

Proposed Marlborough Environment Plan

**Section 42A Hearings Report for Hearing Commencing
2 July 2018**

Addendum to Report

Dated 20 June 2018

**Report on submissions and further
submissions**

Topic 12: Rural Environments

Report prepared by

Andrew MacLennan

Consultant Planner

Contents

Introduction	3
Code of Conduct	3
Scope of Report	3
Woodlot forestry planting (RE 3.3.8.2, CE 4.3.7.2)	3
Woodlot forestry harvesting (RE 3.3.9.1, CE 4.3.8.1, RL 8.3.8.1)	6
Non-indigenous vegetation clearance (RE 3.3.12, CE 4.3.11.)	8
Miscellaneous changes sought	10

Introduction

1. My name is Andrew Maclennan. I am a Resource Management Consultant from Incite (CH-CH), based in Christchurch. My qualifications and experience are as follows:
2. I hold a Bachelor of Science in Land Planning and Development from Otago University and am currently studying towards a Masters of Resource Management at Massey University. I am an Associate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute and a member of the Resource Management Law Association.
3. I have 7 years' planning experience working in both local government and the private sector. My experience includes both regional and district plan development, including the preparation of s32 and s42A reports. I also have experience in resource consents and notices of requirement, both in preparing applications, as well as processing applications for territorial authorities.
4. In my current and previous roles, I have not undertaken work for any of the submitters on the MEP. 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.
5. I have read Council's Section 32 reports.

Code of Conduct

6. 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.
7. 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.
8. I am authorised to give this evidence on the Council's behalf.

Scope of Report

9. This report is an addendum to my main report, dated 31 May 2018, containing recommendations to the Hearing Panel on submissions made on Topic 12 - Rural Environments. This addendum should be read in conjunction with the s42A report.
10. The following report assess submission points that were unintentionally omitted from Topic 12 - Rural Environments s42A report.
11. This report considers the submission points on the following topics:
 - Woodlot forestry planting setbacks
 - Woodlot forestry harvesting setbacks
 - Non-indigenous vegetation clearance
 - Miscellaneous changes sought

Woodlot forestry planting (RE 3.3.8.2, CE 4.3.7.2)

12. Rules 3.1.8, and 4.1.7 list: '*Woodlot forestry planting*' as a permitted activity. Permitted Standards 3.3.8.2 and 4.3.7.2 are as follows:

X.3.X.2. Planting must not be in, or within:

- (a) 30m of a formed and sealed public road;
- (b) 8m of a river (except an ephemeral river) or lake;
- (c) 8m of a Significant Wetland;
- (d) 200m of the coastal marine area;
- (e) Steep Erosion-Prone Land, unless replanting harvested woodlot forest lawfully established.

Submissions and Assessment

Standard 3.3.8.2

13. K Loe (454.077) supports Standard 3.3.8.2 and seeks that it be retained as notified. Windermere Forests Limited (1238.41) seek that the Standard 3.3.8.2, be removed from the MEP. No rationale was provided as to why this standard should be removed. Forest and Bird (469.088) seek that the setbacks within Standards 3.3.8.2(a) and (b) should be increased from 8m to 20m. No rationale was provided as to why this amendment is sought. The same amendment to Standard 3.3.8.2(c) was assessed as part of Topic 6 – Significant Wetlands, and the Section 42A Report Officer did not support an amendment to the standard, as no evidence was provided as to why an amendment is required. As such, I do not agree that an amendment is required.

Standard 4.3.7.2

14. MECI (1193.028), Pinder Family Trust (578.042) Guardians of the Sounds (752.042) Sea Shepherd New Zealand (1146.042) The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated (1190.017) support Standard 4.3.7.2 and seek that it be retained as notified.
15. M and K Gerard (424.149) (424.150) seek that Standard 4.3.7.2(a) is amended to ensure that the woodlot planting setback applies to all public roads, not just those roads that are formed and sealed. They also seek that the 200m woodlot forestry setback is amended from a 200m setback to a 30m setback so that it aligns with the commercial forestry planting setbacks within Standard 4.3.6.1(c). Windermere Forests Limited (1238.35) seek that the Standard 4.3.7.2(d), which requires that woodlot forestry planting must be setback 200m from the Coastal Marine Area, be removed from the MEP. No rationale was provided as to why this standard should be removed.
16. In relation to the suggestion that woodlot forestry should be setback from all public roads not just formed and sealed public roads, I note that the intent of the setback standard is to ensure that woodlot forestry is not established in areas which will cause shading of the road surface which will lead to increased traffic safety risk i.e. from black ice. I do not consider the same effects need to be managed on unsealed roads. As such, I disagree that an amendment is required.
17. In relation to the suggestion that the woodlot forestry planting setback should be amended from 200m to 30m in the Coastal Environment Zone, I note that there are two setback distances listed within the Coastal Environment Zone, Standard 4.3.6.1(c) requires a 30m setback for the replanting of commercial forestry, and Standards 4.3.7.2(d) and 4.3.8.1(c) require a 200m setback for woodlot forestry planting and woodlot forestry harvesting. The planting of new areas of commercial forestry in the Coastal Environment is a Discretionary Activity (Rule 4.6.3). As noted in paragraph 476. of my Section 42a report, I consider that the woodlot forestry restrictions aim to achieve the direction within Objective 15.4 which seeks to maintain and enhance the quality of Marlborough's soil resource, and also achieves the water quality objectives within Chapter 15 of the MEP. I note that Policy 15.4.3 seek to control land disturbance activities to retain topsoil and minimise the potential for eroded soil to degrade water quality in lakes, rivers, significant wetlands and coastal waters. I consider that the 200m woodlot forestry planting standards included within the MEP seeks to ensure this direction is achieved.

18. I note that the provisions within the MEP have been informed by a Marlborough District Council technical report¹. Section 5 of this report provides a number of mechanisms to mitigate erosion after harvesting. Sub section i) states that:

'Setbacks provide a protective buffer to help reduce soil erosion and sediment deposition entering coastal waters (Figure 2). In the absence of studies nationally about the effectiveness of setbacks around coastlines, ongoing monitoring would be advisable should these be implemented.'

'The benefit of implementing setbacks is that a permanent vegetation cover will protect the erosion-prone, highly-weathered soils between the shoreline and up to 200 metres elevation.'

Section 7.1 of this report then sets out three potential replanting setback options: 30m, 100m, and 200m. The assessment of the 200m setback option reads as follows:

'200 metres: This is based on the literature review which identified that the zone of the most highly weathered, clay-rich and erodible soils in the Sounds is located between the shoreline and 200 metres elevation. The concept is that a 200 m setback would keep this zone under a continuous and undisturbed vegetation cover, thereby eliminating this as a diffuse source of fine sediment, and buffering the coast from sediment generated during harvesting uphill.'

This 200m setback distance was supported by the Landcare Research peer review of the technical report, which stated on that:

'Restricting forestry practices in weathered soils below 200 m could significantly reduce sediment availability and mobility.'

19. As such, I consider that the 200m setback distance for planting woodlot forestry is appropriate. I consider that the merits of the 30m setback for commercial forestry replanting is a matter that will be consider as part of the Topic 22 – Forestry Hearing.
20. Marlborough Recreational Fishers Association (965.003) consider that Standard 4.3.7.2(e) is too vague and seek a mandatory 'Replanting and Afforestation Management Plan', which would identify areas at high risk of erosion and require steps to mitigate that risk, be required by the permitted standard. I disagree that Standard 4.3.7.2(e) is vague, I note that the standard is linked to a District Plan map layer which identifies areas which are considered 'Steep Erosion-Prone Land'. The establishment of new areas of woodlot forestry is a prohibited activity (Rule 4.7.1 of the MEP), and the replanting of woodlot forestry in an area of Steep Erosion-Prone Land, would require consent as a discretionary activity, with the risk of erosion will be considered as part of this process. As such, I consider the effects of woodlot forestry are adequately managed within the MEP. Furthermore, I do not consider it is appropriate for a permitted standard to require a management plan, as in a permitted activity framework there is no ability for the Council to assess the quality of the management plan or require that an applicant undertake the measures set out within the management plan. As such, I consider that the proposed mapping and MEP rules are an efficient and effective method of managing woodlot forestry in steep erosion prone areas.

Recommendation

21. I recommend that Standards 3.3.8.2 and 4.3.7.2 are retained as notified.

¹ Urlich, S. (2015) *Mitigating Fine Sediment from Forestry in Coastal Waters of the Marlborough Sounds*, (Report Number 15-009). Marlborough District Council.

Woodlot forestry harvesting (RE 3.3.9.1, CE 4.3.8.1, RL 8.3.8.1)

22. Rules 3.1.9, 4.1.8, and 8.19 list: 'Woodlot forestry harvesting' as a permitted activity. Permitted Standards 3.3.9.1 3.3.9.9, 3.3.9.10, 4.3.8.1, 4.3.8.7, 4.3.8.8, 4.3.8.9 and 8.3.8.1 are as follows:

Standards x.3.x.1

Harvesting must not be in, or within:

- (a) 8m of a river (except an ephemeral river, when not flowing) or lake, except where the trees being harvested were lawfully established prior to 9 June 2016 (this exception does not apply to excavation);*
- (b) 8m of a Significant Wetland;*
- (c) 200m of the coastal marine area.*

Note: Submission points relating to subsection (b) of the above standards have been considered as part of the Topic 6 – Significant Wetlands report.

Standard x.3.x.7.

All trees must be felled away from a river (except an ephemeral river, or intermittently flowing river when not flowing), lake, Significant Wetland or the coastal marine area

Standard x.3.x.8

No tree or log must be dragged through the bed of a river (except an ephemeral river or intermittently flowing river, when not flowing), lake or Significant Wetland or through the coastal marine area.

Standard x.3.x.9.

Trees, slash and soil debris must:

- (a) not be left within 8m of, or deposited in, a river (except an ephemeral river or intermittently flowing river when not flowing), lake, Significant Wetland or the coastal marine area;*
- (b) not be left in a position where it can enter, or be carried into, a river (except an ephemeral river), lake, Significant Wetland or the coastal marine area;*
- (c) be stored on stable ground;*
- (d) be managed to avoid accumulation to levels that could cause erosion or instability of the land.*

Standard x.3.x.10.

Wheeled or tracked machinery must not be operated in or within 8m of a river (except an ephemeral river or intermittently flowing river, when not flowing), lake, Significant Wetland or the coastal marine area.

Submissions and Assessment

23. Forest and Bird (469.089)(469.090)(496.091) seek that the setbacks within Standard 3.3.9.1(a) which require that woodlot forestry harvesting must be setback 8m from a river, should be increased from 8m to 20m. They also seek that Standard 3.3.9.9(a) and Standard 3.3.9.10 which also require an 8m setback should also be amended to 20m. As noted above, no rationale is provided as to why the setback should be increased. As such, without further evidence as to why the setback should be increased, I disagree an amendment is required.

24. D and C Robbins (640.059) (640.48), G Robb (738.059) (738.048) and M Robb (935.48) (935.059) consider that the proposed setback standards are not practical, they seek the following amendments to Standards 4.3.8.1(a) and (c) in the Coastal Environment and Coastal Living Zones:
- (a) *84m of a river (except an ephemeral river when not flowing) or lake, except where the trees being harvested were lawfully established prior to 9 June 2016 (this exception does not apply to excavation);*
 - (c) *200100m of the coastal marine area.*
25. M and K Gerard (424.151) also disagree with the 200m setback listed in 4.3.8.1(c), as they note that many existing woodlots in the Sounds will be on land close to the coastal marine area. They note that this standard is not consistent with commercial forestry rules, and they do not consider there is any marked difference between the two activities. Finally, Windermere Forests Limited (1238.36) seek that the Standard 4.3.8.1(c) which requires that woodlot forestry harvesting must be setback 200m from the Coastal Marine Area be removed from the MEP.
26. In relation to the above submitters that seek the amendment or removal of the 200m setback from the coastal marine area, as noted in the assessment of woodlot forestry planting above, I consider that the setback distance for the harvesting of woodlots seeks to achieve the water quality outcomes sought within Chapter 15 of the MEP, and this setback distance has been informed by a technical report referred to above. As such, I consider that the 200m setback is appropriate.
27. I note that in paragraph 481. of my section 42a report I have acknowledged that the intent of the woodlot forestry harvesting provisions is to ensure that the harvesting does not result in sedimentation that adversely effects the environment. However, I considered that the felling or trimming of a few trees within a woodlot for private use i.e. for firewood is not likely to cause a significant impact on the environment. As such, I considered (in paragraph 484.) that it would be appropriate to amend the definition of 'woodlot forestry harvesting' to allow the felling of trees that are to be used for domestic purposes on the same property the trees were grown. This amendment may or may not have alleviate the submitters' concerns.
28. In relation to submitters that have sought that the 8m setback from a river be reduced to 4m, I note that they have not provided rational as to why they consider a 4m setback would be more appropriate. I consider that the 8m setback distances seeks to ensure that the quality outcomes within Chapter 15 of the MEP are achieved. As such, without further evidence as to why a 4-metre setback is more appropriate, I do not agree that an amendment is required.
29. M and K Gerard (424.152)(424.153)(424.154) support Standards 4.3.8.7, 4.3.8.8, and 4.3.8.9 in principle, however they consider there needs to be some flexibility to allow the removal of wood that has mistakenly fallen into, or within 8m of water-ways. I consider it is important to note that these standards relate to woodlot forestry, which is defined as:
- 'means the planting, replanting and maintenance of indigenous or exotic trees for non-commercial purposes provided that no more than 2 hectares or 5% of land, whichever is greater, is planted on land within any one Computer Register.*
30. As such, these standards only mange activities within small woodlot forestry blocks. Given this, I consider that the Standards 4.3.8.7, 4.3.8.8, and 4.3.8.9 work together to ensure that the water quality outcomes within Chapter 15 of the MEP area achieved. They ensure that trees a felled away from rivers, wetlands and the coastal marine area, trees are not dragged through these sensitive areas, and trees, slash and soil debris are not left in areas where they can enter waterways. I consider these standards are practical for woodlot forestry activities, and as such I do not consider any amendments are required.

Recommendation

31. I recommend that Standards 3.3.9.1, 3.3.9.9, 3.3.9.10, 4.3.8.1, 4.3.8.7, 4.3.8.8, 4.3.8.9 and 8.3.8.1 are retained as notified.

Non-indigenous vegetation clearance (RE 3.3.12, CE 4.3.11.)

32. Rules 3.1.11 and 4.1.11 lists: '*Non-indigenous vegetation clearance*' as a permitted activity. Permitted Standards 3.3.12.5, 4.3.11.5, 4.3.11.6, and 4.3.11.10, are as follows:

Standard x.3.x.5.

All trees must be felled away from a river (except an ephemeral river, or intermittently flowing river when not flowing), lake, Significant Wetland or the coastal marine area.

Standard x.3.x.6.

No tree or log must be dragged through the bed of a river (except an ephemeral river or intermittently flowing river, when not flowing), lake or Significant Wetland or through the coastal marine area.

Standard x.3.x.10.

Woody material greater than 100mm in diameter and soil debris must:

- (a) not be left within 8m of, or deposited in, a river (except an ephemeral river or intermittently flowing river when not flowing), lake, Significant Wetland or the coastal marine area;*
- (b) not be left in a position where it can enter, or be carried into, a river (except an ephemeral river), lake, Significant Wetland or the coastal marine area;*
- (c) be stored on stable ground;*
- (d) be managed to avoid accumulation to levels that could cause erosion or instability of the land.*

Submissions and Assessment

33. M and K Gerard (424.159)(424.160)(424.162) support Standards 4.3.11.5, 4.3.11.6, and 4.3.11.10 in principle, however they consider there needs to be some flexibility to allow the removal of wood that has mistakenly fallen into, or within 8m of water-ways. As noted above, I consider that the Standards 4.3.11.5, 4.3.11.6, and 4.3.11.10 work together to ensure that the water quality outcomes within Chapter 15 of the MEP area achieved. They ensure that trees are felled away from rivers, wetlands and the coastal marine area, trees are not dragged through these sensitive areas, and woody material and soil debris are not left in areas where they can enter waterways. I consider these standards are practical for non-indigenous vegetation clearance activities (acknowledging that these standards do not capture woodlot forestry harvesting, and commercial forestry harvesting) and as such I do not consider any amendments are required.

34. Ernslaw One Limited (505.034) support Standard 3.3.12.5 but seek the following amendment:

All trees must be felled away from a river (except an ephemeral river, or intermittently flowing river when not flowing), lake, Significant Wetland or the coastal marine area, where safe and practicable to do so.

I agree with the submitter that in certain situations, it will be impractical to fell trees away from rivers, lakes, wetlands, or the CMA as required by the standard. However, I disagree with drafting of the suggested amendment as it requires a subjective assessment as to what 'safe and practicable'. I note that Standards 3.3.7.10 and 3.3.7.11 which manage commercial

forestry harvesting in the MEP, contains the flexibility sought by the submitter. Standards 3.3.7.10 and 3.3.7.11 reads as follows:

3.3.7.10.

Notwithstanding 3.3.7.9, where trees are leaning over a river, lake, Significant Wetland or coastal marine area, they must be felled in accordance with industry safety practices.

3.3.7.11.

Except for trees felled in accordance with 3.3.7.10, no tree or log must be dragged through the bed of a river (except an ephemeral river or intermittently flowing river, when not flowing), lake or Significant Wetland or through the coastal marine area.

35. I consider including the above standards would be a more appropriate method of ensuring that than the water quality standards set out within Chapter 15 of the MEP are achieved, while also allowing trees that are leaning over waterbodies to be felled in a safe and practical manner. As such, I recommend that additions are made to Standards 3.3.12.5 and 3.3.12.6 of the MEP as set out below.
36. Nelson Forestry (990.138) have sought a range of amendments to the non-indigenous vegetation clearance standards (3.3.12.10 and 4.3.11.10), as they consider the standards are unclear and impractical. They seek the standards be amended as follows:

~~Woody material greater than 100mm in diameter and soil debris~~ Cleared vegetation that meets the definition of slash must:

- (a) ~~not be left within 8m of, or deposited in,~~ be removed from within a river wherever practicable and safe (except an ephemeral river or intermittently flowing river when not flowing), lake, Significant Wetland or the coastal marine area;
- (b) ~~not be left in a position where it can enter, or be carried into, a river (except an ephemeral river), lake, Significant Wetland or the coastal marine area;~~
- (c) be stored on stable ground with low risk of instability;
- (d) ~~be managed to avoid accumulation to levels that could cause erosion or when accumulated, be managed to present low risk of instability of the land.~~

37. I note that the MEP contains a definition of 'Commercial Forestry Harvesting' and Standard 3.3.7 in the Rural Environment Zone, and Rule 4.6.4 in the Coastal Environment Zone, manage commercial forestry harvesting. I also note that the standards relating to 'Non-indigenous vegetation clearance' are not relevant to the management of commercial forestry harvesting. It appears that though the Nelson Forestry submission has assessed the non-indigenous vegetation clearance standards as if they were to apply to commercial forestry harvesting. They have sought the same changes to both the non-indigenous vegetation clearance standards and the commercial forestry harvesting.
38. On this basis I have not assessed each of Nelson Forestry's suggested amendments in detail, but instead I have assessed the amends sought as a package, with the understating that woodlot forestry harvesting, and commercial forestry harvesting are not captured by these standards. I consider that the intent of the non-indigenous vegetation clearance standards are to ensure that the clearance of non-indigenous vegetation is undertaken in a manner that ensures that the Water Quality outcomes set out within Chapter 15 are achieved. I do not agree that the amendments sought by Nelson Forestry will better achieve these water quality outcomes. As such, I do not consider the above amendments are required.

Recommendation

39. I recommend that Standards 4.3.11.5, 4.3.11.6, and 4.3.11.10 are retained as notified.
40. I recommend that Standards 3.3.12.6 and 3.3.12.6are amended as follows:

3.3.12.5

All trees must be felled away from a river (except an ephemeral river, or intermittently flowing river when not flowing), lake, Significant Wetland or the coastal marine area.

3.3.12.5(a)

*Notwithstanding 3.3.12.5, where trees are leaning over a river, lake, Significant Wetland or coastal marine area, they must be felled in accordance with industry safety practices.*²

3.3.12.6.

*Except for trees felled in accordance with 3.3.12.5(a),*³ *no tree or log must be dragged through the bed of a river (except an ephemeral river or intermittently flowing river, when not flowing), lake or Significant Wetland or through the coastal marine area.*

Miscellaneous changes sought

41. The MEP includes a definition of 'Farming' as follows:

Farming means a land based activity, having as its primary purpose the commercial production and sale of any livestock or vegetative matter. Farming does not include intensive farming, forestry, and in the case of vegetative matter, does not include the processing of farm produce beyond cutting, cleaning, grading, chilling, freezing, packaging and storage of produce grown on the farming unit.

42. Pernod Ricard (1039.131) and a number of other submitters support the definition of 'Farming' and seek that it be retained as notified. In paragraphs 360. to 371. of my Section 42a report I assessed the submissions relating to the definition of farming, and in paragraph 383. of my report I recommend that the definition of farming remain largely unchanged. The additional submission in support from Pernod Ricard does not alter my recommendation.
43. In the Coastal Environment Zone and Coastal Living Zone, the Fire Service (993.047) recognises that there are situations where fire appliance access is limited or non-existent. This means that the Fire Service may not be able to reach a property in time to safely, efficiently and effectively extinguish a fire. Further, upon reaching a fire in such areas, locating a usable water supply often presents a challenge. The Fire Service therefore seeks that new developments in isolated areas of the Coastal Environment Zone and Coastal Living Zone are required to incorporate a fire sprinkler system into the building design. They seek that an be added to Standards 4.2 and 7.2 'Standards that apply to all permitted activities' within the Coastal Environment Zone and Coastal Living Zones Chapter:

7.2.x.3

Where road access to the building and water supply is not available a fire sprinkler system must be provided.

44. I am unsure whether the MEP is the most appropriate document to be requiring fire sprinkler systems to be installed. I agree that the proposed standard would be beneficial from a fire safety perspective however, there does not appear to be any objective or policy guidance within the MEP which supports this requirement, and I am unsure what resource management issue this standard would seek to manage. As such, I would welcome further evidence from the Fire Service as to why the MEP is the appropriate document to require sprinkler systems, whether this standard has been included within any other District Plans within New Zealand,

² Ernslaw One Limited (505.034)

³ Ernslaw One Limited (505.034)

and what matters should be considered if an applicant applied for a consent to breach the proposed standard.

45. Fulton Hogan (717.081) notes that the MEP does not contain a definition of a Productive Rural Activity. They seek the following definition of Productive Rural Activity be added to the MEP:

means farming, plantation forestry, intensive forestry, horticulture and quarrying activities.

46. I note that this proposed definition relates to the direction set out within Policy 14.4.10 and the associated explanation, which reads as follows:

Policy 14.4.10

Control the establishment of residential activity within rural environments as a means of avoiding conflict between rural and residential amenity expectations.

Explanation

The development of pockets of residential development in rural areas can have an impact on the continued use of rural resources. The presence of residential activities in rural environments can make it very difficult for productive rural activities to continue operating effectively and efficiently, to expand or establish new sites. Therefore, the Council considers there is a need to control the extent of residential activity within rural environments to ensure these outcomes do not eventuate.

47. In paragraph 297. of my Section 42a Report I have considered whether the policy or explanation should be amended to include the specific activities (listed in the suggested definition of 'Productive Rural Activity') that are necessarily located in the rural environment and rely on the rural resource. I considered that the policy refers to avoiding conflict between rural and residential amenity expectations in general. It does not seek to explicitly list the types of rural activities that may be affected by the establishment of new residential activities. I consider that this level of detail is provided for within the standards that implement the policy direction (i.e. setback from activities, or minimum areas requirements for dwellings). As such, I did not consider that an addition to the policy was required. For the same reasons I do not consider that an additional definition of 'Productive Rural Activity' is required.

Appendix 1: Recommended decisions on decisions requested

Submission Number	Submission Point	Submitter	Volume	Chapter	Provision	Recommendation
1193	28	The Marlborough Environment Centre Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.7.2.	Accept
965	3	Marlborough Recreational Fishers Association	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.7.2.	Accept
578	42	Pinder Family Trust	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.7.2.	Accept
752	42	Guardians of the Sounds	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.7.2.	Accept
1146	42	Sea Shepherd New Zealand	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.7.2.	Accept
1190	17	The Bay of Many Coves Residents and Ratepayers Association Incorporated	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.7.2.	Accept
1238	35	Windermere Forests Limited	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.7.2.	Reject
424	149	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.7.2.	Reject
424	150	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.7.2.	Reject
454	77	Kevin Francis Loe	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.8.2	Accept
640	59	Douglas and Colleen Robbins	Volume 2	8 Rural Living Zone	8.3.8.1.	Reject

738	59	Glenda Vera Robb	Volume 2	8 Rural Living Zone	8.3.8.1.	Reject
935	59	Melva Joy Robb	Volume 2	8 Rural Living Zone	8.3.8.1.	Reject
1238	41	Windermere Forests Limited	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.8.2	Reject
496	88	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest & Bird)	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	4.3.8.2.	Reject
424	151	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.8.1.	Reject
1238	36	Windermere Forests Limited	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.8.1.	Reject
424	89	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest & Bird)	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.9.1.	Reject
424	90	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest & Bird)	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.9.9.	Reject
496	91	Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society NZ (Forest & Bird)	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.9.10.	Reject
424	153	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.8.8.	Reject
424	154	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.8.9.	Reject
424	152	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.8.7.	Reject
738	48	Glenda Vera Robb	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.8.1.	Reject

935	48	Melva Joy Robb	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.8.1.	Reject
640	48	Douglas and Colleen Robbins	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.8.1.	Reject
424	159	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.11.5.	Reject
424	160	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.11.6.	Reject
424	162	Michael and Kristen Gerard	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.11.10.	Reject
990	138	Nelson Forests Limited	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone	4.3.11.10.	Reject
505	34	Ernslaw One Limited	Volume 2	3 Rural Environment Zone	3.3.12.5.	Accept in part
1039	131	Pernod Ricard Winemakers New Zealand Limited	Volume 2	25 Definitions	Definitions	Accept
717	81	Fulton Hogan Limited	Volume 2	25 Definitions	Definitions	Reject
993	47	New Zealand Fire Service Commission	Volume 2	4 Coastal Environment Zone 7 Coastal Living Zone	4.2 and 7.2	Reject