

**IN THE MATTER** of the Conservation Act 1987 and the National Parks Act  
1980

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER** of an application by Riverstone Holdings Limited to  
construct, operate, and maintain a monorail and  
associated facilities

---

**STATEMENT OF EVIDENCE BY LOUISE TAYLOR**

**18 May 2012**

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

### Qualifications and Experience

- 1.1 My name is Louise Taylor. I hold a Bachelor's degree in Geography and a Masters degree in Regional and Resource Planning from the University of Otago (completed in 1996). I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I am a partner and Director of the firm Mitchell Partnerships Limited, which practices as an environmental consultancy nationally, with offices in Dunedin, Auckland and Tauranga.
- 1.2 I have been engaged in the field of resource and environmental management for 16 years. My experience includes a mix of local authority and consultancy resource management work. In recent years, this experience has included particular emphasis on providing consultancy advice with respect to resource consent and environmental impact assessments, regional and district plans, and designations. This includes extensive experience with large-scale projects involving inputs from a multidisciplinary team, often within sensitive environments.
- 1.3 A summary of my recent experience is set out within **Appendix A** attached.
- 1.4 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 I express. In particular, unless I state otherwise, this evidence is within my sphere of expertise and I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions I express.
- 1.5 This brief of evidence summarises my assessment of the Riverstone concession application against the relevant provisions of the Mainland Southland/West Otago Conservation Management Strategy and the Fiordland National Management Plan.

## **2. PURPOSE OF CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT STRATEGY AND INTEGRATED CONSERVATION MANAGEMENT**

- 2.1 Section 17D of the Conservation Act 1987 provides that the purpose of a conservation management strategy (CMS) is to implement general policies, including the operative Conservation General Policy 2005, and to establish objectives for integrated conservation management. Conservation General Policy 2005 applies to all lands water and resources administered by the Department (excluding national parks).
- 2.2 Integrated conservation management is achieved by referring to outcomes planned for areas, which may be a combination of different outcomes including those for management of natural resources, historic and cultural heritage and recreational opportunities. At times these outcomes might appear to be conflicting in nature (i.e. protection of natural habitats, as well as allowing concessions for certain activities). In this regard each policy needs to be considered in conjunction with all other policies contained within the CMS.

## **3. MAINLAND SOUTHLAND/WEST OTAGO CMS**

- 3.1 The CMS divides the Mainland Southland/West Otago area into 19 Landscape Units based on physical features with issues and objectives contained for each. The majority of the monorail route is situated in the Te Anau Basin landscape unit. That part of the proposal situated at Te Anau Downs lies within the Fiordland landscape unit. The Snowdon Forest falls within the Te Wahipounamu (South-West New Zealand) World Heritage Area.
- 3.2 The CMS sets out that:

*Once you have determined which landscape unit the proposal is within, it is just a matter of referring to this unit in Part 6 to see what it states about your area.*

- 3.3 It goes on to say that *“to get an overall picture it is suggested that you read the other sections of the CMS”* also. A wider assessment of the CMS is therefore required. This is undertaken below, as well as specific consideration of the objectives particularly relevant to the landscape units affected by this proposal.

- 3.4 The CMS recognises that international attention on Southland, particularly Fiordland, is enhanced by the National Park and adjoining land administered by the Department as part of the World Heritage Area. The CMS notes that for the remainder of mainland Southland/West Otago, local people, particularly from urban centres, are the main recreationalists. Local visitors are more likely to repeatedly visit an area. This makes them more vulnerable to having their recreation experiences altered through incremental changes as compared, for example, to an international visitor whose experience is based on one visit. Local use can also result in a greater diversity of activities undertaken by users, and greater demands for diverse recreation opportunities
- 3.5 Section 4.3 of the CMS discusses Recreation and Tourism Development Proposals<sup>1</sup>, including facility development/upgrading proposals by the Department, commercial operators or other agencies.
- 3.6 The CMS states that such proposals will be assessed in terms of impact on both the natural environment and on visitors to the area.

*„The only facility development allowed will be that which is characteristic of the area and will enhance but not alter the recreation opportunities, as defined by the objectives and implementation provisions for each landscape unit”<sup>2</sup>*

- 3.7 A recreational assessment was undertaken by Rob Greenaway and Associates which accompanies the application<sup>3</sup>. This considers the impact of the proposal on recreation in the area, and concludes that the proposal has the potential to create a more developed recreation setting in the Kiwi Burn and Snowdon areas.
- 3.8 It is acknowledged that this will result in some adverse effects on traditional users of these settings, but will also create new opportunities for users, particularly mountain bikers. The Kiwi Burn area will be the most affected, with the location of the Kiwi Burn terminus relatively close to a traditionally low-key access point for walking, angling and kayaking activities. Beyond this site, the combined assessments in the application lead to a conclusion that the

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 4.3 of the CMS page 122

<sup>2</sup> ibid

<sup>3</sup> Appendix L, Application for Concession Monorail and Mountain Bike Track, Riverstone Holdings Limited, November 2009

relocation and redevelopment of hut and track facilities can mitigate almost all effects resulting from the sight, sound and footprint of the monorail in the natural settings of the Snowdon area.

3.9 Section 4.4 of the CMS discusses Recreation and Tourism Concessions. The CMS recognises that recreation and tourism concessions can enable a wider visitor enjoyment and appreciation of areas administered by the Department. In return for the privilege of a concession, operators must provide quality visitor services *„commensurate with the natural values and recreation opportunities in an area’*.

3.10 The objectives of the CMS in regards to recreation and tourism concessions include:

1. *To enable a range of appropriate, high quality visitor services to be provided through the granting of concessions compatible with the recreation opportunities identified for each landscape unit and which will not adversely affect natural and historic resources.*

3.11 The implementation methods that accompany this objective include the requirement to consider applications in accordance with Part 3B of the Conservation Act 1987, that concession operations will be monitored, and that conditions will be set in order to maintain the recreation opportunities identified in the area. More specifically the implementation methods<sup>4</sup> seek to ensure that concession operations will be kept at levels that do not detract from other visitors use and enjoyment and that this may mean limiting the number of commercial operators in some areas, particularly where opportunities being provided are toward the remote/wilderness end of the spectrum.

3.12 Methods<sup>5</sup> also seek that conditions in relevant concession arrangements, covering party size and access, will be set to maintain the recreational opportunities identified in each area. This goes on to say that “generally, party size for guided operations are restricted to overnight parties of 12, except in areas except in areas being managed for remote/wilderness recreational opportunities where the limit is 6”.

---

<sup>4</sup> Implementation 5 – page 125

<sup>5</sup> Implementation 8 – page 125

- 3.13 The definitions attached to the CMS refer to the implementation methods or provisions as:

*Specific statements on how objectives are to be achieved*<sup>6</sup>.

- 3.14 In my view this implementation method seeks to give effect to objective 1 which is set out above. The monorail proposal is considered to be consistent with the recreational opportunities identified within the Te Anau Basin landscape unit. The general guide to party size restrictions in implementation method 8 is not relevant in my opinion. This is discussed in further detail below.
- 3.15 Section 6.20 of the CMS refers to the Te Anau Basin, which as noted above encapsulates the majority of the monorail proposed route, and is therefore of particular relevance. Under the heading Resource and Estate Use, section 6.20 includes specific reference to the monorail proposal. The accompanying objective<sup>7</sup> seeks to ensure that any proposal for a monorail (or similar activities) avoids damaging important natural values including landscape features in this unit (Te Anau Basin); and that any proposed route through Snowdon Forest is fully assessed for its effects on the existing back country walk in and/or remote recreation opportunities of that area.
- 3.16 The CMS also recognises that mountain biking in specified back country areas should be allowed, where they are compatible with the protection of natural values<sup>8</sup>. The mountain bike track is not, in my opinion incompatible with the natural values of the surrounding area and has the potential to create an important off-road cycling experience for domestic and international cyclists.
- 3.17 Implementation methods to achieve the recreational objectives are also contained in the CMS<sup>9</sup>. These seek to ensure that tramping tracks to Kiwi Burn and Army Huts are maintained, and acknowledges that changes to the location of the Kiwi Burn track and hut may need to be considered as a potential mitigation if the monorail proposal proceeds. The retention of the Kiwi Burn Hut for mountain bikers, and development of an alternative hut for walkers

---

<sup>6</sup> Page 315 of the CMS

<sup>7</sup> Page 307 of the CMS – Objective 3

<sup>8</sup> Objective 2, section 6.20, page 308 of the CMS

<sup>9</sup> Page 309 of the CMS

combined with the relocation of sections of the Kiwi Burn track and Kiwi Burn to Whitestone River walk are proposed as mitigation of the effects of the proposed monorail in these areas. The Recreational Assessment which accompanies the concession application also concludes that no additional facilities are required to service current visitors to the area in order to mitigate the effects of the proposal.

3.18 As an additional implementation method the CMS also states that

*“concessions in the area will be limited to low impact day use, excluding weekends and statutory holidays. Party size will be a maximum of 12 in the valleys and seven on the more remote ranges of the Snowdon Mountains”<sup>10</sup>.*

3.19 This method goes on to state that this area is shown on the accompanying map<sup>11</sup>. It is then confirmed that

*“the specific restrictions on weekend and statutory holiday use, and on party sizes do not apply to other lands administered by the department outside of the Snowdon mountains in this Landscape Unit”.*

3.20 The relevant map of the CMS (page 310) identifies an area referred to as the Central Snowdon Remote Area. Although there is some differences in terminology (Central Snowdon Remote Area versus Snowdon Mountains), it is my view that the implementation method referred to above only applies to this area shown on the map. I say this because the relevant objective, in which this implementation method relates to, seeks that:

3. *To provide and maintain the central Snowdon Forest area as a remote area with opportunities for low impact recreation remote from high use areas and extensive facilities. An area for which access is not too difficult, but users are required to be self reliant.*

*[my emphasis added]*

3.21 As set out in the Recreational Assessment that accompanies the concession application (Appendix L), this remote area has been determined using the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum (ROS). The ROS assessment undertaken as

---

<sup>10</sup> Implementation 9 – page 309

<sup>11</sup> Page 310 of the CMS

part of this assessment also confirms the extent of the Central Snowdon Remote Area which is shown on Figures 6 and 7 of that report (page 30). The proposed monorail route has been designed so that it sits **outside** this Central Snowdon Remote Area. In my view the abovementioned implementation method relating to party size and the corresponding objective are therefore not relevant to this proposal.

- 3.22 The relevant objective in which to assess this proposal is therefore Objective 4 within section 6.20 of the CMS which states that:

*To provide opportunities outside of central Snowdon Forest for visitors to enjoy backcountry areas which offer day and overnight recreation opportunities.*

- 3.23 The Recreational Assessment confirms that the area affected by the proposal is classified in terms of the ROS analysis as “Back Country Walk In or Drive In”. There are no limits on party size in these areas as they are situated outside the Central Snowdon Remote Area referred to above. The Recreational Assessment confirms that although the existing backcountry experience of “walk in” will be altered to “drive in” along the monorail route, the monorail will provide a new recreational opportunity, and any adverse effects on the existing experience can be mitigated via relocation of existing tracks and huts, and will not be significant elsewhere. In my view this is not considered to be inconsistent with the relevant objective set out in paragraph 3.22 above.

- 3.24 The CMS also contains a number of objectives and implementation methods relating to ecology. The CMS identifies that one of the highest priorities for species management is the protection of habitats<sup>12</sup>. The CMS regards red tussock grasslands on alluvial plains, particularly in northern Southland, as a distinguishing feature of the region<sup>13</sup>. There are limited areas of red tussock protected in the region, with less than 2000ha in lowland Southland. Beech forest is the most extensive type of native forest in Southland, with the major areas being northern and western Southland and Fiordland<sup>14</sup>. Beech forest is thought to be still expanding its range as part of the recovery from glaciation. Silver beech is the most widespread species of beech. Red beech forest is

---

<sup>12</sup> Page 67 of the CMS

<sup>13</sup> Page 23 of the CMS

<sup>14</sup> Page 24 of the CMS



found in eastern Fiordland and throughout northern Southland. Mountain beech dominates drier parts of Fiordland, particularly Hope Arm of Lake Manapouri and extends into northern and western Southland<sup>15</sup>.

- 3.25 The overall goal for ecosystem management given in the CMS is to protect Mainland Southland/West Otago's natural biodiversity and vitality<sup>16</sup>.
- 3.26 The CMS states that generally there is adequate protection of representative ecosystems in the Te Anau Basin landscape unit with two exceptions: podocarp forest, such as that at Lynwood Bush, and bog pine shrublands<sup>17</sup>. The ecological objectives specific to the Te Anau Basin unit recognise the lack of protection for these habitat types and seek to give priority to protecting bog pine communities and wetlands in this unit. Weeds are recognised as a threat to extensive, largely natural areas like Snowdon Forest and the Department seeks to control levels of weed infestations in forest and shrublands and control and eradicate, where practicable, levels of infestations of significant pest plants along high-use areas and areas of high landscape value<sup>18</sup>. The CMS identifies Snowdon Forest as an ecosystem of international importance, but considers that the area is only of "regional importance" for species distribution.
- 3.27 The large growth in visitor numbers within environmental constraints is recognised as a challenge within the CMS and the potential for a monorail proposal is explicitly mentioned<sup>19</sup>. The effects of any monorail proposal on the ecology of the area are not considered within the CMS document but it is recognised that the provision of such a facility would have a significant influence on the future recreational use of the surrounding area and significantly alter how affected areas would be managed. The ecological assessment that accompanied the application addressed these issues.
- 3.28 As outlined above the proposal also affects Snowdon Forest, which falls within the Te Wahipounamu (South-West New Zealand) World Heritage Area. In 1972 the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) adopted the international "Convention Concerning the Protection of the World

---

<sup>15</sup> Page 20 of the CMS

<sup>16</sup> Objective 2, section 2.3.1.4, page 51 of the CMS

<sup>17</sup> Page 305 of the CMS

<sup>18</sup> Objectives 1 – 7 of the CMS, page 306

<sup>19</sup> Objective 3, section 6.20, page 307 of the CMS

Cultural and Natural Heritage”. This seeks to protect natural heritage of outstanding value which is included on a World Heritage List. Sites are selected based on the area meeting at least one of four natural or six cultural selection criteria. There are three World Heritage Areas in New Zealand, Te Wahipounamu – South West New Zealand, Tongariro National Park and the New Zealand Sub-Antarctic Islands.

3.29 The objectives of the CMS seek to maintain the ecological and landscape integrity of the Te Wahipounamu World Heritage Area<sup>20</sup>, and to develop a coordinated approach to the management and servicing of visitors to the Te Wahipounamu Works Heritage Area<sup>21</sup>. The monorail clearly has a strong visitor management component, considering its potential to delivering a managed, predictable and quality experience with easily prescribed information services.

3.30 Riverstone recognises the importance of the subject area, for both ecological and landscape values. Because of the potential adverse effects expected during the construction of the monorail (in particular) mitigation will be necessary to ensure the overall ecological integrity and landscape values of the area are not lost. Site management during construction is regarded as critically important to maintain that integrity in the face of changes brought about by the construction and operation of the proposed monorail. Provided that this site management is effective and timely the national and international importance of the site can, in my opinion, be expected to be maintained. Monitoring will be implemented to ensure that this is the case.

#### **4. Fiordland National Park Management Plan**

4.1 The Department has produced a management plan for Fiordland National Park (2007) which aims to maintain the ecological and landscape integrity of the South West New Zealand World Heritage Area and to develop a coordinated approach to the management and servicing of visitors to the area. The majority of the monorail and ancillary activities are outside the Fiordland National Park. The proposal does however affect land within the Fiordland National Park at Te Anau Downs where the western terminus is proposed to be located.

---

<sup>20</sup> Objective 1 and 2, section 6.1, page 177 of the CMS

<sup>21</sup> Objective 1 and 2, section 6.1, page 177 of the CMS

4.2 Te Anau Downs is zoned within the management plan as being a 'front country setting'. This management setting is accompanied by the following objectives<sup>22</sup>:

1. *To provide opportunities for predominately passive to mildly active recreation activities with high vehicle accessibility, while protecting other national park values. Key attributes defining front-country include:*
  - (a) *Visitors will be seeking an instant immersion with nature;*
  - (b) *Visitors are likely to be seeking sights with a high scenic or historical interest;*
  - (c) *It will be low risk, with minimal skills required; and*
  - (d) *Visits will often be of a short duration.*
2. *The six front country areas will be managed to allow vehicle-based visitors (i.e. short stop travelers), to experience the Fiordland National Park with safety and without compromising national park values.*
3. *To ensure the roads within these settings continue to provide significant access opportunities into the backcountry and remote settings of the Fiordland National Park;*
4. *To ensure that other facilities do not have an adverse impact on the national park values of the setting or surrounding areas.*

4.3 In my opinion the monorail will create a sense of arrival to the National Park, with the opportunity to educate visitors as to the values of the Park while on route. The monorail will deliver visitors to the National Park in a controlled, timed manner, which will assist the management of potential effects of visitors throughout the National Park and beyond.

4.4 I also note that the proposed location of the monorail terminus at Te Anau Downs is currently leased by the Department for commercial purposes (accommodation, restaurant and bar facilities). On this basis the terminus is not considered to be inconsistent with the existing or current facilities within this area of the National Park.

4.5 Section 5.3.9.6 of the management plan defines the purposes and development options for Te Anau Downs in more detail. This section defines the management zone (front country setting) to include the "hotel and backpacker accommodation, a jetty and other associated infrastructure" at Te Anau Downs. The management plan makes reference to the potential to develop the area as

---

<sup>22</sup> Page 248 of the Fiordland National Park Management Plan (2007);

a transport node. The management plan also contains a number of implementation methods to achieve the objectives for the area.

4.6 Implementation method 3 states that any revision or extensions to existing buildings or structures at Te Anau Downs should be designed and constructed in harmony with the natural amenities of the surrounding landscape, and that where new buildings are proposed these should be developed in accordance with the criteria set out in section 5.3.9.1 of the management plan<sup>23</sup>. Section 5.3.9.1 relates to the siting, design, colour and materials of new or altered buildings. I can confirm that the proposed terminus building at Te Anau Downs will be designed taking into account these criteria. In my opinion the existing facilities located at Te Anau Downs currently have limited aesthetic appeal. The monorail proposal may therefore trigger a refurbishment of the National Park Lodge and its surrounds.

4.7 Implementation method 4 refers to the development of the area as a transport node and provides that:

4. *Should a request be made to further develop this site as a transport node, the following provisions should apply:*
  - a) *Such an activity will only be for the purpose of reducing the perception of congestion and overcrowding at Milford and along the Milford Road (refer to sections 5.3.9.1 and 5.3.9.2); and*
  - b) *The applicant should have to demonstrate that this option has been assessed in terms of a wider transportation analysis for options to Milford as referred to in section 5.3.9.2; and*
  - c) *That this option is the preferable option in terms of point b) above; and*
  - d) *Such an option may provide for the following:*
    - i) *Transport hub for land based vehicular traffic; and*
    - ii) *Provision of a hotel and accommodation facility; and*
    - iii) *Café facilities; and.*
  - e) *Separate facilities for residential activity should not be provided at the site; and*
  - f) *The activity should minimise any adverse effects on those accessing backcountry, remote, or wilderness recreation experiences from this site; and*

---

<sup>23</sup> Page 250/251 of the Fiordland National Park Management Plan

*g) Implementation 3. c) of this section applies<sup>24</sup>.*

4.8 Method 4 is directly relevant to the subject application. The Moriarty report which accompanied the application concludes that the Experience will provide the opportunity for visitors to Milford to arrive throughout the day, thus reducing the current middle of the day congestion that occurs at Milford (Moriarty 2009). It may be that further development of the Te Anau Downs terminus and Fiordland National Park Lodge is appropriate in the future.

4.9 The Greenaway report concludes, that with some re-routing of existing walking tracks, the monorail will not generate significant adverse effects on existing recreation users in the area (Greenway, 2009).

4.10 Section 5.4 of the Fiordland National Park Management Plan relates specifically to concession applications. The Management Plan states that concessions enable wider visitor enjoyment and appreciation of areas managed by the Department. In return for the privilege of a concession, a resource rental is paid to the Crown and operators must provide quality visitor services that are consistent with the natural values and recreational opportunities of the area. The Plan states that overall concession operations should be kept at levels which do not detract from other visitors' use and enjoyment.

4.11 The objectives in regards concession applications in the Fiordland National Park area seek to:

1. *Enable a range of appropriate, high quality commercial visitor services to be provided through the granting of concessions which are compatible with the visitor settings described in this plan and national park values, and which will ensure adverse effects on natural, cultural or historic resources are minimised.*
2. *To grant concessions (including variations to existing concessions) in such a way that their adverse effects can be understood and monitored in the context of other general independent use of Fiordland National Park<sup>25</sup>.*

4.12 The proposal is likely to alter the level of human activity within the vicinity of Te Anau Downs. However, the area is already recognised as a node of activity,

---

<sup>24</sup> Page 251 of the Fiordland National Park Management Plan

<sup>25</sup> Page 253 of the Fiordland National Park Management Plan

and is defined in the Fiordland National Management Plan as a front country setting. Overall it is my view that the proposed terminus will fit within this existing activity setting and will have no more than minor effects on the wider ecological and recreational values that exist within the Fiordland National Park.

4.13 Section 5.7 relates to roading, vehicle use and other transport options. The two objectives within this section aim to:

- maintain the existing road access routes available to visitors within Fiordland National Park<sup>26</sup>, and
- consider the provision of new roading or other land transport links in frontcountry visitor settings only, and then only if they will improve visitor access and enjoyment of Fiordland National Park without impacting significantly on the recreation opportunities and national park values<sup>27</sup>.

4.14 The plan then lists thirteen methods to implement these two objectives. Firstly, I note that the only part of Fiordland National Park the monorail will enter is a frontcountry visitor setting, thus meets the objectives and associated methods in that respect.

4.15 Method 2 states:

*Any proposal for a rail or monorail transport system should demonstrate the necessity for the project and will be required to identify how the proposal will improve the effective management of Fiordland National Park. Any such proposal will require a full assessment of effects. This assessment should detail how the potential adverse effects on the natural, historical and cultural, recreational, landscape and amenity values resulting from the project will be managed. An audit of this assessment to determine whether the effects are either acceptable or can be adequately mitigated should be required. Consideration of such proposals should include full public consultation<sup>28</sup>.*

4.16 This method directly refers to a monorail proposal, which is consistent with what Riverstone has applied for. Within the application, and its associated

---

<sup>26</sup> Objective 1, page 311 of the Fiordland National Park Management Plan

<sup>27</sup> Objective 2, page 311 of the Fiordland National Park Management Plan

<sup>28</sup> Page 312 of the Fiordland National Park Management Plan

appendices, the necessity for the project is demonstrated, and included is a full assessment of environmental effects. All of the matters listed in the method are covered in detail. Once the application was lodged, a full audit process was undertaken by the Department (including using external consultants). This process was completed in May 2010. In most cases this audit confirmed that the level of assessment undertaken was appropriate and there was a significant understanding of the actual or potential effects and mitigation necessary. Where issues were identified these were responded to in detail by Riverstone and/or its advisors. Consultation with the public has also been a key component. In my opinion the Riverstone team and the Department have worked together in a collaborative manner which I consider has resulted in a robust assessment and mitigation package, a thorough Departmental report, and sound draft Concession conditions. This is entirely consistent with what is envisaged in the management plans.

**L Taylor**

**18 May 2012**

# APPENDIX A

## Summary of Recent Project Experience

- Preparation of Assessment of Environmental Effects, including management of a team of specialist inputs for a Concession application from the Department of Conservation for a monorail linking Queenstown and Te Anau Downs.
- Provision of resource management advice, including the preparation of resource consent applications and the management of specialist experts, and the presentation of planning evidence at hearings for various residential, subdivision and commercial activities in Central Otago and the Queenstown Lakes, including Ayrburn, Bendemeer, Damper Bay and Roys Peninsula.
- Commissioner for various discharge permit applications by Invercargill City Council for its stormwater discharges, on behalf of Environment Southland.
- Project managing the process for obtaining Environment Canterbury and Waimakariri District Council resource consents required to develop Pegasus, a new town in Canterbury, including the management of specialist inputs.
- Provision of resource management advice to the Ministry for Environment, including updating the 'RMA Guide' to reflect the 2003 Amendments to the Act.
- Preparation of plan change and s32 report, and presentation of planning evidence at hearing for extension of marina zone and introduction of Mooring Management Areas in Waikawa Bay, Marlborough on behalf of Port Marlborough.
- Assisting the Minister of Corrections to obtain a new designation and regional council resource consents for a Regional Corrections Facility for Otago.
- Sole Hearing Commissioner for water take application for irrigation purposes for Southland Regional Council.
- Preparation of numerous resource consent applications and presentation of planning evidence at the local authority and Environment Court hearing level for the development, upgrade and maintenance of all aspects of Telecom New



Zealand's and Telecom Mobile's telecommunication and radio communication infrastructure throughout the South Island and North Island.

- Preparation of Environment Canterbury resource consents, including management of technical inputs and consultation for Ravenswood, a proposed mixed use development in North Canterbury.
- Ongoing provision of planning advice to the Department of Child Youth and Family Services regarding the resource management requirements for their residential centres and secure facilities throughout the Country.
- Preparation of an application and preparation of evidence for an extension to the Mercure Hotel in Dunedin.
- Preparation of resource consent applications for commercial re-development of heritage buildings in Dunedin
- Assistance to the Marlborough District Council with respect to the preparation of a section 32 report for a Variation to that Council's Coastal Plan to manage the wash effects of shipping in the Marlborough Sounds.
- Assisting the Minister of Social Services and Employment to obtain a new designation and required regional council resource consents for a Youth Justice Residential Centre for Canterbury at a site located near Rolleston.
- Preparation of submissions and further submissions on behalf of TrustPower and provision of evidence to Council hearings on various plan changes and variations nationally.
- Assisting Telecom New Zealand in the preparation of submissions and presentation of planning evidence on emerging district and regional policy in the South and North Islands.