

Proposed Marlborough Environment Plan

**Section 42A Hearings Report for Hearing Commencing
Monday 26 February 2018**

Report dated 20 November 2017

**Report on submissions and further submissions
Topic 5: Landscapes – Issues, Objectives,
Policies, and Methods**

Report prepared by

Maurice Dale

Consultant Senior Planner, Boffa Miskell Ltd

Contents

1.	Introduction.	1
	1.1 Code of Conduct	1
2.	Scope of Hearings Report	1
3.	Overview of Provisions.	3
4.	Statutory Documents	8
	4.1 Resource Management Act 1991	8
	4.2 New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.	8
	4.3 National Policy Statement of Electricity Transmission.	9
	4.4 National Environmental Standard of Plantation Forestry.	9
5.	Analysis of Submissions.	11
	5.1 Key Issues	11
	5.2 Pre-Hearing Meetings	11
	5.3 General Submissions on Chapter 7 Landscape	11
	5.4 Introduction to Chapter 7 Landscape	15
	5.5 Issue 7A – Modification of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and High Amenity Landscapes	17
	5.6 Objective 7.1 – Identification of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and High Amenity Landscapes	19
	5.7 Policy 7.1.1 – Assessing the Values of Marlborough’s Landscapes.	20
	5.8 Policy 7.1.2 – Defining the Boundaries of Significant Landscapes.	22
	5.9 Policy 7.1.3 – Determining Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and High Amenity Landscapes.	24
	5.10 Policy 7.1.4 – Mapping and Listing of Values of Outstanding Natural Features and High Amenity Landscapes.	27
	5.11 Policy 7.1.5 – Refinement of the Boundaries of Outstanding Natural Features and High Amenity Landscapes.	29
	5.12 Objective 7.2 – Management of Landscapes	31
	5.13 Policy 7.2.1 – Controlling Activities in Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes.	32
	5.14 Policy 7.2.2 – Controlling Activities in the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape.	34
	5.15 Policy 7.2.3 – Controlling Activities in the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape.	37

5.16	Policy 7.2.4 – Consideration of Effects on Landscape Values.	40
5.17	Policy 7.2.5 – Managing Adverse Effects of Activities on Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes.	42
5.18	Policy 7.2.6 – Managing Adverse Effects of Infrastructure and Passive Recreational Activities.	45
5.19	Policy 7.2.7 – Managing Adverse Effects of Structures, Land Disturbance, and Planting.	49
5.20	Policy 7.2.8 – Recognition of Primary Production within Landscapes.	54
5.21	Policy 7.2.9 – Activities in Close Proximity to Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes.	56
5.22	Policy 7.2.10 – Landscape Impacts of Wilding Pines.	57
5.23	Policy 7.2.11 – Landscape Issues on Land Administered by the Department of Conservation.	60
5.24	Policy 7.2.12 – Encouraging Consideration of Landscape Qualities.	60
5.25	General Submissions on Chapter 7 Objectives and Policies.	62
5.26	Methods of Implementation.	66
5.27	Anticipated Environmental Results.	69
5.28	Landscape Rules.	71

List of Figures

Figure 1: MEP Landscape Policy Approach for Managing Subdivision, Use, and Development

Figure 2: MEP Landscape Rule Approach for Managing Activities

List of Abbreviations

DOC	Department of Conservation.
EDS	Environmental Defence Society.
MEP	Proposed Marlborough Environment Plan.
NES-PF	National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry.
NZCPS	New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement.
NPSET	National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission.
NPSFM	National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management.
NPSREG	National Policy Statement on Renewable Energy.
NZTA	New Zealand Transport Agency.
ONFL	Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape.
RMA	Resource Management Act 1991.

1. Introduction

My name is Maurice Dale. I am an Associate Principal / Senior Planner from Boffa Miskell Ltd, based in Christchurch. I hold a Bachelor of Resource and Environmental Planning from Massey University (1998). I am also a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute (NZPI), and a member of the Resource Management Law Association (RMLA). I have 19 years' experience in planning and resource management, gained both in New Zealand and the United Kingdom.

I have provided advice on a broad range of developments and resource management issues to Council's, government agencies, and a range of private clients, a number involving presenting evidence before both regional and district Councils, and the Environment Court. I have extensive experience in the preparation and evaluation of resource management plans under the RMA, including in respect of matters relating to management of landscapes.

I am familiar with the Marlborough environment, having assisted both the Council and private interests with proposals for marine farming in the Marlborough Sounds, as well as worked on winery developments.

I was not involved with the preparation of the MEP. I was contracted by the Marlborough District Council (Council) in August 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.

In preparing this report, I have read the relevant chapters of the MEP, the related section 32 reports, and the supporting technical reports identifying the landscape values of the District. This includes the landscape assessment report titled, the *Marlborough Landscape Study 2015 – Landscape Characterisation and Evaluation*, prepared by Boffa Miskell.

1.1 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.

2. 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 submissions made on Topic 5 –Landscapes, and specifically submissions made on issues, objectives, policies, and methods of implementation of the MEP relating to outstanding and high amenity landscapes.

In particular, this report contains my assessment of submissions on the following aspects of the MEP as they relate to landscapes:

- Volume 1 – Chapter 5 – Landscape – Issues, Objectives, Policies, Methods of Implementation, and Anticipated Environmental Results and Monitoring Effectiveness.
- Volume 2, Chapter 2 – General Rules, Utilities – Rules for structures.
- Volume 2, Chapter 3 – Rural Environment Zone – Rules for buildings and structures, excavation, and filling, commercial forestry, and conservation planting.
- Volume 2, Chapter 4 – Coastal Environment Zone – Rules for buildings and structures, excavation, and filling, and commercial forestry, including replanting.

- Volume 2, Chapter 7 – Coastal Living Zone – Rules for buildings and structures
- Volume 2, Chapter 8 – Rural Living Zone – Rules for buildings and structures, and conservation planting
- Volume 2, Chapter 19 – Open Space 3 Zone – Rules for buildings and structures, excavation, and filling, and conservation planting.

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.

This report also relies on, and is intended to be read in conjunction with, the related s42A report of Mr James Bentley on Topic 5 – Landscape. Mr Bentley’s report specifically identifies the methodology used to identify the landscape values of the District, and evaluates submissions on the assessment of landscape values and the mapping of outstanding and high amenity landscape areas in the MEP.

3. Overview of Provisions

Landscape Character Context

Landscapes are distinct spatial areas influenced by location-specific features, patterns, and processes, which can be natural or human-induced (e.g. land use change). Multiple qualities can contribute to the value of a landscape, and may include:

- Biophysical values, including geological and ecological elements.
- Sensory values, including aesthetics, natural beauty and visual perception.
- Associative values, including cultural and historic values, and landscapes that are widely known and valued by the immediate and wider community for their contribution to a sense of place.

Collectively these values combine to determine the overall significance of the landscape and features within it, which may include those with outstanding values, and others that while not classified as outstanding, may still have high amenity values.

The landscape provisions of the MEP stem from the statutory requirements in section 6(b) and 7(c) of the RMA, and supporting objectives and policies set out in the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS). Section 6(b) of the RMA requires as a matter of national importance, the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. Section 7(c) also requires particular regard be given to the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values. The statutory requirements are described further in section 4 of this report below.

Given these statutory requirements, Chapter 7 of the MEP provides overall direction for management of landscapes, which is supported by associated rules throughout the MEP.

Chapter 7 Issues and Objectives

The identified resource management issue relating to the management of landscapes in Marlborough is set out in Volume 1, Chapter 7, Issue 7A, which recognises:

- *‘Resource use and changes in resource use can result in the modification or loss of values that contribute to outstanding natural features and landscapes and to landscapes with high amenity.’*

This issue recognises that collectively, landscapes contribute significantly to community wellbeing and help create a Marlborough identity, with some landscapes being valued more highly by the community than others, or which may more sensitive to change. The use and development of physical resources can result in the loss or degradation of values that are fundamental or integral to the significance of a particular landscape.

The MEP includes two objectives in addressing Issue 7A:

- *‘Objective 7.1 – Identify Marlborough’s outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value.’*
- *‘Objective 7.2 – Protect outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development and maintain and enhance landscapes with high amenity value.’*

The focus of Objective 7.1 is on identifying outstanding natural features and landscapes (ONFL’s), and high amenity landscapes. The focus of Objective 7.2 is then on managing activities within the identified landscapes so to ensure protection of ONFL’s, and maintaining high amenity landscapes to assist achieve the direction in sections 6(a) and 7(c) of the RMA.

Chapter 7 Policies

These objectives are to be implemented through applying a number of specific policies and methods. Broadly, Policies 7.1.1 – 7.1.5 set out the methodology for identification of the values of landscapes in Marlborough to assist achieve Objective 7.1. Specifically:

- Policy 7.1.1 requires the values of landscapes to be identified by assessing biophysical, sensory, and associative values. This information is intended to assist define and map ONFL's and high amenity landscapes under policies 7.1.2 to 7.1.4, and assist resource users in determining the effects of activities on the landscape values of an area.
- Policy 7.1.2 – requires the boundaries of significant landscapes to be defined using land typing, contour lines, contained landscape features, visual catchment, or land use. The method to be used depends on the values that contribute to the landscape and how they are expressed in the landscape.
- Policy 7.1.3 – requires the assessment of landscape values to determine whether a landscape is either an ONFL in terms of section 6(b) of the RMA, has high amenity in terms of section 7(c) of the RMA, or where landscape values are not sensitive to change. Where a landscape is considered to exhibit exception or very high biophysical, sensory, or associative values, then it will be identified an ONFL. Where sensory values are collectively high, landscapes will be identified as a high amenity landscape.
- Policy 7.1.4 – requires ONFL's, and high amenity landscapes where their values are more sensitive to change, to be identified on the MEP maps, and the identified values of the landscapes set out in Appendix 1 of the MEP. With regard to the coastal environment, this gives effect to policy 15(d) of the NZCPS. Mapping is intended to make it clear to resource users where these landscapes are located, and Appendix 1 makes it clear the values that contribute to the significance of those landscapes.
- Policy 7.1.5 – enables refinement of the boundaries of ONFL, and high amenity landscapes in response to landscape change, or more detailed assessment of landscape values. Changes to boundaries of the identified landscapes is required to pass through the first schedule RMA plan change process.

Assessment of the landscape values of Marlborough, and mapping of ONFL's, and high amenity landscapes has been undertaken to support the development of the MEP. The results of that assessment are found in the report *Marlborough Landscape Study 2015 – Landscape Characterisation and Evaluation*, prepared by Boffa Miskell Ltd. Mr Bentley's section 42A report provides an overview of the methodology used to identify landscape values, and the identification and mapping of ONFL's, and high amenity landscapes. Areas of ONFL's, and high amenity landscapes have been mapped in Volume 4 of the MEP. The values that contribute to the significance of those landscapes have been incorporated in Appendix 1.

Policies 7.2.1 – 7.2.12 set out the means by which subdivision, use, and development will be managed in landscape areas, so as to assist achieve Objective 6.2. This management framework is partly summarised in **Figure 1** below:

Figure 1 – MEP Landscape Policy Approach for Managing Subdivision, Use, and Development.

Proposed Activity	Landscape		
	Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape (ONFL)	Wairau Dry Hills Landscape	Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape
All Activities	<p><u>Control activities</u> that have the potential to degrade landscape values through the resource consent process (policy 7.2.1)</p> <p>Where resource consent is required, have regard to</p>	<p><u>Control activities</u> that have the potential to degrade landscape values by requiring greater assessment where activities exceed permitted activity standards, and requiring resource consent</p>	<p><u>Control activities</u> that have the potential to degrade landscape values by using a non-regulatory approach to maintain and enhance landscape values in the coastal living zone, requiring greater</p>

	<p>the values that contribute to the landscape (policy 7.2.4)</p> <p><u>Avoid</u> adverse effects on landscape values in the first instance. Where adverse effects cannot be avoided, and the activity is not in the coastal environment, ensure that adverse effects are <u>remedied</u> (policy 7.2.5)</p>	<p>for commercial forestry activities (policy 7.2.2)</p> <p>Where resource consent is required, have regard to the values that contribute to the to the landscape (policy 7.2.4)</p>	<p>assessment where activities exceed permitted activity standards, and requiring resource consent for commercial forestry activities (policy 7.2.3)</p> <p>Where resource consent is required, have regard to the values that contribute to the to the landscape (policy 7.2.4)</p>
<p>Regionally significant infrastructure, smaller scale activities that enhance passive recreational opportunities, and renewable energy generation</p>	<p><u>Mitigate</u> the adverse effects, provided the overall qualities and integrity of the landscape are <u>retained</u> (policy 7.2.6)</p>	n/a	n/a
<p>Structures</p>	<p>Protect the values of the landscape by –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Avoiding</u> visual intrusion on skylines, particularly when viewed from public places; • <u>Avoiding</u> new dwellings close to the foreshore; • Using reflectivity levels and building materials that <u>complement</u> the surrounding landscape; • <u>Limiting</u> the scale, height and placement of structures to minimise intrusion of built form; • <u>Recognising</u> that existing structure may contribute to the landscape character and additional structures may complement this contribution. 		
<p>Land Disturbance</p>	<p>Protect the values of the landscape by –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Avoiding</u> extensive land disturbance activity that creates a long term change in the visual appearance of the landscape, particularly when viewed from public places; • <u>Encouraging</u> tracks and roads to locate adjacent to slopes or at the edge of landforms or vegetation patterns, and to follow natural contour lines; • <u>Minimising</u> the extent of any cuts or side castings; • <u>Encouraging</u> the revegetation of cuts or side castings. 		
<p>Vegetation Planting</p>	<p>Protect the values of the landscape by –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Avoiding</u> the planting of new exotic forestry in areas of outstanding natural features and landscapes in the coastal environment of the Marlborough Sounds; • <u>Encouraging</u> plantations of exotic trees to be planted in form that complements the natural landform; and • <u>Recognising</u> the potential for wilding tree spread. 		

Under the above management approach, activities are to be assessed as to whether they will adversely affect the landscape values of that area. Where the activity is within an ONFL, any adverse effects on the landscape values are to be avoided in the first instance, and otherwise remedied where it is not within the coastal environment, or mitigated where the activity relates to regionally significant infrastructure, passive recreational opportunities, and renewable energy generation. Within Wairau Dry Hills, and Marlborough Sounds Coastal high amenity landscapes, activities are to be controlled. Specific requirements apply for structures, land disturbance, and vegetation planting that apply equally across all ONFL's and high amenity landscapes.

In addition, other related policies provide:

- Policy 7.2.8 requires recognition that some ONFL's and high amenity landscapes fall within areas in which primary production activities currently occur. This is intended to recognise that some landscapes are a product of past and present primary production and that the continuation of such activities is not anticipated to threatened the landscape values.
- Policy 7.2.9 requires that regard may be had to the matters in Policy 7.2.7 when considering resource consent applications for activities in close proximity to ONFL's. This is intended to recognise the difficult in establishing the boundaries of ONFL's and high amenity landscapes, and therefore that activities in close proximity to them may have adverse effects.
- Policy 7.2.10 requires reduction in the impact of wilding pines on the landscape, by supporting initiatives to control wilding pines and limit their spread, and controlling the planting of commercial wood species that are prone to wilding tree spread.
- Policy 7.2.11 requires liaison with DOC regarding landscape issues on land administered by the department, and is within an ONFL. This is intended to ensure threats to the landscape values of conservation land are identified and appropriately managed.
- Policy 7.2.12 encourages landowners and resource users to consider landscape qualities as part of use and development in high amenity landscapes. This is intended to encourage consideration of landscape values as part of use and development in other landscapes with high amenity value that have been not been identified in the MEP.

Methods of Implementation

Regional and district rules provide the primary means to implement policies 7.2.1 – 7.2.9. Activities occurring within ONFL's, the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape, and the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape have been subscribed an activity status based on the severity of the threat to the identified landscape values in each area. In addition, rules regulate particular activities by setting permitted activity thresholds above which activities require resource consent in recognition of the potential for modification of the values that contribute to each landscape. Such an approach is intended to avoid application of generic rules which are not related to the differences in landscape values that exist in area.

The rule framework is partly summarised below in **Figure 2** below. Where status of an activity requires resource consent to be obtained, the adverse effects on landscape values are to be assessed against the policy framework of Chapter 7.

Figure 2 – MEP Landscape Rule Approach for Managing Activities.

Landscape	Proposed Activity Standard			
	Buildings and structures	Excavation or filling with clean fill	Commercial forestry in Rural, and Coastal Environment Zones	Conservation planting in Rural, Rural Living, and Open Space 3 Zones
Marlborough Sounds ONFL	Less than 10m ² in Coastal Environment Zone. Paint to have light reflectance value of 45% or less (rules 4.2.1.11, 7.2.1.9).	Less than 500m ³ per computer register within any 12 month period (rules 4.3.13.6, 4.3.15.5).	No <u>new</u> planting – discretionary (rule 4.6.3). Note - Replanting is permitted.	n/a
Limestone Coastline ONFL	Less than 10m ² where within 20m of significant ridgeline. Paint to have light reflectance value of 45% or less (3.2.1.13,	Less than 500m ³ per computer register within any 12 month period (rules 3.3.14.8, 3.3.16.10, 19.3.5.9,	No planting – discretionary (rule 3.3.6.2).	n/a

	19.2.1.5).	19.3.6.13).		
White Bluffs ONFL	No utilities – discretionary (rule 2.39.1.2). No buildings or structures except fences or gates for farming or conservation purposes (rule 19.2.1.7).	n/a	n/a	n/a
All other inland ONFL's	n/a	Less than 500m ³ per computer register within any 12 month period (rules 3.3.14.8, 3.3.16.10, 19.3.5.7, 19.3.5.8, 19.3.5.9, 19.3.5.10, 19.3.6.11, 19.3.6.12, 19.3.6.13, 19.3.6.14).	n/a	n/a
Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape	Paint to have light reflectance value of 45% or less (rule 4.2.1.12).	n/a	No <u>new</u> planting – discretionary (rule 4.6.3). Note - Replanting is permitted.	n/a
Wairau Dry Hills Landscape	Utility structures not to exceed 15 metres in height (rule 2.39.1.6). Less than 10m ² where within 20m of significant ridgeline. Paint to have light reflectance value of 45% or less (3.2.1.14, 8.2.1.8, 19.2.1.6).	n/a	No planting – discretionary (rule 3.3.6.2).	No planting – discretionary (rules 3.3.10.4, 8.3.9.3, 19.3.2.3).

In addition to identifying ONFL's and high amenity landscapes and administering rules, the Council will also produce guidelines to help resource users avoid, remedy, or mitigate the adverse visual effects of development on landscape values. This will include guidelines for forest harvest activities and new structures. A colour palette has also been developed to help resource users integrate structures within ONFL's and high amenity landscapes.

Other non-regulatory methods included in the MEP include:

- Considering rates relief where landscape protection is formalised (e.g. by way of covenant).
- Providing funding for pest control programmes.
- Undertaking research into alternative land use options available to pine forest owners in the Marlborough Sounds.
- Making information available to the public on the Marlborough's landscapes, alternative land use options, and effective control practices for wilding pines.
- Advocating for increased national guidance on assessing the adverse effects of resource use and development on landscape values.

The overall anticipated environmental results of the management framework of the MEP is that Marlborough's ONFL's, and landscapes with visual amenity value are protected from degradation. Effectiveness of the framework in achieving these anticipated results is to be determined, in part, by reassessing Marlborough's landscapes over the life of the MEP, and assessing other monitoring indicators.

4. Statutory Documents

The following statutory documents are relevant to the provisions and/or submissions within the scope of this report. Although a summary of the way in which these provisions are relevant is provided below, the way in which they influence the assessment of the relief requested by submissions will be set out in actual assessment.

4.1 Resource Management Act 1991

The RMA sets out a number of obligations on the Council that it must address in preparing the MEP, with regard to managing landscapes.

Section 6(b) requires the Council to recognise and provide for as a *'matter of national importance'* the *'protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development.'*

Section 6(e) also requires Council to recognise and provide for *'the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga.'*

Although not as significant as section 6 matters, there are two section 7 matters also relevant to the consideration of landscape values. Specifically, sections 7(c) and (f), require particular regard must to be given to the *'maintenance and enhancement of amenity values'* and to the *'maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment'*, respectively.

4.2 New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement (NZCPS)

The NZCPS has specific requirements which support the achievement of sections 6 and 7 of the RMA with respect to managing landscapes within the coastal environment, for which the MEP is then required to give effect to.

Policy 15 of the NZCPS directs that in order to protect the natural features and natural landscapes (including seascapes) of the coastal environment from inappropriate subdivision, use and development, the following should occur:

- (a) *avoid adverse effects of activities on outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes in the coastal environment; and*
- (b) *avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy, or mitigate other adverse effects of activities on other natural features and natural landscapes in the coastal environment; including by:*
- (c) *identifying and assessing the natural features and natural landscapes of the coastal environment of the region or district, at minimum by land typing, soil characterisation and landscape characterisation and having regard to:*
 - i) *natural science factors, including geological, topographical, ecological and dynamic components;*
 - (ii) *the presence of water including in seas, lakes, rivers and streams;*
 - (iii) *legibility or expressiveness—how obviously the feature or landscape demonstrates its formative processes;*
 - (iv) *aesthetic values including memorability and naturalness;*
 - (v) *vegetation (native and exotic);*
 - (vi) *transient values, including presence of wildlife or other values at certain times of the day or year;*

- (vii) *whether the values are shared and recognised;*
 - (viii) *cultural and spiritual values for tangata whenua, identified by working, as far as practicable, in accordance with tikanga Māori; including their expression as cultural landscapes and features;*
 - (ix) *historical and heritage associations; and*
 - (x) *wild or scenic values;*
- (d) *ensuring that regional policy statements, and plans, map or otherwise identify areas where the protection of natural features and natural landscapes requires objectives, policies and rules; and*
- (e) *including the objectives, policies and rules required by (d) in plans.'*

The Supreme Court in *EDS v NZ King Salmon (SC82/2013)* noted that where the term 'inappropriate' is used in the context of protecting areas from inappropriate, subdivision, use, and development, the natural meaning is that 'inappropriateness' should be assessed by reference to what is sought to be protected. Accordingly, subdivision, use, and development which degrades the values which contribute to the landscapes significance, is more likely to be inappropriate.

Policy 6(h) of the NZCPS requires consideration of how adverse visual impacts of development can be avoided in areas sensitive to such effects, and as far as practicable and reasonable apply controls or conditions to avoid these effects. Furthermore, policy 6(i) requires development to be setback from the coastal marine area and other water bodies in the coastal environment where practicable and reasonable, to protect amenity values.

Policy 7 of the NZCPS requires inclusion of provisions in plans to manage cumulative adverse effects, and 'where practicable set thresholds, or specify acceptable limits to change, to assist in determining when activities causing adverse cumulative effects are to be avoided.'

4.3 National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission (NPSET)

The NPS-ET contains objectives and policies addressing the operating, maintenance, development, and upgrade of the electricity transmission network. Policy 8 of the NPS-ET directs that in rural environments, planning and development of the transmission system should seek to avoid adverse effects on outstanding natural landscapes, areas of high natural character, and areas of high amenity.

4.4 National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry (NES-PF)

Since the notification of the MEP, a National Environment Standard for Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) has been introduced which puts in place nationally consistent rules for the management of commercial plantation forestry. The objectives of the NES-PF are:

- To maintain or improve the environmental outcomes associated with plantation forestry activities nationally; and
- To increase certainty and efficiency in the management of plantation forestry activities.

The regulations apply to any commercial forest greater than 1 hectare in size. The NES-PF includes rules covering eight core commercial plantation forestry activities, including afforestation, pruning, and thinning to waste, earthworks, river crossings, forest quarrying, harvesting, mechanical land preparation, and replanting. The NES-PF sets out conditions for these activities, which where they are not met, require resource consent to be obtained.

Regulation 6 of the NES-PF sets out the circumstances where a rule in an RMA plan may be more stringent than the regulations. These circumstances include when the rule gives effect to a freshwater objective in the

NPSFM or Policies 11, 13, 15, and 22 of the NZCPS for the coastal environment, or provides for the protection of section 6 RMA outstanding natural features and landscapes, or significant natural areas.

RMA plans may also restrict 'afforestation' within 'visual amenity landscapes', but not restrict the activity of 'replanting' forestry in these landscapes. By default, 'afforestation' is a controlled activity, and 'replanting' a permitted activity in the NES-PF in such landscapes. A greater level of restriction can however be imposed where the circumstances specified in Regulation 6 apply.

5. Analysis of submissions

There were approximately 630 submission points received on the issues, objectives, policies, and methods of implementation relevant to the landscape topic. A number of these were in common formats and have been grouped as a single entry per relevant matter assessed in this report to avoid unnecessary repetition and duplication.

5.1 Key issues

I have set out my analysis of the submission points under each relevant provision or related group of provisions in the MEP. General submissions which relate to the topic but are not specific to any particular provision of the MEP have been grouped and addressed together. Similarly, submissions that request the addition of new provisions have been grouped and addressed together.

5.2 Pre-hearing meetings

There has been no pre-hearing meeting for this topic.

5.3 General Submissions on Chapter 7 Landscape

Submissions

A range of general submissions have been received on Chapter 7 which addresses the chapter as a whole generally. It includes a number of pro-forma submissions which all seek the same relief.

These general submissions include:

- Support/retain Chapter 7 as notified (**Eric Jorgenson (404/9), Department of Conservation (479/68), Marlborough Chamber of Commerce (961/15), Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association (1190/40), Marlborough Environment Centre (1193/49)**).
- Oppose/delete Chapter 7 (**Kate and Shane Ponder-West (368/2)**).
- Review Chapter 7 (**Tony Hawke (369/2)**).
- Revise the identification of the entirety of the Marlborough Sounds as an ONL and amend the maps accordingly (**A J King Family Trust and S A King Family Trust (514/8), Bryan Skeggs (574/8), Canator Mussels Ltd (726/8), Jim Jessop (809/8), Wainui Green 2015 Ltd (926/18), Michael Jessop (936/8), Marlborough Oysters Ltd (964/8), Southern Crown (1157/8)**).
- Amend Chapter 7 to so that only publicly owned reserves/conservation land is identified as an outstanding natural feature and landscape and landscape with high amenity value, or the financial viability of privately owned and farmed land is protected through monetary compensation on an annual basis for public good (**Murray Chapman (348/1)**).
- Amend the MEP so that subject to commercial forestry is excluded from being classified as outstanding natural features and landscapes (**NZ Forest Products Holdings Ltd (995/13)**).
- Amend Chapter 7 to delete all references to 'amenity' (**Sanford Ltd (1140/20), Aquaculture NZ (401/83), Marine Farming Association (426/87)**).
- Amend Chapter 7 to delete all references to 'significant' landscapes (**Sanford Ltd (1140/18), Ted and Shirley Cully (447/3)**).
- Amend the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape, to exclude those developed areas with urban zoning, such as the areas zoned Port, Port Landing, Marina, Business 1, Urban Residential 2 (**Port of Marlborough Ltd (433/217)**).

- Include appropriate definitions of outstanding natural features, and landscapes, revise the methodologies and maps, recognise existing use of and appropriate ongoing use and development in areas of natural landscape and features (**A J King Family Trust and S A King Family Trust (514/7)**, **Bryan Skeggs (574/7)**, **Canator Mussels Ltd (726/7)**, **Jim Jessop (809/7)**, **Wainui Green 2015 Ltd (926/17)**, **Michael Jessop (936/7)**, **Marlborough Oysters Ltd (964/7)**, **Southern Crown (1157/7)**).
- General comment on chapter – Recognise existing uses of the coastal marine area and do not seek that those change. Recognise that minor or transient effects do not need to be avoided, and that avoidance can be achieved through restoration and enhancement, rather than simply preventing an application from occurring. Only require avoidance where practicable, rather than complete avoidance (**A J King Family Trust and S A King Family Trust (514/11)**, **Bryan Skeggs (574/11)**, **Canator Mussels Ltd (726/11)**, **Jim Jessop (809/11)**, **Wainui Green 2015 Ltd (926/21)**, **Michael Jessop (936/11)**, **Marlborough Oysters Ltd (964/11)**, **Southern Crown (1157/11)**).
- Amend Chapter 7 to replace references to ‘avoid’ with ‘minimise’ (**Windemere Forests Limited (1238/30)**).
- Review the section 32 RMA evaluation to take account of the re-consenting costs, and where existing marine farms are at risk, the costs of loss of farming space should be acknowledged (**Aquaculture NZ (401/86)**, **Marine Farming Association (426/90)**).
- General comment on chapter – Peer review the landscape assessment process and methodology and specific consultation with iwi on the approach taken (**Te Atiawa O Te Waka a Maui (1186/2)**).
- Amend Chapter 7 to acknowledge Ngai Tahu settlement, occupation, and use within landscapes (**Te Runanga o Kaikoura and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (1189/69)**).
- General comment on chapter/no relief requested – Emphasis on Outstanding natural character, landscapes and features, coastal occupation charges and significant marine buffers whilst downplaying the need for water transfer regime issues, sedimentation, does not promote sustainability (**Te Runanga o Ngati Rarua (1188/3)**).
- General comment on chapter – Where MDC has control in the Wither Hills Farm Park, restrict grazing to cattle-only, limit stocking levels, embark on a rotational grazing plan that allows grass recovery; and buy poorly kept areas of the Wairau Hills Dry Landscape and apply best management practice, or plant forests. (**Peter Forester (1017/7)**).

Assessment

These submissions can be broadly grouped into the following categories:

- Support or opposition for the Chapter generally.
- Scope and coverage of the landscapes covered by the Chapter.
- Recognition and provision of existing and future use and development within landscape areas, including review of the section 32 RMA evaluation to take into account re-consenting costs and costs associated with loss of marine farming space.
- Recognition of Maori cultural relationships with landscapes.
- Restoration of the Wairau Dry Hills, and Wither Hills Farm Park.

These submission groupings are addressed in the following sections.

Scope and Coverage of Landscapes Covered by the Chapter

Several submissions have been received requesting revision of the identification of the entire Marlborough Sounds as an ONFL; limiting the coverage of ONFL’s to public conservation land; exclusion of commercial

forestry being classified as ONFL's; deletion of references to 'amenity' and significant amenity landscapes; and exclusion of urban zones from the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape.

As recognised in Mr Bentley's s42A report, the Marlborough Landscape Study 2015 identified the landscapes of the Marlborough Sounds at a range of scales. The study identified the entire Marlborough Sounds as an ONFL at the national scale, due to the complexity and diversity of the Marlborough Sounds, and its value nationwide. At the more detailed regional/district scale however, specific areas of the Marlborough Sounds have been identified as ONFL's. The identification of ONFL's at the regional/district scale has formed the basis for the mapping of ONFL's in Volume 4 of the MEP, with the management framework of Chapter 7 applying to these ONFL's only. The identification of the Marlborough Sound's as an ONFL at the national scale therefore has no practical effect in terms of the ongoing management of landscapes under the MEP. No change is therefore recommended in light of the submissions seeking revision of the identification of the entire Marlborough Sounds as an ONFL.

Identification of only publicly owned reserves/conservation land as ONFL's or high amenity landscapes, and exclusion of commercial forestry from being classified ONFL's, would not properly ensure all landscapes with outstanding or high amenity values, and which require management under sections 6(b) and 7(c) of the RMA are identified. Under Section 85 of the RMA, monetary compensation as a result of the effect of any provisions of a Plan is not payable. No change is therefore recommended to the mapping of landscapes accordingly.

Section 7(c) of the RMA requires particular regard to be had to the 'maintenance and enhancement of amenity values', and enables the identification and management of those landscapes that have visual amenity value, but which are not otherwise considered ONFL's under section 6(b). Removal of those landscapes from the MEP which are significant owing to their high amenity value would therefore be inconsistent with section 7(c) of the RMA, or Policy 15 of the NZCPS within the coastal environment. No change is therefore recommended to delete references to 'amenity' or significant landscapes.

The Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape as identified in the Marlborough Coastal Study 2015 covers the entire coastal environment of the Marlborough Sounds. Whilst the area as a whole is considered to exhibit high amenity landscape values, the area also captures pockets of intensive land use contained within urban or industrial zones, including the townships of Picton and Havelock. These areas have a distinctly contrasting character to the remainder of the Marlborough Sounds, and have a zoning which provides for urban expectations of development which are not necessarily aligned with maintaining high amenity landscape values. Applying the landscape management framework of Chapter 7 to these areas would conflict with the zone expectations for development, and potentially present a regulatory burden to appropriate subdivision, use, and development in these areas. Recognising that, it is recommended that the extent of the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape in Chapter 4 of the MEP be amended to exclude those zones with urban or industrial expectations of development, including: Port Zone, Port Landing Zone, Marina, Industrial 1, Business 1 and 2, and Urban Residential 2 (changes detailed below).

Recognising Existing and Future Use and Development in Landscape Areas

A number of submissions have focused on ensuring provision for existing and future uses within the landscape areas, and in particular exiting marine farming activity in the coastal environment. This includes by recognising that minor or transient adverse effects on landscape character do not need to be avoided; that avoidance can be achieved through restoration and enhancement; and to only require avoidance where practicable. The basis for those submissions, is partly to provide comfort to both industry and the community that an appropriate balance is being achieved within the coastal area without re-litigating sustainable use and development on a case by case basis. Related to this, the submissions Aquaculture NZ and the Marine Farming Association also challenge the Council section 32 RMA evaluation of costs from the proposed MEP provisions, and specifically the view that costs associated with resource consent applications in the coastal marine area are negligible because resource consent is always required.

The management of subdivision, use, and development, including existing uses with regard to landscapes is directed by sections 6(b) and 7(c) of the RMA, and Policies 6 and 15 of the NZCPS as it relates to the coastal environment. The focus of the statute and national policy direction is on ensuring outstanding landscapes are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development; and landscapes with visual amenity value are maintained and enhanced. More specifically within the coastal environment, Policy 15 of the NZCPS requires adverse effects of activities in areas within ONFL's to be avoided, and in all other areas the significant adverse effects of activities to be avoided, and all other effects avoided, remedied, or mitigated. In addition to Policy 15, Policy 6(h) of the NZCPS requires consideration of how adverse visual

impacts of development can be avoided in areas sensitive to such effects. These policies are very directive on the way on which the MEP is required to address management of landscapes in the coastal environment. Avoidance of adverse effects of inappropriate subdivision, use, and development in this context means preventing an adverse effect from occurring, rather than enabling offsetting of effects through restoration and enhancement.

Providing certainty for continuation of existing uses, and new use and development in areas with landscapes is complicated by landscape values varying between different locations. This is recognised in the Marlborough Landscape Study, which was completed to identify the values of Marlborough's landscapes. Accordingly, a balance in providing certainty of use and development is required whereby those activities deemed appropriate regardless landscape values present are permitted, and other activities are required to obtain resource consent to allow consideration of the effects on the landscape values that are present in a particular location.

In regard to the coastal environment, this balance is reflected in the MEP in providing for use and development to occur within the identified landscape areas as permitted activities where they are generally either transient (e.g. temporary structures in the coastal marine zone), provide for enhancement of landscapes (e.g. removal of existing structures), are of a character, scale, and intensity that is unlikely to adversely affect landscape values (e.g. farming), or relates to some regionally significant infrastructure or natural hazard management (e.g. navigational aids in the coastal marine zone).

Outside of such permitted activities, the MEP requires activities to apply for resource consent to enable consideration of the effects of the activity on the values present, and therefore the appropriateness of the activity with respect to protecting those values. This also applies to the continuation of existing activities where the existing consent has expired. Existing activities may be located in ONFL's and high amenity landscapes, and therefore the consenting process enables consideration of the continued appropriateness of those activities in such areas in light of the values present in those areas. Such an approach is consistent with section 6(b), regard to 7(c) of the RMA, and NZCPS. While therefore, the MEP provisions may incur additional costs, those costs may be appropriate in light of the object of the RMA and NZCPS with respect to outstanding and amenity landscapes.

Many of the submissions are in particular concerned about a lack of certainty for the continuation of existing marine farms, where they are located within the landscape areas. That concern is heightened by the fact that the consents for a large proportion of existing marine farms expire in 2024 and will require re-consenting around that time. In this regard the aquaculture provisions of the MEP have yet to be notified, and the Council is continuing to work with stakeholders as to the form of those provisions. Furthermore, the Government has released a proposed National Environmental Standard for Marine Aquaculture, specifically targeted at providing a nationally consistent approach to the re-consenting of existing marine farms. The finalisation of these proposals may assist address the concerns of submitters.

No changes are therefore recommended in response to the general submissions made. Specific changes to provisions of the MEP are addressed in assessing specific submissions later in this report, and particularly commercial forestry.

Recognition of Maori Cultural Relationship with Landscapes

Several submissions have commented on the Maori cultural relationship with landscapes, and specifically the need to ensure by way of peer review and consultation with iwi, that cultural values have been adequately incorporated into the landscape assessment process.

The process for the Marlborough Landscape Study considered tangata whenua values, with landscapes recognised for their connection to Maori values identified as best as practicable from publically available sources. Those cultural values were then incorporated into the assessment used to identify ONFL's and high amenity landscapes. The approach used in the landscape study was confirmed with a group of experienced independent landscape consultants, to ensure the robustness of the approach.

The Marlborough Landscape Study 2009 was presented to the Council's Iwi Working Group (IWG) and considered in several hui. The opportunity to further incorporate the cultural and spiritual values of Marlborough tangata whenua iwi as they relate to landscapes was provided at those hui, however the opportunity was not taken up. It is possible that the opportunity was not realised due to a potential parallel process to provide protection to places of significance to iwi.

It is unclear from the submissions received as to whether there are any specific concerns as to the extent and classification of the landscapes identified in the landscape study and MEP with regards to cultural values. In the absence of further evidence, no change to the MEP is therefore recommended.

Restoration of the Wairau Dry Hills, and Wither Hills Farm Park

The submission of Peter Forester has requested MDC to apply best management practice in controlling grazing on those parts of the Wither Hills Farm Park under its control, and purpose degraded areas of the Wairau Hills Dry Landscape and restore those areas or plant forests. The relief requested is outside the scope of the MEP, and better addressed through Council management of reserves and the long term and annual planning processes. No change is therefore recommended to the MEP as a result of this submission.

Recommendation

Amend the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape overlay in Chapter 4 to exclude areas zoned as:

- Port Zone
- Port Landing Zone
- Marina Zone
- Industrial 1 Zone
- Business 1 and 2 Zones
- Urban Residential 2 Zone. ¹

5.4 Introduction to Chapter 7 Landscape

The introduction to Chapter 7 introduces the concept of landscapes, and sets out the statutory context directing their management in the MEP. The introduction also describes the five broad landscapes areas in Marlborough: The Richmond Range; the Wairau and Awatere River valleys; the mountainous interior; the Marlborough Sounds; and the East Coast.

Submissions

The submissions on the introduction include:

- Amend the introduction to acknowledge and address the lack knowledge regarding the Marlborough Sounds (**Queen Charlotte Sounds Residents Association (504/22)**).
- Amend the introduction to make the relationship clear between the term '*significant landscapes*', ONL's, and amenity landscapes, and how that works within the planning framework (**EDS (698/46)**).
- Amend the introduction to include an explanation of how the natural character values/criteria contribute to the identification of ONFL's and how the provisions of the plan address any overlap in terms identifying specific areas or features (**Forest and Bird (715/142)**).
- Amend the introduction to include reference to Tasman Bay and Cook Strait as two additional broad landscape areas (**Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/70)**).

Assessment

The submissions on the introduction include those that request acknowledgement of the lack of knowledge regarding the Marlborough Sounds, and others that request greater clarity around the relationship between the term '*significant landscapes*' and the landscapes identified in the MEP, and explanation of the relationship between natural character areas and landscape areas in the MEP.

¹ Submission 433/217 Port of Marlborough Ltd.

In regards to the use of the term 'significant landscapes', it is noted that the introduction makes reference to these being landscapes identified under section 6(b) or 7(c) of the RMA. It acknowledged that this relationship could be made clearer through including references to significant landscapes as being either ONFL's or high amenity landscapes identified in the MEP. It is recommended to change the introduction accordingly in response to the submission of EDS (change detailed below).

In regards to the relationship between the natural character and landscape overlays identified in the MEP, the natural character overlays in the MEP identify the degree of 'naturalness' that is present based on the natural elements, patterns, and processes that exist. The landscape overlays are based on a broader range of attributes and include not only biophysical matters, but also sensory and associative attributes. It is acknowledged the relationship between natural character and landscape could be made clearer for plan users. Changes are therefore recommended accordingly in response to the submission of Forest and Bird (changes detailed below).

It is acknowledged that there may be incomplete knowledge of some attributes which contribute to the assessment and identification of landscape values in the Marlborough Sounds. Inclusion of a reference to a lack of knowledge within the introduction as requested by the Queen Charlotte Sounds Residents Association would however represent an unnecessary level of specificity within the introduction, given that the Marlborough Landscape Study clearly identifies the authenticity of the information sources relied on. No change is therefore recommended.

As part of the Marlborough landscape Study, relevant extents of Cook Strait and Tasman Bay were captured within the landscape character area for the Marlborough Sounds. Consequently, it is not considered necessary to include specific references for Tasman Bay and Cook Strait as broad landscape areas in the introduction as requested by the Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay.

Recommendation

Amend the Chapter 7 Introduction as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

Our landscapes provide us with a Marlborough identity and are an integral part of the Marlborough environment. Landscapes are distinct spatial areas influenced by location-specific features, patterns, and processes within the environment. These features, patterns, and processes can be natural or human-induced (e.g. land use change), and incorporate the biophysical aspects of natural character which are separately addressed within Chapter 6 of this Plan. ~~Natural features within the landscape can also help to define a landscape.~~² The resulting landscape characteristics are expressed visually, but can be valued for their ecological significance or for intrinsic reasons (e.g. by providing a sense of place).

The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) identifies the protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development as a matter of national importance (Section 6(b)). Those landscapes that do not meet the threshold of being considered 'outstanding' may still make a contribution to the visual appreciation or amenity values of Marlborough. The RMA seeks to maintain and enhance these landscapes with visual amenity value (Section 7(c)). For the purposes of this chapter, landscapes that are identified ~~for~~ as Section 6(b) outstanding natural features and landscapes or section 7(c) high amenity value landscapes, reasons are referred to generally³ as "significant landscapes."

There are five broad landscape areas in Marlborough: the Richmond Range and associated mountain ranges; the Wairau and Awatere River Valleys; the mountainous interior; the Marlborough Sounds; and the remainder of the coastal environment.

Richmond Ranges

These mountains enjoy a wetter climate than their counterparts to the south. As a consequence, and due to the steep landform, the slopes and valleys are predominantly covered in indigenous forest. Although plantation forestry and intensive pastoral farming are evident within the valleys and on some of the lower slopes, especially along the

² Submission 715/142 Forest and Bird.

³ Submission 698/46 EDS.

north bank of the Wairau River, the majority of the land is managed by the Department of Conservation. A number of European and Māori historic and cultural elements can also be found within this landscape, particularly within the eastern coastal margin from Rarangi in the south to Oyster Bay in the north.

Wairau and Awatere River valleys

These river valleys are characterised by their broad, low lying outwash plains confined to the Wairau River plain and the Awatere River valley. These plains are bounded by the characteristic rolling hills of Southern Marlborough. This vastly modified landscape contains urban developments, pasture, forestry, horticulture and vineyards.

Mountainous interior

The mountainous interior south of the Wairau River is an extensive, largely inaccessible tract of land comprising rugged hills and mountains that reach 2,800 metres above sea level in some places. This landscape is largely bare, although remnant indigenous vegetation exists in alpine areas and in many of the river gorges. Some of the land is used for extensive pastoral farming. Due to vegetation clearance that has occurred, the biophysical aspects of this area are somewhat diminished; however, its bold landform, characterised by underlying geology, geomorphology and natural erosion processes, is typical of high country areas.

The Marlborough Sounds

The Marlborough Sounds display a unique combination of landforms formed by drowned river valleys, resulting in a highly fractured coastline with numerous offshore islands. Shaped largely by physical and climatic influences, the Marlborough Sounds include very steep to moderately steep dissected coastal hills and a mixture of vegetated and cleared mountain slopes. Some parts of the Marlborough Sounds are modified through agricultural, forestry and residential land uses and aquaculture activities in the coastal marine area. A number of significant Māori and European historic and cultural elements also contribute to this landscape.

The East Coast

From Rarangi in the north to Willawa Point on the Kaikoura Coast, the east coast of Marlborough provides a variety of landforms. In the north, the coastal environment comprises a sequence of dunes and swales moving inland, although these features have been modified by agricultural and residential activities. There are two significant river mouths - the Wairau and Awatere rivers - and two significant saline lagoons - Vernon Lagoons and Lake Grassmere. Salt is harvested from Lake Grassmere. The remainder of the coastline is rugged and relatively inaccessible. From Cape Campbell south, this coastline is characterised by dramatic limestone features.

The presence of water, in terms of lakes, rivers, wetlands or the sea, makes a significant contribution to the overall landscape and any reference to landscape within the Marlborough Environment Plan (MEP) includes reference to these water environments.

It is important to recognise that there is significant diversity in landscape within the broad areas identified above. This diversity is partly a response to variation in geological and ecological processes. Human activity has also had a considerable effect on our landscape over time, while current land use continues to influence the landscape character of Marlborough. Because the underlying human and natural processes are subject to change and evolution, landscapes are dynamic systems.

5.5 Issue 7A – Modification of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and High Amenity Landscapes

Issue 7A sets out the resource management issue relating landscapes in Marlborough. Issue 7A reads:

'Resource use and changes in resource use can result in the modification or loss of values that contribute to outstanding natural features and landscapes, and to landscapes with high amenity value.'

Submissions

Submissions on Issue 7A include:

- Amend the explanation to the issue by replacing references to 'significant landscapes' with 'outstanding natural landscapes and landscapes with high amenity' (**Forest and Bird (715/143)**).
- Amend the explanation to the issue to include reference to the NZCPS 2010 (**Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/71)**).

Assessment

These submissions seek minor changes to the wording of the description for Issue 7A, including replacement of the more generic term of 'significant landscapes' with the more specific term 'outstanding natural landscapes and landscapes with high amenity', and inclusion of reference to the NZCPS.

The all-encompassing term 'significant landscapes' has been used in the description for the issue to capture both ONFL's and high amenity landscapes. The Chapter 7 introduction describes the way in which landscapes identified for section 6(b) or 7(c) RMA reasons are jointly referred to as 'significant landscapes' throughout the chapter, to make this clear for plan users and ensure no confusion occurs. No change is therefore recommended.

It is acknowledged that the NZCPS provides further direction and guidance on the protection of landscapes in the coastal environment. It would therefore be appropriate to recognise the national policy context in the description for Issue 7A as requested by Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (changes detailed below).

Recommendation

Amend Issue 7A description as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

Resource use and changes in resource use can result in the modification or loss of values that contribute to outstanding natural features and landscapes, and to landscapes with high amenity value.

The use and development of natural and physical resources has always played an important role in sustaining Marlborough communities. The landscape within which this resource use occurs also makes a significant contribution in this regard. For Marlborough's tangata whenua iwi in Marlborough, particular features within the landscape are taonga. The wider community enjoys and values the landscapes that exist within the Marlborough Sounds, Richmond Ranges, in the Wairau and Awatere River valleys and in the mountainous interior. Our landscapes collectively make a significant contribution to our wellbeing and help provide us with a Marlborough identity.

The use and development of natural and physical resources changes the landscape. This can take several forms, such as: the introduction of built form where there is currently none or where it is introduced into prominent locations; the introduction of colour contrasts those in the existing landscape; or the introduction or removal of vegetation that affects pattern and texture within the landscape. Landscape change can occur at a range of scales and timeframes, be they site-specific or broad scale, immediate or incremental and potentially cumulative.

Not all change in the landscape will result in a loss of landscape values. In fact, some changes have enhanced landscape values. An example of this is the indigenous revegetation in the Marlborough Sounds. Other landscapes are a direct result of resource use. For example, the conversion of pastoral land to viticulture in the river valleys has created a landscape of structure, seasonal colour contrast and colour contrast with the surrounding landscape. These examples demonstrate the dynamic nature of our landscape.

Although our landscape is dynamic and will continue to change in response to future resource use, there are some landscapes that the community values above others. The importance of these significant landscapes and the contribution they make to community wellbeing is recognised by the RMA and NZCPS.⁴ The value placed on our significant landscapes means that they are often more sensitive to change.

Issues can arise where the effects of resource use, especially the subdivision, use and development of land result in the loss or degradation of the values fundamental or integral to a landscape being considered significant. As the community gains economic wellbeing from the productive use of natural and physical resources, it can be challenging to balance this against the need to retain the values that contribute to our significant landscapes. Judgements are therefore required to determine appropriate development within our significant landscapes.

5.6 Objective 7.1 – Identification of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and High Amenity Landscapes

Objective 7.1 sets out the objective of the MEP with regard to the identification of significant landscapes, in addressing Issue 7A. Objective 7.1 reads:

'Identify Marlborough's outstanding natural features and landscapes with high amenity value.'

Submissions

The submissions on the objective include:

- Support/retain the objective as notified (**Trustpower (1201/73), Forest and Bird (496/6, 715/144), Judy and John Hellstrom (688/57)**).
- Amend the objective to sit as a policy under Issue 7A, and add a new Objective 7.1 to read: 'Agreement about which natural landscapes and features Marlborough communities and visitors especially value for their landscape values' (**Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/72)**).
- Amend the objective to remove reference to *'high amenity value'*, and make consequential changes throughout the chapter (**Aquaculture NZ (401/64), Federated Farmers (425/96), Marine Farming Association (426/64)**).

Assessment

The submissions on the objective include a request that it become a policy. Other submissions seek that references to landscapes with *'high amenity value'* be deleted. This is on the basis that the creation of second tier landscapes will result in unnecessary restrictions on activities over and above what the RMA requires, and will harm economic, social and cultural wellbeing. The submissions consider that section 7(c) RMA obligations can be achieved through normal zoning.

Regional and District Plans are intended to be a statement of what is to be achieved through the resolution of a particular issue. Objective 7.1 provides a clear statement of what is to be achieved in response to Issue 7A, and which is to be achieved by the supporting policies. The alternative wording of the objective proposed by the Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay seeking 'agreement' as to those landscapes that are

⁴ Submission 716/71 Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay.

valued, would not assist resolve Issue 7A. Such agreement would likely be unachievable given the disparate views over the identification of significant landscapes, as evidenced by the submissions on the MEP. No change is therefore recommended to Objective 7.1.

In regard to those submissions requesting deletion of references to landscapes of 'high amenity value' in the objective, the identification of such landscapes in the MEP is in direct response to section 7(c) of the RMA, which requires particular regard to be had to the 'maintenance and enhancement of amenity values'. While section 7(c) of the RMA does not require the maintenance of visual amenity values of landscapes to be addressed through their identification in a District Plan, such an approach is commonly used where areas of high visual amenity value exist, and the amenity values of such landscapes may be potentially threatened by subdivision, use, and development. Identifying such landscapes is also used where normal land use controls would be too generic as a tool to manage threats, thereby resulting in unnecessary restrictions being put in place in areas of lesser visual amenity value, and therefore too high a regulatory burden on land use.

The Marlborough Landscape Study 2015 has identified six landscapes with high amenity, and two of these areas, the Marlborough Sounds, and the Wairau Dry Hills, have been identified in the MEP on the basis that they require specific controls to ensure their high amenity values are maintained. While controls included in the underlying zoning of these areas could be included to address the potential threats to the high amenity values, doing so would potentially result in unnecessary restrictions being placed over a much greater area. Identification of the high amenity landscapes enables a much more targeted regime to be imposed, to ensure regulation is matched to threats, and ensure unnecessary restrictions are not put in place that would have undue consequences for social and economic wellbeing.

Recognising this, it is considered that the identification of landscapes of high amenity in the MEP, is appropriate to address potential threats to maintain amenity values in response to section 7(c) of the RMA. Furthermore, subject to the provisions of the MEP controlling subdivision, use, and development within those landscapes being appropriate and reasonable, it is considered that there will be no undue impacts on social and economic wellbeing from the proposed identification of such landscapes. No changes are therefore recommended to the objective to delete reference to landscapes of high amenity. The appropriateness and reasonableness of the policies and rules in managing land use within the landscapes is considered later in this report in response to the specific submissions made.

Recommendation

Retain Objective 7.1 as notified.

5.7 Policy 7.1.1 – Assessing the Values of Marlborough's Landscapes

Policy 7.1.1 sets out the attributes to be assessed to determine the values of Marlborough's landscapes, to implement Objective 7.1. Policy 7.1.1 reads:

'Policy 7.1.1 – When assessing the values of Marlborough's landscapes, the following criteria will be used:

- (a) biophysical values, including geological and ecological elements;*
- (b) sensory values, including aesthetics, natural beauty and visual perception; and*
- (c) associative values, including cultural and historic values and landscapes that are widely known and valued by the immediate and wider community for their contribution to a sense of place.'*

Submissions

The submissions on this policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Ian Mitchell (364/1)**, **John Kershaw (95/6)**, **Jane Buckman (96/5, 284/1)**, **Aquaculture NZ (401/67)**, **Marine Farming Association (426/66)**, **Forest and Bird (496/7)**, **Judy and John Hellstrom (688/59)**, **Omaka Valley Group (1005/3)**).

- Delete the policy, or amend it to explain how the Council will apply values, and reassure landowners that they will be applied in combination, not selectively or subjectively (**D C Hemphill (648/26)**).
- Amend the policy by adding reference to 'A landscape must meet all or most criteria to be classified as an Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape, and the above criteria must be used to determine the special extent of the landscape' (**Federated Farmers (425/97)**).
- General comment – Reconsider the assessment of associative values to give a broader definition of cultural values and more weighting to cultural values in the determination of overall site/landscape value (**Te Atiawa O Te Waka a Maui (1186/52)**).
- Amend the policy to read:

'Policy 7.1.1 – ~~When assessing~~ Identify and assess the characteristics and values of Marlborough's landscapes, using the following criteria ~~will be used~~:

- (a) biophysical values, including geological, topographical, hydrological, and ecological elements;*
- (b) expression of natural and formative processes;*
- (c) sensory values, including aesthetics, natural beauty and visual perception; and*
- (d) associative values, including cultural and historic values and landscapes that are widely known and valued by the immediate and wider community for their contribution to a sense of place.'*

(EDS 698/47)

- Amend the policy to read *'When assessing the characteristics values of Marlborough's landscapes, the following values criteria will be considered used'* (**Forest and Bird (715/145)**).
- Amend the policy as follows *'When assessing the values of Marlborough's landscapes and features, the following criteria will be used'* (**Trustpower (1201/66)**).
- Amend clause (c) of the policy to read *'associative values, including landscapes that are widely known and valued by the immediate and wider community for their contribution to a sense of place, cultural values, and historic heritage values and landscapes that are widely known and valued by the immediate and wider community for their contribution to a sense of place'* (**Heritage NZ (768/14)**).
- Amend clause (c) of the policy to read *'associative values, including cultural and historic values and landscapes which have not been assessed or included in the assessment criteria of Volume 3, Appendix 1 and those that are widely known and valued by the immediate and wider community for their contribution to a sense of place'* (**Te Runanga O Ngati Kuia (501/26)**).
- Amend clause (c) of the policy to read *'valued by the immediate and wider community for its contribution to their sense of place or economic wellbeing'* (**Sanford (1040/25)**).
- Amend the policy to include reference to *'the presence of water, including in seas, lakes, rivers and streams'* (**Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/73)**).
- Amend the policy to include reference to *'Tangata Whenua values'* (**Te Runanga O Kaikoura and Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu (1189/70)**).

Assessment

The submissions on the policy, generally either seek changes to the list of attributes used in the identification of landscape values, or seek greater clarity as to how the attributes will be applied in determining landscape values. Specifically, those submissions seeking changes to the attributes request additional recognition of specific biophysical, cultural, or economic values, or clarity that cultural and historic values are already valuable and warrant protection without contributing to a sense of place.

Policy 7.1.1 is intended to set out the attributes to be used in the assessing the values of Marlborough's landscapes, to assist identify ONFL's, and high amenity landscapes, to implement Objective 7.1. The

attributes are intended to align with those used in the Marlborough Landscape Study 2015 to identify the values of Marlborough's landscapes, and which are consistent with those values set out in Policy 15(c) of the NZCPS, landscape best practice, and the relevant case law. Those attributes are broadly listed in page 15 of the study and incorporate many of the more specific attributes sought to be included by many of the submissions. In particular, it is considered that the listed attributes capture topographical, hydrological, natural and formative processes, and Tangata Whenua values. Notwithstanding, it is acknowledged that the listed attributes do not fully align with the broad list set out in the Marlborough Landscape Study, and some changes to the policy are therefore recommended in response to the submissions of EDS, Te Runanga O Kaikoura and Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu, and Heritage NZ (changes detailed below).

In regard to the specific request of Sanford to include reference to 'economic wellbeing', this is not an associative cultural or social attribute of landscapes, and has not formed part of the assessment of landscape values in the Marlborough Landscape Study. It is therefore not appropriate to include reference to economic wellbeing in the policy.

Landscape assessment is inherently complex and requires expert professional judgement to be applied to determine landscape values. While Policy 7.1.1 sets out the attributes to be considered, it would be impracticable to set out in policy how these attributes will be applied. For example, due to the complexity of landscape assessment and the continuing evolution of assessment practice, it is impracticable to specify that a landscape must meet specific number of criteria thresholds to be classified as an ONFL. Furthermore, the methodology used is clearly set out in the Marlborough Landscape Study. No change is therefore recommended to the policy in response to the submissions of Federated Farmers, D C Hemphill, and Te Atiawa seeking greater clarity around how the listed attributes will be applied.

Recommendation

Amend Policy 7.1.1 as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

Policy 7.1.1 – When identify and assessing the values of Marlborough's landscapes, using the following criteria will be used:⁵

- (a) biophysical values, including geological, and ecological, and biological**⁶ **elements;**
- (b) sensory values, including aesthetics, natural beauty and visual perception, transient matters, and distinctive smells and sounds;**⁷ **and**
- (c) associative values, including cultural (tangata whenua),**⁸ **and historic values, and shared and recognised attributes and landscapes that are widely known and valued by the immediate and wider community for their contribution to a sense of place.**⁹

Multiple values contribute to landscape. Primarily, landscape is the expression of natural processes and human activity in and on the land. However, it is also a function of how people perceive the results of this interaction. Those values considered relevant in a Marlborough context are identified in (a) to (c) of the policy. Landscapes may have one or more of these values. The criteria are derived from national and international landscape assessment criteria. More detail on what constitutes the values in (a) to (c) and how the values are assessed is included within the report "Marlborough Landscape Study August 2015" undertaken by expert landscape consultants. The Council will use these values as the basis of any assessment of landscape.

5.8 Policy 7.1.2 – Defining the Boundaries of Significant Landscapes

Policy 7.1.2 sets out the methods to be used in defining the boundaries of ONFL's and high amenity landscapes in the MEP, to implement Objective 7.1. Policy 7.1.2 reads:

⁵ Submission 698/47 EDS

⁶ Submission 698/47 EDS

⁷ Submission 698/47 EDS

⁸ Submission 1189/70 Te Runanga O Kaikoura and Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu

⁹ Submission 768/14 Heritage NZ

'Policy 7.1.2 – Define the boundaries of significant landscapes using the following methods:

- (a) land typing;*
- (b) contour line;*
- (c) contained landscape features;*
- (d) visual catchment; and/or*
- (e) land use.'*

Submissions

The submissions on this policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Jane Buckland (284/2), Ian Mitchell (364/2), Forest and Bird (496/8), Judy and John Hellstrom (688/60)**).
- Delete the policy (**Federated Farmers (425/99), Sanford (1140/19)**).
- Amend the policy to delete reference to *'significant'* landscapes, and only use the visual catchment approach (i.e. a bay, reach, or valley approach). (**Marine Farming Association (426/67), Aquaculture NZ (401/66)**).
- Amend the policy to read *'Define the boundaries of ~~significant~~ landscapes with high amenity value landscapes using the following methods: (a) land typing; (b) contour line; (c) contained landscape features; (d) visual catchment; and/or (e) land use and zoning'* (**Port Marlborough NZ Ltd (433/23)**).
- Amend the policy to read *'Define the boundaries of ~~significant~~ landscapes with different characteristics using the following methods'* (**Forest and Bird (715/146)**).
- Amend the policy to read *'Define the boundaries of ~~significant~~ landscapes units using the following methods'* (**Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/74)**).
- Amend the policy to include reference to *'inclusion of cultural values and landscapes which have not been assessed or included in the assessment criteria of Volume 3, Appendix 1'* (**Te Runanga O Ngati Kuia (501/27)**).
- Amend the policy to include reference to *'consultation with Tangata Whenua Iwi'* (**Te Runanga O Kaikoura and Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu (1189/71)**).

Assessment

The submissions include those that seek deletion of the policy or its amendment to remove reference to *'significant'* landscapes on the basis that it is unclear as to the scope of landscapes captured by the policy, and inconsistent with other policies which instead refer to *'outstanding natural features and landscapes'*, and *'landscapes of high amenity'*. Other submissions seek that the methods be limited to only using the visual catchment approach; or expanded to capture property ownership, zoning, cultural values, and consultation with Tangata Whenua.

Policy 7.1.2 is intended to set out the methods to be used in defining the boundaries of ONFL's and high amenity landscapes in the MEP, to implement Objective 7.1. The methods listed in the policy align with those used in the mapping of landscapes in the Marlborough Landscape Study 2015, as recognised on page 21 of the study. The range of techniques used reflects the wide range of landscape values present, and therefore the need to use a method which best reflects how those values are expressed in the landscape. Deletion of the policy or changes to the listed methods in the policy would therefore result in an inconsistency with the methodology used in the study, and the basis on which the ONFL's and high amenity landscapes in the MEP have been identified.

Furthermore, in regards to the specific changes sought, it also noted that using property ownership or zoning as a method would be inappropriate as the definition of ownership and zoning boundaries does not typically have a landscape basis. Inclusion of cultural values and landscapes that have not been assessed or

included in Volume 3, Appendix 1, and consultation with Tangata Whenua would be inappropriate in the context of a policy which is intended only to set out the methods to be used identify the boundaries of landscapes, and not the determination of the values such landscapes. The identification and assessment of the values of landscapes, including cultural values is instead addressed in Policy 7.1.1. No changes to the policy are therefore recommended in response to the submissions requesting changes to the listed methods.

It is acknowledged that the use of the generic term ‘*significant*’ landscapes in the policy, could create confusion for plan users. Changes are therefore recommended accordingly as sought by the submissions of Forest and Bird and Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (changes detailed below). Use of the more generic and all-encompassing term of ‘*significant*’ landscapes should only be used in the description for objectives and policies when describing both ONFL’s, and landscapes with high amenity values collectively and generically. In that regard, the Chapter 7 introduction describes the way in which landscapes identified for section 6 (b) or 7(c) RMA reasons are jointly referred to as ‘*significant landscapes*’ throughout the chapter, to make this clear for plan users and ensure no confusion occurs.

Recommendation

Amend Policy 7.1.2 as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

Policy 7.1.2 – Define the boundaries of ~~significant~~ outstanding natural features and landscapes, and landscapes of high amenity value¹⁰ using the following methods:

- (a) land typing;***
- (b) contour line;***
- (c) contained landscape features;***
- (d) visual catchment; and/or***
- (e) land use.***

The identification of significant landscapes requires the extent or boundary of these significant landscapes to be identified. This policy identifies the methods that will be used to establish the boundaries, as follows:

- Land typing: uses a change in landform to establish a boundary at and following the edge of the landform.*
- Contour line: uses a specific contour line(s) to establish a boundary.*
- Contained landscape feature: uses an enclosed area of land around a landscape feature, such as an island.*
- Visual catchment: uses ridgelines and spurs to establish a boundary.*
- Land use: uses a variation in land use to establish a boundary.*

The method to be used will depend on the values that contribute to the landscape and how they are expressed in the landscape.

5.9 Policy 7.1.3 – Determining Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and High Amenity Landscapes

Policy 7.1.3 sets out the basis for the identification of ONFL’s and high amenity landscapes in the MEP in response the assessment of values under Policy 7.1.1, and to implement Objective 7.1. Policy 7.1.3 reads:

¹⁰ Submissions 715/146 Forest and Bird, 716/74 Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay.

'Policy 7.1.3 – Assessment of the values in Policy 7.1.1 will determine:

- (a) whether a landscape is identified as an outstanding natural feature and landscape in terms of Section 6(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991;*
- (b) whether the landscape has high amenity value in terms of Section 7(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991; or*
- (c) where landscape values are not sensitive to change.'*

Submissions

The submissions on this policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**John Kershaw (95/4)**, **Jane Buckman (96/9, 284/3)**, **Ian Mitchell (364/3)**, **Forest and Bird (496/9)**, **Judy and John Hellstrom (688/61)**, **Omaka Valley Group (1005/4)**).

- Amend the policy to read:

'Assessment of the values in Policy 7.1.1 will determine:

(a) whether a landscape is identified as an outstanding natural feature and landscape in terms of Section 6(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991;

~~*(b) whether the landscape has high amenity value in terms of Section 7(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991; or*~~

(b) what the specific values and attributes of the identified ONFL are so these can be listed in Appendix 1 of Volume 3 of the Marlborough Environment Plan.

(c) where outstanding landscape values are not sensitive to change.

Landscapes that meet the criteria to be identified as an outstanding natural feature and landscape will be specifically identified on the Landscape Overlay'

Federated Farmers (425/100))

- Amend the policy by deleting reference to 'high', and deleting clause (c) (**Aquaculture NZ (401/69)**, **Marine Farming Association (426/71)**, **Sanford Ltd (1140/26)**).

- Amend the policy to delete clause (c) (**Trustpower (1201/67)**).

- Amend the policy to read:

~~*'Assessment of the values in Identification and assessment under Policy 7.1.1 and Policy 7.1.2 will determine:*~~

~~*(a) whether a landscape is identified as an outstanding natural feature and landscape in terms of Section 6(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991;*~~

~~*(b) whether the landscape has high amenity value in terms of Section 7(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991;*~~

~~*(c) where landscape values are not sensitive to change.'*~~

EDS (698/48)).

- Amend clause (c) of the policy to read 'where landscape values are not sensitive to change which landscapes have values such that only significant adverse effects on their landscape values are required to be managed' (**Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/75)**).
- Amend the policy by deleting clause (c) and include reference to 'the characteristics of natural features and natural landscapes in the coastal environment, including whether a natural feature or natural landscape is outstanding in terms of Policy 15 of the NZCPS' (**Forest and Bird (715/147)**).
- Amend the policy to include reference to 'whether a landscape is identified as a feature of high cultural value in terms of section 6(e) and 7(a) of the RMA' (**Te Atiawa O Te Waka a Maui (1186/53)**).

Assessment

The submissions on this policy include one seeking deletion of reference to high amenity landscapes, and incorporation of a reference to mapping and listing of values of landscapes which are currently separately addressed in Policy 7.1.4. A number of submissions seek deletion of clause (c) regarding landscape values which are not sensitive to change, or its amendment to capture landscapes for which significant adverse effects on their values are required to be managed. Other submissions seek addition of a clause requiring the identification of landscapes consistent with Policy 15 of the NZCPS, and landscapes of cultural value.

As noted in considering submissions on Objective 7.1 the identification of high amenity landscapes in the MEP is in direct response to section 7(c) of the RMA, which requires particular regard to be had to the *'maintenance and enhancement of amenity values'*. The Marlborough Landscape Study 2015 identified six landscapes with high amenity, and two of these areas, the Marlborough Sounds, and the Wairau Dry Hills, have been identified in the MEP on the basis that they require specific controls to ensure their high amenity values are maintained. Removal of those landscapes from the MEP would therefore be inconsistent with section 7(c) of the RMA. No change is therefore recommended in response to those submissions requesting deletion of references to landscapes of high amenity.

In regard to those submissions seeking deletion or amendment of clause (c), it is acknowledged that clause (c) as worded could imply that all other landscapes in the MEP are not sensitive to any form of change, when in fact they still may be sensitive to some forms of change depending on the character, scale, and intensity of any subdivision, use, and development. Recognising that other landscapes may be sensitive to change also aligns with Policy 15(b) of the NZCPS which requires significant adverse effects on other landscapes to be avoided, and all other adverse effects avoided, remedied, and mitigated. It is therefore recommended to amend clause (c) to instead refer to where *'where landscape values are less sensitive to change'* in response to the submissions of Aquaculture NZ, the Marine Farming Association, Sanford, Trustpower, EDS, and Forest and Bird (changes detailed below).

Identification of ONFL's in the coastal environment is considered to adequately captured within the existing wording of the policy, and the change promoted by Forest and Bird requesting a new clause setting out the identification of landscapes consistent with Policy 15 of the NZCPS would introduce an unnecessary level of specificity in the policy. No change is therefore recommended.

In regard to the submission of Te Atiawa requesting inclusion of a reference to cultural landscapes identified under section 6(e) and 7(a) of the RMA, cultural landscapes have not been separately identified within the MEP.

The Marlborough Landscape Study 2009 was presented to the Council's Iwi Working Group (IWG) and considered in several hui. The opportunity to further incorporate the cultural and spiritual values of Marlborough tangata whenua iwi as they relate to landscapes was provided at those hui, however the opportunity was not taken up. It is possible that the opportunity was not realised due to a potential parallel process to provide protection to places of significance to iwi.

Inclusion of specific cultural landscapes is an emerging area of landscape practice and has been undertaken by some other Council's as part of their 2nd generation plan reviews. While inclusion of cultural landscapes would be consistent with sections 6(e) and 7(a) of the RMA, identification of such landscapes can only practically occur with the adequate resourcing and full involvement of Tangata

Whenua to identify such landscapes. Including such landscapes within the MEP would necessitate full community engagement and consultation through the first schedule RMA process. Recognising that, it is considered premature to include references to identifying cultural landscapes in the MEP policies, and that they could be included by way of a later plan change once any necessary landscape identification has been completed and consulted on. No change is therefore recommended at this time.

Recommendation

Amend Policy 7.1.3 and the associated description as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

Policy 7.1.3 – Identify and assess ~~Assessment of the values in Policy 7.1.1 will to~~¹¹ determine:

- (a) *whether a landscape is identified as an outstanding natural feature and landscape in terms of Section 6(b) of the Resource Management Act 1991;***
- (b) *whether the landscape has high amenity value in terms of Section 7(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991; or***
- (c) *where landscape values are ~~not~~ less sensitive to change.*¹²**

Once an assessment of a landscape has been undertaken based on the values identified in Policy 7.1.1, a determination will be made as to whether the landscape values are significant enough for the landscape to be considered outstanding in the context of Section 6(b) of the RMA. If a landscape is considered to exhibit exceptional or very high biophysical, sensory and/or associative values, then it will be identified as an outstanding natural landscape. Outstanding natural features can also be included within this assessment.

There are also landscapes in Marlborough that, although their values are not as significant as those for an outstanding natural feature or landscape, can still make a significant contribution to the appreciation and quality of our environment. A range of sensory values can contribute to the amenity of these landscapes, including scenic beauty, coastal character, dramatic or attractive natural features within the landscape and the openness or naturalness of the landscape. Where these sensory values are collectively considered to be high, the landscape can be categorised as a landscape with high amenity value.

Controls will apply to both of these landscapes, as set out in subsequent policy. Landscapes ~~not~~ identified as being less sensitive to change will not be included in the MEP and subject to specific management for landscape outcomes.¹³

5.10 Policy 7.1.4 – Mapping and Listing of Values of Outstanding Natural Features and High Amenity Landscapes

Policy 7.1.4 addresses the mapping and listing of the values of outstanding natural features and landscapes, and high amenity landscapes in the MEP, to implement Objective 7.1. Policy 7.1.4 reads:

'Policy 7.1.4 – Landscapes that meet the criteria to be identified as an outstanding natural feature and landscape, or landscapes with high amenity value, where those values are more sensitive to change:

- (a) are specifically identified on the Landscape Overlay; and*
- (b) the specific values associated with the identified landscapes are set out in Appendix 1 of Volume 3 of the Marlborough Environment Plan.'*

¹¹ Submission EDS 698/48.

¹² Submissions 401/69 Aquaculture NZ, 426/71 Marine Farming Association, 1140/26 Sanford, 1201/67 Trustpower, 698/48 EDS, and 715/147 Forest and Bird.

¹³ Submissions 401/69 Aquaculture NZ, 426/71 Marine Farming Association, 1140/26 Sanford, 1201/67 Trustpower, 698/48 EDS, and 715/147 Forest and Bird.

Submissions

The submissions on this policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Clova Bay Residents Association (152/15)**, **Jane Buckman (284/4)**, **Ian Mitchell (364/4)**, **Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/19)**, **Forest and Bird (496/10)**, **D C Hemphill (648/27)**, **Judy and John Hellstrom (688/62)**, **Flaxbourne Setters Association (712/100)**, **Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association (868/11)**, **Trustpower (1201/75)**).
- Delete the policy (**Federated Farmers (425/101)**, **Forest and Bird (715/148)**).
- Amend the policy to read '*Landscapes that meet the criteria to be identified as an outstanding natural feature and landscape, or landscapes with high amenity value, where those values are more sensitive to change*' (**Aquaculture NZ (401/71)**, **Marine Farming Association (426/72)**).
- General comment – If an area qualifies as a section 7 RMA amenity landscape, then it should be mapped as such in the Plan (**EDS (698/49)**).
- Amend the description to the policy to read '~~*Those landscapes that an outstanding natural feature or landscape*~~ *Landscapes that meet the criteria to be identified as an outstanding natural landscape, or outstanding natural feature will be identified (and mapped) in the MEP*' (**Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/76)**).

Assessment

The submissions on this policy include those that seek its deletion and incorporation with Policy 7.1.3, and others that seek all section 7(c) RMA amenity landscapes should be mapped in the MEP, and not just those that are more sensitive to change. A minor change is also sought to the description to the policy to recognise outstanding 'features'.

Policy 7.1.4 requires the mapping and listing of the values of the ONFL's, and high amenity landscapes identified under Policy 7.1.3, to implement Objective 7.1. The policy is essentially a method of implementation and has no practical effect in terms of the identification and assessment of landscape values for determining the extent of ONFL's and high amenity landscapes. Given that Policy 7.1.4 is essentially a method of implementation (and is already captured by the stated method in clause 7.M.1), it is considered redundant, and is therefore recommended to be deleted as requested by Federated Farmers and Forest and Bird. As a consequence, it is also recommended to include some additional explanation in the description to Policy 7.1.3 to provide clarity for plan users that the identified landscapes are mapped in the MEP and their values listed in Appendix 1 of Volume 3 (changes detailed below).

In regard to EDS's submission that all areas qualifying as amenity landscapes should be mapped in the MEP, the Marlborough Landscape Study 2015 identified four additional high amenity landscapes that have not been mapped in the MEP. As acknowledged in the study, only the Marlborough Sounds, and Wairau Dry Hills however were considered to require planning mechanisms to ensure that the identified high amenity values would be maintained. Consequently, the additional landscapes have not been identified in the MEP. Given that specific management mechanisms are not required to manage those landscapes, mapping them in the MEP would be superfluous and therefore no change is recommended.

Recommendation

Delete Policy 7.1.4 and the associated description as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

~~**Policy 7.1.4 – Landscapes that meet the criteria to be identified as an outstanding natural feature and landscape, or landscapes with high amenity value, where those values are more sensitive to change:**~~

~~**(a) – are specifically identified on the Landscape Overlay; and**~~

~~(b) the specific values associated with the identified landscapes are set out in Appendix 1 of Volume 3 of the Marlborough Environment Plan.~~

~~Those landscapes that are an outstanding natural feature or landscape will be identified (and mapped) in the MEP. For the coastal environment particularly, this policy helps to give effect to Policy 15(d) of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS), which requires regional policy statements and plans to map or otherwise identify areas that need protection. For those landscapes identified as having high amenity value, only landscapes that are more sensitive to change have been identified. The two specific areas considered sensitive to change are the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape and the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape.~~

~~Mapping makes it clear to resource users where Marlborough's significant landscapes are located. Additionally, the values that make these landscapes significant are described in Appendix 1. These values should be considered when resource consent applications are made and decided upon including the extent to which they may be affected by a particular use or development.~~¹⁴

Amend the description for Policy 7.1.3 as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be include shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struck through~~.

Once an assessment of a landscape has been undertaken based on the values identified in Policy 7.1.1, a determination will be made as to whether the landscape values are significant enough for the landscape to be considered outstanding in the context of Section 6(b) of the RMA. If a landscape is considered to exhibit exceptional or very high biophysical, sensory and/or associative values, then it will be identified as an outstanding natural landscape. Outstanding natural features can also be included within this assessment.

There are also landscapes in Marlborough that, although their values are not as significant as those for an outstanding natural feature or landscape, can still make a significant contribution to the appreciation and quality of our environment. A range of sensory values can contribute to the amenity of these landscapes, including scenic beauty, coastal character, dramatic or attractive natural features within the landscape and the openness or naturalness of the landscape. Where these sensory values are collectively considered to be high, the landscape can be categorised as a landscape with high amenity value.

*Those landscapes that are an outstanding natural feature or landscape are mapped in the MEP. Landscapes identified as having high amenity values which are more sensitive to change are also mapped in the MEP. The two specific areas considered sensitive to change are the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape and the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape. Mapping makes it clear to resource users where Marlborough's significant landscapes are located. Additionally, the values that make these landscapes significant are described in Appendix 1. These values should be considered when resource consent applications are made and decided upon, including the extent to which they may be affected by a particular use or development.*¹⁵

Controls will apply to both of these landscapes, as set out in subsequent policy. Landscapes ~~not~~ identified as being less sensitive to change will not be included in the MEP and subject to specific management for landscape outcomes.¹⁶

¹⁴ Submissions 425/1010 Federated Farmers, 715/148 Forest and Bird.

¹⁵ Submissions 425/1010 Federated Farmers, 715/148 Forest and Bird.

¹⁶ Submissions 401/69 Aquaculture NZ, 426/71 Marine Farming Association, 1140/26 Sanford, 1201/67 Trustpower, 698/48 EDS, and 715/147 Forest and Bird.

5.11 Policy 7.1.5 – Refinement of the Boundaries of Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes and High Amenity Landscapes

Policy 7.1.5 addresses the refinement of the boundaries of significant landscapes by way of plan change in response to landscape change and more detailed assessment, to implement Objective 7.1. Policy 7.1.5 reads:

'Policy 7.1.5 – Refine the boundaries of outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value in response to:

- (a) landscape change over time; or*
- (b) more detailed assessment of landscape values.'*

Submissions

The submissions on this policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Jane Buckman (284/5), Ian Mitchell (364/5), Kevin Loe (454/7), Forest and Bird (496/11), Flaxbourne Residents Association (712/70), Kiwirail (873/17), NZTA (1002/29)**).
- Delete the policy (**Aquaculture NZ (401/70), Marine Farming Association (426/74)**).
- Amend the policy by deleting all references to 'amenity', and delete reference to clause (b) (**Sanford (1140/21 and 1140/27)**).

- Amend the policy to read:

'Policy 7.1.5 – Refine the boundaries of outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value in response to:

- (a) landscape change over time; or*
- (b) more detailed assessment of landscape values by Council.'*

EDS (698/50)

- Amend the policy to read:

'Policy 7.1.5 – Refine and update the boundaries values and areas of outstanding natural features an outstanding natural and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value as set out in Appendix 1 and shown on the Landscape Overlay maps in response to:

- (a) landscape change over time; or*
- (b) more detailed assessment of landscape values; or*
- (c) new information.'*

(Forest and Bird (715/149))

Amend the policy by adding reference to *'effects of climate change and changed community views and aspirations'* (**Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/77)**).

- Amend the policy to read '*Refine the boundaries of outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value via the plan change process in response to*' (Trustpower (1201/68)).
- Amend the policy by adding reference to '*Costs associated with the refinement of any boundaries of outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value will be paid by the Council*' (D C Hemphill (648/28)).
- General comment/no relief requested – Oppose the potential use of policy 7.1.5 as a possible escape clause by developers with an eye to clearing indigenous forest or permanently altering outstanding natural landscapes for commercial or speculative reasons (Judy and John Hellstrom ((688/63)).

Assessment

The submissions on this policy include those that seek its deletion on the basis that the identified landscapes require review every 10 years in any event, or that it be qualified so that refinement of the boundaries can only by way of Council reassessment so that re-litigation of landscape boundaries does not occur on a case by case basis. Other submissions seek that the policy be broadened by allowing refinement in response to new information, effects of climate change, or changed community views. Clarification is also requested that any refinement will occur by way of plan change, and that the costs of reassessment will be met by the Council.

It is acknowledged that the Marlborough Landscape Study will need to be reviewed every 10 years as part of the 10-year cycle of reviewing the MEP. Nevertheless, it is considered appropriate to enable refinement of boundaries in response to any more immediate landscape change or more detailed assessment undertaken in the meantime. It is not considered necessary to limit refinement only by way of Council reassessment, as any reassessment undertaken privately would still need to be peer reviewed by the Council in considering any proposals to refine boundaries. No change is therefore recommended in response to those submissions seeking deletion or qualification that refinement can only occur by way of Council reassessment.

In regard to those submissions seeking inclusion of additional clauses allowing refinement of boundaries in response to new information, effects of climate change, or changed community views, it is acknowledged that refinement of the boundaries in response to such new information may be appropriate. A change to the policy in response to the submission of Forest and Bird is recommended accordingly (changes detailed below).

It acknowledged that any refinement in boundaries would need to occur by way of plan change (either Council initiated or privately promoted), and it is therefore recommended to amend the policy to recognise this for clarity (changes detailed below). Including reference to the costs of any reassessment is unnecessary as where the costs fall will depend on whoever is promoting the refinement of the boundaries.

Recommendation

Amend Policy 7.1.5 as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

Policy 7.1.5 – Refine the boundaries of outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value through the plan change process¹⁷ in response to:

(a) landscape change over time; ~~or~~

(b) more detailed assessment of landscape values; or

***(c) new information*¹⁸**

¹⁷ Submission 1201.68 Trustpower.

¹⁸ Submission 715/149 Forest and Bird.

5.12 Objective 7.2 – Management of Landscapes

Objective 7.2 sets out the objective of the MEP with regard to the management of ONFL's and high amenity landscapes, in addressing Issue 7A. Objective 7.2 reads:

'Protect outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and maintain and enhance landscapes with high amenity value.'

Submissions

The submissions on the objective include:

- Support/retain the objective as notified (**Chorus NZ (464/11), Forest and Bird (496/12), D C Hemphill (648/30), Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/78), Heritage NZ (768/15), Spark NZ (1158/9), Trustpower (1201/74)**).
- Amend the policy to delete references to 'amenity' (**Sanford (1140/23)**).
- Amend the objective to read '*Protect outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development ~~and maintain and enhance landscapes with high amenity value~~*' (**Aquaculture NZ (401/65), Marine Farming Association (426/65), Federated Farmers (425/102)**).
- Amend the policy to read '*Protect outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use and development and maintain and enhance those landscape features with high amenity value that contribute to the landscapes with high amenity value*' (**Port Marlborough NZ (433/25)**).
- General comment – Clarify the explanation in terms of Objective 15(a) and (b) of the NZCPS (**Forest and Bird (715/152)**).

Assessment

The submissions on the objective include a number which deletion of reference to high amenity landscapes, and others seeking minor amendments, and greater clarity is provided in the description to the policy to ensure inappropriate activities do not occur in landscape areas.

As noted in considering submissions on Objective 7.1 the identification of high amenity landscapes in the MEP is in direct response to section 7(c) of the RMA, which requires particular regard to be had to the '*maintenance and enhancement of amenity values*'. The Marlborough Landscape Study 2015 identified six landscapes with high amenity values, and two of these areas, the Marlborough Sounds, and the Wairau Dry Hills, have been identified in the MEP on the basis that they require specific controls to ensure their high amenity values are maintained. Removal of those landscapes from the MEP would therefore be inconsistent with section 7(c) of the RMA. No change is therefore recommended in response to those submissions requesting deletion of references to high amenity landscapes.

No other changes to the policy or description are considered to be required. In particular, it is not the role of an objective to ensure inappropriate activities do not occur within ONFL's, which is instead the role of supporting policies. No change is therefore recommended as a result of the submission of Forest and Bird.

Recommendation

Retain Objective 6.2 as notified.

5.13 Policy 7.2.1 – Controlling Activities in Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes

Policy 7.2.1 addresses the control of activities within ONFL's by requiring that they be subject to a comprehensive assessment of effects on landscape values through the resource consent process, to implement Objective 7.2.

Policy 7.2.1 reads:

'Control activities that have the potential to degrade those values contributing to outstanding natural features and landscapes by requiring activities and structures to be subject to a comprehensive assessment of effects on landscape values through the resource consent process.'

Submissions

The submissions on the policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Jane Buckman (284/6), Ian Mitchell (364/6) Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/20), Kevin Loe (454/8), Forest and Bird (496/13), Judy and John Hellstrom (688/176), Flaxbourne Settlers Association (712/71), Heritage NZ (768/16)**).
- Delete the policy (**Aquaculture NZ (401/74), Marine Farming Association (426/78)**).
- Amend the policy to read *'Control activities that have the potential to degrade ~~those the characteristics and values contributing to outstanding natural features and landscapes of sensitive landscapes~~ by requiring activities and structures to be subject to a comprehensive assessment of effects on landscape values through the resource consent process consent applications to address:*
 - (a) the potential adverse effects on the characteristics and values of the landscape.*
 - (b) How the Chapter 7 policies will be achieved and taking into account:*
 - (a) The location, scale and design of the proposed activity.*
 - (b) The extent of anthropogenic changes.*
 - (c) The presence of absence of structures, buildings or infrastructure.*
 - (d) The temporary or permanent nature of adverse effects.*
 - (e) The physical and visual integrity of the area, and the natural processes of the location.*
 - (f) The intactness of any areas of significant vegetation and vegetative patterns.*
 - (g) The physical, visual and experiential values that contribute significantly to the wilderness and scenic value of the area.*
 - (h) The integrity of landforms, geological features and associate natural processes.*
 - (i) The natural characters and qualities that exist or operate across land and water and between freshwater bodies and coastal water bodies.'*

EDS (698/51)).

- Amend the policy to read *'~~Control~~ Manage activities that have the potential to ~~degrade~~ affect those values contributing to outstanding natural features and landscapes ~~by requiring activities and structures to be subject to a comprehensive assessment of effects on landscape values through the resource consent process~~ through permitted activities standards that ensure activities avoid, remedy, and mitigate adverse effects' (**Federated Farmers (425/103)**).*

- Amend the policy read 'Protect the landscape values of areas identified as outstanding from inappropriate subdivision, use and development by controlling activities that may degrade these values and requiring activities and structures to be subject to a comprehensive landscape assessment' (**Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/79)**).
- Amend the policy to limit its application to 'new' activities and structures (**Kiwirail (873/18)**).
- Amend the policy to read 'Control activities that have the potential to degrade those values contributing to outstanding natural features and landscapes by requiring activities and structures to be subject to an ~~comprehensive~~ assessment of effects on landscape values, to the level of detail that corresponds with the scale and significance of those effects, through the resource consent process' (**Trustpower (1201/69)**).
- Amend the policy to refer to 'natural landscapes and natural features' in the coastal environment (**Forest and Bird (715/153)**).
- General comment – Ensure provision is made for working rural environments, which do not change (**Marlborough Forest Industry Association (962/53)**).
- General comment – This policy will not apply to commercial forests within the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape (**Nelson Forests Ltd (990/188)**).

Assessment

The submissions on this policy include those that request changes to the management approach, including that activities be managed through setting permitted activity standards, rather than through the resource consent process. Others submissions seek to broaden the scope of the policy to also capture amenity landscapes, or specifically require protection of ONFL's from *'inappropriate subdivision, use, and development'*. Other submissions seek to limit its application to 'new' activities and structures, or excluding commercial forestry within the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape. Various other changes are sought, including setting out the requirements that need to be covered within a resource consent.

Policy 7.1.1 is a process related policy which is intended to set the basis for how activities are to be managed within ONFL's. It requires that activities that have the potential to degrade the values of ONFL's are to be controlled through the resource consent process. Activities therefore that do not have the potential to degrade the values of ONFL's are not to be controlled through the resource consent, and instead are permitted activities in the MEP. No change is therefore considered necessary in response to Federated Farmers submission seeking control of the activities through permitted activity standards, as the policy approach essentially already recognises this.

The approach taken in the MEP to managing high amenity landscapes are separately addressed by Policies 7.2.2 and 7.2.3 (discussed below), and consequently no change is recommended in response to EDS's submission. Furthermore, the appropriateness of subdivision, use, and development in ONFL's is addressed by policy 7.2.5, and therefore no change is recommended as a consequence of Forest and Bird's submission. The appropriateness of subdivision, use, and development in ONFL's is considered further in response to submissions made on policy 7.2.5 later in this report.

In regards to Kiwirail's request to limit the application of the policy to 'new' activities and structures, replacement of existing activities/structures may also degrade values of ONFL's depending on the character and scale of replacement structure. Limiting the application of the policy to new activities/structures would therefore not be consistent with section 6((b) of the RMA, and Policy 15 of the NZCPS where within the coastal environment. Where replacement activities/structures will not degrade the values of ONFL's, then these are provided for as permitted activities in the MEP. Furthermore, in regard to Kiwirail's specific interests, it is noted that the rail corridor is designated, which has the effect of overriding the district rules of the MEP relating to landscape management. No change is therefore recommended.

The policy does not apply to commercial forests within the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape, as the policy only applies to ONFL's and not high amenity landscapes, which are instead captured under policy 7.2.3. No change is therefore required, or recommended as a result of Nelson Forest's submission.

Whilst there would be some merit in having a list of information requirements for applications for resource consent in sensitive landscapes as proposed by EDS, this would more appropriately sit as guidance outside of the MEP, rather than within a policy. This would allow refinement of those information requirements over time without having to go through the 1st schedule RMA plan change process. No change is therefore recommended.

Recommendation

Retain Policy 7.2.1 as notified.

5.14 Policy 7.2.2 – Controlling Activities in the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape

Policy 7.2.2 addresses the control of activities within the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape by setting permitted activity thresholds, and requiring resource consent for commercial forestry activities, to implement Objective 7.2.

Policy 7.2.2 reads:

'Control activities that have the potential to degrade the amenity values that contribute to the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape by:

- (a) setting permitted activity standards that are consistent with the existing landscape values and that will require greater assessment where proposed activities and structures exceed those standards; and*
- (b) requiring resource consent for commercial forestry activities.'*

Submissions

The submissions on the policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Jane Buckman (284/7, 96/10), Andrew Dwyer (58/3), Jo Dwyer (59/3), Sandy Shields (63/3), John Kershaw (95/5), Robin Taylor (104/1), Peter Lamb (107/3), Lynda Kelly (128/2), Glenis and Ian McAlpine (153/3), Nigel Sowman (164/3), Nicola Bright (205/3), Tony Westend (239/3), Lisa Haliday (265/1), Stuart Kennigton (362/1), Angela Kennington (363/1), Ian Mitchell (364/7), Richard Wilson (438/1) Beconbrae Farm (452/3), Anna and Hayden Dunne (511/3), Corina Naus (596/1), David Allan (639/3), Dog Point Vineyard (683/3), Elizabeth MacDonald (685/3), Evon Goodwin (690/3), Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/80) Ivan and Margaret Sutherland (772/3), Janine Mayson (816/1), Kristy Sutherland, and Steve Planthaber (846/3), Kevin Judd (858/1), Kimberley Judd (872/1), Mathew Clark (917/3), Mike Just (937/3), Murray MacDonald (939/3), Michael Naus (944/1), Omaka Valley Group (1005/7), Patricia Goodwin (1009/3), Peter Banks (1011/1), The Bell Tower on Dog Point (1191/3), Christine Potts (1259/1)).**
- Delete the policy or recognise farming activities as positively contributing to the values and attributes of the Wairau Dry Hills and are provided for as permitted, and the policy provides for management of adverse effects on the landscape via permitted activity standards (**Tempello Partnership (429/10), Sally and Timothy Wadworth (1121/8)**).
- Amend the policy to read *'~~Control~~ Enable activities that have the potential to degrade are consistent with the amenity values that contribute to the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape by:*

~~(a) setting permitted activity standards that are consistent with the existing landscape values and uses and that will require greater assessment where proposed activities and structures exceed those standards; and~~

~~(b) requiring resource consent for commercial forestry activities.'~~

(Federated Farmers (425/105))

- Amend the policy to read 'Control activities that have the potential to degrade the amenity values that contribute to the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape by:

(a) *setting permitted activity standards that are consistent with the existing landscape values and that will require greater assessment where proposed activities and structures exceed those standards; and*

(b) ~~requiring resource consent for commercial forestry activities~~ prohibiting new resource consents for commercial forestry.'

Judy and John Hellstrom (688/177))

- Amend the policy to read 'Control activities that have the potential to degrade the amenity values that contribute to the Wairau Hills Dry Landscape by:

(a) *setting permitted activity standards that are consistent with no more than minor effects the existing landscape values and that will require greater assessment where proposed activities and structures exceed those standards; and*

(b) ~~requiring resource consent for commercial forestry activities~~ controlling existing activities and new activities, with potential for more than minor adverse effects, to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects; and

(c) avoiding new activities which have significant adverse effects'

Forest and Bird (715/154))

- General comment – commercial forestry is not allowed but shelter belts are, especially with a preference for indigenous species on ridges, valleys and hills **(Hawkesbury Farm Ltd (767/1))**

Assessment

The policies on the policy include those seek its deletion, or amendment to include recognition of the contribution of farming activities to the values and attributes of the Wairau Dry Hills, and the enablement of such activities. Other submissions seek either removal of the requirement for resource consent for commercial forestry activities, or conversely that such forestry become a prohibited activity in the Wairau Dry Hills. Finally, Forest and Bird seek the policy be expanded to set out the basis by which activities will be controlled, including avoiding new activities that have significant adverse effects.

Policy 7.1.2 is a process related policy which is intended to set the basis for how activities are to be managed within the Wairau Hills Dry Landscape. It requires activities that have the potential to degrade the high amenity values of the landscape are to be controlled through permitted activity standards, and requiring resource consent for commercial forestry activities.

As noted in considering submissions on Objective 7.1, section 7(c) of the RMA requires particular regard to be had to the 'maintenance and enhancement of amenity values', and enables the identification and management of those landscapes that have visual amenity value, but which are not otherwise considered ONFL's under section 6(b). Deletion of the policy would therefore not be consistent with section 7(c) of the RMA.

In regard to those submissions seeking recognition and enablement of farming activity and commercial forestry, it is acknowledged that the Wairau Dry Hills accommodate farming activities and some limited areas of forestry. Under the policy activities that do not have the potential to degrade the high amenity values are permitted activities. Permitted activities within the underlying Rural Environment Zone, include

farming, cultivation, and a wide range of farming related activities. That permitted status applies irrespective of whether it is within the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape. The only specific activities that require resource consent for landscape management purposes are buildings and structures more than 10m² which are located within 20 metres vertically below any significant ridgeline; commercial forestry planting; and conservation planting. Consequently, it is considered that there is no undue restriction on farming activity as a consequence of the Wairau Hills Dry Landscape area, or the associated rules. No change is therefore recommended to provide specific recognition for farming activity.

In regard to the enablement of commercial forestry, since the notification of the MEP, the National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) has been gazetted, which comes into force from the 1st of May 2018. The NES-PF puts in place nationally consistent rules for the management of commercial plantation forestry, with Regulation 6 of the NES-PF setting out limited circumstances where a rule in an RMA plan may be more stringent than the NES-PF. These circumstances include when the rule gives effect to a freshwater objective in the NPSFM or Policies 11, 13, 15, and 22 of the NZCPS for the coastal environment, or provides for the protection of section 6 RMA outstanding natural features and landscapes, or significant natural areas.

In response to the NES-PF, the Council needs to complete a comprehensive review process in accordance with Section 44A of the RMA, to determine the extent to which the provisions of both the Operative Resource Management Plans, and proposed MEP either duplicate or conflict with the provisions of the NES-PF. That process will identify and make the required changes to these plans to align with the NES-PF requirements. Recognising this, the Hearings Panel determined on the 21st of September 2017 to defer considering any submissions on the MEP relating to the management of commercial/plantation forestry until such time as the alignment process has occurred. Those submissions will be the subject of a latter hearing, the timing of which is yet to be confirmed. No consideration or recommendation on the submissions of Federated Farmers, Judy and John Hellstrom, and Hawkesbury Farm Ltd as they relate to commercial forestry are therefore made at this time.

In terms of Forest and Bird's request to expand on the basis by which activities will be managed, the management of use and development within the Wairau Hills Dry Landscape is addressed by policy 7.2.7 (discussed below), and no change is therefore recommended.

Recommendation

Retain Policy 7.2.2. as notified.

5.15 Policy 7.2.3 – Controlling Activities in the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape

Policy 7.2.3 addresses the control of activities within the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape by using a non-regulatory approach to maintain values in the Coastal Living Zone, setting permitted activity thresholds, and requiring resource consent for commercial forestry activities, to implement Objective 7.2.

Policy 7.2.3 reads:

'Control activities that have the potential to degrade the amenity values that contribute to those areas of the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape not identified as being an outstanding natural feature and landscape by:

- (a) using a non-regulatory approach as the means of maintaining and enhancing landscape values in areas of this landscape zoned as Coastal Living;*
- (b) setting permitted activity standards/conditions that are consistent with the existing landscape values and that will require greater assessment where proposed activities and structures exceed those standards; and*
- (b) requiring resource consent for commercial forestry activities.'*

Submissions

The submissions on the policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Jane Buckman (284/8)**, **Ian Mitchell (364/8)**, **Forest and Bird (496/14)**, **Peter Banks (1011/2)**).
- Delete the policy (**Aquaculture NZ (401/72)**, **Marine Farming Association (426/75)**, **Raeburn Property Partnership (1085/1)**).
- Amend the policy to read *'For areas of the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape that are classified as an Outstanding Feature and Landscape, ~~Control~~ Enable activities that have the potential to degrade are consistent with the amenity values and attributes that contribute to those areas of the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape not identified as being an outstanding natural feature and landscape by:*
 - (a) *using a non-regulatory approach as the means of maintaining and enhancing landscape values in areas of this landscape zoned as Coastal Living;*
 - (b) *setting permitted standards/conditions that are consistent with the existing landscape values and land uses; and*
 - ~~(c) requiring resource consent for commercial forestry activities.'~~

Federated Farmers (425/109)).

- Delete reference to 'amenity' (**Sanford (1140/24)**).
- Delete the policy and replace with a new policy that establishes a compliance regime that provides a fast track resource consent approval for landowners, operators, approved by the Council for their past satisfactory environmental performance, having regard also to the internal regime of each organisation for achieving environmental protection (**D C Hemphill (648/33)**).
- General comment – delete provisions in relation to plantation forest (**Marlborough Forest Industry Association (962/54)**).
- Amend clause (c) of the policy to read *'requiring controlled activity resource consent for commercial forestry activities and restricted discretionary resource consent for new commercial forestry activities'* (**Nelson Forests Ltd (990/189)**).
- Amend the policy by deleting clause (c) (**Judy and John Hellstrom (688/178)**).
- Amend clause (c) of the policy to read 'requiring resource consent for commercial forestry activities including re-establishment after harvesting' (**Port Underwood Association (1042/4)**).
- Amend the policy to delete clause (a) (**Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association (504/23)**).
- Amend the policy to read as follows:

'Control activities that have the potential to degrade the amenity values that contribute to those areas of the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape not identified as being an outstanding natural feature and landscape by:

(a) using a non-regulatory approach as the primary means of maintaining and enhancing landscape values in the Coastal Living Zone and only granting resource consent to activities and structures within the coastal marine area in proximity to this zone that have a functional requirement to be located in these areas of this landscape zoned as Coastal Living or are reasonably necessary to facilitate access and from the land;...'

Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/81).

- Amend the policy to including marine farming in clause (c) (**Clova Bay Residents Association (152/14), Michael and Kirsten Gerard (424/21), Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association (868/12)**).
- Amend clause (c) of the policy as follows *'requiring resource consent for commercial forestry activities, including the transport of logs on public roads'* (**Clintondale Trust, (484/35)**).
- Delete the policy or amend it to set out clear guidance that the approaches will ensuring significant adverse effects are avoided, and other adverse effects are avoided, remedied, or mitigated on natural features and natural landscapes in the coastal environment (**Forest and Bird (715/155)**).

Assessment

Submissions on this policy include those that request that the scope of the policy be limited to those parts of the Marlborough Sounds which are ONFL's, and those seeking recognition of the contribution of farming activities to the values and attributes of the Marlborough Sounds, and the enablement of such activities. Other submissions seek removal of the requirement in clause (c) for resource consent for commercial forestry activities on the basis that the policy will prevent the replanting of commercial forestry. Conversely other submissions seek that the policy be expanded to further restrict new commercial forestry and replanting of forestry; control activities, structures, and marine farming in the coastal marine area in response to section 6 RMA; and control the transport of logs on public roads. Finally, the submission of Forest and Bird seeks the policy provide clear guidance to ensure significant adverse effects are avoided, and other adverse effects are avoided, remedied, or mitigated on other landscapes in the coastal environment.

Policy 7.1.3 is a process related policy which is intended to set the basis for how activities are to be managed within the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape. It requires activities that have the potential to degrade the high amenity values of the landscape are to be controlled through using a non-regulatory approach to maintain values in the Coastal Living Zone, setting permitted activity thresholds, and requiring resource consent for commercial forestry activities.

As noted in considering submissions on Objective 7.1, section 7(c) of the RMA requires particular regard to be had to the *'maintenance and enhancement of amenity values'*, and enables the identification and management of those landscapes that have visual amenity value, but which are not otherwise considered ONFL's under section 6(b). Limiting the application of the policy to ONFL's would therefore not be consistent with 7(c) of the RMA or with Policy 15 of the NZCPS within the coastal environment.

In regard to those submissions seeking recognition and enablement of farming activity, it is acknowledged that the Marlborough Sounds accommodate farming activities. Under the policy activities that do not have the potential to degrade the high amenity values are permitted activities. Permitted activities within the underlying Coastal Environment Zone include farming, cultivation, and a wide range of farming related activities. That permitted status applies irrespective of whether it is within the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape. The only specific requirement that applies for farming related activities for landscape management purposes is a requirement that any paint applied to the exterior cladding of a building or structure must have a light reflectance value of 45% or less. Consequently, it is considered that there is no undue restriction on farming activity as a consequence of the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape area, or the associated rules.

The principle concerns of the submissions seeking the deleting of the policy or clause (c) addressing commercial forestry activities, is that it would prevent the replanting of existing commercial forests in the Marlborough Sounds once they are harvested. As noted in response to submissions on Policy 7.2.2, since the notification of the MEP, the National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) has been gazetted, which comes into force from the 1st of May 2018. The NES-PF puts in place nationally consistent rules for the management of commercial plantation forestry. In response to the NES-PF, the Council needs to complete a comprehensive review process in accordance with Section 44A of the RMA, to determine the extent to which the provisions of both the Operative Resource Management Plans, and proposed MEP either duplicate or conflict with the provisions of the NES-PF. That process will identify and make the required changes to these plans to align with the NES-PF requirements. Recognising this, the Hearings Panel determined on the 21st of September 2017 to defer considering any submissions on the MEP

relating to the management of commercial/plantation forestry until such time as the alignment process has occurred. Those submissions will be the subject of a latter hearing, the timing of which is yet to be confirmed. No recommendation on the submissions of Federated Farmers, D C Hemphill, Marlborough Forest Industry Association, Nelson Forests Ltd, Judy and John Hellstrom, and Port Underwood Association, as they relate to commercial forestry are therefore made at this time.

In regards to the submission of the Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay seeking amendment of clause (a) to require control of activities and structures in the coastal marine area in response to section 6(b) of the RMA, Policy 7.2.3 is intended only to control activities for the purposes of maintain the high amenity values of the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape, and not control activities within those areas of the coastal marine area identified as ONFL's. Consequently, it does not address the effects of activities and structures in the coastal marine area in respect to section 6(b) of the RMA, which are instead addressed through Policy 7.2.1. No change is therefore recommended.

The aquaculture provisions of the MEP are still to be developed and have yet to be notified. Consequently, it would not be appropriate to address the restriction of marine farming as a specific activity within Policy 7.2.3, as sought by a number of submitters. Furthermore, the transport of logs on public roads is not an activity that requires management for landscape purposes, and therefore the inclusion of controls on transport as sought would not be appropriately addressed in Policy 7.2.3. No changes are therefore recommended.

In regard to Forest and Bird's request to include clear guidance to ensure significant adverse effects are avoided, and other adverse effects are avoided, remedied, or mitigated on natural features and natural landscapes in the coastal environment, the management of use and development is addressed by policy 7.2.7 (discussed below), and no change is therefore recommended.

Recommendation

Retain Policy 7.2.3 as notified.

5.16 Policy 7.2.4 – Consideration of Effects on Landscape Values

Policy 7.2.4 sets out the requirement that where resource consent is required, regard is to be had to potential adverse effects on the values that contributes to the landscape, to implement Objective 7.2.

Policy 7.2.4 reads:

'Where resource consent is required to undertake an activity within an outstanding natural feature and landscape or a landscape with high amenity value, regard will be had to the potential adverse effects of the proposal on the values that contribute to the landscape.'

Submissions

The submissions on the policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Jane Buckman (284/9)**, **Ian Mitchell (364/9)**, **Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/22)**, **Port Marlborough Ltd (433/27)**, **Forest and Bird (496/15)**, **Judy and John Hellstrom (688/64)**, **Friends of Nelson Have and Tasman Bay (716/82)**, **Heritage NZ (768/17)**, **Peter Banks (1011/3)**, **Trustpower (1201/76)**, **Z Energy Ltd (1244/20)**, **Christine Potts (1259/2)**).
- Delete the policy (**Aquaculture NZ (401/75)**, **Marine Farming Association (426/79)**, **EDS (698/52)**).
- Delete the policy or amend it to read *'Where resource consent is required to undertake an activity within an outstanding natural feature and landscape ~~or a landscape with high amenity value~~, regard will be had to the ~~potential adverse effects consistency of the proposal~~ on with the values that contribute to the landscape'*, and ensure farming and rural activities are recognised as positively

contributing to the values and attributes of ONFL's, and are provided for as permitted (**Federated Farmers (425/111)**).

- General comment - delete the application of the policy to commercial forestry (**Nelson Forests Ltd (990/190)**).
- Amend the policy to make it clear that a cumulative effects policy must be applied when applying policy 7.2.4 (**Clova Bay Residents Association 152/13**).
- Amend the policy to include the positive identification of areas where coastal marine landscape values are under threat from adverse cumulative effects, and that for all activities requiring a resource consent, an assessment of cumulative adverse effects be undertaken (**Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association (868/13)**).
- Amend the policy to set out the requirements of Policy 15(a) and (b) NZCPS, and achieve the protection required by s6(b) RMA (**Forest and Bird (715/156)**).
- Amend the policy to note that assessment of effects on landscape values, may include consultation with Tangata Whenua (**Te Runanga o Kaikoura and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu (1189/72 and 73)**).

Assessment

The submissions on this policy include those that request that it be deleted, including due to it duplicating Policy 7.2.1, or that it does not apply to commercial forestry. Other submissions seek it be amended to require consideration of cumulative adverse effects, and that the policy be amended to ensure it is consistent with Policy 15 of the NZCPS. Te Runanga O Kaikoura and Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu request amendment of the policy to reference that consultation with Tangata Whenua may be required in considering the effects on values that contribute to the landscape.

Policy 7.1.4 is a process related policy which is intended to make it clear that in assessing resource consents for use and development in ONFL's and high amenity landscapes, that effects on the values that contribute to the landscape is required. This ensures the degradation of the values from which the significant of a landscape are derived, are appropriately considered in the assessment resource consents. The policy applies in conjunction with policies 7.2.5, 7.2.6, and 7.2.7 which together form the basis for managing adverse effects on ONFL's and high amenity landscapes. These policies together address the requirements of sections 6(b) and section 7(c) of the RMA, and Policy 15 of the NZCPS in regard to the coastal environment.

In regard to those submissions seeking deletion of the policy, consideration of the adverse effects of proposals on the values that contribute to ONFL's and high amenity landscapes is important to ensure values which underpin those landscapes are not degraded, and therefore ensures consistency with sections 6(b) and 7(c) of the RMA, and Policy 15 of the NZCPS within the coastal environment. It is therefore not recommended to delete the policy.

In regard to the application of the policy to commercial forestry, as noted in response to submissions on Policy 7.2.2, since the notification of the MEP, the National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) has been gazetted, which comes into force from the 1st of May 2018. The NES-PF puts in place nationally consistent rules for the management of commercial plantation forestry. In response to the NES-PF, the Council needs to complete a comprehensive review process in accordance with Section 44A of the RMA, to determine the extent to which the provisions of both the Operative Resource Management Plans, and proposed MEP either duplicate or conflict with the provisions of the NES-PF. That process will identify and make the required changes to these plans to align with the NES-PF requirements. Recognising this, the Hearings Panel determined on the 21st of September 2017 to defer considering any submissions on the MEP relating to the management of commercial/plantation forestry until such time as the alignment process has occurred. Those submissions will be the subject of a latter hearing, the timing of which is yet to be confirmed. No recommendation on the submission of Nelson Forests Ltd is therefore made at this time.

Cumulative adverse effects are a subset of adverse effects and therefore are encapsulated within the requirements in Policy 7.2.4. No specific recognition of cumulative adverse effects in the policy is therefore necessary, and no change is recommended in response to the submission of the Clova Bay Residents

Association, and Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association. Notwithstanding it is acknowledged that Chapter 7 currently does not sufficiently address cumulative adverse effects on landscape values. This is addressed later in this report in considering general submissions seeking the addition of new policies, where a new cumulative effects policy is recommended for inclusion in Chapter 7.

It is acknowledged that consultation is beneficial with Tangata Whenua in determining the effects on the cultural values that contribute to ONFL's and high amenity landscapes. Notwithstanding, including a specific reference to matters of process in undertaking an assessment of effects on values, including consultation, would result in unnecessary specificity within the policy. Consultation is just one of many facets that would need to be considered in undertaking an assessment of environmental effects. Furthermore, under section 36A of the RMA, there is no duty under the Act to consult with any person on an application for resource consent. No change is therefore recommended as a consequence of the submissions of Te Runanga O Kaikoura and Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu.

Recommendation

Retain Policy 7.2.4 as notified.

5.17 Policy 7.2.5 – Managing Adverse Effects of Activities on Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes

Policy 7.2.5 sets out the basis for managing adverse effects from activities on the values that contribute to ONFL's, to implement Objective 7.2.

Policy 7.2.5 reads:

'Avoid adverse effects on the values that contribute to outstanding natural features and landscapes in the first instance. Where adverse effects cannot be avoided and the activity is not proposed to take place in the coastal environment, ensure that the adverse effects are remedied.'

Submissions

The submissions on the policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Jane Buckman (284/10)**, **Ian Mitchell (364/10)**, **Kevin Loe (454/9)**, **Forest and Bird 496/16)**, **Judy and John Hellstrom (688/65)**, **Flaxbourne Settlers Association (712/72)**, **Heritage NZ (768/18)**, **Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association (868/14)**, **Peter Banks (1011/4)**, **Te Runanga O Kaikoura and Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu (1189/74)**, **Christine Potts (1259/3)**).
- Delete Policy 7.2.5 and add new policies as follows:

'New Policy 7.2.5 - In the coastal environment:

- (a) Avoid adverse effects of subdivision use, and development on the characteristics and qualities which make up the outstanding values of areas of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes.*
- (b) Where (a) does not apply, avoid significant adverse effects and avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects of subdivision, use and development on natural features and natural landscapes. Methods which may achieve this include:*
 - (i) Ensuring the location, intensity, scale and form of subdivision and built development is appropriate having regard to natural elements, landforms and processes, including vegetation patterns, ridgelines, headlands, peninsulas, dune systems, reefs and freshwater bodies and their margins; and*
 - (ii) Encouraging any new subdivision and built development to consolidate within and around existing settlements or where natural landscape has already been compromised.*

New Policy 7.2.5A - Outside the coastal environment avoid significant adverse effects and

avoid, remedy or mitigate other adverse effects (including cumulative adverse effects) of subdivision, use and development on the characteristics and qualities of outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes. Methods which may achieve this include:

- (a) In outstanding natural landscapes, requiring that the location and intensity of subdivision, use and built development is appropriate having regard to, natural elements, landforms and processes, including vegetation patterns, ridgelines and freshwater bodies and their margins; and
- (b) In outstanding natural features, requiring that the scale and intensity of earthworks and built development is appropriate taking into account the scale, form and vulnerability to modification of the feature.

New Policy 7.2.5B - When considering whether there are any adverse effects on the characteristics and qualities of the natural features and landscape values in terms of 7.2.5(a), whether there are any significant adverse effects and the scale of any adverse effects in terms of 7.2.5(b) and 7.2.5A, and in determining the character, intensity and scale of the adverse effects:

- (a) Recognise that a minor or transitory effect may not be an adverse effect;
- (b) Recognise that many areas contain on-going use and development that:
 - (i) Were present when the area was identified as high or outstanding or have subsequently been lawfully established
 - (ii) May be dynamic, diverse or seasonal;
- (c) Recognise that there may be more than minor cumulative adverse effects from minor or transitory adverse effects;
- (d) Have regard to any restoration and enhancement of the characteristics and qualities of that area of natural features and/or natural landscape;
- (e) Recognise it may be appropriate to offset significant residual adverse effects on a landscape or feature to result in no net loss and preferably a net landscape gain;
- (f) Recognise that where adverse effects cannot be practicably avoided, adverse effects could be minimised; and
- (g) Acknowledge that a future adverse effect may be avoided where the effect is temporary and is authorised for a finite term.'

(Aquaculture NZ (401/76), Marine Farming Association (426/80)).

- Amend the policy to read 'Avoid adverse effects on the characteristics and values that contribute to the outstanding natural features and landscapes in the first instance. Where adverse effects cannot be avoided and the activity is not proposed to take place in the coastal environment, ensure that the adverse effects are remedied.', and make consequential changes to the description to the policy **(EDS (698/53))**.
- General Comment – Clarify the policy and its interpretation in light of the definition for the word 'avoid' in section 2 of the MEP **(Marlborough Forest Industry Association (962/56))**.
- Amend the policy to read 'Avoid adverse effects on the values and land uses that contribute to outstanding natural features and landscapes in the first instance. Where adverse effects cannot be avoided and the activity is not proposed to take place in the coastal environment, ensure that the adverse effects are remedied or mitigated', and that farming and rural activities are recognised in Appendix 1 as positively contributing to the values and attributes of ONFL's where they occur **(Federated Farmers (425/112))**.
- Amend the policy to read 'Avoid adverse effects on the values that contribute to outstanding natural features and landscapes in the first instance. Where adverse effects cannot be avoided and the activity is not proposed to take place in the coastal environment, ensure that the adverse effects are adequately remedied or mitigated' **(Port Marlborough (433/28))**.
- Amend the policy to ensure protection of these features and landscapes, by avoiding, mitigating, and then considering remediation of adverse effects **(Forest and Bird (715/157))**.

- Amend the policy to read 'Avoid adverse effects of inappropriate subdivision, use and development on the values that contribute to outstanding natural features and landscapes in the first instance. Where adverse effects cannot be avoided and the activity is not proposed to take place in the coastal environment, ensure that the adverse effects are remedied or mitigated', and make consequently changes to the description to the policy (**Transpower (1198/16)**).
- Amend the policy to read 'Avoid adverse effects on the values that contribute to outstanding natural features and landscapes in the first instance. Where adverse effects cannot be avoided and the activity is not proposed to take place in the coastal environment, ensure that the adverse effects are remedied or mitigated' (**Trustpower (1201/70)**).
- Amend the explanation by deleting the second sentence (**Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/83)**).

Assessment

The submissions on this policy include those that seek its deletion and its replacement with a series of new policies addressing the management of adverse effects on all outstanding landscapes, and other landscapes within the coastal environment. Those requested new policies also provide further direction in determining the character, intensity, and scale of adverse effects on landscape values. Other submissions seek amendment of the policy to provide greater protection for those ONFL's outside of the coastal environment, by removing the ability for adverse effects to be remedied. Conversely submissions also seek the ability for adverse effects to be mitigated, including within the coastal environment.

The intent of Policy 7.2.5 is to set out the basis for managing adverse effects from activities on the values that contribute to ONFL's, to implement Objective 7.2. It requires adverse effects on those values to be avoided, with the exception that outside the coastal environment, effects can also be remedied. The requirement for avoidance of adverse effects on values of ONFL's in the coastal environment gives effect to the more directive requirements in Policy 15(a) of the NZCPS. Exemptions from the requirements of this policy for certain activities, including regionally significant infrastructure are addressed in Policy 7.2.6 (which is discussed below).

In regards to the submissions of the Marine Farming Association and Aquaculture NZ, seeking new replacement policies, it is considered that the elements of those replacement policies are adequately captured within Policies 7.2.5 - 7.2.7, and are in a form consistent with sections 6(b) and 7(c) of the RMA, and Policy 15 of the NZCPS within the coastal environment. In particular, while Policy 7.2.5 does not address adverse effects on other non-outstanding landscapes within the coastal environment, this is instead addressed through the measures set out in Policy 7.2.7 aimed at addressing effects on the high amenity values of the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape. No change is therefore recommended.

Aquaculture NZ and the Marine Farming Association have also proposed a new policy providing further direction in determining the character, intensity, and scale of adverse effects on landscape values. In particular, the policy wording would direct recognition of the following:

- Minor transitory effects may not be an adverse effect.
- Many areas contain ongoing use and development present at the time of identifying the area as high amenity or outstanding landscapes, and that such use may be dynamic, diverse, or seasonal.
- There may be more than minor cumulative adverse effects from minor or transitory adverse effects.
- Have regard to restoration and enhancement of landscapes.
- That it may be appropriate to offset residual adverse effects.
- That where adverse effects cannot be practicably avoided, adverse effects should be minimised.
- That a future adverse effect may be avoided where the effect is temporary and authorised for a finite term.

The policy appears intended to provide greater clarity and certainty as to how adverse effects will be determined. The policy would however to some extent introduce a level of specificity in the MEP which is unnecessary, duplicate other policy, is contrary to proper effects assessment practice, or would undermine section 6(a) of the RMA and the NZCPS. In particular, it is considered reasonably understood that many areas contain use and development that existed when ONFL's and high amenity landscapes were identified, and that such use can be dynamic, diverse, or seasonal. It is similarly well understood that there can be more than minor cumulative adverse effects from minor or transitory adverse effects, and that some effects

can be reversible. Inclusion of such policy references is therefore considered unnecessary specificity. Additional policy references would not serve any useful purpose.

Environmental offsets are a way in which adverse effects on the environment can be addressed. It is most commonly applied in respect to biodiversity or natural character in addressing residual adverse effects that cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated. Unlike for biodiversity, offsets with regard to landscape management are not enshrined in RMA practice. Inclusion of a policy providing for compensation and offset of effects on ONFL's and high amenity landscapes would also be inconsistent with sections 6(b) and 7(c) of the RMA, or Policy 15 of the NZCPS within the coastal environment. No change is therefore recommended.

Including reference to minor transitory effects not being an adverse effect, does not align with proper resource management practice. Transitory effects can be an adverse effect, with the relevant question then being the scale, character, and intensity of that effect. Inclusion of a reference specifying that where adverse effects cannot be practicably avoided, adverse effects should instead be minimised, would undermine the overall approach to managing landscapes in the MEP and would be inconsistent with sections 6(b) and 7(c) of the RMA, and Policy 15 of the NZCPS. The NZCPS in particular requires that in the coastal environment, adverse effects are to be avoided within ONFL's and significant adverse effects be avoided elsewhere. Recognising the above, it is not recommended to include the requested new policy.

In regards to the submission of EDS therefore seeking removal of the ability to remediate adverse effects on ONFL's outside of the coastal environment, there is no similar national direction to Policy 15(a) of the NZCPS which applies outside of the coastal environment. Consequently, the requirement in Policy 15(a) to avoid adverse effects on ONFL's does not apply. Policy 7.2.5 therefore provides scope for remediating adverse effects in recognition that remediation can result in the reversal of adverse effects on the values which contribute to ONFL's. Such an approach is considered consistent with section 6(b) of the RMA. No change to the policy is therefore recommended.

Conversely enabling mitigation of adverse effects on ONFL's within the coastal environment would not give effect to the requirement in Policy 15 of the NZCPS to avoid adverse effects on ONFL's. Outside of the coastal environment, no such national direction exists. However, enabling mitigation would mean that adverse effects would only need to be alleviated or moderated, rather than avoided or remedied, and therefore more likely to lead to some degradation of the values which contribute to the ONFL. Enabling mitigation would therefore be inconsistent with section 6(b) of the RMA insofar that it would not protect such landscapes from inappropriate, subdivision, use, and development. No change is therefore recommended to include reference to mitigation.

Cumulative adverse effects are a subset of adverse effects and therefore are encapsulated within the requirements in Policy 7.2.5. No specific recognition of cumulative adverse effects in the policy is therefore necessary, and no change is recommended in response to the submission the Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay.

Recommendation

Retain Policy 7.2.5 as notified.

5.18 Policy 7.2.6 – Managing Adverse Effects of Infrastructure and Passive Recreational Activities

Policy 7.2.6 sets out the basis for managing adverse effects from regionally significant infrastructure, passive recreational activities, and renewable electricity generation within ONFL's, to implement Objective 7.2.

Policy 7.2.6 reads:

'Where the following activities are proposed to take place in an area with outstanding natural features and landscapes, then any adverse effects on the values of those areas can be mitigated, provided the overall qualities and integrity of the wider outstanding natural feature and landscape are retained:

- (a) activities involving the development and operation of regionally significant infrastructure;

- (b) *activities that enhance passive recreational opportunities for the public where these are of a smaller scale; and*
- (c) *activities involving the development and operation of renewable electricity generation schemes within Marlborough where the method of generation is reversible.'*

Submissions

The submissions on the policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Jane Buckman (284/11)**, **Ian Mitchell (364/11)**, **Chorus NZ (464/12)**, **Forest and Bird (496/17)**, **Kiwirail (873/19)**, **Peter Banks (1011/5)**, **Spark NZ (1158/10)**, **Christine Potts (1259/4)**).
- Delete the policy (**Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/84)**).
- Amend the policy to provide direction consistent with section 6(b) of the RMA and Policy 15 of the NZCPS (**Forest and Bird (715/158)**).
- Amend to clarify how outstanding natural features and landscapes will be protected (**Te Runanga O Kaikoura and Te Runanga O Ngai Tahu (1189/75)**).
- Amend the policy to clarify within the text of the policy that it does not apply to activities in the coastal environment (**Port Marlborough NZ (433/29)**).
- Amend the policy to read

Where the following activities are proposed to take place in an area with outstanding natural features and landscapes, then any adverse effects on the characteristics values of these areas should be preferentially avoided. If avoidance is not possible then adverse effects can be remedied or mitigated, provided only if the overall qualities and integrity of the wider outstanding natural feature and landscape are retained:

- (a) *activities involving the development and operation of regionally significant infrastructure;*
- (b) *activities that enhance passive recreational opportunities for the public where these are of a smaller scale; and*
- (c) *activities involving the development and operation of renewable electricity generation schemes within Marlborough where the method of generation is reversible.*

(EDS (698/54).

- Amend the policy to read:

'Where the following activities are proposed to take place in an area with outstanding natural features and landscapes, then ~~any~~ the adverse effects on the values of those areas can be mitigated, to the extent reasonably possible, having regard to ~~provided~~ the overall qualities and integrity of the wider outstanding natural feature and landscape ~~are retained~~:

- (a) *activities involving the upgrade and development ~~and operation~~ of regionally significant infrastructure;...*

and make consequential changes to the description to the policy **Transpower NZ (1198/17)**.

- Amend clause (c) of the policy to read *'activities involving the development and operation of renewable electricity generation schemes within Marlborough ~~where the method of generation is reversible~~'* (**Trustpower (1201/71)**).

- Amend the policy by adding reference to *'aquaculture activities where the method and effects of farming are reversible'* (**Aquaculture NZ (401/77), Marine Farming Association (426/81)**).
- Amend the policy by adding reference to *'irrigation schemes'*, and *'farming and primary production'* (**Federated Farmers (425/113)**)

Assessment

The submissions on this policy include those that seek its deletion, or amendment on the basis that it does not provide for protection of outstanding landscapes consistent with the in direction section 6(b) of the RMA, or Policy 15 of the NZCPS. Other submissions request that it be amended to enable avoidance and remediation of adverse effects; mitigation of effects to the extent reasonably possible; and deletion of the requirement that the effects of renewable energy generation be reversible. Several submissions seek addition of enablement of other activities within the policy including aquaculture, irrigation, and farming and primary production.

Policy 7.2.6 sets out the basis for managing adverse effects from development and operation of regionally significant infrastructure, enhancement of small scale passive recreational activities, and renewable electricity generation which is reversible within ONFL's, to implement Objective 7.2. It essentially provides an exemption from the requirements of Policy 7.2.5 to avoid or remedy adverse effects, by enabling mitigation of adverse effects provided the overall qualities and integrity of the ONFL are retained. The policy is intended to recognise that these activities have significant benefits for social and economic wellbeing, and health and safety of the community, or provide for enhancement of recreational values associated with ONFL's. In regard to infrastructure, it also gives effect to the enabling provisions of the NPSET and NPSREG which recognise the national significance of electricity transmission and renewable energy generation. The policy is intended to apply only outside of the coastal environment.

In regard to those submissions requesting the deletion of the policy or its amendment on the basis that it does not provide for protection of outstanding landscapes consistent with section 6(b) of the RMA, or Policy 15 of the NZCPS, it is acknowledged that Policy 15(a) of the NZCPS is particularly directive that adverse effects are to be avoided on ONFL's in the coastal environment. Conversely there are no policies in the NZCPS which are as equally enabling of infrastructure activity, and the NPSET and NPSREG do not provide countering directive policy which enable electricity transmission and renewable electricity generation in ONFL's in the coastal environment. Accordingly, it is not considered appropriate that the exemptions of Policy 7.2.6 apply in the coastal environment, and this recognised in the last paragraph of the policy description. Despite that, the wording of the policy itself does not limit its application to areas outside of the coastal environment, and therefore amendments to the policy are recommended accordingly (changes detailed below).

Outside of the coastal environment where the NZCPS does not apply, enabling mitigation would allow for adverse effects to be alleviated or moderated, rather than avoided or remedied. Such an approach is considered appropriate for regionally significant infrastructure, renewable electricity generation, and enhancement of passive recreation in light of their significant benefits for social and economic wellbeing and health and safety of the community. Furthermore, it recognises the national significance of electricity transmission and renewable generation activities, therefore giving effect to the NPSET and NPSREG. For these reasons it's also considered appropriate for the policy to also provide the options of avoidance and remediation of adverse effects, and that mitigation occur to the extent reasonably possible as sought in a number of submissions.

In regard to Trustpower's request to delete the requirement for renewable electricity generation to be reversible, it is accepted that there is no apparent reason to require renewable electricity generation to be reversible, given the same requirement has not been imposed on regionally significant infrastructure. Furthermore, imposing such a requirement on renewable generation would not recognise the national significance of renewable generation, as per the NPSREG. It is therefore recommended that renewable generation should be enabled, provided the overall qualities and integrity of the wider ONFL are retained, as is required for other regionally significant infrastructure under the policy. It is noted that given electricity generation is captured within the definition of regionally significant infrastructure in policy 4.2.1 of the MEP, that a specific reference to renewable electricity generation is also not required in Policy 7.2.6 (changes detailed below).

It is not recommended to include other activities in the policy such as aquaculture, irrigation, farming, and primary production as requested in a number of submissions. Whilst these activities important to

Marlborough's social and economic wellbeing, the benefits arising from regionally significant infrastructure are considered to have greater significance for the Marlborough community as a whole or nationally, including as is recognised in the NPSET and NPSREG in respect of electricity transmission and renewable generation. No change is therefore recommended to add these activities into the policy.

Recommendation

Amend Policy 7.2.6 and the associated description as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

Where the following activities are proposed to take place in an area with outstanding natural features and landscapes outside of the coastal environment,¹⁹ avoid as reasonably possible, and remedy, and mitigate ~~then any adverse effects on the values that contribute to of those areas can be mitigated~~,²⁰ provided the overall qualities and integrity of the wider outstanding natural feature and landscape are retained:

- (a) activities involving the development and ~~operation~~ upgrade²¹ of regionally significant infrastructure;***
- (b) activities that enhance passive recreational opportunities for the public where these are of a smaller scale; and***
- ~~(c) activities involving the development and operation of renewable electricity generation schemes within Marlborough where the method of generation is reversible.~~²²***

This policy relaxes the direction provided by Policy 7.2.5 for outstanding natural features and landscapes in limited circumstances. These circumstances are described in (a) to ~~(e)~~ (b) and reflect the considerable benefits that the listed activities provide to the social and economic wellbeing, health and safety of our community.

Regionally significant infrastructure is essential to allowing our communities to function on a day-by-day basis. This infrastructure may need to be expanded in the future and that expansion may need to occur in areas of outstanding natural features and landscapes. In respect of (b), many outstanding natural features and landscapes can already be accessed for passive recreational purposes and the RMA seeks to maintain and enhance these amenity values. Enhancement may take the form of new tracks or huts in the landscape, but would be of a small scale. ~~The MEP seeks to optimise the use of the Marlborough's renewable energy and encourages the use and development of renewable electricity resources. This is recognised in (c) of the policy. However, (c) does not apply where the structures associated with the generation cannot be realistically removed from the environment with minimal trace, as any landscape effects in these circumstances are permanent. It is also important in consideration of this policy to acknowledge that the Council is required to give effect to the NPSREG, which sets out a framework to enable the sustainable management of renewable electricity generation.~~²³

The policy does not allow the activities in (a) to ~~(e)~~ (b) to occur without consideration of the impact they may have on outstanding natural features and landscapes. Any adverse effects on the biophysical, sensory or associative values within the landscape must still be avoided, remedied, or²⁴ mitigated as much as possible. As adverse effects can occur at various scales, there should also be consideration of the impacts of the proposed activity on the overall qualities and integrity of the wider outstanding natural feature or landscape. The policy requires that the overall quality and integrity of the landscape should be retained.

¹⁹ Submissions 715/158 Forest and Bird, 433/29 Port Marlborough Ltd.

²⁰ Submitters 698/54 EDS, 1198/17 Transpower.

²¹ Submitter 1198/17 Transpower.

²² Submitter 1201/71 Trustpower.

²³ Submitter 1201/71 Trustpower.

²⁴ Submitters 698/54 EDS, 1198/17 Transpower.

This policy does not apply to activities occurring in the coastal environment, as Policy 15 of the NZCPS requires that adverse effects of activities on outstanding natural feature or landscape be avoided.'

5.19 Policy 7.2.7 – Managing Adverse Effects of Structures, Land Use, and Planting

Policy 7.2.7 sets out the basis for managing adverse effects from activities on the values that contribute to ONFL's, the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape, and Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape, to implement Objective 7.2.

Policy 7.2.7 reads:

'Protect the values of outstanding natural features and landscapes and the high amenity values of the Wairau Dry Hills and the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscapes by:

- (a) In respect of structures:*
 - (i) avoiding visual intrusion on skylines, particularly when viewed from public places;*
 - (ii) avoiding new dwellings in close proximity to the foreshore;*
 - (iii) using reflectivity levels and building materials that complement the colours in the surrounding landscape;*
 - (iv) limiting the scale, height and placement of structures to minimise intrusion of built form into the landscape;*
 - (v) recognising that existing structures may contribute to the landscape character of an area and additional structures may complement this contribution;*
 - (vi) making use of existing vegetation as a background and utilising new vegetation as a screen to reduce the visual impact of built form on the surrounding landscape, providing that the vegetation used is also in keeping with the surrounding landscape character; and*
 - (vii) encouraging utilities to be co-located wherever possible;*
- (b) In respect of land disturbance (including tracks and roads):*
 - (i) avoiding extensive land disturbance activity that creates a long term change in the visual appearance of the landscape, particularly when viewed from public places;*
 - (ii) encouraging tracks and roads to locate adjacent to slopes or at the edge of landforms or vegetation patterns and to follow natural contour lines in order to minimise the amount of land disturbance required;*
 - (iii) minimising the extent of any cuts or side castings where land disturbance is to take place on a slope; and*
 - (iv) encouraging the revegetation of cuts or side castings by seeding or planting.*
- (c) In respect of vegetation planting:*
 - (i) avoiding the planting of new exotic forestry in areas of outstanding natural features and landscapes in the coastal environment of the Marlborough Sounds;*
 - (ii) encouraging plantations of exotic trees to be planted in a form that complements the natural landform; and*
 - (iii) recognising the potential for wilding pine spread.'*

Submissions

The submissions on the policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Jane Buckman (284/12), Andrew Dwyer (58/4), Jo Dwyer (59/4), Sandy Shields (63/4), John Kershaw (95/3), Robin Taylor (105/1), Peter Lamb (107/4), Lynda Kelly (128/1), Glenis and Ian McAlpine (153/4), Nigel Sowman (164/4), Nicola Bright (205/4), Tony Westend (239/4), Lisa Haliday (265/2), Stuart Kennigton (362/2), Angela Kennington (363/2), Ian Mitchell (364/12), Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/23), Richard Wilson (438/2) Beconbrae Farm (452/4), Forest and Bird (496/18), Te Runanga O Ngati Kuia (501/28), Anna and Hayden Dunne (511/4), Pinder Family Trust (578/10), Corina Naus (596/2), David Allan (639/4), Dog Point Vineyard (683/4), Elizabeth MacDonald (685/4), Evon Goodwin (690/4), Guardians of the Sounds (752/10), Hawkesbury Farm (767/2), Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/85), Ivan and Margaret Sutherland (772/4), Janine Mayson (816/2), Kristy Sutherland, and Steve Planthaber (846/4), Kevin Judd (858/2), Kimberley Judd (872/2), Mathew Clark (917/4), Melva Robb (935/4), Mike Just (937/4), Murray MacDonald (939/4), Michael Naus (944/2), Omaka Valley Group (1005/8), Patricia Goodwin (1009/4), Peter Banks (1011/6), Sea Shepherd NZ (1146/10), The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association (1190/43), The Bell Tower on Dog Point (1191/4), Marlborough Environment Centre (1193/55), Z Energy Ltd (1244/21), Christine Potts (1259/5)).**
- Delete the policy (**Nelson Forests Ltd (990/191)**).
- Delete the policy and replace with new policy which reads *'Applications for subdivision, use and development in outstanding natural features and landscapes must demonstrate that activities, including buildings and earthworks, will be located, designed and of a scale and character that will ensure that the values of the areas are protected'* (**Federated Farmers (425/114)**).
- General comment – Ensure legally established plantation forest is not captured by the policy (**Marlborough Forest Industry Association (962/57)**).
- Amend the policy to exclude barges used for aquaculture, and remove reference to 'amenity' (**Aquaculture NZ (401/78), Marine Farming Association (426/82)**).
- Amend the policy by deleting references to 'high amenity values', constrain the policy to only land designated ONFL's, and replace the term 'avoiding' to 'minimising' (**Ernslaw One Ltd (505/8)**).
- Amend the policy to read:

'Protect the values of outstanding natural features and landscapes and avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on the high amenity values of the Wairau Dry Hills and the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscapes by:

(a) *In respect of structures:*

- in Outstanding Natural Features and landscapes, for buildings and structures, avoiding visual intrusion on land based skylines, particularly when viewed from public places;*
- in Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes avoiding significant visual effects of new dwellings in close proximity the foreshore;*

(b) *In respect of land disturbance (including tracks and roads):*

- ~~*avoiding extensive land disturbance activity that creates a long term change in the visual appearance of the landscape, particularly when viewed from public places;...*~~

(Port Marlborough Ltd NZ (433/30).

- Amend the policy to read *'Protect the values of outstanding natural features and landscapes and the high amenity values of the Wairau Dry Hills and the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape by only considering granting resource consents for activities where: ...*, and replace use of the term 'encourage' to 'requesting' (**Forest and Bird (715/159)**).
- Amend clause (a)(viii) by including reference to *'recognising the functional needs to utilities and regionally significant infrastructure'* (**Transpower (1198/18)**).

- Amend clause (b) of the policy to read:

'b) In respect of land disturbance (including tracks and roads):

- (i) avoiding, remedying or mitigating adverse effects from extensive land disturbance activity that creates a long term change in the visual appearance of the landscape, particularly when viewed from public places;*
- (ii) encouraging tracks and roads to locate adjacent to slopes or at the edge of landforms or vegetation patterns and to follow natural contour lines in order to minimise the amount of land disturbance required;*
- (iii) minimising where practicable the adverse effects from the extent of any cuts or side castings where land disturbance is to take place on a slope; and*
- (iv) encouraging the revegetation of cuts or side castings by seeding or planting while recognising and providing for the maintenance, construction, operation and upgrade of the road network.*

(NZTA (1002/30)).

- Amend clause (a)(vi) of the policy as follows *'Making use of existing vegetation as a background and utilising new vegetation as a screen to reduce the visual impact of built form on the surrounding landscape, ~~providing that the vegetation used is also in keeping with the surrounding landscape character; and~~*, and delete clause (c)(i) **(Douglas and Colleen Robbins (640/4), Glenda Robb (738/7)).**
- Amend clause (c) of the policy to include reference to *'encourage indigenous forestry and recognise its co-benefits*' **(EDS (698/55)).**
- General comment – Areas classified as ONFL should not permit replanting of exotic forestry once the existing forest on the land has been harvested **(Tu Jaes Trust (1202/5)).**
- Amend the policy by including references to *'avoid the clearing of the foreshore reserve in the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape by builders or adjacent property owners*, and *'enable weed control and re-vegetation of the foreshore reserve in the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape*' **(Judy and John Hellstrom (688/66)).**
- Amend the policy by including references to *'avoiding the disturbance of archaeological sites*' **(Heritage NZ (768/19)).**

Assessment

The submissions on this policy can be grouped as follows:

- Delete the policy on the basis that it is too prescriptive and places a significant regulatory burden on landowners, including commercial forest operators; and is unclear and open to interpretation.
- Amend the policy to delete references to landscapes of high amenity, and limit application of the entire policy or clauses (a)(i) and (ii) to ONFL's only.
- Amend clause (a) of the policy to exclude barges for aquaculture; only require avoidance of visual intrusion on *'land based'* skylines; avoid *'significant visual effects'* of new dwellings close to the foreshore; recognise the functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure; and delete the requirement for vegetation to be in keeping with surrounding landscape character.
- Amend clause (b) of the policy by deleting the requirement to avoid extensive land disturbance, or enabling remedying and mitigating of adverse effects of land disturbance, and recognising and providing for construction and maintenance of the road network.
- Amend clause (c) of the policy to recognise indigenous forestry, and not enable replanting of exotic forestry.
- Amend the policy to include references to avoiding the clearance of foreshore reserve, enable weed control/revegetation, and avoiding the disturbance of archaeological sites.

Policy 7.2.7 sets out the basis for managing adverse effects from activities on the values that contribute to ONFL's, the Wairau Dry Hills and Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape, to implement Objective 7.2. It includes a number of matters which structures, land disturbance (including tracks and roads), and vegetation

planting (including forestry) are required to address in order to ensure the values of ONFL's and high amenity landscapes are protected.

In regard to the submissions requesting deletion of the policy or its amendment to delete references to high amenity landscapes, section 6(b) of the RMA requires the '*protection of outstanding natural features and landscapes from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development*'. Section 7(c) requires particular regard to be had to the '*maintenance and enhancement of amenity values*', and enables the identification and management of those landscapes that have visual amenity value, but which are not otherwise considered ONFL's under section 6(b) of the RMA. Deletion or amendment of the policy to delete reference to high amenity landscapes would therefore not be consistent with section 6(b) or section 7(c) of the RMA, or Policy 15 of the NZCPS within the coastal environment.

Notwithstanding the above, it is acknowledged that the '*protection*' focus in the wording of Policy 7.2.7 is potentially too onerous and presents too high a regulatory burden to managing activities in response to the requirement of section 7(c) of the RMA to maintain and enhance amenity values, and the requirement in Policy 15(b) of the NZCPS which directs that only significant adverse effects to be avoided. Given this, it is recommended that Policy 7.2.7 should be amended to reflect the statutory and national policy direction (changes detailed below).

In regard to new exotic or indigenous forestry activity within ONFL's in the coastal environment of the Marlborough Sounds, as noted in response to submissions on Policies 7.2.2 and 7.2.3, since the notification of the MEP, the National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) has been gazetted. The NES-PF puts in place nationally consistent rules for the management of commercial plantation forestry. In response to the NES-PF, the Council needs to complete a comprehensive review process in accordance with Section 44A of the RMA, to determine the extent to which the provisions of both the Operative Resource Management Plans, and proposed MEP either duplicate or conflict with the provisions of the NES-PF. That process will identify and make the required changes to these plans to align with the NES-PF requirements. Recognising this, the Hearings Panel determined on the 21st of September 2017 to defer considering any submissions on the MEP relating to the management of commercial/plantation forestry until such time as the alignment process has occurred. Those submissions will be the subject of a latter hearing, the timing of which is yet to be confirmed. No recommendation on the submissions of Nelson Forests Ltd, the Marlborough Forest Industry Association, EDS, and Tu Jaes Trust, as they relate to commercial forestry are therefore made at this time.

There are submissions seeking various changes to the list of matters addressed in the policy to address matters of clarity, interpretation, and practicality. A number of changes are recommended in response to address these issues (changes detailed below). Specifically, in regard to the submissions of Transpower and NZTA it is acknowledged that the provision of regionally significant infrastructure, including the roading network, have significant benefits for social and economic wellbeing, and the health and safety of the community. While Policy 7.2.6 (discussed above) addresses such infrastructure within ONFL's, it does not address infrastructure within high amenity landscapes managed through Policy 7.2.7. Recognising this, it is recommended to amend the policy to recognise the importance of regionally significant infrastructure within Policy 7.2.7. Doing so will appropriately provide for the benefits of infrastructure, and including the national significance of electricity transmission and renewable generation activities to give effect to the NPSET and NPSREG. (changes detailed below).

There are a number of requested changes to the policy which are not considered appropriate, as follows:

- Barges associated with aquaculture are not recommended to be excluded from the provisions relating to structures. In particular managing reflectivity levels, and scale, height, and placement of structures is appropriate to ensure the outstanding and high amenity values of the Marlborough Sounds are maintained. Notwithstanding, it is noted that the aquaculture provisions of the MEP are yet to be notified.
- It is not recommended to delete the requirement to avoid land disturbance activity that creates a long term in the visual appearance of the landscape, and for vegetation to be in keeping with the surrounding landscape character. Avoiding large scale land disturbance, and consistency of vegetation is important to protecting ONFL's, and maintaining high amenity landscapes.
- It is not recommended to enable weed control and re-vegetation of the foreshore reserve in the Marlborough Sounds Coastal landscape. Furthermore, whilst the control of weeds in the foreshore reserve may enhance landscape values, it is not considered appropriate to promote or encourage this activity in Policy 7.2.7 which has a focus on controlling activities rather than enabling them.

- Vegetation clearance within the foreshore reserve and disturbance of archaeological sites, is separately addressed in the MEP (and HNZPTA for archaeological sites) outside of the landscape management framework of Chapter 7. It is therefore not recommended to include reference to avoiding the clearing of foreshore reserve in the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape.

Recommendation

Amend Policy 7.2.7 and the associated description as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

Protect the values of outstanding natural features and landscapes and the high amenity values of the ~~Wairau Dry Hills and the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscapes, and maintain the high amenity values of the Wairau Dry Hills~~²⁵ by:

(a) In respect of structures:

- (i) avoiding visual intrusion on skylines, particularly when viewed from public places;**
- (ii) avoiding new dwellings in ~~close proximity~~ adjacent²⁶ to the foreshore;**
- (iii) using reflectivity levels and building materials that complement the colours in the surrounding landscape;**
- (iv) limiting the scale, height and placement of structures to minimise intrusion of built form into the landscape;**
- (v) recognising that existing structures may contribute to the landscape character of an area and additional structures may complement this contribution;**
- (vi) making use of existing vegetation as a background and utilising new vegetation as a screen to reduce the visual impact of built form on the surrounding landscape, providing that the vegetation used is also in keeping with the surrounding landscape character; and**
- (vii) encouraging utilities to be co-located wherever possible;**
- (viii) whilst recognising the functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure.²⁷**

(b) In respect of land disturbance (including tracks and roads):

- (i) avoiding ~~extensive~~²⁸ land disturbance activity that creates a long term change in the visual appearance of the landscape, particularly when viewed from public places;**
- (ii) encouraging tracks and roads to be located²⁹ adjacent to slopes or at the edge of landforms or vegetation patterns and to follow natural contour lines in order to minimise the amount of land disturbance required;**
- (iii) minimising the extent of any cuts or side castings where land disturbance is to take place on a slope; and**
- (iv) encouraging the revegetation of cuts or side castings by seeding or planting.**
- (vi) whilst recognising the functional needs of regionally significant infrastructure.³⁰**

(c) In respect of vegetation planting:

²⁵ Submissions 425/114 Federated Farmers, 433/30 Port Marlborough Ltd.

²⁶ Submission 433/30 Port Marlborough Ltd.

²⁷ Submissions 1198/18 Transpower, 1002/30 NZTA.

²⁸ Submission 433/30 Port Marlborough Ltd.

²⁹ Submission 990/191 Nelson Forests Ltd.

³⁰ Submissions 1198/18 Transpower, 1002/30 NZTA.

- (i) **avoiding the planting of new exotic forestry in areas of outstanding natural features and landscapes in the coastal environment of the Marlborough Sounds;**
- (ii) **encouraging plantations of exotic trees to be planted in a form that complements the natural landform; and**
- (iii) **recognising the potential for wilding pine spread.'**

The sensory values of outstanding natural features and landscapes are vulnerable to change brought about by resource use. The introduction of new structures, tracks and roads into the landscape, and the planting of new vegetation, all have the ability to affect our visual perception and appreciation of the landscape. Although not an exhaustive list, this policy describes how the visual integrity of the landscape can be maintained in response to changes in resource use. The subdivision of land can act as a pre-cursor to such changes, so it is also appropriate to have regard to this policy when considering subdivision consent applications.

The matters in (a) to (c) guide how visual intrusion into significant landscapes can be avoided, remedied or mitigated. These mostly relate to undertaking land use activities in ways that limit the visual intrusion into the landscape. These actions will be implemented through a range of activity status as well as standards on permitted activity rules. Policy 7.2.1 provides guidance on how these controls will be applied to outstanding natural features and landscapes. For landscapes with high amenity value, guidance is provided through Policies 7.2.2 and 7.2.3.

This policy cannot apply to existing land use activities that have been lawfully established due to existing use rights under Section 10 of the RMA.'

5.20 Policy 7.2.8 – Recognition of Primary Production within Landscapes

Policy 7.2.8 recognises that primary production activities currently occur within ONFL's, and high amenity landscapes, to implement Objective 7.2.

Policy 7.2.8 reads:

'Recognise that some outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value will fall within areas in which primary production activities currently occur.'

Submissions

The submissions on the policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Nicholas Webby (14/3), Jane Buckman (284/13), Ian Mitchell (364/13), Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/24), Kevin Loe (454/10), Forest and Bird (496/19), Flaxbourne Settlers Association (712/73), Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/86), Nelson Forests Ltd (990/192), Ravensdown Ltd (1090/8).**
- Delete the policy (**Clova Bay Residents Association (152/11), Forest and Bird (715/160), Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association (868/15)).**
- Amend the policy to delete reference to 'amenity', and provide specific recognition of aquaculture as an existing primary production activity (**Aquaculture NZ (401/79), Marine Farming Association (426/83)).**
- Amend the policy to read *'Recognise that some outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value will fall within areas in which primary production activities currently occur, and accept farming is an appropriate land use involving activities which may modify the landscape'* (**Federated Farmers (425/115)).**

- General comment – Essential that consideration is given particularly where economic development and innovative ideas can develop in the primary production sector (**Marlborough Chamber of Commerce (961/16)**).
- General comment – Ensure equality for all primary land use (**Marlborough Forest Industry Association (962/58)**).

Assessment

The submissions on this policy include those which seek that it be deleted on the basis that it unnecessary as primary production activities have been considered as part of the assessment of the values of the landscape, and that it could support the re-consenting of activities with significant adverse landscape effects. Other submissions seek to more explicitly acknowledge the validity of primary production in landscape areas, and include recognition of aquaculture and greater enablement of forestry in the policy.

Policy 7.2.8 recognises that in some areas of ONFL's and high amenity landscapes, there are a range of primary production activities that exist, and that those landscapes are in part a product of past and present primary production activity. As well as recognising the influence of these activities for the existing landscape values, the policy provides the basis for enabling rules within the MEP which provide for activities such as farming and cultivation to be permitted within ONFL's and high amenity landscapes, which will protect the existing outstanding or high amenity values.

In regard to those submissions seeking deletion of the policy or the more explicit recognition of the validity of primary production activity, it is acknowledged that the contribution of primary production activities to landscape values has been assessed in determining ONFL's and high amenity landscapes. Furthermore, the management approach of Policies 7.2.1 to 7.2.3 essentially recognises primary production activities insofar that they only control activities which degrade the values of the landscapes. Policy 7.2.8 however goes further than those policies in providing a more express recognition of the relationship of primary production activities with landscape values so as to guide the status and rules that apply to those activities. The policy therefore is not intended to direct the re-consenting of primary production activities for example which are instead considered under the management approach contained in Policies 7.2.1 to 7.2.7.

However, while it is intended to guide the status and rules that apply to primary production activities, this is not well reflected in the current policy wording. In particular, it does not provide useful direction to guide the extent to which these activities will be provided for with respect to modification of landscape values. Given this it is recommended to amend the policy to provide more explicit direction for the status and rules that apply to these activities (changes detailed below). As part of this, it is also recommended to re-order the policies under Objective 7.2 so that Policy 7.2.8 instead sits under Policy 7.2.3 so as to more logically follow Policies 7.2.1 – 7.2.3 which similarly direct the rules of the MEP for controlling activities in landscape areas.

It is not recommended to include reference to aquaculture within the policy. Aquaculture is considered a primary production activity and is therefore captured within the policy. With respect to commercial forestry, the extent to which commercial forestry will be enabled in the MEP will be first determined through the Council completing a process in accordance with Section 44A of the RMA, to identify and make the required changes to the MEP to align with the National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) requirements. The completion of that process will be followed by the Hearings Panel considering the specific submissions on the MEP relating to the management of commercial/plantation forestry at a latter hearing (as noted in relation to the discussion on policies 7.2.2 and 7.2.3 above).

Recommendation

Relocate Policy 7.2.8 and the associated description to sit under Policy 7.2.3, and amend the policy as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

Recognise that some outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value ~~will fall within areas in which~~ include areas where primary production activities

currently occur, and enable such activities on the basis of their likelihood of degrading landscape values.³¹

In some areas where outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity values have been identified in the MEP, there are a range of primary production activities taking place.

Some landscapes, especially south of the Wairau River, are a product of past and present extensive pastoral farming. In this situation, the continuation of such pastoral farming is not anticipated to threaten the biophysical, sensory or associative values that contribute to landscape significance. This will be reflected in the status of regional and district rules that apply in identified outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value in rural areas. Existing land uses within these areas will also have existing use rights under Section 10 of the RMA.

Primary production activities currently also occur in the Marlborough Sounds in locations identified within the MEP as having landscape significance. Rules applying to land uses do require consent for new commercial forestry activity and land disturbance over certain limits. However, given the existing use rights under Section 10 of the RMA, existing land-based primary production activity, even within an area of landscape significance, can continue to take place.

5.21 Policy 7.2.9 – Activities in Close Proximity to Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes

Policy 7.2.9 addresses activities in close proximity to ONFL's, to implement Objective 7.2.

Policy 7.2.9 reads:

'When considering resource consent applications for activities in close proximity to outstanding natural features and landscapes, regard to the matters in Policy 7.2.7.'

Submissions

The submissions on the policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Jane Buckman (284/14), Ian Mitchell (364/14), Forest and Bird (496/20), Judy and John Hellstrom (688/67), Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/87)**).
- Delete the policy (**Aquaculture NZ (401/80), Federated Farmers (425/116), Marine Farming Association (426/84), Port Marlborough Ltd (433/31), D C Hemphill (648/34), Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association (868/16), Marlborough Forest Industry Association (962/59), Nelson Forests Ltd (990/193), Windermere Forests Ltd (1238/39)**).
- Delete the policy or confirm that it does not apply to high amenity landscapes and reword to capture all Permitted Activities as well as activities that require Resource Consents, so to reduce the Plan's current pro-farming anti-forestry bias (**Ernslaw One Ltd (505/9)**).
- Clarify the application of the policy or delete it (**Kilearnan Ltd (167/3)**).
- Amend the policy to include setbacks (**Forest and Bird (715/161)**).

Assessment

The submissions on this policy request its deletion or amendment for the following reasons:

³¹ Submission 425/115 Federated Farmers.

- There is no statutory direction that provides for managing activities in close proximity to ONFL's.
- ONFL's have been appropriately identified, and there is no need for added protection beyond them.
- Policy extends the same degree of protection provided beyond ONFL's.
- Uncertainty for resource users due to the broad discretion available to Council as to when to implement the policy. It would render land incapable of reasonable use.
- No attempt to quantify costs of additional regulation.
- Clear guidance is needed as to the appropriateness of activities adjacent to ONFL's.

Policy 7.2.9 enables resource consents for activities in close proximity to ONFL's to be assessed against the matters in Policy 7.2.7. The policy essentially introduces a buffer management approach whereby activities outside of ONFL's but near to them are managed to ensure the values that contribute to the ONFL are not degraded, in recognition that establishing the boundary beyond which the values no longer contribute to landscape significance is difficult.

Use of management buffers around ONFL's is not a new concept and has been recognised elsewhere in New Zealand. For example, it is recognised as a valid approach with the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement for managing activities adjacent to ONFL's. Such an approach can ensure the protection of ONFL's from inappropriate, subdivision, use, and development, and therefore is considered appropriate in response to section 6(b) of the RMA.

Notwithstanding the benefits, adoption of such an approach in contemporary planning practice in New Zealand is rare. Furthermore, it is acknowledged that implementation of this approach as proposed in Policy 7.2.9 presents some practical difficulties as identified in many of the submissions. In particular, the use of the wording '*in close proximity*' is open to interpretation and provides the Council with a broad discretion as to when the policy is implemented. This in turn presents uncertainty to resource users, who may or may not need to avoid, remedy, and mitigate adverse effects in order to ensure landscape values are not degraded. The costs of this uncertainty have not been quantified but may be significant depending on the extent to which the policy is applied.

Consideration has been given as to the circumstances as to when the policy might be applied, and how greater certainty could be provided. Identification of a buffer area either by way of mapping or imposing a setback distance from ONFL's within the policy could assist. However, defining the extent of these areas is complicated by the wide variation of activities and their effects that can locate adjacent to ONFL's. For example, a small scale structure immediately adjacent to an ONFL may have no effect on the values of that ONFL, whereas a large scale activity (e.g. a wind farm) which is located a greater distance from the ONFL could degrade its values. It is this difficulty in defining the extent of such a buffer that has led to the broad discretion provided in the policy so as to ensure all eventualities arising from activities that may impact on the values of adjacent ONFL's are captured.

Given the above, it is considered that retention of the policy is finely balanced. No recommendation is offered in relation to the policy at this time, and further evidence is invited from submitters on the merits or otherwise of the policy. The Hearings Panel will need to consider these merits in ultimately determining whether it should remain in the MEP.

5.22 Policy 7.2.10 – Landscape Impacts of Wilding Pines

Policy 7.2.10 addresses the management of the impact of wilding pines on landscapes, to implement Objective 7.2.

Policy 7.2.10 reads:

'Reduce the impact on wilding pines on the landscape by:

- (a) supporting initiative to control existing wilding pines and limit their further spread; and*
- (b) controlling the planting of commercial wood species that are prone to wilding pine spread.'*

Submissions

The submissions on the policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Harold Fowler (183/1)**, **Jane Buckman (284/15)**, **Landcorp (294/4)**, **Ian Mitchell (364/15)**, **Brian Godsiff (376/1)**, **Aquaculture NZ (401/81)**, **Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/25)**, **Federated Farmers (425/117)**, **Marine Farming Association (426/85)**, **Forest and Bird (496/21)**, **Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association (504/24)**, **Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/88)**, **Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association (868/17)**, **James Fowler (1249/1)**).
- Amend the policy to align with the methodology used in the proposed forestry NES and use a spread-risk based approach to define permitted versus discretionary status for planting various conifers (**Ernslaw One Ltd (505/11)**).
- Amend the policy to take into account science, specifically ecology and carbon sequestration as a means of climate change mitigation (**D C Hemphill (648/35)**).
- Amend the policy to capture all wilding exotic tree species (**Judy and John Hellstrom (688/180 and 688/181)**).
- Amend the policy to include reference to *'(c) Use consent conditions to require forestry operations to remove wilding pines within 1km of the designated forestry boundary and to cover the cost of removing wilding pines at a greater distance that have emanated from that operation' and '(d) Using consent conditions to require wilding removal as part of subdivision.'* (**EDS (698/56)**).
- Amend the policy to include other pest plants and the control of pests which detract from landscape values (**Forest and Bird (715/162)**).
- Amend the policy to require reduction of the impact of wilding pines *'on other resource users'* (**Trustpower (1201/72)**).
- General comment - Councils powers under the Biosecurity Act, not the RMA are key. The Branch and Letham catchments, planted by the Former Catchment Board (predecessor of the District Council) are significant seed sources and should be addressed under the Biosecurity Act. Any policy enacted under the RMA should give rise to a risk based approach, and not blanket prohibitions (**Ernslaw One Ltd (505/10)**).
- General comment – Ensure planning controls are warranted, based on risk analysis (**Marlborough Forest Industry Association (962/60)**).
- General comment - Ensure that the rules that are developed from this policy apply to all land uses and areas of the region, not just in relation to forestry type planting. Employ the Wilding Risk Calculator rather than have a blanket ban on particular tree species. (**Nelson Forests Ltd (990/194)**).

Assessment

The submissions on this policy include those that seek the application of a risk based approach to managing wilding tree spread as per the National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry (NES-PF), rather than controlling the planting of specific wilding species as required by clause (b) of the policy. Others seek amendment of the policy to recognise the ecological and carbon sequestration benefits of wilding trees. Finally, several submissions seek greater restriction on wildings, including for additional species and other plant pests, and use of consent conditions to remove wildings.

Policy 7.2.10 addresses the landscape impacts of wilding pines through supporting control initiatives, and controlling the planting of species that are prone to wilding spread. The policy provides the basis for rules in the MEP which restrict the planting of several conifer species, including:

- Douglas fir (*Pseudotsuga menziesii*);
- Lodgepole pine (*Pinus contorta*);
- Muricata pine (*Pinus muricata*);
- European larch (*Larix decidua*);
- Scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*);
- Mountain or dwarf pine (*Pinus mugo*);
- Corsican pine (*Pinus nigra*).

RMA plans have a limited role in the management of wilding trees, insofar that they can only control the causative land uses which result in wilding tree spread. They cannot regulate removal of wilding trees unrelated to a land use, which are instead addressed through Regional Pest Management Plans prepared under the Biosecurity Act 1993. Recognising this, Policy 7.2.10 therefore only provides policy support for control initiatives, and controls the land use of planting specific commercial wood species which are prone to wilding spread.

Since the notification of the MEP, the National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) has been gazetted, which comes into force from the 1st of May 2018. The NES-PF puts in place nationally consistent rules for the management of commercial plantation forestry. The NES does not restrict the types of conifer species that may be planted. However, it does include standards which requires landowners and forest operators to apply a Wilding Tree Risk Calculator to a site when they are considering establishing a new plantation forest or replanting a different type of conifer that has a higher risk score than the previous species. If the risk of wilding spread is high, resource consent is required for afforestation and planting the new species.

In response to the NES - PF, the Council needs to complete a comprehensive review process in accordance with Section 44A of the RMA, to determine the extent to which the provisions of both the Operative Resource Management Plans, and proposed MEP either duplicate or conflict with the provisions of the NES-PF. That process will identify and make the required changes to these plans to align with the NES-PF requirements. Recognising this, the Hearings Panel determined on the 21st of September 2017 to defer considering any submissions on the MEP relating to the management of commercial/plantation forestry until such time as the alignment process has occurred. Those submissions will be the subject of a latter hearing, the timing of which is yet to be confirmed. No recommendation on the submissions of EDS, Ernslaw One Ltd, Marlborough Forest Industry Association, and Nelson Forests Ltd, as they relate to commercial forestry are therefore made at this time.

It is not recommended to include reference to the ecology and carbon sequestration benefits of wilding trees. While these benefits are acknowledged, wilding trees can have significant impacts on landscape values, including in areas with outstanding or high amenity values. No change to the policy is therefore recommended.

Wilding conifers are considered the most significant plant pest issue in Marlborough which directly affects landscape values, and which has a direct relationship to the use of land (i.e. forestry activity). As noted RMA plans can only control pests to the extent that they relate to a use of land, with other pests controlled through mechanisms under the Biosecurity Act. No change is therefore recommended to include other plant pest species within the policy.

Requiring removal of wildings as part of the process subdivision would not be an appropriate, effective or proportional response to the issue of exotic wilding tree spread. Specifically, it could lead for example to conditions on wilding tree management being imposed on subdivision consents for activities which comprise relatively minor rule infringements or have no effect or bearing on wilding tree spread. Furthermore, it could impose such requirements over a wide area where the application site is larger. Such an approach would not be a proportionate or reasonable response to the issue. Other mechanisms outside the MEP, including Biosecurity Act 1993 and Regional Pest Management Plans provide a more

effective and efficient means to address exotic wilding tree spread. No change is therefore recommended.

Recommendation

Retain Policy 7.2.10 as notified.

5.23 Policy 7.2.11 – Landscape Issues on Land Administered by the Department of Conservation

Policy 7.2.11 addresses landscape issues on land administered by DOC and identified as ONFL's, to implement Objective 7.2.

Policy 7.2.11 reads:

'Liaise with the Department of Conservation regarding any landscape issues on land administered by the Department and identified as having outstanding natural features and landscapes (including within the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape).'

Submissions

The submissions on the policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Jane Buckman (284/16), Ian Mitchell (364/16), Federated Farmers (425/118), Forest and Bird (496/22), Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association (504/25), Forest and Bird (715/163), Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/89)**).

Assessment

All submissions support and seek retention of the policy. No change is therefore recommended.

Recommendation

Retain Policy 7.2.11 as notified.

5.24 Policy 7.2.12 – Encouraging Consideration of Landscape Qualities

Policy 7.2.12 encourages landowners and resource users to consider landscape qualities in undertaken use and development in high amenity landscapes, to implement Objective 7.2.

Policy 7.2.12 reads:

'Encourage landowners and resource users to consider landscape qualities in the use or development of natural and physical resources in landscapes with high amenity value.'

Submissions

The submissions on the policy include:

- Support/retain the policy as notified (**Jane Buckman (284/17), Ian Mitchell (364/17), Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/26), Forest and Bird (496/23, 715/164), Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/90)**).

- Delete the policy (**Aquaculture NZ (401/82), Federated Farmers (425/119), Marine Farming Association (426/86)**).
- Amend the policy to reflect a more active stance on managing areas with high amenity values to ensure that they are maintained or enhanced as required under section 7 of the RMA (**EDS 698/57**).

Assessment

The submissions on this policy include those that seeks its deletion on the basis that is not appropriate to address 'amenity' in a landscape chapter, and that the description to the policy suggests a regulatory approach will be taken despite the policy advocating a non-regulatory approach. EDS seek the policy take a more active stance on managing areas with high amenity values.

Policy 7.2.12 encourages landowners and resource users to consider landscape qualities in undertaking activities in other landscapes with high amenity values which are not identified in the MEP. That is those landscapes which have been identified in the Marlborough Landscape Study, but have not been included in the MEP due to their high amenity values not being under threat.

As per similar submissions on the chapter requesting deletion of the policy, section 7(c) of the RMA requires particular regard to be had to the 'maintenance and enhancement of amenity values', and enables the identification and management of those landscapes that have visual amenity value, but which are not otherwise considered ONFL's under section 6(b). Deletion of the policy in ONFL's would therefore be inconsistent with section 7(c) of the RMA and Policy 15 of the NZCPS within the coastal environment.

Notwithstanding the above, it is acknowledged in response to the submission of Federated Farmers, that the wording description for the policy suggests that a regulatory approach will be taken while the policy itself encourages rather than directs consideration of landscape qualities. It is therefore recommended to amend the description for the policy accordingly to make the intention of the policy clearer (changes detailed below).

In regard to EDS's request to take a more active stance on managing areas with high amenity values, as acknowledged in the Marlborough Landscape Study, only the Marlborough Sounds, and Wairau Dry Hills however were considered to require planning mechanisms (over and above the underlying zone mechanisms) to ensure that the identified high amenity values would be maintained. Given that other landscapes with high amenity values are not under any threat, it is not considered necessary to apply a more active regulatory approach to those landscapes. No change is therefore recommended.

Recommendation

Amend Policy 7.2.12 and the associated description as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

Encourage landowners and resource users to consider landscape qualities in the use or development of natural and physical resources in landscapes with high amenity value.

The primary means of maintaining and enhancing landscapes with high amenity value is through non-regulatory methods, except in the Wairau Dry Hills and Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscapes where a management framework for a range of activities is set out in Policies 7.2.2, 7.2.3 and 7.2.7. Other landscapes with high amenity values have not been identified in the MEP, as these landscapes are usually located in remote areas or areas where sensory values are not under any critical threat. ~~Nonetheless, it may appropriate to consider landscape qualities in these areas as part of a resource consent application, landowners and resource users are encouraged to consider landscape qualities when undertaking use and development in these landscapes.~~³²

³² Submission 425/119 Federated Farmers.

5.25 General Submissions on Chapter 7 Objectives and Policies

Submissions

A range of general submissions have been received on the Chapter 7 objectives and policies which addresses the objectives and policies as a whole generally or request the addition of new objectives and policies. These general submissions request:

- Add a new policy to read 'Define boundaries of a feature as a coherent land and sea type' and map those features and describe their values in Vol 3, Appendix 1 **(Marine Farming Association (426/69), Aquaculture NZ (401/68))**.
- Add a new policy to read 'Provide recognition of and provision for environmental compensation or offsets including but not restricted to Biodiversity offsets for effects that may result in beneficial outcomes in regard to the resource being affected or utilised' **(Totaranui Ltd (233/22))**.
- Amend the objectives and policies, and add new objectives and policies to:
 - recognise that commercial forestry forms, contributes to, and is part of the Marlborough Sounds landscape and should be enabled within the rules that seek to protect landscape values.
 - recognise the importance of primary industry (specifically commercial forestry), rural industry, and transport infrastructure to the region, even within the Marlborough Sounds landscape
 - enable minor expansion of existing forestry without resource consent
 - enable the intensification of commercial forestry in those areas where it is already established and in areas adjacent existing commercial forestry, particularly where such a use may be anticipated by the underlying zoning; and
 - recognise commercial forestry activities in areas not identified as outstanding, only require controlled or restricted discretionary consent.

(NZ Forest Products Holdings Ltd (995/13))

- Add new policy to read 'Recognise and provide for farming and rural activities where these currently occur on ONFLs and are consistent with the identified values and attributes' **(Federated Farmers (425/98))**.
- Add a new policy to read 'Activities that are consistent with the values and factors of Outstanding Natural Landscapes will be recognised for their contribution to the landscape and provided for. Primary production activities in particular will be enabled' **(Federated Farmers (425/104))**.
- Add a new objective to read: 'Objective 7.X The natural landscapes and features identified in accordance with the above policy are protected from inappropriate subdivision use and development' **(Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay (716/72))**
- Add a new policy to read:

'Protect outstanding landscapes by:

(a) requiring resource consent of activities which are likely to have an impact on the values identified for landscapes in appendix 1.

(b) providing standards for permitted activities within outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes identified on Planning maps to avoid adverse effects in the Coastal Environment

(c) providing standards for permitted activities within outstanding natural features and landscapes identified on Planning maps and ensure they are no more than minor outside the Coastal Environment'

(Forest and Bird (715/148)).

- Add a new objective to read 'Maintain, preserve and, enhance and increase the amenities of landscape provided in road environments' (Mark Batchelor (263/5), Helen Ballinger (351/40)).
- Add a new policy to read 'Rules within each zone applying to public roadways and reserves and other areas of public land and thoroughfares shall include requirements for existing trees to be retained and resource consent for their removal, applications for subdivision consent will be required to provide landscape plans, pruning or removal of any trees within street, reserves and other areas of public thoroughfare shall require resource consent and where telecommunication or lines for similar purpose and electricity lines are being installed or replaced these shall be installed underground' (Mark Batchelor (263/5), Helen Ballinger (351/40)).
- Add a new cumulative landscape effects policy to meet the requirements of NZCPS Policy 7, similar to that included in Chapter 7 for natural character effects. Such a policy should prescribe:
 - The positive identification of areas such as Clova Bay where coastal landscape values are under threat from adverse cumulative effects; and
 - That for all activities requiring a resource consent in the coastal marine environment, an assessment of cumulative adverse landscape effects be undertaken considering:
 - (a) the effects of the existing level of activity;
 - (b) the result of re-consenting or allowing more of a particular effect, whether from the same activity or from other activities causing the same or similar effect; and
 - (c) the combined effects from all activities in the coastal marine environment in the locality.
 - That acceptable limits of cumulative effects will be determined by reference to the thresholds specified in a particular policy, or by effects not reducing landscape value to a lower level on a seven point scale, or through guidelines developed with stakeholders with reference to best practice and international assessment standards.
 - That where a retraction of consented activities is required to meet acceptable cumulative effect thresholds then this may occur by default through re-consenting attrition until acceptable levels of adverse cumulative effects are reached, or through the application of activity retraction guidelines developed and agreed with effected stakeholders.

(Clova Bay Residents Association (152/12)).

Assessment

These submissions can be broadly grouped as follows:

- New objectives and policies addressing the assessment and determination of significant landscapes and features.
- New policies that recognise and provide for environmental compensation or offsets.
- New objectives and policies seeking greater enablement of subdivision, use, and development within significant landscapes, including commercial forestry and farming activities.
- New policies addressing the management of subdivision, use, and development within significant landscapes, including within public roadways and reserves, and management of cumulative adverse effects.

Each of these submission groupings are addressed in the following sections.

Requested New Objectives and Policies Addressing the Assessment and Determination of Significant Landscapes and Features

The request of the Marine Farming Association and Aquaculture NZ for a new policy to define the boundaries of a feature as a coherent land and sea type is considered to adequately captured within Policy 7.1.2 which addresses the methods used to define the boundaries of significant landscapes. The methods in Policy 7.1.2 align with those used in the mapping of landscapes used in the Marlborough landscape Study 2015. No change is therefore recommended.

Requested New Policies Addressing Environmental Compensation or Offsets

Totaranui Ltd has requested the inclusion of an additional policy requiring recognition and provision for environmental compensation and offsets. The policy sought is the same as that sought by the same submission for inclusion in Chapter 6 on managing natural character.

Environmental compensation or offsets is a way in which adverse effects on the environment can be addressed. It is most commonly applied in respect to biodiversity or natural character in addressing residual adverse effects that cannot be avoided, remedied, or mitigated. Unlike for biodiversity, compensation or offsets with regard to landscape management are not enshrined in RMA practice. Inclusion of a policy providing for compensation and offset of effects on ONFL's would be inconsistent with sections 6(b) and 7(c) of the RMA, and Policy 15 of the NZCPS within the coastal environment. No change is therefore recommended.

Requested New Objectives and Policies Addressing Enablement of Subdivision, Use, and Development

NZ Forest Product Holdings Ltd and Federated Farmers have requested the addition of new objectives and/or policies to recognise the importance of primary industry, including recognition that commercial forestry and farming contributes to, and is consistent with the values of Marlborough Sounds landscape and should be enabled.

Proposed policy 7.2.8 recognises that in some areas where ONFL's and high amenity landscapes exist, there are a range of primary production activities that exist, and that those landscapes are in part a product of past and present primary production activity. As well as recognising the influence of these activities for the existing landscape values, the policy provides the basis for enabling rules within the MEP which provide for activities such as farming and cultivation to be permitted within ONFL's and high amenity landscapes which will protect ONFL's, or maintain high amenity values.

While it is intended to guide the status and rules that apply to primary production activities, this is not well reflected in the current policy wording. In particular, it does not provide useful direction to guide the extent to which these activities will be provided for with respect to modification of landscape values. Given this it has been recommended earlier in this report to amend the policy to provide more explicit direction for the status and rules that apply to these activities. Specifically, primary production will therefore be enabled or controlled by the policy on the basis of its likelihood to degrade landscape values. With those changes it is considered that the policy addresses these submissions insofar that primarily production activities which are compatible with the identified landscape values are enabled. No new objective and policies are therefore recommended.

Furthermore, as noted in other parts of this report, the extent to which commercial forestry will be enabled will also be first determined through the Council completing a process in accordance with Section 44A of the RMA to identify and make the required changes to the MEP to align with the National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) requirements. The completion of that process will be followed by the Hearings Panel considering the specific submissions on the MEP relating to the management of commercial/plantation forestry at a latter hearing.

New Policies Addressing the Management of Subdivision, Use and Development

The Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay have requested the addition of a new objective that provides that identified natural landscapes and features and landscapes are protected from inappropriate subdivision, use, and development. Objective 7.2 sets out the aim of the MEP with regard to the management of ONFL's, and high amenity landscapes, in addressing Issue 7A. The wording of that objective appropriately responds to Issue 7A and the statutory direction in section 6(b) and 7(c) of the RMA, and Policy 15 within the coastal environment. The management of inappropriate subdivision, use, and development to ensure the achievement of Objective 7.2 is addressed within the supporting policies. Accordingly, no new objective is considered necessary, and no change is recommended.

The request of Forest and Bird for the addition of a policy setting out the way in which outstanding landscapes will be protected is considered to be appropriately addressed by proposed Policies 7.2.1, 7.2.5, 7.2.6, and 7.2.7 as recommended to be amended in this report. Specifically, Policy 7.2.1 recognises that only

those activities that have the potential to degrade those values contributing to ONFL's will be controlled. No change is therefore recommended.

Mark Batchelor and Helen Ballinger have requested a new objective and policy aimed at maintaining, preserving, and enhancing the amenity of landscapes within public roadways and reserves, specifically by retaining existing trees, requiring landscape plans for subdivision, requiring resource consents for pruning and removal of street trees, and requiring telecommunication and electricity lines to be installed underground. While potentially of merit, such a policy would not be appropriate in response to Issue 7A regarding the loss of values that contribute to ONFL's and high amenity landscapes. Such matters are better addressed through specific general rule and zone provisions in other Chapters of the MEP. In this regard it is noted that the submitter has sought similar objectives and policies, and related rules in other sections of the MEP, and these will be considered through other MEP hearings.

The Clova Bay Residents Association have requested the inclusion of a new cumulative effects policy similar to Policy 6.2.7 in Chapter 6 of the MEP which addresses the management of cumulative effects on natural character. In addition, they request the policy include reference to acceptable limits of cumulative effects established through policy or guidelines to give effect to Policy 7 of the NZCPS. Whilst no specific policy addressing adverse cumulative adverse effects has been included in Chapter 7, they are covered by Policies 7.2.1 to 7.2.5 as a subset of adverse effects which are managed through those policies. Notwithstanding, it is recognised that a specific cumulative effects Policy 6.2.7 has been included in Chapter 6 of the MEP in regard to managing natural character. Recognising that, it is considered appropriate to include a similar policy in Chapter 7 under Objective 7.2. Such a policy will respond to sections 6(b) and 7(c) of the RMA, and Policies 7 and 15 of the NZCPS within the coastal environment (changes detailed below).

It is acknowledged, that inclusion in the MEP of acceptable limits of cumulative effects established through policy or guidelines, could provide an acceptable threshold of modification and provide greater certainty as to the appropriateness of development at the time of consenting new or re-consenting existing activities. Given the submitters primary concern around cumulative effects of activities in the coastal environment, in theory, such an approach could provide an acceptable threshold of modification when considering the appropriateness of existing and new activities within these areas in responding to sections 6(b) and 7(c) of the RMA, and Policies 7 and 15 of the NZCPS.

The DOC guidance note on Policy 7 of the NZCPS recognises that cumulative effects in the coastal environment are better addressed through a strategic planning approach, including the identification of environmental limits and integrated management of the impact of different and/or numerous similar activities. It also however recognises that addressing cumulative adverse effects can be challenging, as they can arise from direct and indirect influences. Management responses need to consider all sources, and an approach that tackles only a fraction of the problem will be ineffective and lack credibility. The guidance notes that the management responses need to be practicable and will vary according to the significance of the issue and resources available.

While there is merit seen in the approach proposed by the Clova Bay Residents Association, significant work would be required to develop this approach. It would require ensuring that there is sufficient information as to the nature scale of all cumulative effects sources, and require development of policy or guidelines to occur collaboratively with all relevant stakeholders to achieve a comprehensive approach that can be effectively implemented. In regard to the coastal environment for example, such an approach could be best delivered through first undertaking holistic coastal spatial planning approach. Given the amount of work required to deliver a robust and workable management approach, including consultation, it is not recommended to include any new policy or guidance in the MEP at this time.

Recommendation

Add a new Policy after Policy 7.2.7 as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

Policy 7.2.X – In assessing the cumulative effects of activities on outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity values, consideration shall be given to:

- (a) the effect of allowing more of the same or similar activity;**
- (b) the result of allowing more of a particular effect, whether from the same activity or from other activities causing the same or similar effect; and**
- (c) the combined effects from all activities in the locality.**

Although individual activities may not adversely affect the values that contribute to significant landscapes, when combined with the effects of similar activities or other activities with similar effects, the activities may collectively have cumulative adverse effects on those values. This Policy describes how the cumulative effects of activities on significant landscapes will be considered.³³

5.26 Methods of Implementation

The methods of implementation in Chapter 7 set out the means by which the objectives and policies of Chapter 7 are to be implemented. Nine methods are listed, including:

- 7.M.1 Identifying Marlborough's outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value that are sensitive to change.
- 7.M.2 Information.
- 7.M.3 District and regional rules.
- 7.M.4 Guidelines.
- 7.M.5 Colour palette.
- 7.M.6 Incentives.
- 7.M.7 Investigation.
- 7.M.8 Information.
- 7.M.9 Advocacy.

Submissions

The submissions received on the methods of implementation include:

- Delete Method 7.M.1 (**D C Hemphill (648/29), Forest and Bird (715/150)**).
- Amend method 7.M.1 to delete reference to 'amenity' (**Sanford Ltd (1140/22)**).
- Amend method 7.M.2 to read '~~The Council will continue to make has made~~ available information on Marlborough's diverse landscape character and the results of any evaluations of landscapes ~~significance~~ (following consultation with relevant landowners). This information will be ~~a useful reference document generally, but can also be used by~~ made available to resource consent applicants to assist in any assessment of adverse effects on landscape values' (**Forest and Bird (715/151)**).
- Support/retain method 7.M.3 as notified (**Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association (504/26)**), **Judy and John Hellstrom (688/182)**, **NZTA (1002/31)**).
- Oppose/delete method 7.M.3 (**D C Hemphill (648/31), Marlborough Forest Industry Association (962/61)**).
- Amend method 7.M.3 to remove commercial forestry and planting of specific exotic tree species from the list of activities to be regulated (**Nelson Forests Ltd (990/195)**).
- Amend method 7.M.3 to include marine farming (**Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association (868/18)**).
- Support/retain method 7.M.4 as notified (**Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/27)**), **Judy and John Hellstrom (688/183)**, **Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association (868/19)**).
- Amend method 7.M.4 as follows '~~The Council will provide guidelines to help landowners and resource users to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse visual effects of development on landscape values. Guidelines for forest harvest activities and new structures will be priorities for development. These guidelines are intended to encourage landowners and resource users to consider landscape qualities when using or developing natural and physical resources. This may result in improved recognition of the landscape within which the resource use or development is proposed to occur and~~

³³ Submission 152/12 Clova Bay Residents Association.

therefore improved (~~harvest or structure~~) design from a landscape perspective. In this way, the guidelines will assist with the implementation of the regulatory methods and are complimentary to these methods. It is not proposed to develop guidelines for forestry as the NESPF will become the eminent regulation for the industry' (Nelson Forests Ltd (990/196)).

- Support/retain method 7.M.5 as notified (**Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/28), Judy and John Hellstrom (688/184), Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association (868/20)**).
 - Support/retain method 7.M.6 as notified (**Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/29), Pinder Family Trust (578/17) Judy and John Hellstrom (688/185), Guardians of the Sounds (752/17), Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association (868/21), Sea Sheppard (1146/17), Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association (1190/6), Marlborough Environment Centre (1193/18), Forest and Bird (715/165)**).
 - Support/retain method 7.M.7 as notified (**Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/30), Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association (504/27), Pinder Family Trust (578/18) Judy and John Hellstrom (688/186), Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association (868/22)**).
 - Delete method 7.M.7 (**D C Hemphill (648/32)**).
 - Amend method 7.M.7 to provide for identification of sites for permanent carbon sink initiatives to support the retention and enhancement of landscapes and natural landscapes (**Forest and Bird (715/166)**).
 - Amend method 7.M.7 to require research is undertaken into alternative forestry and land use options such as permanent sink forestry for pine forest owners in the Marlborough Sounds. The investigations should include how best to manage the transition from pine plantations to the chosen alternatives in a manner that minimises landscape effects, especially those caused by wilding pines (**Guardians of the Sounds (752/18), Sea Sheppard (1146/18), Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association (1190/7), Marlborough Environment Centre (1193/19)**).
 - Support/retain method 7.M.8 (**Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/31), Judy and John Hellstrom (688/187), Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association (868/23)**).
 - Amend method 7.M.8 to provide for a proactive programme to increase public awareness of landscape values and requirements to protect these values to achieve compliance with permitted standards and seeking consent where needed as well as covenant incentives (**Forest and Bird (715/167)**).
 - Amend method 7.M.8 to develop meaningful incentives to drive land use change (**Marlborough Forest Industry Association (962/62)**).
 - Amend method 7.M.8 be deleting paragraph 3 as follows. ~~'Provide the community with information on effective control practices for wilding pines'~~ (**Nelson Forests Ltd (990/197)**).
- Support/retain method 7.M.9 as notified (**Judy and John Hellstrom (688/188)**).
- Add a new landscape assessment method of implementation setting out a detailed method to encourage consistency of approach between landscape architects (**Marine Farming Association (426/88), Aquaculture NZ (401/84)**).
 - Add a new method of implementation to introduce an industry levy on logs harvested to control for wilding spread beyond the boundary and/or into the coastal setback area and the cost of this control (**Pinder Family Trust (578/21), Guardians of the Sounds (752/21), Sea Sheppard (1146/21)**).
 - Add a new method of implementation to read '7.M.10 Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Act 2014. This Act makes it an offence to destroy or modify an archaeological site without first obtaining an 'archaeological authority'. This applies to both recorded and unrecorded archaeological sites. It is important that the planning for any building or development takes this issue into account and an archaeological assessment may be required. The applicant is advised to contact Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga if any activity such as earthworks, fencing or landscaping may modify damage or destroy any archaeological site. More information is contained in Appendix 13' (**Heritage NZ (768/20)**).

Assessment

The submissions on the methods of implementation are grouped as follows:

- Deletion of particular methods on the basis they are redundant or lack clarity, or request minor wording changes.
- Inclusion of marine farming to the list activities to be regulated by District and Regional rules, and removal of commercial forestry as an activity to be regulated.
- Deletion of requirement for landscape guidelines for forest harvest activities.
- Deletion of requirement for research into alternative forestry and land use options in the Marlborough Sounds, and providing information on that research to forest owners, or inclusion of research into permanent carbon sink forestry as an alternative land use option.
- Deletion of method to provide community with information wilding control practices.
- Greater proactive public awareness of landscape values and requirements to protect these values.
- New methods for a detailed method to encourage consistency in landscape assessment, introduction of an industry level on logs to control wilding spread, and protection of archaeological sites.

The purpose of the methods of implementation section in Chapter 6 is to broadly set out the methods that will be used to implement the objectives, and policies of that chapter. It is not intended for example to set out the detail of those methods, including the form of any rules that will be applied to individual land use activities, such as commercial forestry. All of the methods of implementation are considered sufficiently purposeful and clear, and therefore it is not recommended to delete or clarify any of the proposed methods as sought in the submissions.

Method 7.M.3 covers the application of District and Regional rules. The aquaculture provisions of the MEP have yet to be notified, and therefore it would not be appropriate at the present time to include marine farming in the list of activities to be regulated in Method 7.M.3 as sought by the Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association. As noted in other parts of this report, the extent to which commercial forestry will be enabled in the MEP will be first determined through the Council completing a process in accordance with Section 44A of the RMA, to identify and make the required changes to the MEP to align with the National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) requirements. The completion of that process will be followed by the Hearings Panel considering the specific submissions on the MEP relating to the management of commercial/plantation forestry at a latter hearing. No recommendations in response to the submissions of D C Hemphill, Marlborough Forest Industry Association, or Nelson Forests Ltd on Method 7.M.3 are therefore made at this time.

Method 7.M.4 addresses the provision of non-regulatory landscape guidelines, including for forest harvest activities. Whilst it is acknowledged that the NES-PF will in effect provide a regulatory basis for managing forest harvest activities, it is considered appropriate to prepare and provide non-regulatory guidelines to help resource users avoid, remedy, or mitigate the adverse effects of forest harvest activities on landscape values in implementing the NES-PF requirements. No change is therefore recommended to Method 7.M.4 as a result of the submission of Nelson Forests Ltd.

Method 7.M.7 and 7.M.8 provide for undertaking research into options for transition to alternative forestry and land use options in the Marlborough Sounds, and providing information to forest owners from that research so they can make informed succession planning leading up to and upon the harvest of existing forestry. The method recognises that commercial forestry can degrade values of ONFL's and high visual amenity landscapes, and that undertaking research into alternatives may assist promote transition to more landscape appropriate forms of land use. Recognising this it is not recommended to delete Method 7.M.7 as sought by the submission of D C Hemphill. Furthermore, whilst permanent carbon sink forestry may be a valid alternative land use, it is not recommended to include specific reference to that use in Method 7.M.7 as sought by the Forest and Bird and other submitters. The scope of the research should not be constrained to any particular land use option.

It is acknowledged the successful transition from commercial forest to viable alternative forestry and land use options may require incentives to drive land use change as noted in the submission of the Marlborough Forest Industry Association. Recognising this, it is recommended that Method 7.M.6 be amended to enable consideration of providing incentives as informed by the outcomes of the research (changes detailed below).

Method 7.M.8 also addresses providing the community information on effective wilding control practices. The method is intended to support non-regulatory community initiatives to control wilding spread in recognition of their impact on areas with outstanding and high amenity landscape values. Recognising that, it is not recommended to delete the method as sought by Nelson Forests Ltd.

Achieving consistency in the assessment of landscapes between landscape architects, as noted by the submissions of Aquaculture NZ and the Marine Farming Association, is a desirable outcome. However, establishing a consistent detailed methodology is problematic given the wide variation in assessment methodologies used, the lack of national level guidance, and continued evolution of landscape planning practice in response to Environment Court case law. Inclusion of a methodology in the MEP at this time could result in a methodology which is inconsistent with evolving practice, and it is considered that achieving a consistent methodology is best led by the landscape planning profession, to achieve consistency nationally and not just within Marlborough. Furthermore, the Marlborough Landscape Study provides a methodology which can be applied consistently within Marlborough. No changes are therefore recommended to the methods of implementation.

Inclusion of an industry levy on harvested logs to control spread beyond the boundary of the property is not recommended to be addressed through the MEP. Other than where the NES-PF regulates control of wildings, all other regulation including contributions on the costs associated with management are best addressed through Regional Pest Management Plans under the Biosecurity Act 1993. No new method of implementation is therefore proposed in response to the submissions of Guardians of the Sounds, Pinder Family Trust, and Sea Sheppard.

Disturbance of archaeological sites, is separately addressed in the MEP (and HNZPTA for archaeological sites) outside of the landscape management framework of Chapter 7. It is therefore not recommended to include a method relating to the protection of archaeological sites in Chapter 7 as sought by Heritage NZ.

Recommendation

Amend Method 7.M.6 as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struck through~~.

7.M.6 Incentives

Consider providing rates relief where landscape protection is formalised by way of covenant or similar methods of protection.

Consider providing funding to wilding pine control programmes and other community initiated control programmes for undesirable plants and animals.

*Consider providing incentives to drive transition of commercial forests within outstanding natural features and landscapes, and landscapes with high amenity to alternative forestry or land uses, as informed by the outcomes of research.*³⁴

5.27 Anticipated Environmental Results

The anticipated environmental results in Chapter 7 set out the outcome expected through the implementation of the objectives, policies and rules relating to landscapes in the MEP, and the way effectiveness in achieving that outcome will be monitored.

A single anticipated environmental result is included in Chapter 7 which reads:

³⁴ Submission 962/62 Nelson Forest Industry Association.

'Marlborough's outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with visual amenity value are protected from degradation.'

Submissions

The submissions received on the anticipated environmental results include:

- Support/retain AER.1 as notified (**Marine Farming Association (426/89), Aquaculture NZ (401/85)**).
- Amend AER.1 to read '*Marlborough's outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with visual amenity value are protected from degradation inappropriate subdivision, use or development*' (**Port Marlborough Ltd (433/32)**).
- Amend AER.1 to read '*Marlborough's outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with visual amenity value are protected from degradation*' (**Forest and Bird (715/168)**).
- Add a new monitoring indicator to AER.1 to read '*Number of programmes in the community to control wilding pines*' (**Marlborough District Council (91/74)**).
- Amend the 5th monitoring indicator to AER.1 as follows '*The area of land vegetated by wilding pines in the Marlborough Sounds decreases does not increase*' (**Marlborough District Council (91/75)**).
- Add a new monitoring indicator to AER.1 to read '*Removal of wilding pines in the Marlborough Sounds*' (**Pinder Family Trust (578/22), Guardians of the Sounds (752/22), Sea Sheppard (1146/22)**).
- Add a new monitoring indicator to AER.1 to read '*The instances of archaeological site damage recorded by Heritage New Zealand decreases or is maintained at zero, and the instances of site avoidance increases*' (**Heritage NZ (768/21)**).

Assessment

The submissions on the anticipated environmental results include those that seek amendments to refer to protection of landscapes, or protection from '*inappropriate subdivision, use, and development*'. Other submissions seek inclusion of monitoring indicators for wilding pine control, and there being no damage to archaeological sites.

The management approach of Chapter 7, and in particular in Objective 7.2 and related policies is to protect ONFL's from inappropriate, subdivision, use and development, and maintain and enhance landscapes with high amenity value. It essentially seeks at a high level that landscapes are protected from degradation so that their values are not lost. Given that focus, it is considered that the current wording of the anticipated environmental results accurately recognises the outcomes intended through the application of the objectives, policies and rules relating landscapes in the MEP. No change is therefore recommended in response to the submissions of Port Marlborough and Forest and Bird.

The inclusion of a new monitoring indicator covering the number of community programmes to control wilding pines is considered an appropriate monitoring indicator. Furthermore, it is considered appropriate to broaden and amend the scope of the 5th monitoring indicator regarding the extent of wilding pines to capture all of Marlborough, and ensure the area of land covered by wilding pines does not increase. These changes will better reflect Policy 7.2.10 which seeks to limit the further spread of wilding pines, the methods of implementation addressing funding to support community control programmes, and providing information on effective control practices. Changes to the monitoring indicators are recommended accordingly (changed detailed below). It should however be recognised, that the MEP has a limited role in the control wildings, and that it will work in parallel with other mechanisms available under the NES-PF and Biosecurity Act 1993.

Disturbance of archaeological sites, is separately addressed in the MEP (and HNZPTA for archaeological sites) outside of the landscape management framework of Chapter 7. It is therefore not recommended to include a monitoring indicator covering the disturbance of archaeological sites in Chapter 7 as sought by Heritage NZ.

Recommendation

Amend the monitoring indicators under AER.1 as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

Outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value are included within the MEP. This will include the identification of values that make each landscape significant and mapping of the extent of the significant landscapes.

The awareness of Marlborough's outstanding natural features and landscapes and landscapes with high amenity value increases, as measured by public perception survey.

The biophysical, sensory and associative values that contribute to the significance of particular landscapes are maintained (or enhanced), as measured by reassessment of Marlborough's landscape.

Only appropriate development is allowed to occur in outstanding natural features and landscapes, as measured by reassessment of Marlborough's landscape.

The area of land vegetated by wilding pines in ~~the Marlborough Sounds~~ decreases does not increase.

*The number of programmes in the community to control wilding pines.*³⁵

5.28 Landscape Rules

The MEP includes rules to assist implementation of the Chapter 7 objectives, policies and rules relating to ONFL's and landscapes with high visual amenity. These include rules which prescribe a particular activity status, or specific standards with thresholds for permitted activities within ONFL's and high amenity landscapes. The specific rule requirements that have been submitted on include:

- Utility structures to be no more than 15m high in the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape (permitted activity standard 2.39.1.6).
- Buildings and structures to be 10m² or less where within 20 metres vertically below a significant ridgeline in the Limestone Coastline ONFL, and Wairau Dry Hills Landscape, any (permitted activity standards 3.2.1.13, 3.2.1.14, 8.2.1.8, 19.2.1.5).
- Any exterior paints on buildings or structures to have a light reflectance value of 45% or less in the Limestone Coastline ONFL, and Wairau Dry Hills Landscape, any Marlborough Sounds ONFL, Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape (permitted activity standards 3.2.1.13, 3.2.1.14, 4.2.1.11, 4.2.1.12, 7.2.1.9, 8.2.1.8, 19.2.1.6).
- No more than 500m³ of excavation per computer register within any 12 month period where located within the Chalk Range, Inland Kaikoura Range, Molesworth Station and Upper Clarence, Limestone Coastline, Marlborough Sounds, Bryant Range, Upper Pelorus Area, Richmond Range Conservation Estate, Red Hills, Mt Duncan, Mt Rutland, and Mt Cullen ONFL (permitted activity standards 3.3.14.8, 4.3.13.6, 19.3.5.7, 19.3.5.8, 19.3.5.9, and 19.3.5.10).
- No more than 500m³ of filling with clean fill per computer register within any 12 month period where located within the Chalk Range, Inland Kaikoura Range, Molesworth Station and Upper Clarence, Limestone Coastline, and Marlborough Sounds, Bryant Range, Upper Pelorus Area, Richmond Range Conservation Estate, Red Hills, Mt Duncan, Mt Rutland, and Mt Cullen ONFL's (permitted activity standards 3.3.16.10, 4.3.15.5, 19.3.6.11, 19.3.6.12, 19.3.6.13, 19.3.6.14).
- Buildings over 10m³ to be a restricted discretionary activity within any Marlborough Sounds ONFL (Rule 4.5.1).

³⁵ Submissions 91/74 and 91/75 Marlborough District Council.

- No conservation planting within that part of the Wairau Hills Dry Landscape zoned as Rural Living Zone (permitted activity standard 8.3.9.3).
- No building or structure within the White Bluffs ONFL, except for fences or gates necessary for farming or conservation purposes (permitted activity standard 19.2.1.7).

Submissions

The submissions received on the rules include:

- Support/retain Rule 2.39.1.6 as notified (**Omaka Valley Group (1005/11)**).
- Support/retain Rule 3.2.1.13 as notified (**Helen Ballinger (351/1)**).
- Delete standard 3.2.1.13 (**Federated Farmers (425/508)**).
- Amend Rule 3.2.1.13 to capture any coastline outstanding natural feature and landscape (**Marlborough Environment Centre (1193/50)**).
- Support/retain Rule 3.2.1.14 as notified (**Jane Buckman (96/7 and 284/23)**).
- Delete Rule 3.2.1.14 (**Federated Farmers (425/509)**).
- Amend Rule 3.2.1.14 to also require surface colours to meet the light reflectance value of 45% or less (**Omaka Valley Group (1005/9)**).
- Amend Rule 3.2.1.14 to apply additional controls around excavation and filling (**Helen Ballinger (351/5)**).
- Amend Rule 3.2.1.13 to capture any coastline outstanding natural feature and landscape (**Marlborough Environment Centre (1193/54)**).
- Support/retain Rule 3.3.14.8 (**Kevin Loe (454/96)**).
- Amend Rule 3.3.14.8 to exclude excavation associated with forming and maintaining farm tracks, fences, and drains (**Federated Farmers 425/549**).
- Amend Rule 3.3.14.8 to capture any outstanding natural feature and landscape (**Marlborough Environment Centre (1193/52)**).
- Amend Rule 3.3.14.8 to apply additional controls around excavation and filling (**Helen Ballinger (351/3, 351/7 and 351/9)**).
- Delete Rule 3.3.16.10 (**Federated Farmers (425/556)**).
- Amend Rule 3.3.16.10 to capture any outstanding natural feature and landscape (**Marlborough Environment Centre (1193/53)**).
- Amend Rule 3.3.16.10 to apply additional controls around excavation and filling (**Helen Ballinger (351/4, 351/8 and 351/10)**).
- Amend the rules for light reflectance values in Chapter 3 to also require exterior cladding to meet the light reflectance value of 45% or less (**Helen Ballinger (351/17)**).
- Support/retain Rule 4.2.1.11 as notified (**Helen Ballinger (351/12), Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/141)**).
- Delete Rule 4.2.1.11 (**Federated Farmers (424/631), Ian Bond (469/18)**).
- Amend Rule 4.2.1.11 to delete the maximum size for buildings and structures (**NZ Institute of Surveyors (996/24), Ragged Point Ltd (1086/3), Pitapices Ltd (1245/1)**).

- Amend Rule 4.2.1.11 to increase the permissible size of buildings and structure to 50m² and include simple guidelines as to what is acceptable to build in the ONFL coastal environment zone (**East Bay Conservation Society (100/5)**).
- Amend Rule 4.2.1.11 to increase the permissible size of buildings and structure to 50m² (**Port Gore Group (468/2), Karen Marchant (493/2)**)
- Amend Rule 4.2.1.11 to delete the requirement for buildings and structures to meet a light reflectance value of 45% (**Rick Osbourne (1074/3)**).
- Amend Rule 4.2.1.11 to also require exterior cladding to meet the light reflectance value of 45% or less (**Pinder Family Trust (578/11), Guardians of the Sounds (752/11), Sea Sheppard (1146/11), Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association (1190/41), Marlborough Environment Centre (1193/56)**).
- Support/retain Rule 4.2.1.12 as notified (**Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/142)**).
- Delete Rule 4.2.1.12 (**Federated Farmers (425/632), Ian Bond (469/19), Rick Osbourne (1074/4)**).
- Amend Rule 4.2.1.12 to also require exterior cladding to meet the light reflectance value of 45% or less (**Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association (1190/42)**).
- Amend Rule 4.2.1.12 to include a colour palette for buildings and structures (**Eric Jorgensen (404/43)**).
- Support/retain Rule 4.3.13.6 as notified (**Pinder Family Trust (578/43), Guardians of the Sounds (752/13), Sea Sheppard (1146/43), Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association (1190/45)**).
- Oppose/Delete Rule 4.3.13.6 (**Ragged Point Ltd (1086/4), Pitapisces Ltd (1245/3)**).
- Amend Rule 4.3.13.6 to exclude excavation associated with forming and maintaining farm tracks, races, fences, and drains (**Federated Farmers 425/659**).
- Amend Rule 4.3.13.6 to include additional controls on structures in coastal landscape areas around visual intrusion of excavation (**Pinder Family Trust (578/13), Guardians of the Sounds (752/13), Sea Sheppard (1146/13), Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association (1190/18), Marlborough Environment Centre (1193/29)**).
- Support/retain Rule 4.3.15.5 (**Pinder Family Trust (578/44), Guardians of the Sounds (752/44), Sea Sheppard (1146/44), Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association (1190/46), Marlborough Environment Centre (1193/30)**).
- Delete Rule 4.3.15.5 (**Federated Farmers (425/801), Pitapisces Ltd (1245/4)**).
- Amend Rule 4.3.15.5 to include additional controls on structures in coastal landscape areas around visual intrusion of filling (**Pinder Family Trust (578/14), Guardians of the Sounds (752/14), Sea Sheppard (1146/14), Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association (1190/19), Marlborough Environment Centre (1193/58)**).
- Support/retain Rule 4.5.1 as notified (**Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association (1190/44)**).
- Oppose/Delete Rule 4.5.1 (**Federated Farmers (425/693), Tu Jaes Trust (1202/3)**).
- Amend Rule 4.5.1 to make structures up to 50m² permitted, and structures over 50m² restricted discretionary, and include guidelines as to how structures could be made to blend in the ONFL areas (**East Bay Conservation Society (100/4)**).

- Amend Rule 4.5.1 to include additional controls on structures in coastal landscape areas around visual intrusion on significant ridgelines (**Pinder Family Trust (578/12), Guardians of the Sounds (752/12), Sea Sheppard (1146/12), Marlborough Environment Centre (1193/57)**)
 - Support/retain Rule 7.2.19 as notified (**Michael and Kristen Gerard (424/176)**).
 - Delete Rule 7.2.19 (**Mt Zion Charitable Trust (515/14)**).
 - Amend Rule 7.2.19 to require a light reflectance value of 36% or less, and require colour to be within a nature range of greens, greys, and browns (**Kevin and Mary Daly (432/1)**).
 - Support/retain Rule 8.2.1.8 as notified (**Jane Buckman (96/8, and 284/21)**).
 - Amend Rule 8.2.1.8 to also require surface colours to meet the light reflectance value of 45% or less (**Omaka Valley Group (1005/10)**).
 - General comment – We seek confirmation that the area of Rural Living Zone that covers the land south of Fairbourne Drive whilst within the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape overlay is not limited by Standard 8.2.1.8(a) by virtue of there being no significant ridgeline within that area (**Wilkes RM Ltd (359/44)**).
 - Amend Rule 8.3.9.3 to not restrict restoration of planting of indigenous species (**Chris Shaw (423/34), Thomas Stein (1179/31), QEII National Trust (1265/9)**).
 - Delete Rule 19.2.1.5 (**Federated Farmers (425/715)**).
 - Delete Rule 19.2.1.6 (**Federated Farmers (425/716)**).
 - Amend Rule 19.2.1.7 to not restrict any buildings or structures necessary for farming activity or conservation activity (**Federated Farmers (425/717)**).
 - Support/retain Rule 19.3.5.9 and 19.3.5.10 (**Port Marlborough NZ Ltd (433/192, 433/193)**).
 - Delete Standard 19.3.5.7, 19.3.5.8, 19.3.5.9, and 19.3.5.10 (**Federated Farmers (425/734, 425/735, 425/736, 425/737)**).
 - Delete Rules 19.3.6.11, 19.3.6.12, 19.3.6.13, and 19.3.6.14 (**Federated Farmers (425/826, 425/827, 425/828, 425/829)**).
 - Add rules for the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape that require fencing to exclude stock from gullies, planting of trees and shrubs in the gullies to create riparian strips for soil conservation, and amelioration of water flows, birds, bees, and public amenity (**Peter Forester (1017/7)**).
 - Add new rules, or modify existing rules to:
 - enable minor expansion of existing forestry without resource consent
 - enable the intensification of commercial forestry in those areas where it is already established and in areas adjacent existing commercial forestry, particularly where such a use may be anticipated by the underlying zoning; and
 - recognise commercial forestry activities in areas not identified as outstanding, only require controlled or restricted discretionary consent.
- (NZ Forest Products Holdings Ltd (995/13)).**
- General comment – Any use of the word prohibited relating to ONFL's only be limited to use only where absolute protection is agreed by all parties engaged in responsibility stewardship and is essential to achieve a desired outcome (**Kevin Loe (454/151, 454/152, 454/145, 454/146, 454/147, 454/148)**).

Assessment

The submissions on the methods of implementation can be broadly grouped into the following categories:

- Deletion of all rules and standards that apply to the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape, and Wairau Hills Dry Landscapes, on the basis that high amenity landscapes should not be protected.
- Deletion of size restrictions and restrictions on light reflectance values for painted buildings and structures, on basis that they are too limiting for farm buildings.
- Deletion or increase the 10m² building size restriction in the Marlborough Sounds ONFL to 50m², and inclusion of additional control around visual intrusion on significant ridgelines.
- Apply restrictions on size and light reflectance values for painted building and structures to all coastal ONFL's.
- Amend the restrictions on light reflectance values for painted buildings and structures, to also capture unpainted exterior cladding materials, and reduce light reflectance value to 36% in the Coastal Living Zone.
- Include a colour palette for buildings and structures in the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape.
- Delete earthworks and filling restrictions, or amend them to provide exemptions for forming and maintaining farm, tracks, fences, and drains.
- Include additional controls around filling and excavation within the Wairau Hills Dry Landscape, Chalk Range, Inland Kaikoura Range, Molesworth Station and Upper Clarence, and Limestone Coastline ONFL's.
- Delete the restrictions on the planting of indigenous species as part of conservation planting in the Rural Living Zone.
- Add new rules for the Wairau Hills Dry Landscape requiring fencing of gullies, and planting of trees and shrubs in the gullies.
- Add new rules that enable minor expansion or intensification of existing forestry, and recognise commercial forestry in areas not identified as outstanding only require controlled or restricted discretionary resource consent.

In regard to those submissions seeking deletion of the rules for the Wairau Hills Dry Landscape and Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape, Section 7(c) of the RMA requires particular regard to be had to the *'maintenance and enhancement of amenity values'*, and enables the identification and management of those landscapes that have visual amenity value, but which are not otherwise considered ONFL's under section 6(b). Not providing appropriate landscape management rules for landscapes which are significant owing to their high amenity value would therefore be inconsistent with section 7(c) of the RMA, and Policy 15 of the NZCPS within the coastal environment.

There are two specific restrictions that apply to buildings and structures within select ONFL's and high amenity landscapes, specifically:

- Buildings and structures are limited to 10m² within the Marlborough Sounds ONFL, and 10m² within 20 metres of a significant ridgeline in the Limestone Coastline ONFL, and Wairau Dry Hills Landscape.
- Painted surfaces on buildings and structures are to have a light reflectance value of 45% or less within the Marlborough Sounds ONFL, Limestone Coastline ONFL, Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape, and Wairau Hills Dry Landscape.

These thresholds are the only specific triggers controlling buildings and structures within outstanding and high amenity landscapes. The thresholds provide a level above which any building or structure requires assessment through the resource consent process in order to determine adverse effects on the values of the landscape. The rules recognise that buildings can modify or dominate a landscape depending on their location in relation to topography and vegetation, and their colour, material, finish, height, and size. Ridgelines and sensitive view shafts are particularly vulnerable. While it is acknowledged that the 10m² size restriction in particular is limiting for many activities within the specified landscapes, such a low threshold is therefore required given the potential for buildings greater than this size to affect the identified landscape

values, depending on their location within the landscape. Recognising this, no change is recommended to delete or increase the building size threshold in the relevant rules.

The light reflectance value of 45% has been selected to provide a reasonable safeguard against buildings which are overtly visible or have colours of a tone which would provide a strong contrast to the identified landscape values. This is while at the same time providing for a range of colours that would allow buildings and structures to be integrated into the wide range of landscape types that exist in Marlborough, for example exposed grassed headlands versus mountain slopes comprising dense indigenous vegetation. The 45% value also provides flexibility between ensuring buildings are well integrated into the landscape, and ensuring buildings are sufficiently visible for other purposes; for example, enabling the colour of boat sheds to be readily identified for safe navigation in the coastal marine area. While a more restrictive light reflectance value could be included (e.g. 36%), 45% is therefore considered appropriate in the Marlborough context. It should also be noted that the 45% reflectance value works in combination with the non-regulatory colour palette that has been developed by the Council, and which is recognised in MEP method of implementation 7.M.5.

It is acknowledged that the light reflectance rules as they are currently drafted, only apply to any paint applied to the exterior cladding of a building or structure. As recognised in a number of submissions, not all exterior cladding is necessarily painted, and under the rules as proposed it would be possible for highly reflective non-painted materials to be used (e.g. unpainted steel) which could adversely affect landscape values. Recognising this, it is recommended to changes the relevant rules to capture unpainted exterior cladding materials (changes detailed below).

It is not considered necessary to apply the building and structure size, and light reflectance value rules to other coastal ONFL's. The only other coastal ONFL where these restrictions have not been applied is the White Bluffs ONFL. Under rule 19.2.1.7 no buildings or structures are permitted within that zone, other than fences or gates for farming activities or conservation purposes. Buildings and structures are therefore adequately controlled.

The 500m³ per year restrictions on earthworks and filling in the Marlborough Sounds ONFL, Limestone Coastal ONFL, and all inland ONFL's recognises that earthworks can leave exposed and cut surfaces, which contrast with surrounding vegetation and the natural contour. As a consequence, they can be visually prominent and unsightly. Earthworks can potentially alter the shape and slope of the natural contour, particularly if straight/sharp lines are left, which contrast with a more rounded topography. Cuttings on steep slopes which are prone to erosion can also create unnatural patterns that in turn amplify excessive scaring.

While it is acknowledged that 500m³ threshold is relatively arbitrary and limiting for many activities, such a low threshold is required given the potential for earthworks greater than this volume to affect the identified landscape values, depending on their location within the landscape. As noted by a number of submissions from Federated Farmers, it is however recognised that some limited earthworks such as those necessary to maintain existing tracks, fences, and drains is appropriate, subject to those earthworks not extending the physical extent of such infrastructure or its location. Enabling such earthworks for maintenance purposes should not significantly affect landscape values. Changes to the relevant rules are recommended accordingly (changes detailed below).

There has been a number of submissions received seeking the inclusion of additional controls on earthworks and filling within the Wairau Hills Dry Landscape, Chalk Range, Inland Kaikoura Range, Molesworth Station and Upper Clarence, and Limestone Coastline ONFL's. Those submissions however are unclear as to the specific additional controls sought. In the absence of further detail as to those controls, no changes are recommended. It is considered the 500m³ threshold provides sufficient control.

Several submissions seek amendment of Rule 8.3.9.3 to not restrict the planting of indigenous species as part of conservation planting in the Rural Living Zone. Submissions have also sought new rules for the Wairau Hills Dry Landscape requiring fencing of gullies, and planting of trees and shrubs in the gullies. The restriction on conservation planting within the Wairau Dry Hills recognises the open grasslands of the hills are visually sensitive to change, and that planting could affect their distinctive colour and open values unencumbered by modifications through unnatural vegetation patterns. Notwithstanding these values, it noted that historically the Wairau Dry Hills were covered in indigenous vegetation, and furthermore that many gullies on the hills comprise areas of such regenerating vegetation. Indigenous vegetation therefore makes up part of the inherent values of this landscape. In addition, the hills comprise areas of loess soil which is prone to tunnel gully erosion as identified on the Soil Sensitive Area Overlay maps, and revegetation may assist with soil conservation efforts. Recognising this, it is appropriate to permit

conservation planting with indigenous species within the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape, and changes to the relevant rules are recommended accordingly (changes detailed below).

NZ Forest Product Holdings Ltd have requested new rules that enable minor expansion or intensification of existing forestry, and recognise commercial forestry in areas not identified as ONFL's only require controlled or restricted discretionary resource consent. It is understood that their concern stems from the proposed restrictions on commercial forestry within the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape. As noted in other parts of this report, the extent to which commercial forestry will be enabled in the MEP will be first determined through the Council completing a process in accordance with Section 44A of the RMA, to identify and make the required changes to the MEP to align with the National Environmental Standard on Plantation Forestry (NES-PF) requirements. The completion of that process will be followed by the Hearings Panel considering the specific submissions on the MEP relating to the management of commercial/plantation forestry at a latter hearing. No recommendation is therefore made at this time.

Recommendation

Amend Rules 3.2.1.13(b), 3.2.1.14(b), 4.2.1.11(b), 8.2.1.8(b), 19.2.1.5(b), 19.2.1.6(b) as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

Any exterior cladding, or³⁶ paint applied to the exterior cladding of a building or structure must have a light reflectance value of 45% or less.

Amend Rule 4.2.1.12 as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

On land within the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape any exterior cladding, or³⁷ paint applied to the exterior cladding of a building or structure must have a light reflectance value of 45% or less.

Amend Rule 7.2.1.9 as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

On land within the Marlborough Sounds Coastal Landscape or any Marlborough Sounds Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape any exterior cladding or³⁸ paint applied to the exterior cladding of a building or structure must have a light reflectance value of 45% or less.

Amend Rule 3.3.14.8 to read as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

There must be no excavation in excess of 500m³ per Computer Register located within the following Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscapes within any 12 month period.

- (a) *Chalk Range;*
- (b) *Inland Kaikoura Range;*
- (c) *Molesworth Station and Upper Clarence;*
- (d) *Limestone Coastline.*

*This does not apply to excavation for the purposes of maintaining existing tracks, fences, races, and drains where their location and physical extent does not change.*³⁹

³⁶ Submissions 351/17 Helen Ballinger, 1190/42 Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association, 1005/10 Omaka Valley Group.

³⁷ Submissions 351/17 Helen Ballinger, 1190/42 Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association, 1005/10 Omaka Valley Group.

³⁸ Submissions 351/17 Helen Ballinger, 1190/42 Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association, 1005/10 Omaka Valley Group.

³⁹ Submission 425/549 Federated Farmers.

Amend Rule 3.3.16.10 to read as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

There must be no filling in excess of 500m³ per Computer Register located within the following Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscapes within any 12 month period.

- (a) *Chalk Range;*
- (b) *Inland Kaikoura Range;*
- (c) *Molesworth Station and Upper Clarence;*
- (d) *Limestone Coastline.*

*This does not apply to excavation for the purposes of maintaining existing tracks, fences, races and drains where their location and physical extent does not change.*⁴⁰

Amend Rule 4.3.13.6 to read as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

*There must be no excavation in excess of 500m³ per Computer Register located within the Marlborough Sounds Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape within any 12 month period. This does not apply to excavation for the purposes of maintaining existing tracks, fences, races and drains where their location and physical extent does not change.*⁴¹

Amend Rule 4.3.15.5 to read as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

*There must be no filling in excess of 500m³ per Computer Register located within the Marlborough Sounds Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape within any 12 month period. This does not apply to excavation for the purposes of maintaining existing tracks, fences, races and drains where their location and physical extent does not change.*⁴²

Amend Rule 19.3.5.7 to read as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

*There must be no excavation in excess of 500m³ per Computer Register located within the Bryant Range, Upper Pelorus Area, Richmond Range Conservation Estate and Red Halls Range Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape within any 12 month period. This does not apply to excavation for the purposes of maintaining existing tracks, fences, races and drains where their location and physical extent does not change.*⁴³

Amend Rule 19.3.5.8 to read as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

*There must be no excavation in excess of 500m³ per Computer Register located within the Mt Duncan, Mount Rutland, and Mount Cullen Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape within any 12 month period. This does not apply to excavation for the purposes of maintaining existing tracks, fences, races and drains where their location and physical extent does not change.*⁴⁴

Amend Rule 19.3.5.9 to read as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

There must be no excavation in excess of 500m³ per Computer Register located within the Limestone Coastline Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape within any 12 month period. This

⁴⁰ Submission 425/556 Federated Farmers.

⁴¹ Submission 425/659 Federated Farmers.

⁴² Submission 425/801 Federated Farmers.

⁴³ Submission 425/734 Federated Farmers.

⁴⁴ Submission 425/735 Federated Farmers.

does not apply to excavation for the purposes of maintaining existing tracks, fences, races and drains where their location and physical extent does not change.⁴⁵

Amend Rule 19.3.5.10 to read as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

*There must be no excavation in excess of 500m³ per Computer Register located within the Marlborough Sounds Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape within any 12 month period. This does not apply to excavation for the purposes of maintaining existing tracks, fences, races and drains where their location and physical extent does not change.*⁴⁶

Amend Rule 19.3.6.11 to read as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

*There must be no filling in excess of 500m³ per Computer Register located within the Bryant Range, Upper Pelorus Area, Richmond Range Conservation Estate and Red Halls Range Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape within any 12 month period. This does not apply to excavation for the purposes of maintaining existing tracks, fences, races and drains where their location and physical extent does not change.*⁴⁷

Amend Rule 19.3.6.12 to read as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

*There must be no filling in excess of 500m³ per Computer Register located within the Mt Duncan, Mount Rutland, and Mount Cullen Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape within any 12 month period. This does not apply to excavation for the purposes of maintaining existing tracks, fences, races and drains where their location and physical extent does not change.*⁴⁸

Amend Rule 19.3.6.13 to read as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

*There must be no filling in excess of 500m³ per Computer Register located within the Limestone Coastline Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape within any 12 month period. This does not apply to excavation for the purposes of maintaining existing tracks, fences, races and drains where their location and physical extent does not change.*⁴⁹

Amend Rule 19.3.6.14 to read as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

*There must be no filling in excess of 500m³ per Computer Register located within the Marlborough Sounds Outstanding Natural Feature and Landscape within any 12 month period. This does not apply to excavation for the purposes of maintaining existing tracks, fences, races and drains where their location and physical extent does not change.*⁵⁰

Amend Rules 3.3.10.4, 8.3.9.3, 19.3.2.3 to read as follows. Recommended additions or new provisions to be included shown underlined. Deleted text or provisions to be shown ~~struckthrough~~.

~~There must be no planting~~ Only indigenous species may be planted within the Wairau Dry Hills Landscape.⁵¹

⁴⁵ Submission 425/736 Federated Farmers.

⁴⁶ Submission 425/737 Federated Farmers.

⁴⁷ Submission 425/826 Federated Farmers.

⁴⁸ Submission 425/827 Federated Farmers.

⁴⁹ Submission 425/828 Federated Farmers.

⁵⁰ Submission 425/829 Federated Farmers.

⁵¹ Submissions 423/34 Chris Shaw, 1179/31 Thomas Stein, 1265/9 QEII National Trust.

Appendix 1: Recommended decisions on decisions requested

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter	Volume	Chapter	Provision	Recommendation
1140	20	Sanford Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
263	5	Mark Batchelor	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
348	1	Murray Chapman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
351	40	Helen Mary Ballinger	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
368	2	Kate and Shane Ponder-West	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
369	2	Tony Hawke	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
401	83	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
401	86	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
404	9	Eric Jorgensen	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Accept in part
426	87	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
426	88	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
426	89	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
426	90	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
479	68	Department of Conservation	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Accept in part
504	22	Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
514	7	A J King Family Trust and S A King Family Trust	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
514	8	A J King Family Trust and S A King Family Trust	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
514	11	A J King Family Trust and S A King Family Trust	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
574	7	Bryan Skeggs	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
574	8	Bryan Skeggs	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
574	11	Bryan Skeggs	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
578	21	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
698	46	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Accept
715	142	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Accept in part

716	70	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
726	7	Canantor Mussels Limited and N. I Buchanan-Brown	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
726	8	Canantor Mussels Limited and N. I Buchanan-Brown	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
726	11	Canantor Mussels Limited and N. I Buchanan-Brown	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
752	21	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
809	7	Jim Jessep	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
809	8	Jim Jessep	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
809	11	Jim Jessep	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
868	2	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
926	17	Wainui Green 2015 Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
926	18	Wainui Green 2015 Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
926	21	Wainui Green 2015 Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
936	7	Michael Jessep	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
936	8	Michael Jessep	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
936	11	Michael Jessep	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
961	15	Marlborough Chamber of Commerce	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Accept in part
964	7	Marlborough Oysters Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
964	8	Marlborough Oysters Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
964	11	Marlborough Oysters Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
995	13	New Zealand Forest Products Holdings Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	No recommendation
1140	18	Sanford Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
1146	21	Sea Shepherd New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
1157	7	Southern Crown Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
1157	8	Southern Crown Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
1157	11	Southern Crown Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
1186	2	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
1188	3	Te Runanga o Ngati Rarua	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
1189	69	Te Runanga o Kaikoura and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
1190	40	The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Accept in part

1193	49	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Accept in part
1238	30	Windermere Forests Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.	Reject
233	22	Totaranui Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Issue 7A	Reject
447	3	Ted and Shirley Culley	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Issue 7A	Reject
715	143	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Issue 7A	Reject
716	71	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Issue 7A	Accept
1201	73	Trustpower Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.1	Accept
364	1	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.1	Reject
401	64	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.1	Reject
425	96	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.1	Reject
425	98	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.1	Reject
426	64	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.1	Reject
426	69	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.1	Reject
433	22	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.1	Accept in part
496	6	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.1	Accept
688	57	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.1	Accept
715	144	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.1	Accept
716	72	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.1	Reject
95	6	John Kershaw	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
96	5	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
284	1	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
317	1	David Arthur Barker	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
401	67	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
425	97	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
426	66	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
496	7	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
501	26	Te Runanga O Ngati Kuia	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
648	26	D C Hemphill	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject

688	59	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
698	47	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Accept in part
715	145	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
716	73	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
768	14	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Accept in part
1005	3	Omaka Valley Group Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
1140	25	Sanford Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
1186	52	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
1189	70	Te Runanga o Kaikoura and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Accept
1201	66	Trustpower Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.1	Reject
284	2	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.2	Reject
364	2	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.2	Reject
401	68	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.2	Reject
425	99	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.2	Reject
426	67	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.2	Reject
433	23	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.2	Reject
496	8	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.2	Reject
501	27	Te Runanga O Ngati Kuia	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.2	Reject
688	60	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.2	Reject
715	146	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.2	Accept in part
716	74	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.2	Accept in part
1140	19	Sanford Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.2	Reject
1189	71	Te Runanga o Kaikoura and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.2	Reject
95	4	John Kershaw	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Reject
96	9	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Reject
284	3	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Reject
364	3	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Reject
401	66	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Reject
401	69	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Accept in part

425	100	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Reject
426	71	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Accept in part
496	9	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Reject
688	61	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Reject
698	48	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Accept in part
715	147	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Accept in part
716	75	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Reject
1005	4	Omaka Valley Group Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Reject
1140	26	Sanford Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Accept in part
1186	53	Te Atiawa o Te Waka-a-Maui	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Reject
1201	67	Trustpower Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.3	Accept in part
152	15	Clova Bay Residents Association Inc	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
284	4	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
364	4	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
401	71	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
424	19	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
425	101	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Accept
426	72	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
433	24	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
496	10	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
648	27	D C Hemphill	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
688	62	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
698	49	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
712	100	Flaxbourne Settlers Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
715	148	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Accept
716	76	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
868	11	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject

962	52	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Accept in part
990	187	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
1201	75	Trustpower Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.4	Reject
284	5	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
364	5	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
401	70	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
426	74	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
454	7	Kevin Francis Loe	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
496	11	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
648	28	D C Hemphill	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
688	63	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
698	50	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
712	70	Flaxbourne Settlers Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
715	149	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Accept in part
716	77	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Accept in part
873	17	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
1002	29	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
1140	21	Sanford Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
1140	27	Sanford Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Reject
1201	68	Trustpower Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.1.5	Accept
578	16	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.1	Reject
648	29	D C Hemphill	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.1	No recommendation
715	150	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.1	Reject
752	16	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.1	Reject
1140	22	Sanford Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.1	Reject
1146	16	Sea Shepherd New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.1	Reject
715	151	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.2	Reject
152	12	Clova Bay Residents Association Inc	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Accept in part

401	65	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Reject
401	84	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Reject
425	102	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Reject
425	104	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Reject
426	65	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Reject
433	25	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Reject
464	11	Chorus New Zealand limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Accept
496	12	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Accept
648	30	D C Hemphill	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Accept
715	152	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Reject
716	78	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Accept
768	15	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Accept
768	20	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Reject
1140	23	Sanford Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Reject
1158	9	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Accept
1201	74	Trustpower Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Objective 7.2	Accept
284	6	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Accept
364	6	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Accept
401	74	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Reject
424	20	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Accept
425	103	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Reject
426	78	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Reject
454	8	Kevin Francis Loe	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Accept
496	13	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Accept
688	176	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Accept
698	51	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Reject
712	71	Flaxbourne Settlers Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Accept
715	153	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Reject

716	79	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Reject
768	16	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Accept
873	18	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Reject
962	53	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Reject
990	188	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Reject
1201	69	Trustpower Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.1	Reject
58	3	Andrew Dwyer	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
59	3	Jo Dwyer	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
63	3	Sandy Shields	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
95	5	John Kershaw	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
96	10	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
104	1	Robin Taylor	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
107	3	Peter Lamb	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
128	2	Lynda Scott Kelly	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
153	3	Glenis & Ian McAlpine	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
164	3	Nigel Sowman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
205	3	Nicola Bright	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
239	3	Tony Westend	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
265	1	Lisa Halliday	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
284	7	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
362	1	Stuart Robert Kennington	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
363	1	Angela Marion Kennington	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
364	7	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
425	105	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	No recommendation
429	10	Tempello Partnership	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
438	1	Richard Scott Wilson	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
452	3	Beconbrae Farm	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
511	3	Anna and Hayden Dunne	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
596	1	Corina Naus	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
639	3	David Marshall Allan	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject

683	3	Dog Point Vineyard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
685	3	Elizabeth Ann MacDonald	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
688	177	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	No recommendation
690	3	Evon Ernest Goodwin	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
715	154	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
716	80	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
767	1	Hawkesbury Farm Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	No recommendation
772	3	Ivan and Margaret Sutherland	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
816	1	Janine Merie Mayson	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
846	3	Sutherland, Kirsty and Planthaber, Steve	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
858	1	Kevin Peter Judd	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
872	1	Kimberley Judd	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
917	3	Matthew Desmond Melton Clark	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
937	3	Mike Just	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
939	3	Murray MacDonald	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
944	1	Michael Naus	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
1005	7	Omaka Valley Group Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
1009	3	Patricia Anne Vaughman Goodwin	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
1011	1	Peter Banks	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
1017	7	Peter Gilford Forester	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
1121	8	Sally Jane and Timothy John Wadworth	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
1191	3	The Bell Tower on Dog Point	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
1259	1	Christine Potts	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.2	Reject
152	14	Clova Bay Residents Association Inc	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
284	8	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
364	8	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
401	72	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
424	21	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
425	109	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	No recommendation
426	75	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject

433	26	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Accept in part
484	35	Clintondale Trust, Whyte Trustee Company Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
496	14	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
504	23	Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
648	33	D C Hemphill	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	No recommendation
688	178	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	No recommendation
715	155	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
716	81	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
868	12	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
962	54	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	No recommendation
990	189	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	No recommendation
1011	2	Peter Banks	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
1042	4	Port Underwood Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	No recommendation
1085	1	Raeburn Property Partnership	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
1140	24	Sanford Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.3	Reject
152	13	Clova Bay Residents Association Inc	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Reject
284	9	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Accept
364	9	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Accept
401	73	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Reject
401	75	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Reject
424	22	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Accept
425	111	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Reject
426	77	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Reject
426	79	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Reject
433	27	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Accept
496	15	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Accept
688	64	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Accept
698	52	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Reject

715	156	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Reject
716	82	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Accept
768	17	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Accept
868	13	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Reject
962	55	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Reject
990	190	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	No recommendation
1011	3	Peter Banks	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Accept
1189	72	Te Runanga o Kaikoura and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Reject
1189	73	Te Runanga o Kaikoura and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Reject
1201	76	Trustpower Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Accept
1244	20	Z Energy Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Accept
1259	2	Christine Potts	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.4	Accept
284	10	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Accept
364	10	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Accept
401	76	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Reject
425	112	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Reject
426	80	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Reject
433	28	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Reject
454	9	Kevin Francis Loe	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Accept
496	16	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Accept
688	65	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Accept
698	53	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Reject
712	72	Flaxbourne Settlers Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Accept
715	157	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Reject
716	83	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Reject
768	18	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Accept
868	14	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Accept

962	56	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Reject
1011	4	Peter Banks	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Accept
1189	74	Te Runanga o Kaikoura and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Accept
1198	16	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Reject
1201	70	Trustpower Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Reject
1259	3	Christine Potts	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.5	Accept
284	11	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Reject
364	11	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Reject
401	77	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Reject
425	113	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Reject
426	81	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Reject
433	29	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Accept
464	12	Chorus New Zealand limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Reject
496	17	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Reject
698	54	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Accept in part
715	158	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Accept in part
716	84	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Reject
873	19	KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Reject
1011	5	Peter Banks	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Reject
1158	10	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Reject
1189	75	Te Runanga o Kaikoura and Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Reject
1198	17	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Accept in part
1201	71	Trustpower Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Accept
1259	4	Christine Potts	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.6	Reject
58	4	Andrew Dwyer	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
59	4	Jo Dwyer	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
63	4	Sandy Shields	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
95	3	John Kershaw	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
105	1	Robin Taylor	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject

107	4	Peter Lamb	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
128	1	Lynda Scott Kelly	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
153	4	Glenis & Ian McAlpine	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
164	4	Nigel Sowman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
205	4	Nicola Bright	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
239	4	Tony Westend	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
265	2	Lisa Halliday	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
284	12	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
362	2	Stuart Robert Kennington	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
363	2	Angela Marion Kennington	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
364	12	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
401	78	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
424	23	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
425	114	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Accept in part
426	82	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
433	30	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Accept in part
438	2	Richard Scott Wilson	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
452	4	Beconbrae Farm	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
496	18	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
501	28	Te Runanga O Ngati Kuia	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
505	8	Ernslaw One Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
511	4	Anna and Hayden Dunne	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
578	10	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
596	2	Corina Naus	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
639	4	David Marshall Allan	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
640	4	Douglas and Colleen Robbins	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
683	4	Dog Point Vineyard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
685	4	Elizabeth Ann MacDonald	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
688	66	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
690	4	Evon Ernest Goodwin	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject

698	55	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	No recommendation
715	159	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
716	85	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
738	7	Glenda Vera Robb	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
752	10	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
767	2	Hawkesbury Farm Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
768	19	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
772	4	Ivan and Margaret Sutherland	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
816	2	Janine Merie Mayson	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
846	4	Sutherland, Kirsty and Planthaber, Steve	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
858	2	Kevin Peter Judd	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
872	2	Kimberley Judd	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
917	4	Matthew Desmond Melton Clark	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
935	4	Melva Joy Robb	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
937	4	Mike Just	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
939	4	Murray MacDonald	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
944	2	Michael Naus	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
962	57	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	No recommendation
990	191	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	No recommendation
1002	30	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Accept in part
1005	8	Omaka Valley Group Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
1009	4	Patricia Anne Vaughman Goodwin	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
1011	6	Peter Banks	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
1146	10	Sea Shepherd New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
1190	43	The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
1191	4	The Bell Tower on Dog Point	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
1193	55	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
1198	18	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Accept
1202	5	Tu Jaes Trust	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	No recommendation

1244	21	Z Energy Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
1259	5	Christine Potts	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.7	Reject
14	3	Nicholas Webby	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
152	11	Clova Bay Residents Association Inc	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
284	13	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
364	13	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
401	79	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
424	24	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
425	115	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Accept in part
426	83	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
454	10	Kevin Francis Loe	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
496	19	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
712	73	Flaxbourne Settlers Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
715	160	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
716	86	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
868	15	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
961	16	Marlborough Chamber of Commerce	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
962	58	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	No recommendation
990	192	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
1090	8	Ravensdown Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.8	Reject
167	3	Killearnan Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
284	14	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
364	14	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
401	80	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
425	116	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
426	84	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
433	31	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
496	20	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation

505	9	Ernslaw One Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
648	34	D C Hemphill	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
688	67	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
715	161	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
716	87	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
868	16	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
962	59	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
990	193	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
1238	39	Windermere Forests Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.9	No recommendation
183	1	Harold John Fowler	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
284	15	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
294	4	Landcorp	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
364	15	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
376	1	Brian Walter Godsiff	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
401	81	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
424	25	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
425	117	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
426	85	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
496	21	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
504	24	Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
505	10	Ernslaw One Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	No recommendation
505	11	Ernslaw One Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	No recommendation
648	35	D C Hemphill	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
688	180	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	No recommendation
698	56	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	No recommendation
715	162	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
716	88	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
868	17	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject

		Incorporated				
962	60	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	No recommendation
990	194	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	No recommendation
1201	72	Trustpower Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
1249	1	James Simon Fowler	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.10	Reject
284	16	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.11	Accept
364	16	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.11	Accept
425	118	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.11	Accept
496	22	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ {Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.11	Accept
504	25	Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.11	Accept
688	181	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.11	No recommendation
715	163	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.11	Accept
716	89	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.11	Accept
284	17	Jane Buckman	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.12	Reject
364	17	Ian Balfour Mitchell	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.12	Reject
401	82	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.12	Reject
424	26	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.12	Reject
425	119	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.12	Accept in part
426	86	Marine Farming Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.12	Reject
496	23	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest & Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.12	Reject
698	57	Environmental Defence Society Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.12	Reject
715	164	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.12	Reject
716	90	Friends of Nelson Haven and Tasman Bay Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	Policy 7.2.12	Reject
504	26	Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.3	Accept
648	31	D C Hemphill	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.3	No recommendation
688	182	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.3	Accept
868	18	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.3	Reject

962	61	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.3	No recommendation
990	195	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.3	No recommendation
1002	31	New Zealand Transport Agency	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.3	Accept
424	27	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.4	Accept
688	183	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.4	Accept
868	19	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.4	Accept
990	196	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.4	Reject
424	28	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.5	Accept
688	184	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.5	Accept
868	20	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.5	Accept
424	29	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.6	Reject
578	17	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.6	Reject
688	185	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.6	Reject
715	165	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.6	Reject
752	17	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.6	Reject
868	21	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.6	Reject
1146	17	Sea Shepherd New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.6	Reject
1190	6	The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.6	Reject
1193	18	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.6	Reject
424	30	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.7	Accept
504	27	Queen Charlotte Sound Residents Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.7	Accept
578	18	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.7	Accept
648	32	D C Hemphill	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.7	Reject
688	186	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.7	Accept
715	166	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.7	Reject
752	18	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.7	Reject
868	22	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.7	Accept

		Incorporated				
1146	18	Sea Shepherd New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.7	Reject
1190	7	The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.7	Reject
1193	19	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.7	Reject
424	31	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.8	Accept
688	187	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.8	Accept
715	167	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.8	Reject
868	23	Kenepuru and Central Sounds Residents Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.8	Accept
962	62	Marlborough Forest Industry Association Incorporated	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.8	Accept
990	197	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.8	Reject
688	188	Judy and John Hellstrom	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.M.9	Accept
91	74	Marlborough District Council	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.AER.1	Accept
91	75	Marlborough District Council	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.AER.1	Accept
401	85	Aquaculture New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.AER.1	Reject
433	32	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.AER.1	Reject
578	22	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.AER.1	Reject
715	168	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest and Bird)	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.AER.1	Reject
752	22	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.AER.1	Reject
768	21	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.AER.1	Reject
1146	22	Sea Shepherd New Zealand	Volume 1	7 Landscape	7.AER.1	Reject
1005	11	Omaka Valley Group Incorporated	Volume 2	2 General Rules	2.39.1.6.	Accept
351	1	Helen Mary Ballinger	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.2.1.13.	Reject
351	17	Helen Mary Ballinger	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.2.1.13.	Accept
425	508	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment	3.2.1.13.	Reject

				Zone		
454	151	Kevin Francis Loe	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.2.1.13.	Reject
454	152	Kevin Francis Loe	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.2.1.13.	Reject
1193	50	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.2.1.13.	Accept
96	7	Jane Buckman	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.2.1.14.	Reject
284	23	Jane Buckman	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.2.1.14.	Reject
351	5	Helen Mary Ballinger	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.2.1.14.	Reject
425	509	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.2.1.14.	Reject
1005	9	Omaka Valley Group Incorporated	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.2.1.14.	Accept
1193	54	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.2.1.14.	Reject
351	3	Helen Mary Ballinger	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.14.8.	Reject
351	7	Helen Mary Ballinger	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.14.8.	Reject
351	9	Helen Mary Ballinger	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.14.8.	Reject
425	549	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	3 Rural	3.3.14.8.	Accept

				Environment Zone		
454	96	Kevin Francis Loe	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.14.8.	Reject
454	147	Kevin Francis Loe	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.14.8.	Reject
454	148	Kevin Francis Loe	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.14.8.	Reject
1193	52	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.14.8.	Reject
351	4	Helen Mary Ballinger	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.16.10.	Reject
351	8	Helen Mary Ballinger	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.16.10.	Reject
351	10	Helen Mary Ballinger	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.16.10.	Reject
425	556	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.16.10.	Accept in part
454	145	Kevin Francis Loe	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.16.10.	Reject
454	146	Kevin Francis Loe	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.16.10.	Reject
1193	53	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.16.10.	Reject
100	5	East Bay Conservation Society	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Reject

351	12	Helen Mary Ballinger	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Reject
424	141	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Reject
425	631	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Reject
468	2	Port Gore Group	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Reject
469	18	Ian Bond	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Reject
493	2	Karen Marchant	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Reject
578	11	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Accept
752	11	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Accept
996	24	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Reject
1074	3	Rick Osborne	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Reject
1086	3	Ragged Point Limited	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Reject
1146	11	Sea Shepherd New Zealand	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Accept
1190	41	The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Accept

1193	56	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Accept
1245	1	Pitapisces Limited	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.11.	Reject
404	43	Eric Jorgensen	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.12.	Reject
424	142	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.12.	Reject
425	632	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.12.	Reject
469	19	Ian Bond	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.12.	Reject
1074	4	Rick Osborne	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.12.	Reject
1190	42	The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.2.1.12.	Accept
425	659	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.13.6.	Accept
578	13	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.13.6.	Reject
578	43	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.13.6.	Reject
752	13	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.13.6.	Reject
752	43	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.13.6.	Reject

1086	4	Ragged Point Limited	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.13.6.	Reject
1146	13	Sea Shepherd New Zealand	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.13.6.	Reject
1146	43	Sea Shepherd New Zealand	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.13.6.	Reject
1190	18	The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.13.6.	Reject
1190	45	The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.13.6.	Reject
1193	29	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.13.6.	Reject
1245	3	Pitapisces Limited	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.13.6.	Reject
425	801	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.15.5.	Accept in part
578	14	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.15.5.	Reject
578	44	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.15.5.	Reject
752	14	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.15.5.	Reject
752	44	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.15.5.	Reject
1146	14	Sea Shepherd New Zealand	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.15.5.	Reject

1146	44	Sea Shepherd New Zealand	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.15.5.	Reject
1190	19	The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.15.5.	Reject
1190	46	The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.15.5.	Reject
1193	30	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.15.5.	Reject
1193	58	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.15.5.	Reject
1245	4	Pitapisces Limited	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.15.5.	Reject
100	4	East Bay Conservation Society	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.5.1.	Reject
425	693	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.5.1.	Reject
578	12	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.5.1.	Reject
752	12	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.5.1.	Reject
1146	12	Sea Shepherd New Zealand	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.5.1.	Reject
1190	44	The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.5.1.	Accept
1193	57	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.5.1.	Reject

1202	3	Tu Jaes Trust	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.5.1.	Reject
424	176	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 2	7 Coastal Living Zone	7.2.1.9.	Accept
432	1	Kevin and Mary Daly	Volume 2	7 Coastal Living Zone	7.2.1.9.	Reject
515	14	Mt Zion Charitable Trust	Volume 2	7 Coastal Living Zone	7.2.1.9.	Reject
96	8	Jane Buckman	Volume 2	8 Rural Living Zone	8.2.1.8.	Reject
284	21	Jane Buckman	Volume 2	8 Rural Living Zone	8.2.1.8.	Reject
359	44	WilkesRM Limited	Volume 2	8 Rural Living Zone	8.2.1.8.	Accept
1005	10	Omaka Valley Group Incorporated	Volume 2	8 Rural Living Zone	8.2.1.8.	Accept
423	34	Chris Shaw	Volume 2	8 Rural Living Zone	8.3.9.3.	Accept
1179	31	Thomas Robert Stein	Volume 2	8 Rural Living Zone	8.3.9.3.	Accept
1265	9	Queen Elizabeth the Second National Trust	Volume 2	8 Rural Living Zone	8.3.9.3.	Accept
425	715	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	19 Open Space 3 Zone	19.2.1.5.	Reject
425	716	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	19 Open Space 3 Zone	19.2.1.6.	Reject
425	717	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	19 Open Space 3 Zone	19.2.1.7.	Reject
425	734	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	19 Open Space 3 Zone	19.3.5.7.	Accept in part
425	735	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	19 Open Space 3 Zone	19.3.5.8.	Accept in part
425	736	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	19 Open Space 3 Zone	19.3.5.9.	Accept in part
433	192	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	Volume 2	19 Open Space 3 Zone	19.3.5.9.	Reject
425	737	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	19 Open	19.3.5.10.	Accept in part

				Space 3 Zone		
433	193	Port Marlborough New Zealand Limited	Volume 2	19 Open Space 3 Zone	19.3.5.10.	Reject
425	826	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	19 Open Space 3 Zone	19.3.6.11.	Accept in part
425	827	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	19 Open Space 3 Zone	19.3.6.12.	Accept in part
425	828	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	19 Open Space 3 Zone	19.3.6.13.	Accept in part
425	829	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Volume 2	19 Open Space 3 Zone	19.3.6.14.	Accept in part