaculture New Zealand Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
714	1	Hayden Goulding	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
718	1	Gillian Ann Powley	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
725	1	Gena Cockerell	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
728	1	Graeme Henry Clarke	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
730	1	Gabrielle Jane Pooley	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
740	1	Geoffrey St Clair Wiffen	All	All		Refer to individual submissions

742	1	Gordon Smith	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
744	1	Taylor Partnership	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
747	1	GAL Partnership	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
754	1	Hung Nguyen	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
762	1	Huu Van Tang	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
763	1	Harman Moanoroa Wallace	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
765	1	Heath Webb	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
771	1	Ian Beer	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
775	1	Imelda McCarthy	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
780	1	John A Wilkins	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
782	1	James Baker	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
783	1	Juliet Barton	All	All		Refer to individual submissions

785	1	John Bloomfield	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
791	1	Jonathon Cameron	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
792	1	Joanne Rebecca Clarke	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
794	1	Jacob Collins	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
797	1	Johnathan Dean Arbuckle	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
798	1	Joanne Evalyn Cook	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
800	1	Jonathan Everett	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
801	1	John Gallagher	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
802	1	Janice Hahn	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
806	1	Jamie Hrstich	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
810	1	Jason Khon Beo	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
811	1	Jo Kerry	All	All		Reject
818	1	John Andrew McGregor	All	All		Refer to individual submissions

819	1	Jason McKay	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
821	1	Jo Noonan	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
822	1	Johanna O'Connell	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
823	1	John Paul Tejero	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
828	1	Jimmy Simpson	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
830	1	Julie Solly	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
832	1	Jerome Tejero	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
837	1	Jonathan William Hodges	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
838	1	Jim Wallace	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
841	1	Jacobson Marine Farms Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
850	1	Kyle Gribben	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
853	1	Vanessa Hyslop	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
859	1	Koherangi Pui	All	All		Refer to individual

						submissions
860	1	Ku Ra	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
862	1	Kris Solly	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
880	1	Lovey Filimoeatu	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
882	1	Lydia B Harvey	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
883	1	Lavinia Holland	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
891	1	Lynn Scaife	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
893	1	Liam Solly	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
894	1	Lily Tamaiparea	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
895	1	Lisita Tangataevaha	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
897	1	Luom Thikim	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
898	1	Luke Thompson	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
899	1	Lin Vouch	All	All		Refer to individual submissions

900	1	Long Vu	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
913	1	Michael Bourke	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
920	1	Martin Cunniffe	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
924	1	Matthew Emms	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
930	1	Maria Hemara	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
931	1	Michael Holland	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
945	1	Mick Norton	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
954	1	Michael Wilson	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
956	1	Michelle Xiucin Qiu	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
957	1	Madsen Marine Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
961	99	Marlborough Chamber of Commerce	All	All		Reject
978	1	Nick Carter	All	All		Reject
979	1	Nolan Day	All	All		Reject

983	1	Nicholas James Hearn	All	All		Reject
986	1	Ngapaka P Rangitakatu	All	All		Reject
990	1	Nelson Forests Limited	All	All		Deferred
990	2	Nelson Forests Limited	All	All		Reject
990	3	Nelson Forests Limited	All	All		Reject
992	32	New Zealand Defence Force	All	All		Accept in part
992	33	New Zealand Defence Force	All	All		Accept in part
1002	270	New Zealand Transport Agency	All	All		Deferred
1002	277	New Zealand Transport Agency	All	All		Deferred
1002	288	New Zealand Transport Agency	All	All		Deferred
1002	289	New Zealand Transport Agency	All	All		Accept in part
1002	290	New Zealand Transport Agency	All	All		Accept in part
1002	291	New Zealand	All	All		Reject

		Transport Agency				
1002	292	New Zealand Transport Agency	All	All		Accept in part
1002	293	New Zealand Transport Agency	All	All		Accept in part
1002	301	New Zealand Transport Agency	All	All		Reject
1002	302	New Zealand Transport Agency	All	All		Deferred
1012	1	Phillip Blaylock	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1013	1	Paul Claridge	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1014	1	Paul Dargan	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1028	1	Phoebe Shand	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1030	1	Paul Smythe	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1032	1	Paul Starkey	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1040	1	Port Aquaculture Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1044	24	Progressive Enterprises	All	All		Deferred

		Limited				
1046	1	Quality Equipment Nelson	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1052	1	Robin Bruce and Valerie Annette Harris	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1054	4	Ron Bothwell	All	All		Reject
1058	1	Ross MacDonald	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1062	1	Rebecca Floyd	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1064	1	Roger Glendenning	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1065	1	Robin Harris	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1078	1	Rebecca Spooner	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1081	1	Rosie Turner	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1092	1	REM Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1102	1	Scott Archer	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1104	1	Simon Barnett	All	All		Refer to individual

						submissions
1106	1	Shane Bennett	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1110	1	Sam Clay	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1123	1	Shayne Kerr	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1129	1	Steve O'Neill	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1132	1	Sokhom Pich	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1133	1	Simon Pooley	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1134	1	Sebastian Shand	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1136	1	Steven Thomas	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1137	1	Sam Thompson	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1140	1	Sanford Limited	All	All		Reject
1141	1	Sapphire Shand	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1153	1	Soil and Health Association of New Zealand	All	All		Reject

		Incorporated				
1158	77	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	All	All		Reject
1158	78	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	All	All		Reject
1161	1	Susan Foster	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1163	1	Trevor Brian Satherley	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1167	1	Tiwini Hippolite	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1174	1	Trang Ngo	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1176	1	Tan Pham	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1180	1	Trung Nguyen	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1182	1	Tim Young	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1183	1	TAB Services Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1186	1	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	All	All		Reject

1186	3	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	All	All		Reject
1189	1	Te Runanga o Kaikoura and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1195	1	Transport Investments Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1198	168	Transpower New Zealand Limited	All	All		Accept
1204	1	United Fisheries Holdings Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1204	2	United Fisheries Holdings Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1205	1	Valerie Annette Harris	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1206	1	Vicky Clark	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1207	1	Vicki Maree Evrard	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1208	1	Vivienne Forrester	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1210	1	Vaughan Hugh Ellis	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1212	1	Van Nguyen	All	All		Refer to individual

						submissions
1213	1	Vaughan Paul Warburton	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1215	1	Vincent Redwood	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1217	1	Venture 353 Limited	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1218	83	Villa Maria	All	All		Deferred
1220	1	Wayne Kelvin Benny	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1223	1	Wayne Herd	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1229	1	Wiremu Rowberry	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
1236	1	Wakatu Incorporation	All	All		Reject
1256	1	Gary and Ellen Orchard	All	All		Refer to individual submissions
233	35	Totaranui Limited	Volume 1	All		Reject
233	36	Totaranui Limited	Volume 1	All		Reject
280	2	Nelson Marlborough District Health	Volume 1	All		Reject

		Board				
425	150	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	All		Reject
505	1	Ernslaw One Limited	Volume 1	All		Deferred
510	6	Anne Allison	Volume 1	All		Reject
535	6	Adele Riddle	Volume 1	All		Reject
538	6	Andre Smith	Volume 1	All		Reject
539	6	Allen Steele	Volume 1	All		Reject
540	6	Arthur Stewart	Volume 1	All		Reject
541	6	Akiwa Te Uatuku	Volume 1	All		Reject
543	6	Alistair Willis	Volume 1	All		Reject
549	6	Bryan Albrey	Volume 1	All		Reject
551	6	Ben Armstrong	Volume 1	All		Reject
555	6	Blair Glover	Volume 1	All		Reject
559	6	Belinda Jones	Volume 1	All		Reject
560	6	Brian Lee	Volume 1	All		Reject
562	6	Brendon Lucas	Volume 1	All		Reject
564	6	Belinda Materoa	Volume 1	All		Reject

565	6	Brent Mathews	Volume 1	All		Reject
576	6	Chee Ong Chin	Volume 1	All		Reject
582	6	Cory Burnett	Volume 1	All		Reject
583	6	Carmay Cheong	Volume 1	All		Reject
584	6	Corey Dixon	Volume 1	All		Reject
588	6	Christopher Hall	Volume 1	All		Reject
590	6	Cameron Harvey	Volume 1	All		Reject
593	6	Chang-Seog Jeon	Volume 1	All		Reject
595	6	Clayton McIntyre	Volume 1	All		Reject
600	6	Connor Rangi	Volume 1	All		Reject
603	6	Chee Song Chin	Volume 1	All		Reject
606	6	Cindy Steele	Volume 1	All		Reject
607	6	Cadeena Tepu	Volume 1	All		Reject
611	6	Carla Velez	Volume 1	All		Reject
620	6	Brook Lines	Volume 1	All		Reject
621	6	Becki Findlayson	Volume 1	All		Reject
624	6	Carol-Ann Herbert	Volume 1	All		Reject
625	6	Cheryl Harris	Volume 1	All		Reject

627	6	Carl Scholefield	Volume 1	All		Reject
628	6	Clinton Nott	Volume 1	All		Reject
649	6	Dave Herbert	Volume 1	All		Reject
654	6	David Jones	Volume 1	All		Reject
655	6	Dhaneshkar Karunakaran	Volume 1	All		Reject
656	6	David King	Volume 1	All		Reject
658	6	Dan Lawrence	Volume 1	All		Reject
659	6	Donald M Curie	Volume 1	All		Reject
660	6	Daniel Manson	Volume 1	All		Reject
661	6	Denis Marfell	Volume 1	All		Reject
663	6	Dion McCauley	Volume 1	All		Reject
664	6	Dellae McKenzie	Volume 1	All		Reject
665	6	Dorothy McManaway	Volume 1	All		Reject
667	6	Daniel Paget	Volume 1	All		Reject
677	6	Daniel Walker	Volume 1	All		Reject
678	6	David Horton	Volume 1	All		Reject
680	6	Delwynne Horton	Volume 1	All		Reject

694	6	Elin Shin	Volume 1	All		Reject
703	6	Faye Fosbender	Volume 1	All		Reject
704	6	Febe Jones	Volume 1	All		Reject
705	6	Fay Mathews	Volume 1	All		Reject
708	6	Filisita Tuese	Volume 1	All		Reject
709	6	Ian Dunlop	Volume 1	All		Reject
717	1	Fulton Hogan Limited	Volume 1	All		Reject
717	2	Fulton Hogan Limited	Volume 1	All		Reject
717	3	Fulton Hogan Limited	Volume 1	All		Reject
721	6	Grant Boyd	Volume 1	All		Reject
722	6	Gaik Choo Tan	Volume 1	All		Reject
729	6	Graham Hayter	Volume 1	All		Reject
731	6	Grace Jones	Volume 1	All		Reject
734	6	Gail Learmonth	Volume 1	All		Reject
737	6	Gareth Mcllroy	Volume 1	All		Reject
741	6	Glen Slipper	Volume 1	All		Reject
745	6	Graeme Tregidga	Volume 1	All		Reject

753	6	Hope Lagden	Volume 1	All		Reject
756	6	Hye Sug Ha	Volume 1	All		Reject
758	6	Holly Stanford	Volume 1	All		Reject
759	6	Hudson Steele	Volume 1	All		Reject
760	6	Hui Ting Ng	Volume 1	All		Reject
761	6	Hilda Timoti	Volume 1	All		Reject
768	1	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Volume 1	All		Deferred
768	2	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Volume 1	All		Deferred
768	3	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Volume 1	All		Deferred
768	4	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Volume 1	All		Deferred
770	19	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Incorporated	Volume 1	All		Deferred
773	6	Iosua Kaisara	Volume 1	All		Reject

781	6	Johann Adam	Volume 1	All		Reject
784	6	Jackie Biggs	Volume 1	All		Reject
787	6	Jo Braven	Volume 1	All		Reject
793	6	John Cleal	Volume 1	All		Reject
796	6	John Craddock	Volume 1	All		Reject
799	6	June Ethel Epere	Volume 1	All		Reject
803	6	John Healy	Volume 1	All		Reject
804	6	Jordan Herbert	Volume 1	All		Reject
805	6	James Higgin	Volume 1	All		Reject
807	6	Jeremy Hunter	Volume 1	All		Reject
812	6	Jungmin Ko	Volume 1	All		Reject
814	6	Jeong Lye Jeon	Volume 1	All		Reject
817	6	Jemma McCowan	Volume 1	All		Reject
825	6	Jo-Ann Rickard	Volume 1	All		Reject
826	6	Jade Riri	Volume 1	All		Reject
829	6	Jason Smith	Volume 1	All		Reject
831	6	Jim Taylor	Volume 1	All		Reject

834	6	Jarod Udy	Volume 1	All		Reject
836	6	James William Epere	Volume 1	All		Reject
845	24	Kenneth R and Sara M Roush	Volume 1	All		Reject
851	6	Kevin Hawkins	Volume 1	All		Reject
856	6	Karen Mant	Volume 1	All		Reject
857	6	Kowhai Millan	Volume 1	All		Reject
863	6	Karen Soloman	Volume 1	All		Reject
870	1	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 1	All		Reject
877	6	Lynette Ashby	Volume 1	All		Reject
878	6	Lyndon Daymond	Volume 1	All		Reject
881	6	Laisa Gibbins	Volume 1	All		Reject
884	6	Laura Jillian Moleta-Bentham	Volume 1	All		Reject
885	6	Les McClung	Volume 1	All		Reject
886	6	Linda McGee	Volume 1	All		Reject
887	6	Lauren Mitchell	Volume 1	All		Reject

888	6	Pang Lily	Volume 1	All		Reject
889	6	Lavina Rickard	Volume 1	All		Reject
892	6	Lynda Simpson	Volume 1	All		Reject
901	6	Lo Wai Wing	Volume 1	All		Reject
902	6	Lewis Ward	Volume 1	All		Reject
912	6	Myken Augustine	Volume 1	All		Reject
914	6	Michael Burne	Volume 1	All		Reject
918	6	Maree Cleal	Volume 1	All		Reject
926	6	Wainui Green 2015 Limited	Volume 1	All		Reject
927	6	Mark Gillard	Volume 1	All		Reject
929	6	Mandy Hargood	Volume 1	All		Reject
941	6	Marion Marfell	Volume 1	All		Reject
942	6	Marie Mitchell	Volume 1	All		Reject
943	6	Martina Naplawa	Volume 1	All		Reject
948	6	Melissa Smith	Volume 1	All		Reject
951	6	Michael Wallace	Volume 1	All		Reject
953	6	Mark Whittall	Volume 1	All		Reject
955	5	Moira Winter	Volume 1	All		Reject

976	6	Norazizah Abu Yazid	Volume 1	All		Reject
982	6	Nathan Grey	Volume 1	All		Reject
985	6	Niki McCulloch	Volume 1	All		Reject
988	6	Nathan Wallace	Volume 1	All		Reject
989	6	Natasha Watts	Volume 1	All		Reject
992	30	New Zealand Defence Force	Volume 1	All		Reject
992	31	New Zealand Defence Force	Volume 1	All		Reject
1002	294	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 1	All		Accept in part
1002	298	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 1	All		Deferred
1008	6	Philip Anthony Hawke	Volume 1	All		Reject
1026	6	Patricia Riri	Volume 1	All		Reject
1029	6	Peter Shirley	Volume 1	All		Reject
1031	6	Peter Snape	Volume 1	All		Reject
1037	5	PADD Investments Limited	Volume 1	All		Reject
1053	6	Roger Bee	Volume 1	All		Reject

1055	6	Rory Bryant	Volume 1	All		Reject
1057	6	Roger Dippie	Volume 1	All		Reject
1063	6	Riley George Barnes MacPherson	Volume 1	All		Reject
1067	6	Renee Heta	Volume 1	All		Reject
1072	6	Rob MacGibbon	Volume 1	All		Reject
1073	6	Robert Murdoch	Volume 1	All		Reject
1079	6	Rachel Stanford	Volume 1	All		Reject
1080	6	Rata Steele	Volume 1	All		Reject
1084	1	Raeburn Property Partnership	Volume 1	All		Reject
1084	4	Raeburn Property Partnership	Volume 1	All		Reject
1084	6	Raeburn Property Partnership	Volume 1	All		Reject
1097	6	Sonya Ferguson	Volume 1	All		Reject
1103	6	Stuart Barnes	Volume 1	All		Reject
1108	6	Shane Bray	Volume 1	All		Reject
1113	6	Sivanathan Devaraj	Volume 1	All		Reject
1115	6	Steve Dyer	Volume 1	All		Reject

1116	6	Stuart Edward Borrie	Volume 1	All		Reject
1119	6	Sharon Hill	Volume 1	All		Reject
1120	6	Stewart Holdem	Volume 1	All		Reject
1122	6	Steven John Bickley	Volume 1	All		Reject
1127	6	Soon Ng	Volume 1	All		Reject
1128	6	Sam Oliver	Volume 1	All		Reject
1130	6	Sook Peng Lim	Volume 1	All		Reject
1131	6	Susana Pereyra	Volume 1	All		Reject
1138	6	Shane Turnbull	Volume 1	All		Reject
1139	6	Sarah Williams	Volume 1	All		Reject
1144	6	Scott Foster	Volume 1	All		Reject
1168	6	Tony Jones	Volume 1	All		Reject
1170	6	Tama Lindsay	Volume 1	All		Reject
1172	6	Tyler Materoa	Volume 1	All		Reject
1175	6	Tracy O'Grady	Volume 1	All		Reject
1177	6	Thien Soong Wong	Volume 1	All		Reject
1178	6	Teresa Shaw	Volume 1	All		Reject

1181	6	Tiare Tautari	Volume 1	All		Reject
1186	5	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	Volume 1	All		Reject
1186	17	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	Volume 1	All		Reject
1186	28	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	Volume 1	All		Reject
1193	139	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 1	All		Reject
1211	6	Vaughan Hall	Volume 1	All		Reject
1221	6	Wayne de Joux	Volume 1	All		Reject
1224	6	P Wood	Volume 1	All		Reject
1225	6	Wayne Hollis	Volume 1	All		Reject
1226	6	William Kingi	Volume 1	All		Reject
1227	6	Warwick Neame	Volume 1	All		Reject
1238	1	Windermere Forests Limited	Volume 1	All		Reject
1241	6	Yong Hee Son	Volume 1	All		Reject
1243	6	Zane Charman	Volume 1	All		Reject
1247	6	Robert Walker	Volume 1	All		Reject

1252	6	Frank Prendeville	Volume 1	All		Reject
336	1	William Ian Esson	Volume 2	1 Introduction	1.	Reject
1004	58	Z Energy Limited, Mobil Oil New Zealand Limited and BP Oil Limited	Volume 2	2 General Rules	2.	Reject
715	377	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 2	2 General Rules	2.	Reject
509	200	Nelson Marlborough Fish and Game	Volume 2	2 General Rules	2.	Accept in part
100	9	East Bay Conservation Society	Volume 1	1 Introduction		Accept
43	3	Tony Mortiboy	Volume 1	1 Introduction	1.	Reject
401	1	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	1 Introduction	1.	Reject
426	1	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	1 Introduction	1.	Reject
509	9	Nelson Marlborough Fish and Game	Volume 1	1 Introduction	1.	Accept in part

698	1	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	1 Introduction	1.	Reject
1089	1	Rarangi District Residents Association	Volume 1	1 Introduction	1.	Accept
43	1	Tony Mortiboy	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
401	2	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
401	3	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
401	4	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
425	2	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Accept
426	2	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
426	3	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
426	4	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
447	1	Ted and Shirley Culley	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject

464	3	Chorus New Zealand limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Accept
514	1	A J King Family Trust and S A King Family Trust	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
514	2	A J King Family Trust and S A King Family Trust	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
574	1	Bryan Skeggs	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
574	2	Bryan Skeggs	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
578	1	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
698	2	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
710	1	The Fishing Industry Submitters	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
716	1	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
717	4	Fulton Hogan Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
717	5	Fulton Hogan Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject

717	6	Fulton Hogan Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
726	1	Canantor Mussels Limited and N. I Buchanan-Brown	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
726	2	Canantor Mussels Limited and N. I Buchanan-Brown	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
752	1	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Accept
769	1	Horticulture New Zealand	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Accept in part
809	1	Jim Jessep	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
809	2	Jim Jessep	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
873	1	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Accept
926	11	Wainui Green 2015 Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
926	12	Wainui Green 2015 Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
936	1	Michael Jessep	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
936	2	Michael Jessep	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
962	1	Marlborough Forest Industry Association	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Deferred

		Incorporated				
962	2	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Deferred
962	3	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Deferred
962	4	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Accept
964	1	Marlborough Oysters Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
964	2	Marlborough Oysters Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
990	157	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Deferred
990	158	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Deferred
1077	1	Rodney Roberts	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
1090	1	Ravensdown Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Accept
1140	2	Sanford Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Accept
1146	1	Sea Shepherd	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Accept

		New Zealand				
1157	1	Southern Crown Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
1157	2	Southern Crown Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
1158	1	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Accept
1193	1	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Accept
879	3	Laurence Etheredge	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Structure of the MEP	Reject
1002	4	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Structure of the MEP	Reject
100	10	East Bay Conservation Society	Volume 1	2 Background	2.	Accept
401	5	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	2 Background	2.	Reject
401	6	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	2 Background	2.	Reject
401	7	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	2 Background	2.	Reject

426	5	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	2 Background	2.	Reject
426	6	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	2 Background	2.	Reject
426	7	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	2 Background	2.	Reject
769	2	Horticulture New Zealand	Volume 1	2 Background	2.	Reject
769	3	Horticulture New Zealand	Volume 1	2 Background	2.	Reject
477	1	John Malcolm McKee	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
500	4	Ben Clarke	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
510	1	Anne Allison	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
535	1	Adele Riddle	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
538	1	Andre Smith	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject

539	1	Allen Steele	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
540	1	Arthur Stewart	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
541	1	Akiwa Te Uatuku	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
543	1	Alistair Willis	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
549	1	Bryan Albrey	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
551	1	Ben Armstrong	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1077	1	Rodney Roberts	Volume 1	1 Introduction	Guiding principles	Reject
555	1	Blair Glover	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
559	1	Belinda Jones	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
560	1	Brian Lee	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject

562	1	Brendon Lucas	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
564	1	Belinda Materoa	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
565	1	Brent Mathews	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
576	1	Chee Ong Chin	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
582	1	Cory Burnett	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
583	1	Carmay Cheong	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
584	1	Corey Dixon	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
588	1	Christopher Hall	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
590	1	Cameron Harvey	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
593	1	Chang-Seog Jeon	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally	Reject

					significant issues	
595	1	Clayton McIntyre	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
600	1	Connor Rangi	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
603	1	Chee Song Chin	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
606	1	Cindy Steele	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
607	1	Cadeena Tepu	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
611	1	Carla Velez	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
618	1	Brad Lewis	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
620	1	Brook Lines	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
621	1	Becki Findlayson	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject

624	1	Carol-Ann Herbert	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
625	1	Cheryl Harris	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
627	1	Carl Scholefield	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
628	1	Clinton Nott	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
641	1	Dan McCall	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
649	1	Dave Herbert	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
654	1	David Jones	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
655	1	Dhaneshkar Karunakaran	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
656	1	David King	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
658	1	Dan Lawrence	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally	Reject

					significant issues	
659	1	Donald M Curie	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
660	1	Daniel Manson	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
661	1	Denis Marfell	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
663	1	Dion McCauley	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
664	1	Dellae McKenzie	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
665	1	Dorothy McManaway	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
667	1	Daniel Paget	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
677	1	Daniel Walker	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
678	1	David Horton	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject

680	1	Delwynne Horton	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
694	1	Elin Shin	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
698	3	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
703	1	Faye Fosbender	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
704	1	Febe Jones	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
705	1	Fay Mathews	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
708	1	Filisita Tuese	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
709	1	Ian Dunlop	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
716	2	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject

721	1	Grant Boyd	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
722	1	Gaik Choo Tan	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
729	1	Graham Hayter	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
731	1	Grace Jones	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
734	1	Gail Learmonth	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
737	1	Gareth McIlroy	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
741	1	Glen Slipper	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
745	1	Graeme Tregidga	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
753	1	Hope Lagden	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
756	1	Hye Sug Ha	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally	Reject

					significant issues	
758	1	Holly Stanford	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
759	1	Hudson Steele	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
760	1	Hui Ting Ng	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
761	1	Hilda Timoti	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
773	1	Iosua Kaisara	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
781	1	Johann Adam	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
784	1	Jackie Biggs	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
787	1	Jo Braven	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
793	1	John Cleal	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject

796	1	John Craddock	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
799	1	June Ethel Epere	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
803	1	John Healy	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
804	1	Jordan Herbert	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
805	1	James Higgin	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
807	1	Jeremy Hunter	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
812	1	Jungmin Ko	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
814	1	Jeong Lye Jeon	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
817	1	Jemma McCowan	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
825	1	Jo-Ann Rickard	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally	Reject

					significant issues	
826	1	Jade Riri	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
829	1	Jason Smith	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
831	1	Jim Taylor	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
834	1	Jarod Udy	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
836	1	James William Epere	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
851	1	Kevin Hawkins	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
856	1	Karen Mant	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
857	1	Kowhai Millan	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
863	1	Karen Soloman	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject

877	1	Lynette Ashby	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
881	1	Laisa Gibbins	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
884	1	Laura Jillian Moleta-Bentham	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
885	1	Les McClung	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
886	1	Linda McGee	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
887	1	Lauren Mitchell	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
888	1	Pang Lily	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
889	1	Lavina Rickard	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
892	1	Lynda Simpson	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
901	1	Lo Wai Wing	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally	Reject

					significant issues	
902	1	Lewis Ward	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
912	1	Myken Augustine	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
914	1	Michael Burne	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
918	1	Maree Cleal	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
926	1	Wainui Green 2015 Limited	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
927	1	Mark Gillard	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
929	1	Mandy Hargood	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
941	1	Marion Marfell	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
942	1	Marie Mitchell	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject

943	1	Martina Naplawa	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
948	1	Melissa Smith	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
951	1	Michael Wallace	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
953	1	Mark Whittall	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
955	1	Moira Winter	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
962	5	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Deferred
967	1	Marlborough Roads	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Accept
976	1	Norazizah Abu Yazid	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
982	1	Nathan Grey	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject

985	1	Niki McCulloch	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
988	1	Nathan Wallace	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
989	1	Natasha Watts	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
990	161	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1002	2	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Accept
1008	1	Philip Anthony Hawke	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1026	1	Patricia Riri	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1029	1	Peter Shirley	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1031	1	Peter Snape	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1053	1	Roger Bee	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally	Reject

					significant issues	
1055	1	Rory Bryant	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1057	1	Roger Dippie	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1063	1	Riley George Barnes MacPherson	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1067	1	Renee Heta	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1072	1	Rob MacGibbon	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1073	1	Robert Murdoch	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1077	8	Rodney Roberts	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1079	1	Rachel Stanford	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1080	1	Rata Steele	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject

1097	1	Sonya Ferguson	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1103	1	Stuart Barnes	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1107	1	Shaun Bentham	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1108	1	Shane Bray	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1112	1	Sarah Cumming	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1113	1	Sivanathan Devaraj	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1115	1	Steve Dyer	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1116	1	Stuart Edward Borrie	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1119	1	Sharon Hill	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1120	1	Stewart Holdem	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally	Reject

					significant issues	
1122	1	Steven John Bickley	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1127	1	Soon Ng	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1128	1	Sam Oliver	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1130	1	Sook Peng Lim	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1131	1	Susana Pereyra	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1138	1	Shane Turnbull	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1139	1	Sarah Williams	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1144	1	Scott Foster	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1168	1	Tony Jones	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject

1170	1	Tama Lindsay	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1172	1	Tyler Materoa	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1175	1	Tracy O'Grady	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1177	1	Thien Soong Wong	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1178	1	Teresa Shaw	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1181	1	Tiare Tautari	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1211	1	Vaughan Hall	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1221	1	Wayne de Joux	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1224	1	P Wood	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1225	1	Wayne Hollis	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally	Reject

					significant issues	
1226	1	William Kingi	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1227	1	Warwick Neame	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1241	1	Yong Hee Son	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1243	1	Zane Charman	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1247	1	Robert Walker	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
1252	1	Frank Prendeville	Volume 1	2 Background	Identifying regionally significant issues	Reject
280	4	Nelson Marlborough District Health Board	Volume 1	2 Background	Integrated management of the Marlborough environment	Accept
679	3	David Walker	Volume 1	2 Background	Integrated management of the Marlborough environment	Reject
710	2	The Fishing Industry	Volume 1	2 Background	Integrated management of	Reject

		Submitters			the Marlborough environment	
1193	74	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 1	2 Background	Integrated management of the Marlborough environment	Reject
280	5	Nelson Marlborough District Health Board	Volume 1	2 Background	Working with others to sustainably manage Marlborough's natural and physical resources	Accept
504	1	Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association	Volume 1	2 Background	Working with others to sustainably manage Marlborough's natural and physical resources	Reject
717	7	Fulton Hogan Limited	Volume 1	2 Background	Working with others to sustainably manage Marlborough's natural and physical resources	Reject
962	6	Marlborough Forest Industry Association	Volume 1	2 Background	Working with others to sustainably	Reject

		Incorporated			manage Marlborough's natural and physical resources	
990	162	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	2 Background	Working with others to sustainably manage Marlborough's natural and physical resources	Reject
504	2	Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association	Volume 1	2 Background	Relationship of the MEP to other policy statements, standards and strategies	Reject
698	4	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	2 Background	Relationship of the MEP to other policy statements, standards and strategies	Reject
710	3	The Fishing Industry Submitters	Volume 1	2 Background	Relationship of the MEP to other policy statements, standards and strategies	Accept
1002	3	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 1	2 Background	Relationship of the MEP to other policy statements, standards and	Accept

					strategies	
1198	1	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	2 Background	Relationship of the MEP to other policy statements, standards and strategies	Accept in part
716	3	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	2 Background	Issues that cross local authority boundaries	Reject
504	3	Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association	Volume 1	2 Background	Monitoring the efficiency and effectiveness of the policies or methods	Reject
509	10	Nelson Marlborough Fish and Game	Volume 1	2 Background	How to use the MEP	Reject
509	11	Nelson Marlborough Fish and Game	Volume 1	2 Background	How to use the MEP	Reject
509	12	Nelson Marlborough Fish and Game	Volume 1	2 Background	How to use the MEP	Reject
698	5	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	2 Background	How to use the MEP	Reject
698	6	Environmental Defence Society	Volume 1	2 Background	How to use the MEP	Reject

		Incorporated				
698	7	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	2 Background	How to use the MEP	Reject
716	4	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	2 Background	How to use the MEP	Reject
992	1	New Zealand Defence Force	Volume 1	2 Background	How to use the MEP	Reject
1002	299	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 1	2 Background	How to use the MEP	Reject
1140	3	Sanford Limited	Volume 1	2 Background	How to use the MEP	Reject
75	1	Girl Guiding New Zealand	Volume 2	All		Deferred
222	1	Jessica Bagge	Volume 2	All		Deferred
263	2	Mark Batchelor	Volume 2	All		Deferred
280	94	Nelson Marlborough District Health Board	Volume 2	All		Deferred
290	10	David Wilson	Volume 2	All		Reject
425	347	Federated Farmers of New	Volume 2	All		Reject

		Zealand				
425	348	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	All		Reject
425	349	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	All		Reject
425	350	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	All		Reject
425	351	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	All		Reject
425	352	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	All		Reject
425	353	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	All		Deferred
425	375	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	All		Reject
479	150	Department of Conservation	Volume 2	All		Reject
510	5	Anne Allison	Volume 2	All		Reject
535	5	Adele Riddle	Volume 2	All		Reject

538	5	Andre Smith	Volume 2	All		Reject
539	5	Allen Steele	Volume 2	All		Reject
540	5	Arthur Stewart	Volume 2	All		Reject
541	5	Akiwa Te Uatuku	Volume 2	All		Reject
543	5	Alistair Willis	Volume 2	All		Reject
549	5	Bryan Albrey	Volume 2	All		Reject
551	5	Ben Armstrong	Volume 2	All		Reject
555	5	Blair Glover	Volume 2	All		Reject
559	5	Belinda Jones	Volume 2	All		Reject
560	5	Brian Lee	Volume 2	All		Reject
562	5	Brendon Lucas	Volume 2	All		Reject
564	5	Belinda Materoa	Volume 2	All		Reject
565	5	Brent Mathews	Volume 2	All		Reject
576	5	Chee Ong Chin	Volume 2	All		Reject
582	5	Cory Burnett	Volume 2	All		Reject
583	5	Carmay Cheong	Volume 2	All		Reject
584	5	Corey Dixon	Volume 2	All		Reject
588	5	Christopher Hall	Volume 2	All		Reject

590	5	Cameron Harvey	Volume 2	All		Reject
593	5	Chang-Seog Jeon	Volume 2	All		Reject
595	5	Clayton McIntyre	Volume 2	All		Reject
600	5	Connor Rangi	Volume 2	All		Reject
603	5	Chee Song Chin	Volume 2	All		Reject
606	5	Cindy Steele	Volume 2	All		Reject
607	5	Cadeena Tepu	Volume 2	All		Reject
611	5	Carla Velez	Volume 2	All		Reject
618	5	Brad Lewis	Volume 2	All		Reject
620	5	Brook Lines	Volume 2	All		Reject
621	5	Becki Findlayson	Volume 2	All		Reject
624	5	Carol-Ann Herbert	Volume 2	All		Reject
625	5	Cheryl Harris	Volume 2	All		Reject
627	5	Carl Scholefield	Volume 2	All		Reject
628	5	Clinton Nott	Volume 2	All		Reject
649	5	Dave Herbert	Volume 2	All		Reject
654	5	David Jones	Volume 2	All		Reject
655	5	Dhaneshkar Karunakaran	Volume 2	All		Reject

656	5	David King	Volume 2	All		Reject
658	5	Dan Lawrence	Volume 2	All		Reject
659	5	Donald M Curie	Volume 2	All		Reject
660	5	Daniel Manson	Volume 2	All		Reject
661	5	Denis Marfell	Volume 2	All		Reject
663	5	Dion McCauley	Volume 2	All		Reject
664	5	Dellae McKenzie	Volume 2	All		Reject
665	5	Dorothy McManaway	Volume 2	All		Reject
667	5	Daniel Paget	Volume 2	All		Reject
677	5	Daniel Walker	Volume 2	All		Reject
678	5	David Horton	Volume 2	All		Reject
680	5	Delwynne Horton	Volume 2	All		Reject
694	5	Elin Shin	Volume 2	All		Reject
698	114	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 2	All		Reject
703	5	Faye Fosbender	Volume 2	All		Reject
704	5	Febe Jones	Volume 2	All		Reject
705	5	Fay Mathews	Volume 2	All		Reject

708	5	Filisita Tuese	Volume 2	All		Reject
709	5	Ian Dunlop	Volume 2	All		Reject
717	62	Fulton Hogan Limited	Volume 2	All		Reject
717	63	Fulton Hogan Limited	Volume 2	All		Reject
721	5	Grant Boyd	Volume 2	All		Reject
722	5	Gaik Choo Tan	Volume 2	All		Reject
729	5	Graham Hayter	Volume 2	All		Reject
731	5	Grace Jones	Volume 2	All		Reject
734	5	Gail Learmonth	Volume 2	All		Reject
737	5	Gareth Mcllroy	Volume 2	All		Reject
738	1	Glenda Vera Robb	Volume 2	All		Reject
741	5	Glen Slipper	Volume 2	All		Reject
745	5	Graeme Tregidga	Volume 2	All		Reject
753	5	Hope Lagden	Volume 2	All		Reject
756	5	Hye Sug Ha	Volume 2	All		Reject
758	5	Holly Stanford	Volume 2	All		Reject
759	5	Hudson Steele	Volume 2	All		Reject

760	5	Hui Ting Ng	Volume 2	All		Reject
761	5	Hilda Timoti	Volume 2	All		Reject
770	20	House Movers Section of New Zealand Heavy Haulage Association Incorporated	Volume 2	All		Deferred
773	5	Iosua Kaisara	Volume 2	All		Reject
781	5	Johann Adam	Volume 2	All		Reject
784	5	Jackie Biggs	Volume 2	All		Reject
787	5	Jo Braven	Volume 2	All		Reject
793	5	John Cleal	Volume 2	All		Reject
796	5	John Craddock	Volume 2	All		Reject
799	5	June Ethel Epere	Volume 2	All		Reject
803	5	John Healy	Volume 2	All		Reject
804	5	Jordan Herbert	Volume 2	All		Reject
805	5	James Higgin	Volume 2	All		Reject
807	5	Jeremy Hunter	Volume 2	All		Reject
812	5	Jungmin Ko	Volume 2	All		Reject
814	5	Jeong Lye Jeon	Volume 2	All		Reject

817	5	Jemma McCowan	Volume 2	All		Reject
825	5	Jo-Ann Rickard	Volume 2	All		Reject
826	5	Jade Riri	Volume 2	All		Reject
829	5	Jason Smith	Volume 2	All		Reject
831	5	Jim Taylor	Volume 2	All		Reject
834	5	Jarod Udy	Volume 2	All		Reject
836	5	James William Epere	Volume 2	All		Reject
845	25	Kenneth R and Sara M Roush	Volume 2	All		Reject
851	5	Kevin Hawkins	Volume 2	All		Reject
856	5	Karen Mant	Volume 2	All		Reject
857	5	Kowhai Millan	Volume 2	All		Reject
863	5	Karen Soloman	Volume 2	All		Reject
877	5	Lynette Ashby	Volume 2	All		Reject
878	5	Lyndon Daymond	Volume 2	All		Reject
881	5	Laisa Gibbins	Volume 2	All		Reject
884	5	Laura Jillian Moleta-Bentham	Volume 2	All		Reject
885	5	Les McClung	Volume 2	All		Reject

886	5	Linda McGee	Volume 2	All		Reject
887	5	Lauren Mitchell	Volume 2	All		Reject
888	5	Pang Lily	Volume 2	All		Reject
889	5	Lavina Rickard	Volume 2	All		Reject
892	5	Lynda Simpson	Volume 2	All		Reject
901	5	Lo Wai Wing	Volume 2	All		Reject
902	5	Lewis Ward	Volume 2	All		Reject
912	5	Myken Augustine	Volume 2	All		Reject
914	5	Michael Burne	Volume 2	All		Reject
918	5	Maree Cleal	Volume 2	All		Reject
926	5	Wainui Green 2015 Limited	Volume 2	All		Reject
927	5	Mark Gillard	Volume 2	All		Reject
929	5	Mandy Hargood	Volume 2	All		Reject
935	63	Melva Joy Robb	Volume 2	All		Reject
941	5	Marion Marfell	Volume 2	All		Reject
942	5	Marie Mitchell	Volume 2	All		Reject
943	5	Martina Naplawa	Volume 2	All		Reject
948	5	Melissa Smith	Volume 2	All		Reject

951	5	Michael Wallace	Volume 2	All		Reject
953	5	Mark Whittall	Volume 2	All		Reject
955	6	Moira Winter	Volume 2	All		Reject
973	8	Ministry for Primary Industries	Volume 2	All		Deferred
976	5	Norazizah Abu Yazid	Volume 2	All		Reject
982	5	Nathan Grey	Volume 2	All		Reject
985	5	Niki McCulloch	Volume 2	All		Reject
988	5	Nathan Wallace	Volume 2	All		Reject
989	5	Natasha Watts	Volume 2	All		Reject
990	4	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 2	All		Deferred
990	6	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 2	All		Deferred
992	34	New Zealand Defence Force	Volume 2	All		Reject
992	35	New Zealand Defence Force	Volume 2	All		Reject
992	60	New Zealand Defence Force	Volume 2	All		Reject
992	92	New Zealand Defence Force	Volume 2	All		Reject

1002	179	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 2	All		Deferred
1002	295	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 2	All		Accept
1002	296	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 2	All		Accept
1002	297	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 2	All		Reject
1008	5	Philip Anthony Hawke	Volume 2	All		Reject
1026	5	Patricia Riri	Volume 2	All		Reject
1029	5	Peter Shirley	Volume 2	All		Reject
1031	5	Peter Snape	Volume 2	All		Reject
1053	5	Roger Bee	Volume 2	All		Reject
1055	5	Rory Bryant	Volume 2	All		Reject
1057	5	Roger Dippie	Volume 2	All		Reject
1063	5	Riley George Barnes MacPherson	Volume 2	All		Reject
1067	5	Renee Heta	Volume 2	All		Reject
1072	5	Rob MacGibbon	Volume 2	All		Reject
1073	5	Robert Murdoch	Volume 2	All		Reject

1079	5	Rachel Stanford	Volume 2	All		Reject
1080	5	Rata Steele	Volume 2	All		Reject
1084	2	Raeburn Property Partnership	Volume 2	All		Reject
1097	5	Sonya Ferguson	Volume 2	All		Reject
1103	5	Stuart Barnes	Volume 2	All		Reject
1108	5	Shane Bray	Volume 2	All		Reject
1113	5	Sivanathan Devaraj	Volume 2	All		Reject
1115	5	Steve Dyer	Volume 2	All		Reject
1116	5	Stuart Edward Borrie	Volume 2	All		Reject
1119	5	Sharon Hill	Volume 2	All		Reject
1120	5	Stewart Holdem	Volume 2	All		Reject
1122	5	Steven John Bickley	Volume 2	All		Reject
1127	5	Soon Ng	Volume 2	All		Reject
1128	5	Sam Oliver	Volume 2	All		Reject
1130	5	Sook Peng Lim	Volume 2	All		Reject
1131	5	Susana Pereyra	Volume 2	All		Reject

1138	5	Shane Turnbull	Volume 2	All		Reject
1139	5	Sarah Williams	Volume 2	All		Reject
1144	5	Scott Foster	Volume 2	All		Reject
1168	5	Tony Jones	Volume 2	All		Reject
1170	5	Tama Lindsay	Volume 2	All		Reject
1172	5	Tyler Materoa	Volume 2	All		Reject
1175	5	Tracy O'Grady	Volume 2	All		Reject
1177	5	Thien Soong Wong	Volume 2	All		Reject
1178	5	Teresa Shaw	Volume 2	All		Reject
1181	5	Tiare Tautari	Volume 2	All		Reject
1186	4	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	Volume 2	All		Reject
1186	6	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	Volume 2	All		Reject
1186	7	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	Volume 2	All		Reject
1186	18	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	Volume 2	All		Reject
1186	23	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	Volume 2	All		Reject
1186	27	Te Atiawa o Te	Volume 2	All		Reject

		Waka-a-Maui				
1186	29	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	Volume 2	All		Reject
1211	5	Vaughan Hall	Volume 2	All		Reject
1221	5	Wayne de Joux	Volume 2	All		Reject
1224	5	P Wood	Volume 2	All		Reject
1225	5	Wayne Hollis	Volume 2	All		Reject
1226	5	William Kingi	Volume 2	All		Reject
1227	5	Warwick Neame	Volume 2	All		Reject
1241	5	Yong Hee Son	Volume 2	All		Reject
1243	5	Zane Charman	Volume 2	All		Reject
1247	5	Robert Walker	Volume 2	All		Reject
1252	5	Frank Prendeville	Volume 2	All		Reject
255	21	Warwick Lissaman	Volume 3	All		Reject
280	213	Nelson Marlborough District Health Board	Volume 3	All		Deferred
768	69	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere	Volume 3	All		Deferred

		Taonga				
869	30	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 3	All		Deferred
1090	126	Ravensdown Limited	Volume 3	All		Deferred
1192	98	The Fertiliser Association of New Zealand	Volume 3	All		Deferred
368	8	Kate and Shane Ponder-West	Volume 4	All		Deferred
425	777	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 4	All		Reject
425	778	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 4	All		Reject
425	791	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 4	All		Reject
442	1	GDC Consulting (2010) Limited	Volume 4	All		Accept
484	77	Clintondale Trust, Whyte Trustee	Volume 4	All		Accept

		Company Limited				
548	142	Awatere Water Users Group Incorporated	Volume 4	All		Reject
845	26	Kenneth R and Sara M Roush	Volume 4	All		Refer to individual submissions
961	98	Marlborough Chamber of Commerce	Volume 4	All		Reject
1002	275	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 4	All		Deferred
1089	18	Rarangi District Residents Association	Volume 4	All		Deferred
996	36	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors	Volume 4	Overlay Maps		Reject
1002	278	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 4	Overlay Maps		Accept in part